

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

Thursday, January 28, 2021
Community Development Department
Virtual & Telephonic Meeting, 12:00 pm

Members Present: Nathaniel Dye, Travis Arndt, Mandy Cole

Members Absent: Erik Pedersen, Joshua Winchell

Commissioners Present: Paul Voelckers

Staff Present:

Jill Maclean (CDD Director), Alexandra Pierce (CDD Planning Manager), Irene Gallion (Senior Planner), Joseph Meyers (Planner I)

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:12 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. December 17, 2020 Draft Minutes, Title 49 Committee

MOTION: *by Mr. Arndt to approve the December 17, 2020 minutes.*

The motion passed with no objections.

IV. Agenda Topics

A. Parking

Mr. Dye gave a brief overview of the Title 49 parking changes; discussing specific code changes including fee-in-lieu, and potential changes to the parking districts.

Mr. Voelckers asked questions about documents sent and tracked-changes, as well as technology.

Ms. Cole asked about the stated intentions of this revision.

Ms. Maclean stated that multiple developments in the downtown area have failed because of parking related issues. It was intended for downtown, but staff have decided it is more equitable to open it up borough wide.

Mr. Dye stated that it is a “thorn” in development.

Ms. Gallion said that it was done in the context of a specific project; consider global parking. Staff want this narrowly tailored and project agnostic. The Assembly gave direction only to modify code.

Ms. Pierce stated there is an existing parking management plan. Any code modification will have management implications. Staff will need to change parking management in coordination with Parks and Recreation, and other departments.

Ms. Gallion indicated that section 49.40.210 item D is where the discussion should start and started the discussion with joint use parking, suggesting that the Committee and staff go line by line through the code.

Ms. Maclean stated that staff proposed some changes when they were asked to look at the joint use parking regulations. Staff suggests separating joint use by minor and major development; day time and nighttime bifurcation is another way to approach parking code. Joint use will be similar to a shared parking agreement. Staff also suggests adding sections that differentiate weekday from weekend uses, and changing “church” to “house of worship” to be more inclusive.

Mr. Voelckers stated that the changes seemed very rational and would like to look at everything in black and white, final.

Mr. Dye wondered if items A, B, and C were needed, or if they could be removed. He felt that it seems like an arbitrary line is being drawn at 5 P.M, and item D(i) encompasses the desired change.

Mr. Arndt agreed item D(i) should stay and the rest could be removed.

Mr. Arndt asked Ms. Maclean if she foresaw any issues with emphasizing item D(i).

Ms. Maclean stated that she liked the flexibility of it.

Mr. Dye asked whether this should be a standalone process since it is similar to a parking waiver.

Mr. Arndt stated that it sounded similar to a parking waiver and joint use parking feels like a subset of the waiver.

Mr. Dye stated that he does not see it as a subset of the waiver and it helps monetize parking in the right direction.

Ms. Maclean stated that it’s a distinct tool and could be combined with a parking waiver.

Mr. Dye described the flexibility of the tool.

Mr. Voelckers felt that this should have its own process and it is distinct from the waiver process.

Mr. Dye asked if there was anything else on joint use that needed to be discussed at this meeting.

Ms. Gallion reiterated that items A, B, and C would be removed, and language would be cleaned up.

Mr. Arndt asked if staff planned to remove the main heading in item D.

Mr. Dye asked about the breakdown of item D and where it becomes a major vs. minor development.

Ms. Maclean suggested taking information from item D(i) and making a new item A. In response to how major vs. minor development would be determined, she noted that 500 feet is quite a distance and a large radius. It's a minor development, if we have 500 feet as maximum. If more than 500 feet, it should go to the Commission.

Ms. Pierce noted that the 500-foot number was put in place to avoid some of the parking agreements of the past. She suggested putting parameters on the radius.

Mr. Dye noted that the discussion had moved onto the next section.

Ms. Gallion stated that section B brings about the issue of lists; it was meant to be beneficial for applicants, but it would be best to be consistent.

Mr. Arndt expressed support for removing the list, suggesting that it be on a flyer, not in the code book.

Mr. Dye stated that he had issues with some items on the list, including item 3 fire code and item 5.

Ms. Gallion stated that items 3 and 5 could be removed.

Mr. Dye suggested discussing item 6.

In response to item 6, Mr. Arndt stated that creating compact spaces should not impact the number of spaces provided.

Mr. Voelckers stated that there should be one space size and no differentiation. He suggested letting CDD management tell the Committee what they know about compact parking.

Ms. Maclean stated that compact parking is not in CDD's purview. Item B could simply be used to match the nonconforming language.

Mr. Dye stated that items C and D are fine, but item E should be included everywhere in parking to make sure it's codified.

Mr. Voelckers expressed support for having Item E language in there.

Ms. Cole asked if there is an issue in attaching that language.

Ms. Maclean stated that a joint use agreement is a civil tool that CDD does not enforce.

Ms. Pierce expressed concern about the enforcement mechanism, as well. The mechanics of enforcement would need to be decided; what are the distinctions and are they arbitrary.

Ms. Cole stated that using the language "shall expire" and "may expire" could limit some of the capriciousness of the language.

Ms. Gallion proposed fee-in-lieu be reduced to 60%.

Mr. Dye suggested discussing the text of the document and asked why item 5B was in this section.

Ms. Gallion stated that she would look at moving item 5B to a higher level.

Ms. Maclean asked about item 5B. Until the final boundaries are decided on, there may be some properties only accessible by stairs, so that should be kept in mind.

Mr. Arndt stated if it were in section 200, it would apply to town centers.

Mr. Voelckers recalled that the Committee had discussed linking fee-in-lieu to the Consumer Price Index (CPI), and was surprised to see that the language is still included.

Ms. Gallion stated that this tool would help to keep fees in tandem with the CPI.

Mr. Dye asked if language could be added to re-determine fees every two years.

Mr. Arndt stated that the Committee had discussed setting a number now and adjusting it later. He asked what year the current number was set.

Ms. Maclean stated that fee-in-lieu was around \$10,000 per space and has gone up around \$2,000 over the past few years.

Mr. Voelckers stated that this topic is tricky and arbitrary. One parking space is one fifth the cost of a building. He suggested setting these numbers and allowing them to be changed at another point in the future.

Ms. Cole asked what the requirements are for fee-in-lieu and if it is a one-time payment, or not.

Ms. Maclean said that a developer might need 20 spaces, and they can either provide parking, or pay a fee-in-lieu, or a mixture of both, to get the required number of spaces.

Ms. Cole suggested that developers either get by-right fee-in-lieu or need a determination based on meeting criteria. She believes requirements need to be included in code.

Ms. Maclean asked whether requirements should be added back to this section.

Ms. Cole suggested not adding the requirements to this section, stating that this would help clarify fee-in-lieu as a right.

Mr. Dye stated that item 6A should be one sentence, item B should be \$10,000, and item C should not include fee-in-lieu, so no Temporary Certificate of Occupancy.

Ms. Pierce asked fee-in-lieu should be treated almost as a right; if developers want to pay for 100% of their parking spaces, they should be able to do that, or they can combine tools that need to be evaluated by the Director and the Commission.

Ms. Maclean stated item 6A would be revised and just makes sure they are paying fee-in-lieu.

Mr. Dye felt that loading zones should not be eligible for fee-in-lieu. He stated that reductions and waivers are only for standard parking spaces and not for loading zones or ADA spaces. Mr. Dye asked if item D should be its own section in the numbering scheme.

Ms. Maclean stated that the Law Department would make decisions on this and staff would flag it for them.

Mr. Dye initiated a brief discussion about the map boundaries.

Ms. Maclean asked if more feedback on the map could be provided before the meeting ended.

Mr. Dye took a poll and determined that the Committee preferred a broader map encompassing areas of downtown.

V. Committee Member Comments and Questions

The next meeting was set for February 18, 2021, at 12 P.M.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:33 P.M.