

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

Thursday, April 1, 2021
Community Development Department
Virtual & Telephonic Meeting, 12:00 pm

Members Present: Nathaniel Dye, Travis Arndt, Mandy Cole, Joshua Winchell, Erik Pedersen

Members Absent: None

Commissioners Present: None

Staff Present: Jill Maclean (CDD Director), Alexandra Pierce (CDD Planning Manager), Irene Gallion (CDD Senior Planner)

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:01 P.M.

II. Approval of Agenda

MOTION: *by Ms. Cole to approve the agenda.*

The motion passed with no objections.

III. Approval of Minutes

A. January 28, 2021 Draft Minutes, Title 49 Committee

MOTION: *by Mr. Arndt to approve the January 28, 2021 minutes, with minor corrections.*

The motion passed with no objections.

IV. Agenda Topics

A. Parking

Ms. Gallion gave a brief overview of the materials for the meeting, noting that it would be best for the Committee to start with the Parking and Loading reorganization document.

Mr. Dye suggested going through the document page by page, and asked for comments starting with page 1.

Mr. Arndt stated that he agreed with the changes on page 1, but asked if the material applied to all of the parking spots. He asked if the off-street parking information could be removed, so that everything would be all-inclusive.

Ms. Gallion replied that this information had been directly moved from another piece of text. However, she didn't see any issues with applying it to everything.

Mr. Dye suggested referencing the entirety of the chapter, to make things more clear. He asked if anyone else had comments on page 1.

Referencing line 28 of page 1, Ms. Cole noted that Joint Use is discussed in waivers. She feels they are different; however, they don't necessarily read differently, and it is hard to tell the difference with the suggested language.

Mr. Dye thought it might be good to reference the parking calculations table in this section to make it discernible.

Ms. Gallion stated this could be done.

Referencing the Expansion or Change in Use section, Mr. Pedersen asked if this material came from existing code or if it was new.

Ms. Gallion replied that the last line was in a different section, but it seemed to fit well in this section, so it was moved.

Mr. Pedersen felt that the whole section could use some work, but specifically, he would like to see the "increase" and "intensity" language changed.

Ms. Gallion stated that this language was added to clarify that the new requirement will only be applied to space added to an already existing unit.

Mr. Pedersen understood this, and didn't want the intent of the section to change, but still felt that more work was needed.

Mr. Winchell asked Mr. Pedersen to elaborate more on what he felt should be changed.

Mr. Pedersen replied that he felt the term "intensity" didn't give a clear representation of what is intended.

Mr. Dye stated that "intensity" here means if you have a change in use that requires an increase in need for more parking, then it goes with that.

Mr. Winchell spoke in favor of using that language, and asked Staff if that was possible.

Staff stated they could change "intensity" to "change of use".

Mr. Dye moved forward to line 37 of page 2. He noted that it didn't mention triplexes, and asked if they should be included.

Ms. Gallion stated that triplexes were incorporated as multi-family and that information was farther down in the document.

Mr. Dye asked how a triplex can offset the parking, but a duplex cannot.

Ms. Gallion stated that a line had to be drawn somewhere, and this is where it was drawn in existing code.

Ms. Cole spoke in favor of keeping everything consistent.

Mr. Arndt agreed, noting that since this came from existing code, most people are familiar with it and understand.

Mr. Dye agreed, but wanted to make sure that the true intent was being shown.

Ms. Gallion stated that the intent is that parking is within 100 feet on the same lot, or a different lot.

Mr. Pedersen noted that there could be something with the multi-family developments. A lot of time, they are made up with multiple lots.

Mr. Dye thought it would be good to clarify this information. He asked if anyone else had comments for page 2, there were no further comments for page 2.

Mr. Arndt moved forward to line 54 of page 5, at the top of the table. He thought the heading didn't quite fit the table, and thought calling the loading spaces "facility" loading spaces were be more inclusive and fit better.

Mr. Dye agreed. He recalled discussing moving the new parking districts under modifications and reductions, noting that the percentage would be automatic, and then the reduction would be given.

Mr. Arndt understood Mr. Dye's suggestion, but felt that it is better to have the information for reductions under a heading of "reduction" rather than elsewhere.

Mr. Dye agreed. He asked if anyone had comments for page 6. Referencing line 59 of page 6, he asked if it wasn't a reduction per say, as one would not be required to expand over a certain percentage.

Ms. Cole felt that expansions should fall under modifications, not reductions.

Mr. Dye agreed and asked for Staff's thoughts.

Ms. Gallion replied that she could see it falling under either category.

Mr. Pedersen suggested moving the information to fall under the change in use section, or back up into the paragraph lines 19-24.

Mr. Winchell felt that reductions, especially for parking, would need clear definitions and stand-alone procedures. He thought it best that it have its own section to provide clarification, because the CBJ may be hit more often than not with waivers on reductions.

Mr. Arndt spoke in favor of moving the expansion section.

Ms. Maclean noted that there are two different sections discussing expansions, and this section used to, or currently is, called "Exceptions". She felt it would be helpful to change the name to "Modifications" or something similar.

Mr. Dye agreed, noting that the intent is to help clarify that language and clarify the trigger point. Staff agreed and Ms. Gallion stated she would work on the section title, and combine everything to one spot at the beginning.

Mr. Arndt asked for clarification on lines 68-71, asking if it came from code, or if it was new.

Ms. Maclean stated that this section needed some edits and clarification.

Mr. Dye agreed and suggested that lines 62-71 be moved to the Joint Use section, and should be listed twice: once for public and once for private. Mr. Arndt and Staff agreed.

Ms. Maclean noted that line 64 should be changed to say “determined by Director”, rather than the whole department. Mr. Arndt stated the same change should be made in line 70, as well.

Mr. Dye asked if anyone had further comments on page 6 or 7. The Committee and Staff discussed some small language changes including using the term “bicycle” instead of “bike”.

Mr. Arndt asked if the comments on off-site improvements had been incorporated into this new version.

Mr. Gallion stated that they had been incorporated, but were not made as obvious. She asked if the Committee would like to see this again at Title 49 with the newly incorporated edits, or if they would like to send it to the Planning Commission for a Regular meeting or a Committee of the Whole meeting.

After some deliberation, the Committee and Staff decided this would be sent to the Planning Commission for a Regular meeting, allowing for public input, and then it would be sent to the Law Department for finalization.

Mr. Dye asked if Staff had a date in mind for the next Title 49 meeting.

Staff replied that they did not have a date set, yet, and would work with the Committee to schedule the next meeting.

V. Committee Member Comments and Questions

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 P.M.