



Legislation Text

File #: 20-713B, Version: 1

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

ACTION REQUESTED:

Pass the ordinance approving a variance to reduce the amount of required off-street parking for the subject property located at 1899 High Grove Lane (Phoenix Closures) - PZC 20-1-031

DEPARTMENT: Transportation, Engineering and Development

SUBMITTED BY: Gabrielle Mattingly, Community Planner

BOARD/COMMISSION REVIEW:

The Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) considered PZC 20-1-031 on June 17, 2020. The PZC voted to approve the request, approved (8,1).

BACKGROUND:

The subject property is zoned I (Industrial District) and is located east of Route 59, south of the BNSF railway with a common address of 1899 High Grove Lane. The approximately 10.4-acre property is comprised of 4 parcels. The subject property is improved with an approximately 115,170 square foot building and an 88-space surface parking lot.

DISCUSSION:

The petitioner is requesting approval of a parking variance in order to remove 11 parking spaces, construct an 16,840-square foot addition and reconfigure the parking lot on the west side of the subject property facing Route 59. Currently, 88 off street parking spaces exist on site. In preparation of the addition and removal of 11 parking spaces, the petitioner has submitted engineering plans, which are currently under review by City staff, for construction of a parking lot with 28 new parking spaces on the east side of the building (total of 116 off-street parking spaces). However, because of the future building addition, parking spaces will be removed and the parking lot will be reconfigured resulting in a total of 105 off-street parking spaces.

The different building uses are identified in the chart below. A total of 253 parking spaces are required on the subject property per Section 6-9-3 (Schedule of Off-Street Parking Requirements) of the Municipal Code. There will be 105 parking spaces on the subject property, resulting in a deficit of 148 parking spaces.

Building Use	Sq. Footage	No. of Spaces Required Per Code	Parking Required
Warehouse	65,000	1	65
Manufacture	43,000	2.5	108
Existing Office	7,170	3.3	24

Proposed Office	16,840	3.3	56
Total Building Size	132,010	Total Parking Required:	253
		Total Parking Provided:	105
		Deficit:	148

The petitioner has submitted a parking study to support the requested parking variance. The study reviewed parking counts for employees over a 31-day period at the subject property. Per the parking study, peak weekday occupancy was 89 vehicles (85% of the future parking lot) and peak weekend occupancy was 11 vehicles (10% of the future parking lot). The study found the 105-space parking lot on the subject property was sufficient to support the current number of employees and provided an excess of 16 spaces during the peak occupancy. The petitioner indicates the proposed addition will not result in an increased number of employees, rather, the addition will be used by the existing number of employees. The petitioner expects to have only a minor increase in the number employees over the next 5 years with an expected 5-10 additional employees.

In addition, the petitioner has provided a theoretical site population to account for the number of daily visitors over a 153-day period. The analysis found the maximum visitor count is 12, for a total of 101 vehicles on site during the peak employee count leaving 4 available parking spaces on site. The petitioner noted the maximum visitor count of 12 occurs very infrequently with 90% of the days having less than 7 visitors.

The future addition and parking lot reconfiguration will require submittal of permits subject to review by City staff. The petitioner's responses to the Standards for Granting a Variance can be found in the attachments. Staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission have reviewed the findings and recommend their adoption by the City Council.

Condition of Ordinance Approval

If the City's Zoning Administrator determines that the tenants parking needs cannot be accommodated within the parking on the subject property, the owner shall take adequate measures to meet the parking needs of said tenant, including but not limited to formally assigning/reserving parking spaces for each employee, constructing additional parking spaces, or establishing an overflow parking location off-site, as necessary, which shall be subject to the review and approval of the Zoning Administrator. Failure to timely take adequate measures to adequately accommodate tenant parking needs may result in the City's revocation of the parking variance. This has been included as a condition of approval in the ordinance.

Planning and Zoning Commission

The PZC opened the public hearing for case 20-1-031 on June 17, 2020 and voted to approve the variance request (approved 8,1). The dissenting vote was cast by Commissioner Bansal. Commissioner Bansal expressed concern with the variance request finding the number of parking spaces provided on site to be significantly lower than the required number of parking spaces as required by code. Commissioner Margulies suggested that the parking variance approval be specific to Phoenix Closures and expire if a new user were to occupy the site, staff stated this could be included as an additional condition in the ordinance. Commissioner Bansal was in support of the proposed language; however, Chairman Hanson was not in support finding the language to be too restrictive and could create issues to the future sale of the site. Commissioner Habel and Chairman

Hanson both found the existing condition provided by staff to suffice. Following discussion, the PZC voted on the variance request as presented and did not add any additional conditions regarding its applicability to only Phoenix Closures. No members of the public spoke on the request.

Key Takeaways

- The petitioner requests approval of a parking variance to reduce the amount of required off-street parking for the subject property located at 1899 High Grove Lane from 253 parking spaces to 105 parking spaces. Staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission are in support of the proposed variance.

FISCAL IMPACT:

N/A