MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
April 25, 2016

The regular meeting of the Mission Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Mike Lee at 7:00 PM Monday, April 25, 2016. Members also present: Scott Babcock, Robin Dukelow, Stuart Braden, Dana Buford, Brad Davidson and Frank Bruce. Also in attendance: Danielle Murray,City Planner.

Approval of minutes from the January 25, 2016 meeting

Ms. Dukelow moved and Mr. Braden seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the January 25th meeting. The vote was taken (7-0). The **motion carried**.

Case #15-13 Final Site Plan – The Bar – 6101 Johnson Drive

Ms. Murray: This is a final site plan for an addition to The Bar at 6101 Johnson Drive. They came to us in 2015 with a proposal to add a second story on the building. They originally submitted that as an idea, but decided not to go that route. So, before you today is an addition to the west side of the building. When they initially came to us with a proposal for a second floor, we asked them to submit a parking study. We know that this use generates more traffic than what was there before which was a gas station that ceased to provide gas and was simply a service station. It did not have a lot of traffic. So, we were curious if they were going to double their square footage with a second floor addition, what impact that would have on traffic or parking. Even after the scope of the project was changed to a smaller addition, we still said we were interested in having them do a parking study. It was performed by their engineers and reviewed by our engineers, and the memo that is in your packet is from the City's traffic engineer.

The subject property is in the Main Street District 1, which is a downtown zoning district. Included in your packet is a picture of what the use looked like prior to its purchase and renovation by the current property owners in 2014. At the time they renovated the building and opened it as The Bar, they did a very minor renovation to it, basically converting some of the overhead service doors to roll-up doors for their outdoor seating and patio areas. Staff reviewed those changes at that time without bringing them to the Planning Commission since they weren't changing the square footage of the building or the exterior facade in a significant way. They were also using materials that matched an existing building.

Tonight, because the proposed project is an addition, we're bringing it to the Planning Commission for review. The expansion is about 531 square feet interior space, and an outdoor patio that is adjacent, which is another 265 square feet. They are still going to be using materials that match the existing materials on the building, which is brick and metal siding, and a metal roofing component as well.

The City's traffic engineer reviewed their parking generation for the site. Basically, because they're in the MS-1 zoning district, there is no required parking on site. They do have on-site parking of about 29 on-site stalls in their parking lot. They are actually not required to have any of those, but they took the service area where the gas pumps were and converted that to a parking area when they originally opened in 2014. The parking study shows that most of the

time, those spaces are more than enough to accommodate the parking that they generate. We had them look at nighttime hours, the peak dinner rush, and sports events. We had them look at how much parking those hours of operation generated, and how much demand for additional parking the expansion would add to that. Also, to look at how much the parking along Johnson Drive – which is public parking – is utilized, to see if the MS zoning district was working like we hoped it would work, which is that people would use and share all that parking, and businesses would have different hours of operation, so it could function that way. The study showed that many of the businesses in that neighborhood are not open past three-five o'clock in the evening, so demand for those parking stalls by those businesses goes down at about the same time that the dinner hour and sports hour use for this particular use goes up. The traffic engineer did a count of the parking use in that area every 15 minutes and wrote down license plate numbers to see how long a car was parked in each individual stall. And it looks like there's generally only 30 or 40 percent of the stalls being used along Johnson Drive so, there is plenty of parking available. So, there really is no parking problem in the neighborhood.

We do know that a lot of people park in the vacant parking lot of the adjacent office building. Someday that will redevelop and it's possible that that parking will no longer be available for this user. This was also considered. Even if that office parking lot, which has about 170 stalls in it, if that were someday gated and private and not accessible, there still would be sufficient parking on site and in the immediate block around the establishment.

Also in your packet is an analysis of the building design. The subject property is in the Johnson Drive corridor, so it is subject to the Johnson Drive design guidelines. As usual, I pulled out and highlighted the relevant sections from design review. I thought the most relevant were regarding parking, the building facades, building materials, the roof, display windows, and awnings and canopies. Staff doesn't see anything of concern in the design. Obviously, it's an expansion of an existing architectural style, and they're just continuing that on with the addition.

Included in the staff report are the findings of fact for consideration of final site plans. Since the proposed project builds off of an already an existing development, a lot of these don't really apply. Staff does recommend approval of the final site plan. That concludes staff's report.

Chairman Lee: Thank you. Would the applicant like to step forward?

Nick Ewing, Sullivan Palmer Architects, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Ewing: We are the architects for the addition. Like Danielle said, we're going to match the materials around the building, put in a new overhead door that will match the existing. It's got lots of good glazing on the façade. I brought some sample materials. It's the same brick that's going to match the existing. Same metal shingles. It will all match. Metal siding on the sides and the back. Any questions?

Chairman Lee: Any questions of the applicant?

Ms. Dukelow: I do have a question. When I look at that elevation, where is the walk-in cooler?

Mr. Ewing: It's actually in the back, right there.

Ms. Dukelow: Is it currently part of the plan to cover part of that walk-in cooler with the standing seam metal siding to match the building? Do you want to change the walk-in cooler's orientation?

Mr. Ewing: It's actually painted the same color to match the siding.

Ms. Dukelow: Regarding the trash enclosure and accessibility, are there any plans to reorient or re-screen the trash and grease receptacles?

Mr. Ewing: The grease receptacle?

Ms. Dukelow: Does it have a grease bin, where they dump the grease at night? For collection? It sits outside the trash enclosure.

Mr. Ewing: Okay. Well, they have the grease interceptors here. I don't know anything about a grease receptacle. But the trash receptacle, the trucks would back up here, [*inaudible*] goes forward. This is the way we discussed with our client, to where the truck can actually lift it up.

Ms. Dukelow: You all have to manually roll it out?

Mr. Ewing: I'm not sure.

Unidentified: Yeah, we have a trash service that will come and manually roll it out. There are no plans to change the orientation of it.

Ms. Dukelow: And current trash enclosure material is a wood fence? Is that accurate?

Mr. Ewing: I believe it is.

Mr. Davidson: I have a question, probably more for Danielle. There's a 13 foot dimension from the west side of the building to – Is that the property line, or is that - ?

Ms. Murray: Probably the property line.

Mr. Davidson: Is that 13 feet or 13 inches? Because I saw – It's 13 inches, I think. And it was to a line that was kind of designated as, I thought it was the property line. I just wanted to make sure that engineering has looked at this, that it follows the proper setbacks.

Ms. Murray: Yes, it definitely meets the zoning requirements for setbacks. The follow-up question would be is there proper fire separation from adjacent buildings - If buildings do eventually get much closer to each other than they are now. That's all handled by the building code when we review the plans for how they're going to actually construct it. .

Mr. Ewing: Yeah, there is 13 inches between the addition and the property line, so we know that there may need to be a fire-rated wall.

Mr. Braden: Not that it's pertinent to our review, but the addition, is it just more table area? I'm not seeing tables in there. Is it more dining area?

Mr. Ewing: Yes, there will be some tables. We just didn't have the furniture layout.

Mr. Braden: It's actually a dining area, and then there's a restroom in the back of it, right?

Mr. Ewing: Yes. The total square footage is 753 square feet, and [*inaudible*] that's only the restaurant and dining area. There's going to be a storage closet, a closet for the new fire lines when they come into the building, and the restroom back there, as well. They're also going to extend the patio, as well, on the addition there.

Ms. Dukelow: I have a question for staff. What are the requirements for trash enclosures in this district?

Ms. Murray: They do need to be screened. We ask that they be of a material that is harmonious or compatible with the building. I believe at the time that they reopened this as The Bar, it had already been screened with a wood fence. We just asked that they make sure that that was in good shape – replace any boards that might be missing, make sure the doors close and function properly. We did not have them construct a new trash enclosure at that time.

Mr. Babcock: Is that the appropriate materials, or should it be brick like the building?

Ms. Murray: It depends. We would consider a brick or metal as probably higher quality because they ultimately require less maintenance. But, we have other wood screening of trash enclosures elsewhere, and it's really fairly well out of sight from the main streets of Johnson Drive, or even Beverly. It's a quality question.

Mr. Davidson: A question for staff. I can't remember where I heard this, but someone I remember said something about, they wouldn't let their daughter go down to The Bar because of the lighting.

Mr. Babcock: That was me.

Mr. Davidson: Oh, I thought it might have been Scott. Anyway, to Danielle. I guess offsite parking generally funnels down Beverly, probably back to the south, is maybe where a lot of that off site parking is done when Johnson Drive is filled up. So, my question would be: Is the city street lighting adequate for cars parking, in a nighttime parking situation?

Ms. Murray: That's a good question, and I'm not sure we've ever studied the lighting levels from the City's perspective on that street because the only maintenance we've done to it is mill and overlay. We haven't done any kind of full-depth reconstruction projects in the area where we would normally look at other facilities along the street, like street lighting or stormwater drainage, etc. That's a good question.

Mr. Davidson: Correct. What I'm saying is, we have these special adds or additions to development, or whatever, is to look at each one, just to make sure that there's adequate lighting. That was Scott that said that, so, for whatever that is worth.

Chairman Lee: I know we have parking to the south of their lot, but we don't have on-street parking on Beverly, do we?

Ms. Murray: Actually, it is allowed on Beverly, yes. There's not a lot of frontage there, and I think the average allotment for a parallel parking stall is 20 to 25 feet, so you don't get a whole lot of stalls when you count that way. But it is possible, yes. Where there isn't a driveway.

Mr. Babcock: Once the beauty shop is closed, I think there's parking to the east. There's also a lot of parking across the street to the north. I typically park there.

Mr. Davidson: What time does the facility close down?

Mr. Ewing: I think 1:30 a.m. is the latest. [*Inaudible*] shows some light poles along Beverly. There's actually one by our drive. I'm not sure if [*inaudible*] remove the fence.

Mr. Babcock: The issue is that with these new street lights, they kind of limit the ambient lighting to just down the sidewalk. But the business sits back just enough that, there was actually – It wasn't my daughter, but I had overheard some women talking about not wanting to go there because the light in the parking lot was not good. Especially when you went around the east side of the building, farther away from the street. They felt like it was darker and wasn't real safe.

Mr. Ewing: Obviously, we want [*inaudible*] for patrons, at that time, the morning hours is all, just so we can double check and make sure that that's [*inaudible*].

Mr. Bruce: A question for staff. The parking in front of the beauty shop, across Beverly, are those private parking spots?

Ms. Murray: Those are private parking stalls.

Mr. Bruce: So they can tag those and mark them for beauty shop parking only?

Ms. Murray: Yes. On Beverly, they can.

Mr. Bruce: Okay. Because that was the only business that looked like would be directly impacted by The Bar. Thank you.

Chairman Lee: So, the only thing you would be doing across the south elevation is just the addition on the west side? You're not going to do anything else to the existing?

Mr. Ewing: Right.

Chairman Lee: Since we know that the cooler is not gray and doesn't blend into the building, would you be opposed to doing something to that, to make it less conspicuous?

Mr. Ewing: Absolutely. I appreciate the feedback, also with the lighting. That's an important aspect, and a relatively easy fix, too. So, absolutely we could. We could put some wall patch or something on the building.

Chairman Lee: And I think that's all it needs. As long as it meets the aesthetics. Additional comments or questions?

Ms. Dukelow moved and Mr. Babcock seconded a motion to approve the final site plan for Case #15-13, The Bar addition, with the following conditions:

1) Work with staff to improve the lighting, as appropriate, and
2) Resurface the white walk-in cooler with metal standing seam siding to match the existing.

The vote on the motion was taken, (7-0). **The motion carried**.

Staff Update

Staff provided an update on sign inventory, safe routes to school, and development update.

ADJOURNMENT

With no other agenda items, **a motion was made and seconded to adjourn**. (Vote was unanimous). The **motion carried**. The meeting adjourned at 7:47 P.M.

_____
Mike Lee, Chair

ATTEST:

_____
Danielle Murray, Staff