



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-71-24-7

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| <b>Date of VPC Meeting</b> | August 12, 2024                                    |
| <b>Request From</b>        | P-1 and R-5 RI                                     |
| <b>Request To</b>          | WU Code T5:3                                       |
| <b>Proposal</b>            | Church   |
| <b>Location</b>            | Northeast corner of 9th Avenue and Fillmore Street |
| <b>VPC Recommendation</b>  | Approval, per the staff recommendation             |
| <b>VPC Vote</b>            | 8-2  |

#### **VPC DISCUSSION:**

*Two members of the public registered to speak on this item in opposition.*

#### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

**Anthony Grande**, staff, provided a presentation regarding the proposal, reviewing the surrounding context, policy background, existing and proposed zoning, the proposed development, and the staff recommendation.

#### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

**Martha Baker**, representing the applicant with MoD a+p, provided a presentation about the proposal, reviewing the proposed development including enhancements to comfort and safety to the surrounding area.

**Moazam Khan**, representing the applicant with MoD a+p, described the design features of the proposal, highlighting the use of the Walkable Urban Code and the setback provided to the neighboring residential properties.

**Anthony Cox** with the Mercy Hill Church provided additional information about the church that is looking to occupy the proposed building.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE**

**Vice Chair Gaughan** asked if turf or grass will be incorporated into the development.

**Ms. Baker** replied that the open space area could have grass and possibly some desert landscaping.

**Vice Chair Gaughan** asked for clarification about the driveway on 9th Avenue and whether unused curb cuts will be eliminated. **Ms. Baker** confirmed it will be an exit only driveway on 9th Avenue and that unused curb cuts will be eliminated.

**Committee Member Starks** asked about the parking. **Ms. Baker** replied that the proposed parking meets the zoning requirement and that many church users will be walking to the site.

**Ms. Starks** asked about any feedback from the neighboring property to the east. **Mr. Khan** replied that concerns were about safety, privacy, and parking, noting that the building will be set back from that property line and the parking meets the zoning requirement.

**Committee Member Burns** asked for clarification that the parking is based on the number of seats, noting the building overall is quite large. **Mr. Khan** replied that there are accessory spaces in the building, but the parking is based on the number of seats, which is when there is the greatest parking demand for the site.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

**Mollie McCurdy** introduced herself as a nearby homeowner and spoke in opposition to the proposal, noting that it is a residential neighborhood, that parking will be an issue, and that the applicant had not conducted sufficient outreach to the community.

**Beatrice Moore** introduced herself and spoke in opposition to the proposal, noting that the parking is insufficient for the size of the building, that the church had not been in the neighborhood very long, and that the previous church was demolished for housing that is not affordable.

#### APPLICANT RESPONSE

**Mr. Cox** clarified that food distribution will no longer be done by the church. **Ms. Baker** stated that the other portions of the proposed building are ancillary spaces to the church use, that the parking meets the City's requirement, and that many people walk and bike to the location.

#### COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

**Mr. Burns** asked how many parking spaces are in the current surface parking lot and how that compares to the proposed parking. **Ms. Baker** estimated that it might have around 35 spaces, noting that while the parking will be reduced, the church is not as large as it used to be. **Mr. Cox** added that the church across the street that was sold was a large facility that had uses that are no longer operational. **Mr. Khan** noted that the activities in the accessory spaces are generally not happening at the same time as the worship services.

**Committee Member Sonoskey** asked where the church is meeting now. **Mr. Cox** replied that they meet at the Dauz event venue.

**Mr. Sonoskey** reviewed the history of the rezoning of the former church site across the street, noting that the applicants stated at the time that the new church would be built at this proposed location.

**Committee Member Greenman** stated that churches are allowed in residential districts. **Mr. Grande** confirmed that is the case.

**Vice Chair Gaughan** stated that the church was in the neighborhood before and is allowed in residential zoning.

**Mr. Burns** stated that the WU Code is the desirable zoning for this location.

**Mr. Sonoskey** asked if a variance would come after the rezoning process. **Mr. Grande** noted that no variances have been identified for the proposal, but that if they need any, they would apply for the variance after rezoning approval.

#### **MOTION**

**Nate Sonoskey** made a motion to recommend approval of Z-71-24-7 per the staff recommendation. **Jordan Greenman** seconded the motion.

#### **VOTE**

**8-2;** Motion to recommend approval of Z-71-24-7 per the staff recommendation passed; Committee Members Ban, Burns, Burton, Greenman, Johnson, Sonoskey, Vargas, and Gaughan in favor; Committee Members Nervis and Starks opposed.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:**

None.