Meeting Agenda of the City and Borough of Juneau
Title 49 Committee of the Planning Commission

Thursday, June 24, 2021
Community Development Department
Virtual & Telephonic Meeting, 12:00 P.M.

Members Present: Nathaniel Dye, Mandy Cole, Erik Pedersen,

Members Absent: Travis Arndt, Joshua Winchell

Commissioners Present: None

Staff Present: Jill Maclean (CDD Director), Irene Gallion (CDD Senior Planner), Laurel Christian (CDD Planner), Sherri Layne (CBJ Law)

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:05 P.M.

II. Approval of Agenda

MOTION: *by Mr. Pedersen to approve the agenda as written.*

The motion passed with no objections.

III. Approval of Minutes – None

IV. Agenda Topics

A. Parking

Ms. Gallion explained the packet provided to the Committee. She explained that an outstanding question was ADA. The solution was to add a separate table to the parking section for the downtown area. These would be the standard for various areas rather than a reduction. She clarified that the only way to ensure no ADA was required, is to have no parking requirement. If one space was required, it would need to be ADA.

Ms. Gallion added that the draft incorporated comments from Commissioner Voelckers and staff. She said there should also be a discussion on loading spaces and how many should be required. The draft aims to make loading space requirements more flexible.

Ms. Gallion explained the table. There were three columns for different areas: one for the entire borough, one for geographic area of Juneau and Douglas, and one for the parking district. There would be a separate requirement for each.

Regarding the geographic area of Juneau or Douglas, Mr. Dye asked if this was an amendment.

Ms. Gallion explained there are already reductions for geographic area of Juneau or Douglas in code, so these are not new. The additional column clarifies there is a different standard.

Mr. Dye asked where that is in existing code.

Ms. Gallion said it was in the current parking table and the proposed table clarifies the existing difference and creates a column for the parking district. She then explained the tables and spaces per column and how staff arrived at the number.

Mr. Dye wondered if single-family/duplex/apartments should get a reduction. He thought they should be the same throughout the entire borough for those uses. Two would be required for each dwelling unit and one for an apartment for all in the borough.

Mr. Pedersen said he would be more inclined to have one be required for a single-family and one for an accessory apartment. He asked what Mr. Dye's reasoning was.

Mr. Dye replied that this is the current requirement and he wanted the parking district to be able to be applicable borough-wide later.

Ms. Cole thought it would be confusing to not make a reduction to single-family in the parking district. She added there were a lot of variables and different goals.

Mr. Pedersen wondered if the 60 percent needed to be applied to all uses; if not, they could not evenly apply that to all use types. The 60 percent was a starting point and the Committee would change it for different uses.

Mr. Dye agreed and thought that the 60 percent was the initial reduction and was supposed to be a quick fix, but since the Committee was looking at the table, they could not decide if that actually made sense for those uses.

Ms. Cole preferred requiring one parking space for single-family and per unit of duplex or accessory apartment. She thought there was more balance between what was realistic and the goals of the reduction.

Mr. Dye added that those uses would never need ADA, so it's safer to increase those now and have people ask for a waiver later.

Ms. Gallion clarified that the amount would be two spaces per single-family dwelling, and one for an accessory apartment.

Ms. Cole and Mr. Pedersen wanted it to be one space.

Mr. Dye asked why they couldn't reduce the spaces required for multi-family everywhere. He asked for column 2 to become the numbers in column 1 so there weren't three areas.

Ms. Gallion said staff could try to take the reduction to the full Commission.

Mr. Pedersen agreed with Commissioner Voelckers' comments to reduce the amount of parking required for sobering centers.

Mr. Dye recommended one space per bed in column 1 and one space per 24 beds on column 2. He also asked to add a visitor space.

Ms. Cole added that there would be employees and a staff van. She thought functionally three spaces would be needed. She thought it should be based on employee numbers not number of beds.

Ms. Gallion agreed that sobering centers are usually 24 hours to public transportation might not be an option that is available late at night when the busses stop running.

Mr. Dye asked if the office space requirement could apply for employees.

Ms. Gallion replied that it could, but cautioned that office space might not be a good indicator of staff presence.

Ms. Cole agreed that it wouldn't be characterized as office space typically.

Mr. Dye asked from staff's perspective if office space would apply for a break room.

Ms. Maclean said it could be case dependent.

Mr. Dye said that it would make more sense to round up always and wondered if that could be a premise of the table.

Ms. Cole replied that the math we use is pretty standard and if we want one space, we should say one space.

Mr. Dye replied that he did not want rounding to zero.

Ms. Gallion clarified that one space per 12 beds and one per 14 in the second column.

Ms. Gallion further explained the table and commented on convenience stores. She said that in column 2, there would be more of a reduction than 49.65, which allows reductions for adding certain features.

Ms. Layne said that the standards needed to be clear in how the Committee wanted to do it.

Ms. Gallion replied then that the Committee had some latitude to determine what the reduction should be.

Ms. Layne agreed and said the Committee needed to be clear with their preference.

Mr. Dye clarified that in 49.65, bonuses allow a reduction in parking or other items the applicant requests.

Ms. Gallion agreed there were multiple ways to get a reduction to parking.

Mr. Dye said suggested that the parking section should be struck from 49.65.540. He recommended one per 625 in the first column and one per 650 in the second column. The Committee agreed.

Ms. Gallion discussed additional comments from commissioner Voelckers. She said parking at schools was a question.

Mr. Dye asked staff to reach out to schools to determine whether or not their parking was meeting their needs.

Mr. Pedersen was inclined to leave schools as it is.

Mr. Dye said it should be left as is or the schools should be asked for their preference. He added to reach out to the University of Alaska Southeast, as well.

Ms. Gallion said that staff clarified non-accessible spaces for stacked parking on vehicle repair stations. She also discussed additional comments from Mr. Voelckers on post offices.

Ms. Gallion explained that childcare centers and homes have parking requirements in 49.65, which cannot be varied.

Mr. Dye said that staff should move the parking requirement into the table and the asterisk with a note and remove it from 49.65, but note that it cannot be varied.

Ms. Layne said that was fine as long as the Committee was clear on what they wanted to do.

Ms. Gallion explained there were a number of added items by staff that were run into often. She asked if the Commission was interested in looking at these items.

Mr. Dye asked what was being used for mobile food.

Ms. Gallion said that these are infill development and don't typically require much parking. She said they're taking advantage of where people already are and not attracting new people.

Ms. Cole suggested no change to salon and sports, but noted that food trucks and food was important.

Mr. Dye said that the starting position would be half of what a standard restaurant required for seasonal food and mobile.

Ms. Maclean added that it has been difficult for food trucks to find parking and accommodate parking similar to brick and mortar. She added that they are usually seasonal and temporary.

Mr. Dye said that half the requirement would be one per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area. He asked what is used to measure the square footage.

Ms. Maclean said that the square footage was based on the size of the food truck, or the structure, and added for all the structures on the property. She said the tented areas didn't count, only where you were getting food or drink.

Mr. Dye said staff and the Committee should be thinking about how employees park, not the customer base.

Ms. Cole felt the starting point should be zero.

Mr. Pedersen agreed to zero parking and requiring parking limits where food trucks can be stationed.

Ms. Gallion said the opening position for the parking district could be zero and the half of regular restaurants for the rest of the borough.

Mr. Dye said he thought it should be one per two on-shift employees everywhere and in the parking district would be one per four people. He noted they could still get a parking waiver.

Ms. Gallion said that if parking were required, the space required would need to be ADA, so not for employees.

Mr. Pedersen said that was a problem and supported Ms. Gallion's proposal for zero in the parking district and half restaurants in the rest of the borough.

Mr. Dye agreed. He added concerns for the name "mobile". He wanted clarification on what "mobile" means. He said there was a difference for Bolin trucks parked for a few hours versus something stuck in place, connected to utilities.

Ms. Gallion said she pulled a definition from the state and other communities on what mobile means.

Mr. Dye said that mobile should be zero everywhere. If they come for a night and leave the same day, they don't need parking. He said the definitions should be enforceable. Mobile food vendors could then be zero everywhere.
The Committee agreed.

Ms. Gallion moved forward to loading space requirements. She said that they were based on a percent of square footage.

Mr. Pedersen questioned the table provided to the Committee and asked for what staff wanted from the Committee and if this would just be for downtown. He said that 50 percent looked fine for the downtown area.

Ms. Gallion further explained the table provided in the packet.

Mr. Dye said he didn't want to change what was required for one, but thought the second space should have a much higher threshold.

Ms. Cole asked if 5,000 square feet was okay needing one.

Mr. Dye agreed.

Mr. Pedersen said he didn't agree, because in the downtown area it would almost be impossible to create a loading space. He generally supported Mr. Dye's number, but was also comfortable with staff's recommendation.

Ms. Gallion said that she has never seen a development proposal require two spaces in the downtown area.

Mr. Dye agreed and said there would not be a functional change. He said typical development downtown won't trigger a loading zone. He didn't think there was a need to reduce it downtown.

Mr. Pedersen wondered if a change in use would trigger parking.

Mr. Dye said there was code language that exempted existing buildings from parking requirements downtown.

Mr. Pedersen said that alleviated his concerns.

Ms. Cole asked if is the Commission was comfortable with 7,000 square feet instead of 5,000. She said that was in line with lightening other requirements.

Mr. Dye said that 5,000 square feet was a very large building and it is not reasonable to need one, at least.

Ms. Cole said that she was trying to make it slightly less onerous.

Mr. Pedersen said he supported meeting in the middle at 6,000 square feet.
Mr. Dye agreed to 6,000 square feet and said never require two in the downtown parking district, because it was unlikely to have a building constructed that large anyways.

Ms. Gallion confirmed a 6,000 square-foot floor and getting rid of the second space requirement in the parking district.

B. Office space in Industrial zoning

Ms. Maclean said that a priority of the Assembly was to preserve Industrial zoning for Industrial uses, but also said there needed to be a balance. She said that the Honsinger Pond area next to the airport is zoned Industrial and is prime for uses that are not allowed in Industrial. She said that Note S in the TPU allows office spaces in Industrial only on the Sherwood Lane area and this was not equitable to other landowners in Industrial zoning districts. She thought if it was allowed in one area, it should be allowed in all Industrial zoning districts.

Mr. Dye asked how this weighed with increasing access to Industrial land in Juneau.

Ms. Maclean said that Industrial land is a priority, but she said staff could float this to see if it would be supported since there has been community interest.

Mr. Dye asked if Note S could be deleted and allow Sherwood Lane to become nonconforming, to preserve Industrial land going forward.

Ms. Maclean said that could be an option. She said that limiting uses is not always the highest and best use of land. She noted there is not a huge need for heavy Industrial uses in the borough.

Ms. Cole said that she supported Chair Dye’s suggestion to delete the note. She felt this was a larger conversation that may not be quick; there was a clear problem with the note and said Industrial uses should be a longer discussion.

Mr. Pedersen said that the Honsinger Pond area worked for these uses, but it may not work everywhere that is zoned Industrial. He would more information on how this could change Industrial Boulevard. He also agreed with the Director in that traditional Industrial uses are not in very high demand here. He felt it would be good to have more Commissioners weigh in, but was in general support of the proposal.

Mr. Dye wondered about residential uses in Industrial zones. He thought the long-term solution would be a new subcategory for office space that is tolerant of Industrial activity. He thought the Conditional Use Permit process would help ensure this, but thought there might be a burden on the Commission in the future to determine if uses were complimentary. He didn't want to erode the Industrial area with uses that were not complementary.

Ms. Maclean asked what the next step would be.

Mr. Dye said that staff and the Committee needed to determine where this fit into the priorities. He wanted further conversation on this with the Assembly and staff. He said the Committee supported deleting Note S, but that the Chair would report back on where a new line item in the TPU fits into the workflow.

The Committee agreed.

V. Committee Member Comments and Questions

Ms. Maclean said there was a Committee scheduled for July 1, 2021 at 12 noon to discuss streams.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:26 P.M.