

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

Wednesday, October 19, 2016
Community Development Department, Large Conference Room
3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Members:

Michael Levine, Chair Bill Peters – via phone
Paul Voelckers

Staff (all CDD):

Laura Boyce Jonathan Lange Eric Feldt Jill Maclean
Rob Steedle, Director Bhagavati Braun Beth McKibben, Planning Manager

- I. Call to Order
 3:07
- II. Approval of Agenda
 Approved
- III. Approval of Minutes:
- IV. New Business

1. Proposed CBJ-Wide Parking Waiver

Ms. Maclean gave an overview of the creation of the new ordinance so far:

Most of the public who have voiced their concerns are in favor of having the process be the Director, and appealable to the Planning Commission.

There was a low turn-out at public meetings, some concern from Downtown groups who were satisfied with the answers they received.

The proposed waiver would be for outside of the transit area.

The process would be similar to a De Minimus Variance; neighbor's approval would be needed in writing, there could be a public hearing if neighbors written approval isn't received.

Waivers should run with use and location in all zoning districts.

There would be a variance process for areas with zero parking (eg: homes only accessible by stairs downtown).

Mr. Voelckers - Specify what the Director will consider:

What are the factors?

Availability of alternate parking

Uses

The term “any use” includes housing, in meetings in Downtown Douglas people did not want parking waivers for housing.

Ms. Maclean – these concerns weren’t voiced in other places in the Borough.

Mr. Voelckers – seems reasonable to include housing, but we might encounter some push back.

Mr. Levine – does there have to be a written determination with findings to know what to appeal if that comes forth? – need some determinations for the director to make.

Mr. Levine – will we rely on the director to make reasonable determinations or constrain them for different possible problems – e.g. a large housing development not putting any parking in.

Ms. Maclean – improving sites (with parking waivers) provided there are other improvements.

Mr. Levine – evidence that “reasonably demonstrates” that the parking isn’t fully necessary
Under Recommendation insert “reasonable” before “public amenities”

Mr. Voelckers – happy with criteria

Mr. Levine – from which neighbors would we need written approval?

Should it be a larger group than abutting neighbors? The whole street? Across the street?

Mr. Levine – maybe it should be written that the Community Development Department decides what this is?

Mr. Voelckers – instead of letters of support, and in absence of any protest, active versus passive.
“absent any letters of opposition.”

More thought needed on the term abutting

Mr. Levine – suggested a process in which more people get noticed and either voice support or not protest.

Reasonable number of people who will be affected by this.

Discussion on various ways to address “abutters” and if there needs to be a wider range of input

Mr. Voelckers – a 250 foot buffer is a rational number, Director can add to it if needed.

Ms. Boyce asked if the Committee was ready for the creation of a draft ordinance.

Yes all around

Mr. Voelckers – Would like to see it again before going to the Planning Commission.

Once the ordinance is drafted email it to the committee – if they have an issue we can address it again.

Ms. McKibben – draft ordinance just arrived, we’ll look over it and send it to you.

Ms. Maclean returned with the draft ordinance.

Mr. Voelckers – fee in lieu important issue.

Mr. Levine – prefer we not create hard and fast rules.

Mr. Voelckers – agrees.

Mr. Levine – make a finding, vs meeting lots of specific requirements.

Mr. Voelckers – threshold level for this shouldn’t be hardship – it should be a use not a level of parking that is in the requirements.

Ms. McKibben – there are going to be situations that where lots cannot physically provide parking.

Ms. Maclean – fee in lieu is only in two areas – we aren’t talking about that here.

Ms. McKibben – wants ordinance to have flexibility either with the site or with the use.

The goal is to create flexibility.

Mr. Steedle – create a reasonable person standard. There may be many more circumstances, but requests may be unreasonable.

Mr. Voelckers – love reasonable person standard.

Judgement that there is enough parking it's fine.

No waiver to exacerbate a non-conforming uses.

Ms. McKibben – wants to look further into it – do some research.

Ms. Maclean – majority of applicants will probably be non-conforming – they were built pre-zoning and pre-automobiles.

Mr. Voelckers – adding lot size in here may make it tricky.

Ms. McKibben – nonconforming lot, structure, and use – have to figure out which to address.

2. Auke Bay Plan Implementation – Proposed Code Changes (cont.) 3:36

This was a continuation from an earlier meeting.

Mr. Feldt gave history of these meetings, overview of the town center idea of Auke Bay.

Proposed future roads and buildings helped discussion about the change.

These proposals will require the city to sell the idea to property owners in the area to willingly allow right of ways to reduce their property, to allow further subdivision of their lots.

The challenge is to sell this idea.

The draft ordinance doesn't contain any marketing ideas or push for how the Rights of Way should be designed though some routes are shown in the plan.

Explained some of the Draft Ordinance, what it contains, and what it doesn't contain.

Mr. Voelckers – Concern that nothing in the ordinance gets us to that main street feel.

No active language

Mr. Feldt – draft ordinance – edits in blue are past, edits in red are since the last meeting

Not substantial change

Mr. Lange and Mr. Feldt – gave an overview and opened discussion instead of reading though the ordinance – reline edits are a reflection of this.

Questions were raised about creating a grid structure for the town square.

Ms. McKibben – explained about street creation, proposed street system is a larger thing than just development of a parcel etc. Suggests we focus on the concepts rather than the details.

Greater Auke Bay community (not just steering committee) needs to have some sort of notice prior to the public hearing with the planning commission where we invite the community to learn about the process moving forward.

Public comments will hopefully help inform what we do.

Mr. Voelckers – explain how you view the process of creating this new street system.

Ms. McKibben – Auke Bay plan has been adopted in Comprehensive Plan, it must be consulted.

Mr. Voelckers – Concerned about the lack of “teeth” in the ordinance to create the desired town square grid of streets.

Ms. McKibben – the plan says “we want a grid system” – this will lead us to have us pay attention to it when reviewing changes in the area.

Mr. Levine – Continued concerns on street creation, specifically about zoning.

Ms. McKibben – the map of the area in the Comprehensive Plan would lead to that – could be an amendment to the Auke Bay Plan.

Mr. Voelckers – questions about creating ROW – land swaps

Mr. Feldt – that is possible – happening with Pederson Hill:

Economic viability incentives are an option.

Mr. Voelckers – wants a grid as a “discussional template” – without a cohesive look it may fall apart, or not reach our vision.

Mr. Steedle – the code is not the proper tool – the plan lays out the vision. The real tool is money.

Ms. McKibben – CIP is another tool

Mr. Levine – recommendations on next steps on Auke Bay

Mr. Feldt – only red-line change – view-sheds – only one overlays and impacts private property.

Staff is recommending we remove mapped view-sheds.

Mr. Voelckers – wants to review at home and come back.

Mr. Feldt – Jon and I will go over our revisions and these edits to T49 committee.

Mr. Levine – would like a process to completion – code changes and otherwise; timelines, when and how they will go to full commission etc.

Mr. Voelckers – would like specifics about a mechanism to get a rational grid system.

Mr. Lange – Auke Bay Plan has an implementation chapter – should all review this.

Mr. Levine – wants to have an easy way to explain the ordinance and get through to the larger committee and community without eyes glazing over.

Mr. Steedle – will show the Auke Bay video during directors report of next meeting.

V. Committee Member Comments - none

V. Next Meeting

October 26, 2016, 3 p.m., CDD large conference room

VII. Adjournment: 4:55