

CITY OF PULLMAN  
**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
Special Meeting Minutes  
February 25, 2008

The City of Pullman Board of Adjustment held a special meeting at 7:30 p.m. on Monday, February 25, 2008, in Council Chambers, City Hall, 325 SE Paradise, Pullman, Washington with Chairperson Michael Kallaher presiding.

ROLL CALL:           Present:        Beaumont, Finch, Kallaher, Schoenbachler, Yrazabal  
                  Excused:       Harbour, Smart  
                  Staff:          Dickinson, Johnson

---

KALLAHER                    Opened the meeting at 7:34 p.m. Explained that the meeting was a continuation of the public hearing begun during the January 28, 2008 Special Meeting. Asked Dickinson for an update on the information requested of staff during the first meeting.

DICKINSON                   Entered the memorandum from Mark Workman, dated February 15, 2008, into the record as Exhibit No. 4.  
Entered the memorandum from Jason Radtke, dated February 20, 2008, into the record as Exhibit No. 5.  
Entered the traffic information provided by George Kunkel into the record as Exhibit No. 6.  
Mentioned the proposed revisions to Draft Resolution No. BA-2008-1.  
Reminded the chair that the public information portion of the hearing was closed at the January 28, 2008 meeting, but explained that the Board has the option to re-open public input and to leave it open for any comments related to the hearing or to limit input to a specific topic.

KALLAHER                    Reopened the public input portion of the hearing but limited input to Exhibit 6 as listed above. Called for proponents.

George Kunkel  
315 NW Dillon Street  
Pullman, WA 99163                    Stated that at the end of the January meeting, he felt the Board did not have adequate information regarding traffic. He specifically chose Sunnyside and Jefferson Elementary schools as examples for his traffic analysis because of their locations and limited access. Answered questions regarding standard width of streets with the City. Opined that traffic impact of the church would be minimal.

KALLAHER                    Called for opponents.

Paul Clay  
2360 NW High Point Ct.                Opined that the suggestion of minimal traffic impact was a shocking claim. Provided documentation, using the numbers provided by the

Pullman, WA 99163           proponent, showing calculations for the number of automobile trips per month.

DICKINSON                   Entered the traffic calculation information provided by Paul Clay into the record as Exhibit No. 7.

Paul Clay  
2360 NW High Point Ct.  
Pullman, WA 99163           Stated that he lives within 300 feet of the proposed development. From Exhibit No. 7, he stated that the projected number of vehicle trips per month is 3,200-4,000. Opined that the proposed development is well in excess of the trip information for other comparable churches. Stated that the largest vehicle load for churches within Pullman is going to be in the middle of a residential zone. Opined the neighborhood is not prepared to handle an increase in traffic of 30-40%. Answered questions regarding his assumption of auto traffic; the number of cars entering and leaving schools daily versus church traffic occurring generally on weekends; compared high traffic loads during "rush hour" for vehicle danger versus high traffic loads on weekends increasing the risk to residents who are out enjoying their neighborhood.

DISCUSSION                 The Board discussed that traffic is more controlled and patrolled in school zones. Compared resident foot traffic and vehicle traffic.

Andy Dephtereos  
2350 NW High Point Ct.  
Pullman, WA 99163           Stated that he is more strongly opposed to the development now than he was at the previous meeting. Opined that the traffic studies missed the point regarding the nature of the neighborhood, resident average time spent outside at present versus average time spent outside after traffic increases. Opined that it is important to consider the nature of the neighborhood and compare current standing with the impacts of the development. Opined that during the worst of this most recent winter weather, Robert Street was barely a single lane wide.

Pamela Thoma  
2350 NW High Point Ct.  
Pullman, WA 99163           Stated that her comments were not specifically related to the traffic information, but requested permission to address the proposed changes to Condition No. 2.

KALLAHER                   Allowed Ms. Thoma to speak.

Pamela Thoma  
2350 NW High Point Ct.  
Pullman, WA 99163           Maintained that it was the developer who expressed a concern about the screening plantings; the residents were concerned with the height of the building and the steeple. Requested that the Board either remove the proposed change (allowing the church some flexibility in establishing perimeter landscaping if nearby residents agree), or modify it so that the residents allowed to request a change be limited to those whose property abuts the subject property.

KALLAHER

Asked for response from proponents.

George Stecker  
122 Warren Acres Road  
Yakima, WA 98901

Reminded the Board that part of the discussion in the first meeting was centered on traffic information for a ward in Spokane and the opponents disagreed because the information was not specific to Pullman. Also compared the amount of vehicle trips for the proposed church versus residential development of the subject property. Stated that all property owners in the immediate vicinity of the subject property purchased their land after the church purchased the subject property. Answered questions regarding the number of vehicle trips per residence per day.

KALLAHER

Asked for a response from opponents.

Paul Clay  
2360 NW High Point Ct.  
Pullman, WA 99163

As a purchaser of property in the vicinity approximately two years ago, he was offended by the developer's implication that a purchaser should know what developmental plans another land owner might have for an undeveloped piece of property. Opined that the developer's suggestion that a residential property generates six vehicle trips per house per day is high.

KALLAHER

Asked for a rebuttal from proponents. No response. Closed the public input portion of the hearing.

DISCUSSION

Yrazabal stated that he appreciated the efforts put forth by staff and George Kunkel to provide a traffic analysis. The vehicle numbers provided are not seven days a week, and there are alternating peak periods. Referred to the memorandum from Mark Workman. Stated that he is sympathetic to the traffic situation but opined that the Board received the adequate traffic information they requested in the previous meeting.

Beaumont stated that when he was taking planning courses in college, churches and schools were considered desirable additions to neighborhoods. Opined that the proposed development is neighbor friendly. Accepts the statements of Mark Workman as a solid professional opinion. Opined that the neighborhood in general is not as concerned as the few opponents might lead the Board to believe.

Schoenbachler stated that she appreciated the feedback and Mark Workman's input. She supports churches in Pullman but is concerned about the traffic impact on the neighborhood. Opined that with such a large building and the parking lot with 200 stalls proposed, one must assume that the church hopes for growth. Opined that Robert and Terre View are fast streets and the traffic is not very effectively controlled.

Kallaher stated that he attends church in a residential zone, though not as large as the proposed development, and that he just hasn't seen that much traffic. Agreed with the report from Mark Workman. Stated that he sees no problem with churches in a residential zone, though he neither understood nor saw the need for the 200 parking stalls proposed.

DICKINSON

Proposed a Finding of Fact No. 40 stating, "At the Board of Adjustment public hearing on February 25, 2008, Paul Clay entered into the record a letter, dated February 25, 2008, from Paul and Marnie Clay as Exhibit No. 7; said letter states that the proposed church is inconsistent with applicable Comprehensive Plan policies and traffic generated by the church would impose an unnecessary danger to the residents of the neighborhood."

MOTION

Yrazabal moved to accept Findings of Fact Nos. 1-40 as previously prepared and proposed by staff. Seconded by Beaumont and passed unanimously.

DICKINSON

Pointed out a spelling error in Conclusion No. 6, indicating that the first word on the second line should be "and" versus the "an" and suggested altering Conclusion No. 6 to include Finding of Fact No. 40, so that it would state, "This Board assigns more weight to the information contained in Finding of Fact Nos. 18 and 37 than it does to the information provided in Finding of Fact Nos. 13, 27, 32, and 40, and therefore, this Board believes that the subject use would be located on a site that has sufficient access to streets adequate in width and type of surface to carry the quantity and quality of traffic generated by the proposed use, and the subject use would create no significant traffic impacts on the surrounding area."

MOTION

Yrazabal moved to accept Conclusions Nos. 1-11 as prepared by staff, with the proposed revisions to Conclusion No. 6. Seconded by Finch and passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION

The Board discussed proposed Condition No. 2.

MOTION

Schoenbachler moved to remove the last line of Condition No. 2 so that it would state, "Prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy for the church facility, a minimum six (6) foot high screening device, such as a sight-obscuring fence or wall shall be installed along the northwest, northeast, and southwest property lines of the subject property, with the exception of the area reserved for the driveway to Valley View Drive, and a landscape strip of evergreen trees and/or evergreen shrubs shall be planted within ten (10) horizontal feet of the aforementioned screening device, with said trees and/or shrubs

being a minimum height of eight (8) feet at time of planting and spaced so as to grow together within three (3) years of their planting in a manner sufficient to screen views along the length of the landscape strip. When a fence is used as the aforementioned screening device, said fence shall be composed of wood, vinyl, or other solid material approved by the planning department; a chain link fence with slats may not be used to meet this requirement.”  
Seconded by Yrazabal and passed unanimously.

MOTION

Finch moved to approve Resolution No. BA-2008-1 with Conditions No. 1 and 3 as prepared by staff and Condition No. 2 as previously amended. Yrazabal seconded and passed 4-1 by roll call vote with Schoenbachler opposed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary