

Minutes of the
City and Borough of Juneau
Subdivision Review Committee of the Planning Commission

Wednesday, October 16 2015
CDD Large Conference Room, Marine View Building
5:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Dennis Watson
Michael Levine
Dan Miller

Staff: Laura Boyce

Guests: Joanne Wilta
Andrew Gamble

Call to Order: 5:00 p.m.

New Business

- Proposed two-lot subdivision of a common wall lot in Mountainside Estates
Applicant: Joanne Wiita, Andrew Gamble
Address: 1125 Timberline Court
Legal Description: Hillside View Lot 2A

Ms. Wiita submitted two applications for the proposed subdivision of the existing lot located at 1125 Timberline Court. It's a lot that contains a zero lot line home and the lot shares access with two other properties. This lot, if subdivided, would share access along the shared access easement. The applicant submitted two variances, one for the requirement for 30 feet of frontage on a maintained right-of-way and the other for access along a maintained right-of-way.

The applicant was told that the two variances could be combined into the same request for a variance for frontage and direct and practical access. Another variance is needed for lot design which was not submitted. When the applications were submitted, one of the proposed lots met the requirements for the "minimum rectangle/Director's discretion" section of Code. With the new subdivision rules in place since September 30th, that section of Code no longer exists so therefore the applicant must submit a variance for lot width. The applicant was advised that she could submit additional information regarding her requests for the variance to frontage and access if she wanted, but she would need to submit information addressing the six variance criteria for the needed lot width variance.

Additionally, the SRC discussed the frontage along Timberline Court. A portion of the existing frontage is encumbered by either the shared access easement or a utility easement in favor of abutting neighbors. Practical access, other than by the shared easement, isn't really possible.

The existing shared driveway provides access to one land-locked parcel and the two zero lot line parcels. The proposed subdivision, if approved with variances, would add another land-locked parcel to the shared driveway. One SRC member stated that he doesn't see those as land-locked parcels and that the easement should be recognized as un-land-locking the parcels, but current Code language doesn't recognize this.

The applicant was advised to talk to the neighbors that share the access as the access agreement would need to be revised to allow any new users along the shared driveway. The applicant stated that she had not yet done that.

Motion Passed: That the applications should move forward to the Planning Commission for further analysis and full discussion.

Adjournment

Approximately 6 p.m.