TITLE 49 ADVISORY AD HOC COMMITTEE AGENDA

October 28, 2025 at 12:00 PM

Zoom Webinar Only

https://juneau.zoom.us/j/88195824566 +1 253 215 8782 Webinar ID: 881 9582 4566

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT We would like to acknowledge that the City and Borough of Juneau is on Tlingit land and wish to honor the indigenous people of this land. For more than ten thousand years, Alaska Native people have been and continue to be integral to the well-being of our community. We are grateful to be in this place, a part of this community, and to honor the culture, traditions, and resilience of the Tlingit people. Gunalchéesh!

C. ROLL CALL

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **February 13, 2025 Title 49 Advisory Ad Hoc Committee DRAFT Minutes**

F. AGENDA TOPICS

1. **Phase 1 Wave 2 – Ordinance 2025-40 – seeking discussion by the Committee to see if they would like to submit comments to the Assembly before their 15DEC25 meeting.**
2. **Dimensional Standards discussion – staff seeking opinions regarding dimensional standards within existing zone districts**

G. STAFF REPORTS

1. **Title 49 webform comments**

H. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

1. **Open discussion on Title 49 rewrite, including process, public engagement, and specific questions with project staff**

I. NEXT MEETING DATE - TO BE DETERMINED

J. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

K. ADJOURNMENT

ADA accommodations available upon request: Please contact the Clerk's office 36 hours prior to any meeting so arrangements can be made for closed captioning or sign language interpreter services

depending on the meeting format. The Clerk's office telephone number is 586-5278, e-mail: city.clerk@juneau.gov.

TITLE 49 ADVISORY AD HOC COMMITTEE AGENDA

September 24, 2025 at 12:00 PM

Zoom Webinar Only

https://juneau.zoom.us/j/86964237460 or call 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID 869 6423 7460

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Greg Smith called the meeting to order at 12:03pm

B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT – Read by Greg Smith

We would like to acknowledge that the City and Borough of Juneau is on Tlingit land and wish to honor the indigenous people of this land. For more than ten thousand years, Alaska Native people have been and continue to be integral to the well- being of our community. We are grateful to be in this place, a part of this community, and to honor the culture, traditions, and resilience of the Tlingit people. Gunalchéesh!

C. ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present: Greg Smith, Maggie McMillan, Lorraine DeAsis, Corey Baxter, Bill Heumann, Rich Harris

Committee Members Absent: Mandy Cole

Staff/Others Present: Erik Pedersen, Planning Commissioner (Mr. Pedersen represented the Planning Commission in Place of Ms. Cole who is unavailable until December); Rob Dumouchel, Special Project Planning Manager; Breckan Hendricks, Municipal Clerk

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – Approved

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **February 13, 2025 Title 49 Advisory Ad Hoc Committee DRAFT Minutes**
   Minutes approved without objection

F. AGENDA TOPICS

1. **Title 49 Rewrite Status Update – Phase 1 ordinances and Phase 1.5 technical rewrite organization update.**
   Mr. Dumouchel provided a presentation that started with a refresher regarding the Title 49 Rewrite Project and Phase 1 Wave 1 activities. He then discussed Phase 1 Wave 2 which was introduced by the Assembly as Ordinance 2025-40 and covers reasonable accommodation, zoning maps, subdivisions on arterials, and general housekeeping items. He also discussed an upcoming ordinance to remove Chapter 49.65 Article XI – Marijuana Establishments and make related edits to Title 1 – General Provisions and Title 20 – Business Regulations. Mr. Dumouchel then shifted into an overview of Phase 1.5 and the plans for reorganization of Title 49 from a title with 17 top-level chapters, to 5 or 6 top-level articles. Additionally, the reorganization envisions moving subdivisions, platting, and utilities and improvements (currently chapter 49.35) into a separate title. Mr. Dumouchel concluded with a brief overview

of topics he'd like to discuss with the Committee at future meetings to include development incentive programs, dimensional standards, the table of permissible uses, and Chapter 49.35 – Public and Private Improvements.

Chair Smith asked about public process beyond the Planning Commission and the Assembly. Mr. Dumouchel discussed the need to do targeted outreach on specialty portions of Title 49 and that he's looking forward to working with the new CBJ Communications Division to do that work.

Chair Smith asked how the Committee will engage with the Phase 1.5 rewrite as portions of the new code are drafted. Mr. Dumouchel explained that once a drafted portion of Title 49 is completed by the contract attorney, he will review and work through revisions with her and then filter it through the Committee for feedback to drive further revision work. Phase 1.5 won't go to the Assembly in pieces like Phase 1 projects, instead it will go together as one full package because they are so interconnected.

Mr. Heumann asked about the timeframe and when the process would be complete. Mr. Dumouchel indicated that the target for a full draft of the Phase 1.5 rewrite to be completed in early 2026 and ready for the political process of review and approval. Phase 2, Comprehensive Plan alignment, would be dependent on the completion of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Heumann had further questions about the separation between the Comprehensive Plan and Title 49. Mr. Dumouchel highlighted that the Comprehensive Plan sets policy and Title 49 implements. There are many changes to Title 49 that can be made with the current policy guidance, however, changes to things like the locations of zone districts or the creation of new zone districts would need to wait for the Comprehensive Plan to set the policy direction. Mr. Heumann asked if we can make changes before the Comprehensive Plan is adopted based on progress made by that team. Mr. Dumouchel indicated that we could begin to build code elements to implement changes likely to be created by the Comprehensive Plan, but whether the Title 49 amendments could be adopted before the Comprehensive Plan are an Assembly decision.

2. **Phase 1 Wave 2 – Ordinance 2025-40 – seeking discussion by the Committee to see if they would like to submit comments to the Assembly before their 15DEC25 meeting.**

    A) **Ordinance 2025-40 An Ordinance Amending Title 49 Land Use Code Relating to Reasonable Accommodation, Zoning Maps, Subdivisions on Arterials, And Remove References to Committees and Programs No Longer in Existence.** Discussion was pushed to a future meeting.

3. **Sign Code discussion – staff seeking opinions and concerns regarding sign code, signs in Juneau, and prospective stakeholders for future signage-related outreach.**
Mr. Dumouchel gave a brief overview of the complexity of sign code and shared a list of questions for discussion. He indicated that reform of the sign code would likely be part of Phase 1.5 as it is not Comprehensive Plan dependent. The Committee asked clarifying

questions regarding what a sign is for this discussion. Mr. Heumann indicated that he believes there aren't many challenges related to signs in Juneau right now outside of some issues in downtown, including recent issues with signs on sidewalks blocking pedestrian movement. The Committee discussed potential stakeholders and brainstormed sign businesses that would have an interest in any changes to Juneau's sign code. Chair Smith encouraged the Committee to reach out to Mr. Dumouchel if they had thoughts on sign code after the meeting.

G. STAFF REPORTS

1. Title 49 webform comments

Chair Smith pointed out the new format for web comments in the packet.

H. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

1. Open discussion on Title 49 rewrite, including process, public engagement, and specific questions with project staff

I. NEXT MEETING DATE - TO BE DETERMINED

Chair Smith indicated that the next meeting would be sometime after October 21st, probably the last week of October, and that the date would be coordinated via email.

J. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

K. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, meeting adjourned at 1:00pm.

ADA accommodations available upon request: Please contact the Clerk's office 36 hours prior to any meeting so arrangements can be made for closed captioning or sign language interpreter services depending on the meeting format. The Clerk's office telephone number is 586-5278, e-mail: city.clerk@juneau.gov.

DRAFT

City and Borough of Juneau
City & Borough Manager's Office
155 Heritage Way
Juneau, Alaska 99801
Telephone: 586-5240| Facsimile: 586-5385

TO: Ad Hoc Title 49 Rewrite Advisory Committee

FROM: Rob Dumouchel, Special Project Planning Manager

DATE: 28OCT25

RE: Dimensional Standards Discussion

At our meeting on October 28, 2025, we will have an open discussion regarding dimensional standards in each zone district. In Phase 1.5 of the rewrite project, we are not creating new zone districts, or rezoning portions of the Borough, that will be a Phase 2 concern driven by the Comprehensive Plan update. What we can address in Phase 1.5 is whether the current dimensional standards for each zone district remain appropriate for Juneau's current development context. What I'd like Committee members to consider is whether specific dimensional standards within each district could be modified while still maintaining the purpose and intent of the zone district as described in code.

I have attached a document that includes the description of each zone district from Chapter 49.25, Article II – Zoning Districts split into the following categories: Rural Reserve (RR), Single-Family/Low Density Residential (D-1, D-3, D-5, D-10 SF), Multifamily Residential (D-10, D-15, D-18), Mixed-Use (MU, MU2, MU3), Commercial (NC, LC, GC), Waterfront (WC, WI), and Industrial (I). Each category description is followed by a dimensional standards table along with relevant footnotes. If you wish to view the full dimensional standard table, it can be found in Chapter 49.25, Article IV – Dimensional Standards.

Attachments: Zone Descriptions and Dimensional Standards

Zone Descriptions and Dimensional Standards – October 2025

Rural Reserve

Rural Reserve Zone Description (49.25.200)

- The RR, rural reserve zoning district, is intended for lands primarily in public ownership managed for the conservation and development of natural resources and for future community growth. In addition, recreation cabins, lodges and small seasonal recreational facilities may be allowed

Rural Reserve Dimensional Standards

Standard	Zoning District
	RR
Minimum Lot Size[1] (square feet)	
Permissible Uses	36,000
Duplex	54,000
Single-family detached, two dwelling per lot	72,000
Minimum Lot Width (feet)	
Standard	150
Maximum Lot Coverage	
Permissible Uses	10
Conditional Uses	20
Maximum Height (Feet)	
Permissible Uses	45
Accessory	45
Setbacks (Feet)	
Minimum Front Yard[3]	25
Minimum Street Side Yard	17
Minimum Rear Yard[3]	25 [2]
Minimum Side Yard[3]	15 [2]
Density (Units per Acre)	
	Density determined by minimum lot size in section 49.25.400 and special density requirements in section 49.25.510

1. Minimum lot size is existing lot or area shown on chart in square feet. 2. Sixty feet between nonresidential and designated or actual residential site; 80 feet between industrial, extractive and other uses.; 3. Where one district abuts another the greater of the two setbacks is required for both uses on the common property line.

Single-Family/Low Density Residential

Low Density Residential Zone Descriptions (49.25.210 (a) through (d))

- The following districts are established to provide a healthy, safe and pleasant environment for residential living protected from incompatible and disruptive activities:
    - The D-1, residential district, is intended to accommodate primarily single-family and duplex residential development in areas outside the urban service boundary at a density of one dwelling per acre. Certain D-1 zoned land, however, may exist within the urban service boundary in transition areas if public water or sewer are absent but planned for. The D-1 classification will be changes to a higher density upon provision of services.
    - The D-3, residential district, is intended to accommodate primarily single-family and duplex residential development at a density of three dwelling units per acre. D-3 zoned lands are primarily located outside the urban service boundary where public utilities are not provided, the density reflects the existing pattern of development of properties in the district. There is a limited amount of D-3 zones lands located within the urban service boundary. These lands for which a lower density is deemed appropriate or, in the case of transition zones, where the zoning will be changed to a higher density when sewer and water are provided.
    - The D-5, residential district, is intended to accommodate primarily single-family and duplex residential development at a density of five dwelling units per acre. D-5 zoned lands are located in the urban service boundary and are served or can be served by public water and sewer.
    - The D-10 SF, residential district, is intended to accommodate primarily single-family residential development at a density of ten dwelling units per acre. This is the highest-density single-family residential district.

Single-Family/Low Density Residential Dimensional Standards

Standard	Zoning District			
	D-1	D-3	D-5	D-10SF
Minimum Lot Size[1] (square feet)				
Permissible Uses	36,000	12,000	7,000	3,600 [10]
Bungalow[9]		18,000	6,000	3,500
Single-family home attached, two dwellings per lot	54,000	18,000	10,500	
Common Wall Dwelling			7,000	3,600 [10]
Single-family detached, two dwellings per lot	72,000	24,000		
Minimum Lot Width (feet)				
Standard	150	100	70	40
Bungalow	75	50	35	25
Common Wall Dwelling			60	40
Maximum Lot Coverage (%)				
Permissible Uses	10	35	50	50
Conditional Uses	20	35	50	50
Maximum Height (Feet)				
Permissible Uses	35	35	35	35
Accessory	25	25	25	25
Bungalow	25	25	25	25
Setbacks (Feet)				
Minimum Front Yard[3]	25	25	25	20 [10]
Minimum Street Side Yard	17	17	13	10
Minimum Rear Yard[3]	25	25	20	10
Minimum Side Yard[3]	15	10	5	3
Common Wall Dwelling			10 [6]	3
Minimum Vegetative Cover (% of lot)				
	20	20	20	15
Density (Units per Acre)				
	1	3	5	10

1. Minimum lot size is existing lot or area shown on chart in square feet. 3. Where one district abuts another the greater of the two setbacks is required for both uses on the common property line. 6. Zero-foot setback for the portion of the dwelling with a common wall, five-foot setback or five-foot wide easement for the portion of the dwelling at the common lot line without a common wall, and five-foot setback for the remaining size yards of the lot. 9. Special restrictions apply to construction on bungalow lots. See special use provisions 49.65.600. 10. For lots adjacent to an alley, the following reductions to the dimensional standards apply: (a) minimal lot area includes 50% of adjacent alley; (b) reserved; (c) minimum front yard setback of ten feet.

Multifamily

Multifamily Residential Zone Descriptions (49.25.210 (e) & (f))

- The following districts are established to provide a healthy, safe and pleasant environment for residential living protected from incompatible and disruptive activities
    - The D-10 and D-15, residential districts, are intended to accommodate primarily multifamily residential development at ten and 15 units per acre respectively. These are relatively low density multifamily districts.
    - The D-18, residential district, is intended to accommodate primarily multifamily development at a density of 18 dwelling units per acre. This is a high density multifamily zoning district intended to accommodate midrise-type development.

Multifamily Dimensional Standards

Standard	Zoning District		
	D-10	D-15	D-18
Minimum Lot Size[1] (square feet)			
Permissible Uses	6000	5000	5000
Bungalow[9]	3000	3000	2500
Common Wall Dwelling	5000	3500	2500
Minimum Lot Width (feet)			
Standard	50	50	50
Bungalow[9]	25	25	25
Common Wall Dwelling	40	30	20
Maximum Lot Coverage			
Permissible Uses	50	50	50
Conditional Uses	50	50	50
Maximum Height (Feet)			
Permissible Uses	35	35	35
Accessory	25	25	25
Bungalow[9]	25	25	25
Setbacks (Feet)			
Minimum Front Yard	20	20	20
Minimum Street Side Yard	13	13	13
Minimum Rear Yard[3]	20	15	10
Minimum Side Yard[3]	5	5	5
Common Wall Dwelling	5 [7]	5 [7]	5 [7]
Minimum Vegetative Cover (% of lot)			
	30	30	30
Density (Units per Acre)			
	10	15	18

1. Minimum lot size is existing lot or area shown on chart in square feet. 3. Where one district abuts another the greater of the two setbacks is required for both uses on the common property line. 7. Zero-foot setback for the portion of the dwelling with a common wall, five-foot setback or five-foot wide easement for the portion of the dwelling at the common lot line without a common wall, and five-foot setback for the remaining side yards of the lot. 9. Special restrictions apply to construction on bungalow lots. See special use provisions 49.65.600.

Mixed-Use

Mixed-Use Zone Descriptions (49.25.220)

- The mixed use and mixed use 2 districts are established to accommodate a mix of appropriate commercial and residential uses
    - **The MU, mixed use district**, reflects the existing downtown development patterns and is **intended to maintain the stability of the downtown area**. Multifamily residential uses are allowed and encouraged
    - **The MU2, mixed use 2 district**, is intended to place a **greater emphasis on residential development than is the case in the MU district**. A range of residential development types is allowed. Multifamily residential uses are allowed at a density of up to 80 units per acre
- **The MU3, mixed use 3 district**, is intended to place a greater emphasis on the integration of **small-scale commercial uses within high-density residential structures**. Flexible setback regulations are deliberate to promote cohesive neighborhoods and encourage the development of pedestrian-oriented buildings

Mixed-Use Dimensional standards

Standard	Zoning District		
	MU	MU2	MU3
Minimum Lot Size[1] (square feet)			
Permissible Uses	4000	4000	3000
Common Wall Dwelling		2500	
Minimum Lot Width (feet)			
Standard	50	50	40
Common Wall Dwelling		20	
Maximum Lot Coverage			
Permissible Uses	80%	75%	None
Conditional Uses	80%		
Maximum Height (Feet)			
Permissible Uses	None	45[4]	35
Accessory	None	35	25
Setbacks (Feet)			
Minimum Front Yard	0	5 [5,8]	0
Maximum Front Yard			20
Minimum Street Side Yard	0	5	0
Maximum Street Side Yard			15
Minimum Rear Yard[3]	0	5	5
Minimum Side Yard[3]	0	5	0
Common Wall Dwelling		5 [7]	
Minimum Vegetative Cover (% of lot)			
		5	10
Density (Units per Acre)			
	No Max.	80	30

1. Minimum lot size is existing lot or area shown on chart in square feet. 3: Where one district abuts another the greater of the two setbacks is required for both uses on the common property line; 4: (Height Bonus) Reserved ; 5: (Pedestrian Amenities Bonus) Reserved ; 7: Zero-foot setback for the portion of the dwelling with a common wall, five-foot setback or five-foot wide easement for the portion of the dwelling at the common lot line without a common wall, and a five-foot setback for the remaining side yards of the lot ; 8: On corner lots, buildings shall be set back 15 feet from a street intersection. The area in which buildings shall be prohibited shall be determined by extending the edge of the traveled ways to a point of intersection, then measuring back 15 feet, then connecting the points.

Commercial

Commercial Zone Descriptions (49.25.230)

- The following districts are established to accommodate commercial activities:
    - The LC, light commercial district, is intended to accommodate commercial development that is less intensive than that permitted in the general commercial district. Light commercial districts are primarily located adjacent to existing residential areas. Although many of the uses allowed in this district are also allowed in GC, general commercial district, they are listed as conditional uses in this district and therefore require commission review to determine compatibility with surrounding land uses. A lower level of intensity of development is also achieved by stringent heigh and setback restrictions. Residential development is allowed in mixed- and single-use developments in the light commercial district
    - The GC, general commercial district, is intended to accommodate most commercial uses. Commercial activities are permitted outright in the zone except for those few uses that are listed as conditional uses to ensure compatibility. Residential development is allowed in mixed- and single-use developments in the general commercial district.
    - The NC, neighborhood commercial district, is intended to encourage the development of lively, mixed-use neighborhoods that are compact and walkable. Greater emphasis is placed upon medium density residential as the primary use with neighborhood-scale commercial activity that is less intensive than that permitted in the light commercial, general commercial and mixed-use zoning districts. Neighborhood commercial zoning districts are primarily used as a buffer between commercial and mixed-use zoning districts and single-family and lower density multifamily residential zoning districts.

Commercial Dimensional Standards

Standard	Zoning District		
	NC	LC	GC
Minimum Lot Size[1] (square feet)			
Permissible Uses	3000	2000	2000
Minimum Lot Width (feet)			
Standard	40	20	20
Maximum Lot Coverage			
Permissible Uses	None	None	None
Conditional Uses		None	None
Maximum Height (Feet)			
Permissible Uses	35	45	55
Accessory	25	35	45
Setbacks (Feet)			
Minimum Front Yard	0	25	10
Maximum Front Yard	15		
Minimum Street Side Yard	0	17	10
Maximum Street Side Yard	10		
Minimum Rear Yard[3]	0’11	10	10
Minimum Side Yard[3]	0’11	10	10
Minimum Vegetative Cover (% of lot)			
	25	15	10
Density (Units per Acre)			
	15	30	50

1. Minimum lot size is existing lot or area shown on chart in square feet. 3. Where one district abuts another the greater of the two setbacks is required for both uses on the common property line.

Waterfront

Waterfront Zone Descriptions (49.25.250)

- Waterfront Districts – the following districts are established to accommodate those uses that are dependent or directly related to water, a waterfront location, or both. These districts regulate development of the waterfront to take advantage of the unique attributes and limitations of its lands:
    - The WC, waterfront commercial district, is intended to provide both land and water space for uses which are directly related to or dependent upon a marine environment. Such activities include private boating, commercial freight and passenger traffic, commercial fishing, floatplane operations, and retail services directly linked to a maritime clientele. Other uses may be permitted if water-dependent or water-oriented. Residential development is allowed in mixed- and single-use developments in the waterfront commercial district.
    - The WI, waterfront industrial district, is intended for industrial and port uses which need or substantially benefit from a shoreline location. In addition, many of the uses that are allowed in the WC, waterfront commercial district, are also allowed in the WI, waterfront industrial district. Residential uses are limited to permitted caretaker units in the waterfront industrial district.

Waterfront Dimensional standards

Standard	Zoning District	
	WC	WI
Minimum Lot Size[1] (square feet)		
Permissible Uses	2000	2000
Minimum Lot Width (feet)		
Standard	20	20
Maximum Lot Coverage		
Permissible Uses	None	None
Conditional Uses	None	None
Maximum Height (Feet)		
Permissible Uses	35 [4]	45 [4]
Accessory	35 [4]	45 [4]
Setbacks (Feet)		
Minimum Front Yard	10	10
Minimum Street Side Yard	10	10
Minimum Rear Yard[3]	10	10
Minimum Side Yard[3]	10	10
Minimum Vegetative Cover (% of lot)		
Standard	10	5
Density (Units per Acre)		
	18	

1. Minimum lot size is existing lot or area shown on chart in square feet. 3: Where one district abuts another the greater of the two setbacks is required for both uses on the common property line; 4: (Height Bonus) Reserved.

Industrial District

Industrial Zone Description (49.25.240)

The I, industrial district, is intended to accommodate industrial activity which includes manufacturing, processing, repairing and assembling goods. Because of noise, odors, waste and other impacts inherent in industrial activity, performance standards are applied.

Dimensional standards

Standard	Zoning District
	I
Minimum Lot Size (square feet)	
Permissible Uses	2,000
Minimum Lot Width (feet)	
Standard	20
Maximum Lot Coverage	
Permissible Uses	None
Conditional Uses	None
Maximum Height (Feet)	
Permissible Uses	None
Accessory	None
Setbacks (Feet)	
Minimum Front Yard[3]	10
Minimum Street Side Yard	10
Minimum Rear Yard[3]	10
Minimum Side Yard[3]	0
Minimum Vegetative Cover (% of lot)	
	5

1. Minimum lot size is existing lot or area shown on chart in square feet. 3. Where one district abuts another the greater of the two setbacks is required for both uses on the common property line.

From: domadmin@juneau.org
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions
Date: Thursday, February 13, 2025 4:32:35 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49

49.25.300, 49.80.120

What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?

The current zoning rules and definitions allowing personal-use agriculture of poultry are both inconsistent in effect and overly restrictive such that they prevent residents in many zoning districts from attaining the greater food security that comes with having a backyard flock.

Additionally, a strict reading of code currently suggests that poultry other than hens (like ducks, geese, quail, etc.) should be considered like other, large farm animals and thus, are subject to overly strict requirements (and all but disallowed in many zoning districts).

There are many ways that Title 49 might be used to reduce human-bear conflict, but I would also suggest considering how this could be considered as it relates to farm animals and poultry - requiring measures like electric fences in some or all cases can reduce the risk of bears killing poultry.

For some background on previous efforts to update Title 49 to this regard, see this 2016 petition which garnered 307 signatures: https://www.change.org/p/city-and-borough-of-juneau-sustainability-committee-promote-sustainability-in-juneau-ak-by-enhancing-current-chicken-laws

How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?

In 49.80.120 (Definitions), define poultry as domestic fowl including chicken, turkey, goose, duck, Rock Cornish hens, and game birds such as pheasant, squab and guinea fowl. This excludes animals requiring space similar to other farm animals like emu, rhea, and ostrich (which are allowed under permissible commercial uses).

In the table found at 49.25.300, edit permissible uses under 14.250 (Personal use agriculture) to generally reflect the following:

#1 In zoning districts: RR, D-1, D-3, D-5, D-10SF, D-10, LC, GC, WC, WI, I

Allowed up to 12 poultry if they are kept 15 ft from neighboring dwellings. If your property is 1 acre or more 24 poultry allowed. 2 acres or more unlimited poultry allowed. The city may restrict your operations if it causes a public nuisance (bear-human conflict, noise), public health (disease), or if the poultry roam at large.
Poultry keepers will be given 2 warnings to remedy violations before the city can prohibit operations.

#2 In zoning districts: D-15, D-18, MU, MU2

-Up to six poultry may be kept without any special permit IF the poultry coop and yard are more than 20 feet from the nearest neighboring residence.
-When the coop & yard are closer than 20 feet from the nearest neighboring residence a conditional use permit is required.
-If more than six poultry are to be kept a conditional use permit is required.

#3 In zoning districts: D-15, D-18

-80% of the residents of a community in a mobile home park, apartment complex, or condominium association and the landlord (if applicable) must approve by signature for a designated community small poultry area where chicken zoning rule #1 applies and may be implemented. Otherwise, chicken zoning rule #2 supersedes.

The above is adapted from suggestions made by the 2016 petitioners, with "poultry" used in lieu of "chicken" and adding some language re: bears to discussion of nuisance. Some of the rules suggested may be outside the scope of Title 49; if this is the case, I would suggest limiting the proposal to reflect what can be changed in Title 49. For instance, if changes required to effectuate rules control of roosters (noise nuisance) can't be done here, a compromise could be excluding roosters from personal use, either wholesale via the definition or specifically for some denser zoning districts.

See the 2016 proposal here: https://juneau.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/20160711090437-a.pdf

Name

Griffin Plush

Email

griffin.plush@gmail.com

From: domadmin@juneau.org
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:15:33 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49
49.20.250 - Variance standards
What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?
Variances should be granted for reasons other than "special conditions" of the property. Human common sense should allow for mistakes that occur, for variances that promote sensible development, even for financial reasons. For example, a variance that that means a property can be subdivided even though it's 3 inches short of the requirement makes sense. A variance that allows an encroachment into the setback for better sun expose probably doesn't. But as the variance chapter rests now, it cannot be used for subjective decision making by the PC.
How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?
Expanding the criteria to encompass other reasons for variance. Perhaps by citing hardship, which could be interpreted as a special condition of the land, an error in planning/surveying/etc, or a financial reason.
Name
mandy cole
Email
mandyoc@awareak.org

Rob Dumouchel

From: domadmin@juneau.org
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 8:58 AM
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49

Chapter 49.25

What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?

Title 49 currently underutilizes the development potential of residential zones within the urban service boundary—i.e. D-5 districts and similar. These areas, already served or serviceable by public water, sewer, and public transportation are limited to five dwelling units per acre and largely constrained to single-family and duplex housing. This land-use model is inefficient in addressing Juneau's housing shortage, contributes to sprawl, and undercuts the value of existing public infrastructure investments.
By restricting density in already-developed, infrastructure-ready areas, Title 49 inadvertently pushes development further out, increasing reliance on cars, contributing to environmental degradation, and reducing the city's overall housing supply and affordability.

How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?

The City and Borough of Juneau is urged to upzone areas within the urban service boundary—i.e. D-5 districts and similar—to allow for higher residential density by right. This could include transitioning D-5 to a new zone permitting 10–20+ dwelling units per acre, or adopting flexible overlays that allow multifamily housing, small apartment buildings, and townhomes. Encourage infill development by reducing lot size minimums, allowing for form-based zoning, and eliminating unnecessary parking mandates. Create clear, streamlined approval processes for higher-density developments in these areas.

Numerous U.S. cities have successfully increased housing supply and affordability by reforming zoning to allow higher densities in residential neighborhoods, particularly near transit and public services. Examples include:
• Minneapolis, MN: Eliminated single-family-only zoning citywide, leading to modest but steady increases in multi-unit housing within established neighborhoods.
• Portland, OR: Adopted the Residential Infill Project, allowing up to four homes per lot (and six if affordable) in formerly single-family zones, with strong design standards.
• Seattle, WA: Encouraged urban village upzoning and accessory dwelling units (ADUs), resulting in more diverse housing options and higher density in key growth areas.
• Boise, ID: Introduced form-based code overlays to support gentle density in core neighborhoods, enabling a mix of townhomes and small apartments.
These reforms have helped meet growing demand, reduce housing costs, and make efficient use of public infrastructure—goals that align well with Juneau's sustainability and housing affordability objectives.

Conclusion: Title 49 should reflect a forward-thinking approach to land use, recognizing that D-5 zones and other similar zones within the urban service boundary are prime candidates for responsible densification. Upzoning these areas can relieve pressure on undeveloped lands, reduce housing scarcity, and enhance walkable, transit-accessible communities. This is a critical opportunity to align zoning policy with the city's long-term housing and climate goals.

Name

Leslie Hill

Email

leslieahlgren@hotmail.com

From: domadmin@juneau.org
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 4:44:08 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49
45.15/110
What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?
Permits are not issued efficiently or in a timely manner. This discourages development and is a contributing factor in ignoring the permitting process entirely. In order for the process to flow smoothly, applicants must have a guaranteed, reasonable time line for construction.
How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?
Anyone applying for a residential or other non commercial building permit with either and engineer or architect's stamp may proceed with construction 14 days after submital to the CBJ permit office. Permits will be deemed approved and will not be subject to change or delay if the CBJ fails to issue a permit within 14 days from the date of submittal. The CBJ will have 50 days to issue a permit for commercial construction. Any applicant that presents building plans with and engineers or architect's stamp may proceed with construction 14 days after submital to the CBJ permit office. Permits will be deemed approved and will not be subject to change or delay if the CBJ fails to issue a permit within 14 days from the date of submittal. *Note, this would not eliminate construction code compliance,
Name
Bruce Abel
Email
bruce@donabel.biz

From: domadmin@juneau.org
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 10:34:02 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49

Chapter 35

What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?

Subject: Please Support Chapter 35 Revisions to Enable Workforce Housing

We are writing as longtime, fifty plus years, residents and proud grandparents of a newly sworn-in firefighter/paramedic to express our strong support for the proposed revisions to Chapter 35. Specifically, we urge you to support the change that would allow subdivisions on arterial roads to follow the underlying zoning, rather than defaulting to the D1 lot size standard, as is currently required.

When we purchased our property in 2012, we did so with the understanding that subdivision in the future would be possible. Now that time has come—we want to help our grandson, who cannot otherwise afford to purchase land in town, build a home on a portion of our property. Unfortunately, a 2015 code change now prohibits this - our lot is just 5,789 square feet short of meeting the D1 minimum, even though we live in a D3 zoning district. Why are we being held to a standard that doesn't match the zoning of our own property?

Our grandson was born and raised in this city. He chose a career in public service to protect and care for the community he grew up in. And yet, like so many of his peers—first responders, teachers, city workers, and young families—he cannot afford to live here. The rising cost and limited supply of housing are driving out the very people who keep this community running.

The Assembly has stated time and again that housing is a top priority. This section of code has been flagged by planning staff for years as a clear and critical barrier to development. Revising it now is a tangible and timely action that would remove unnecessary restrictions—particularly in areas where added density is both appropriate and needed.

It's time to align policy with the priorities we all share. Updating Chapter 35 is more than a procedural change—it's a meaningful step toward keeping our city livable, equitable, and safe for future generations. Thank you for your time and your consideration of this important revision.

How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?

By allowing properties zoned D3 to be governed by D3 zoning instead of D1 regulations. There is no logical safety issues involved.

Name

Warren Van Sickle

Email

wjvansickle@gci.net

From: domadmin@juneau.org
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions
Date: Monday, June 30, 2025 11:39:26 AM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49
Chapter 35
What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?
I would like to rewrite the line that states main arterioles need a minimum lot size of 36,000 sqft. Per 49.35.210(b)(3)(A). eff. 2015 – Subdivisions involving frontage along an arterial street with less than 500 feet of frontage on a street may be subdivided if the resulting lots meet the minimum lot area standard for a single-family dwelling in the D1 zoning district (minimum 36,000 square feet).
How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?
I propose to have it written so the minimum lot size correlates directly with the zoning that the land is in. This would allow for more housing opportunities in our community.
Name
Liam Van Sickle
Email
liamvansickle@gmail.com

From: domadmin@juneau.org
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:43:02 AM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49

Section 49.35.210(b)(3)(A)

What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?

Challenge:
Our challenge is the inability to subdivide our North Douglas, 44,552 sq. ft. D-15 lot, because Section 49.35.210(b)(3)(A), which relies on an outdated Title 49 classification map that has North Douglas Highway labeled as a Minor Arterial, rather than using the current State of Alaska DOT functional classification of Major Collector that would allow the subdivision under Section 49.35.210(c)(1)(C).
Problem — Title 49 / State of Alaska roadway classification issues:
Section 49.35.210(b)(3)(A) requires: All of the resulting lots must meet the minimum lot area standard for a single-family dwelling in the D-1 zoning district (36,000 square feet).
North Douglas Highway is a State of Alaska roadway with a current DOT functional classification being Major Collector per ak.dot maps — see link below
https://akdot.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=8d34059bbfed4fada20a4fdc2a138aca
Section 49.35.210(c)(1)(C) regarding Major Collector states: (C) Exception a parcel of land with less than 500 feet of frontage or less than 350 feet of depth may be subdivided so as to allow access directly onto a major collector street.
Our lot meets this Major Collector exception, and could be divided into two parcels if current DOT functional classifications for state roadways governed Title 49 roadway classifications.

How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?

Proposed Suggested Improvement:
Section 49.35.230 - Roadway classification map states — There are adopted roadway classification maps A—D, dated June 5, 2006, as the same may be amended from time to time by ordinance. These maps set forth the classification of streets and roadways within the CBJ. The roadway classification maps will govern references to streets in this title.
Editor's note— Sec. 26 of Serial No. 2015-03(c)(am), adopted Aug. 31, 2015, repealed and reenacted § 49.35.230 in its entirety to read as herein set out. Former § 49.35.230 pertained to design criteria and derived from Serial No. 87-49, 1987; and Serial No. 95-27, 1995.
It seems justified that Title 49 governing roadway classification maps should be amended (updated) to reflect current DOT map functional classifications for state roadways since these transportation links are developed and maintained by the State of Alaska. I spoke with Michael Schuler of DOT's Property Office Management for Region regarding this inconsistency in roadway classifications, and was told that they are aware of this inconsistency, and question why their functional classifications do not govern state roadway issues. He stated that he would be very receptive to discussing this issue further with those rewriting Title 49. Michael's contact number is (907) 465-4499.

Name

Kris Ritter

Email

rick.kris.ritter@gmail.com