

Agenda

Planning Commission - Regular Meeting City and Borough of Juneau

April 12, 2022
Virtual & In Person
7:00 PM

This meeting will be held in person and by remote participation. For remote participation: join the Webinar by visiting <https://juneau.zoom.us/j/88987928148> and use the Webinar ID: 889 8792 8148, or join by telephone, calling: 1-253-215-8782 and enter the Webinar ID. You may also participate in person in City Hall Assembly Chambers, 155 S. Seward Street, Juneau, AK.

I. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

II. ROLL CALL

III. REQUEST FOR AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. December 14, 2021 Draft Minutes, Regular Planning Commission - APPROVED
- B. February 22, 2022 Draft Minutes, Regular Planning Commission - APPROVED
- C. March 8, 2022 Draft Minutes, Regular Planning Commission - APPROVED

V. BRIEF REVIEW OF THE RULES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

VI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

VII. ITEMS FOR RECONSIDERATION

VIII. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. CSP2022 0001: CBJ Land Disposal - 1 Acre to Brian Maller - REMOVED FROM CONSENT AND APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF TO RECOMMEND THE ASSEMBLY APPROVE THE LAND DISPOSAL

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. AME2021 0010: A rezone of 2.6 acres from D10 to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Light Commercial (LC) - APPROVED AS AMENDED, RECOMMENDING REZONE FROM D10 TO LIGHT

COMMERCIAL TO THE ASSEMBLY FOR ADOPTION

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

XII. STAFF REPORTS

XIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

XIV. LIAISON REPORT

**XV. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA
ITEMS**

XVI. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

XVII. EXECUTIVE SESSION

XVIII. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

- A. Additional Materials for April 12, 2022 Planning Commission

XIX. ADJOURNMENT

**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA**

December 14, 2021 Draft Minutes, Regular Planning Commission - APPROVED

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Upload Date	Type
▣	December 14, 2021 Draft Minutes, Regular Planning Commission	3/11/2022	Minutes

Agenda
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Michael LeVine, Chairman
December 14, 2021

- I. **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT** – Read by Chari LeVine
II. **ROLL CALL**

Michael LeVine, Chairman, called the Regular Meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held virtually via Zoom Webinar and telephonically, to order at 7:04 P.M.

Commissioners present: All Commissioners present via video conferencing – Michael LeVine, Chairman; Nathaniel Dye, Vice Chairman; Paul Voelckers, Clerk; Travis Arndt, Deputy Clerk; Ken Alper; Dan Hickok; Josh Winchell; Erik Pedersen

Commissioners absent: Mandy Cole

Staff present: Jill Maclean, CDD Director; Alexandra Pierce, CDD Planning Manager; Teri Camery, CDD Senior Planner; Allison Eddins, CDD Planner II; Joseph Meyers, CDD Planner I; Sherri Layne, Law

Assembly members: Alicia Hughes-Skandijs

- III. **REQUEST FOR AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – Ms. Maclean stated that case USE2016 0006/USE2021 0022 had been withdrawn by the applicant.

- IV. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. Draft Minutes November 9, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to approve the November 9, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes.*

- V. **BRIEF REVIEW OF THE RULES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** – None

- VI. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS** – None

VII. ITEMS FOR RECONSIDERATION – None

VIII. CONSENT AGENDA

USE2016 0006: ~~_____ A Marijuana Retail License Five-Year Renewal for Rainforest Farms (USE2021 0022)~~
Applicant: ~~_____ Blissful Awakenings, LLC~~
Location: ~~_____ 201 Seward Street~~

Staff Recommendation

~~Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Special Use Permit five-year Renewal. The permit would allow the renewal of a five-year marijuana retail Special Use Permit without amended conditions.~~

USE2021 0021: An extension of Conditional Use Permit USE2020 0001 for a new educational and research laboratory structure
Applicant: University of Alaska Southeast
Location: 11308 Glacier Highway

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Conditional Use Permit Extension. The permit would allow the extension of a Conditional Use Permit to construct an education and research laboratory structure.

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve USE2021 0021.*

The motion passed with no objection.

USE2021 0017: ~~_____ A Conditional Use Permit for an addition of a second story to a nonconforming structure~~
Applicant: ~~_____ Janell Liles~~
Location: ~~_____ 923 Glacier Avenue~~

Staff Recommendation

~~Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Conditional Use Permit. The permit would allow the construction of a~~

~~second story atop a nonconforming structure in the Light Commercial zoning district.~~

USE2021 0016: ~~_____ A Conditional Use Permit for an accessory apartment on an undersized lot~~

Applicant: ~~_____ Janell Liles~~

Location: ~~_____ 923 Glacier Avenue~~

Staff Recommendation

~~Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Conditional Use Permit. The permit would allow the development of an accessory apartment on an undersized lot.~~

Marc Wheeler asked for a full public hearing on items USE2021 0017 and USE2021 0016, so they were moved to the Regular Agenda as items A and B.

USE2021 0008: A Conditional Use Permit renewal for explosives storage in lower Hidden Valley

Applicant: Orica USA Inc.

Location: Lower Hidden Valley

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Conditional Use Permit with conditions. The permit would allow the development of explosives storage in lower Hidden Valley. The approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. The permit shall be effective for ten years.
2. The applicant shall maintain approved ATF kingpins, locks, and steel hoods on all storage containers/magazines regardless of ownership, mobility, and type of container.

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve USE2021 0008.*

The motion passed with no objection.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

X. REGULAR AGENDA

USE2021 0017: A Conditional Use Permit for an addition of a second story to a nonconforming structure
Applicant: Janell Liles
Location: 923 Glacier Avenue

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Conditional Use Permit. The permit would allow the construction of a second story atop a nonconforming structure in the Light Commercial zoning district.

Mr. Voelckers declared a potential conflict, as he is the owner of the property next to 923 Glacier Avenue. He stated that he can remain impartial.

Mr. LeVine asked if any Commissioners or member of the public had objections to Mr. Voelckers hearing cases USE2021 0017 and USE2021 0016. Seeing none, Mr. LeVine declared that Mr. Voelckers could remain in the meeting and hear the cases.

STAFF PRESENTATION by Planner Allison Eddins for both case USE2021 0017 and USE2021 0016

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Mr. Voelckers asked Ms. Eddins to elaborate more on Question 1 regarding the rebuilding of the structure and if "rebuilding" included the addition of the second story, just the original structure.

Ms. Eddins stated that staff took these cases piece by piece and broke them down into sections. Question 1 was a Director's decision and the cost for rebuilding was in regards to the first floor only. Code states that this can be done; however, a second permit would be needed for the addition of a second story.

Mr. LeVine asked if the cost estimate came from the CDD Building Official.

Ms. Eddins replied that that was correct.

Mr. Arndt asked for clarification on the cost requirements for rebuilding a structure and how it works into code.

Mr. LeVine noted that this information did not fall under the Planning Commission's purview, but deferred to Ms. Maclean.

Ms. Maclean stated that Ms. Eddins' information was correct and the section of code Mr. Arndt was referring to, while accurate, was not the code section used for this this development and it falls under another category.

Mr. Dye asked for clarification on how the 72% or 75% cost estimate would be determined.

Mr. LeVine stated that this determination was not for the Planning Commission to make; this determination is made by the Director of Community Development. The Planning Commission begins with knowing that the applicant has been allowed to move forward on this and all of this information is just background information and not for the Planning Commission to debate. Mr. LeVine asked if there were other questions.

Mr. Dye asked for more information on the dimensions of the parking spaces. He expressed concerns that the drawings didn't accurately convey what is truly possible on this lot.

Ms. Eddins stated that, based on the required dimensions and the potential for a combination of different parking types, the applicant can meet the parking requirements. Some vegetation may need to be reorganized, but with the dimensions of the lot and the requirements, also knowing that stacked parking is allowed and back-out parking would be allowed into the alley, staff are confident that the applicant can make the parking space and type requirements. Staff did consider having a condition that entering the lot from Glacier Highway would only be allowed to back into the space. She noted where and how the applicant could work parking spaces in, showing these options on the drawing.

Mr. Dye asked if a parking waiver was considered as a more appropriate option.

Ms. Eddins noted that parking waivers are typically only applied for when the requirements cannot be met and the lot itself cannot support the number of parking spaces required. The applicant can meet their vegetation requirement, as well as their on-site parking requirement set forth in Title 49, so staff didn't feel recommendation of a parking waiver would be appropriate here.

Ms. Pierce stated that the applicant submitted application materials showing that there were options and flexibility for meeting the parking requirements.

Mr. LeVine asked if it was relevant that the parking spaces in the front of the lot are actually parallel, or if they should be considered in a different way.

Ms. Eddins replied that the spaces could be considered stacked parking, and the alley would likely be used as a right-of-way, or they could be considered parallel if Glacier Highway was being used as the right-of-way. It all really depends on which situation you consider. Ms. Eddins stated that

if width is an issue, the applicant would have the option to use the narrower parallel parking spaces in lieu of a standard parking space.

Mr. LeVine asked if the only requirement to deem a parallel space “parallel” is that it has to run parallel to the right-of-way. He expressed concerns with someone being able to actually parallel park in these proposed spaces.

Ms. Eddins noted that staff considered this, but without driving around and trying to park there, it would be hard to know for sure. Ms. Eddins then showed examples of how the parking spaces Mr. LeVine was referring to would be able to be used for parking.

Mr. Voelckers asked if the Planning Commission needed to go into great depth when considering the geometry of the parking situations, or if it was sufficient to say that the application includes the requirement to have three legal parking spaces on site and the Engineering and Building Departments will ensure that they will make it work.

Ms. Eddins reminded the Planning Commission that the parking dimensions and exact placement of vegetation is something that will be reviewed by staff and must be approved when the applicant submits a building permit.

Ms. Pierce agreed with Ms. Eddins and reiterated that the dimensions will be reviewed and if the requirements cannot be met, a Certificate of Occupancy will not be issued until the requirements are met.

Mr. Dye stated that he understands the process, but expressed concerns that issues could arise down the road that would require a modification. He asked how much the Planning Commission could expect this to change and what they should be considering at this time.

Ms. Pierce stated that if this plan does not work, or cannot work with minor changes, then the Planning Commission will likely see it before them again.

Ms. Maclean suggested that if Commissioners have strong concerns, they can add a condition, such as the standard condition, stating that prior to issuance of the building permit, the applicant shall be required to meet the parking requirements. Then, if it turns out that the dimensions or the maneuverability aren't practical, the applicant would have to come forward for a parking waiver.

Mr. LeVine then asked to bring the applicant forward for their presentation.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION – Janell Liles presented further information, noting that all the utilities are buried underground and that she is very willing to modify any of the plans for the landscaping and driveway parking to make it safe and user-friendly.

QUESTIONS FOR THE APPLICANT – NonePUBLIC COMMENT

Marc Wheeler, W. 9th Street – Excited about the project and believes it will be a great addition to the neighborhood, but has concerns about the parking. Currently, parking is very limited and congested in the neighborhood. He noted that it is hard to come in off the alley, but he doesn't see how someone could back in from Glacier Highway.

ADDITIONAL APPLICANT COMMENTS – NoneADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE APPLICANT – NoneADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Mr. Voelckers asked if there were other examples where a condition was made for parking and back-out parking.

Ms. Eddins stated that back-out parking is only allowed onto the alley, not Glacier Highway. The condition she mentioned earlier was used prior to make it so vehicles could only back into a driveway, then would drive forward onto the right-of-way. However, she believes this has been discouraged in the past though, because it would be difficult to enforce.

Ms. Maclean agreed with Ms. Eddins and could not recall a situation similar to this one. She asked Ms. Layne if it would be possible for the Commission to waive a parking space at this time, even though the applicant hadn't applied for a parking waiver. If the issue is with the maneuverability of the site, maybe this could alleviate concerns from the Commission.

Ms. Layne stated that if the Planning Commission were to go through the same analysis if the parking waiver had been applied for and made clear findings, the Planning Commission could approve a parking waiver during this hearing.

Mr. Dye asked if there would be potential for issues to arise from this, since abutters notices had not gone out, informing the neighborhood that this was a possibility.

Ms. Layne stated that it would be cleaner to go through the whole process, but the Planning Commission could make it very clear on the record that they could see that this was the best option for this situation and had proper findings and analysis.

Mr. Pedersen asked if the third required parking space came into play, because of the proposal of the accessory apartment, but the two-story building only required two parking spaces.

Ms. Eddins stated that that was correct.

Mr. Arndt asked if separate motions needed to be made for each case.

Mr. LeVine stated two separate motions would be needed.

MOTION: *by Mr. Dye to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve USE2021 0017.*

Mr. Voelckers asked for clarification on the required parking spaces and how they fell into place with this motion.

Mr. LeVine clarified that the parking space requirement is for USE2021 0016 and the cases were being broken apart for approval.

The motion passed with no objection.

MOTION: *by Mr. Dye to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve USE2021 0016 with a condition that prior to the issuance of a building permit, a site plan with dimensions must be submitted that demonstrates all parking and maneuverability requirements per Title 49 are met, or a parking waiver is approved.*

Mr. Hickok objected to this motion, stating that this is already a nonconforming area that is very congested and this would cause more congestion.

Mr. LeVine spoke in favor of the motion, but felt that a parking waiver may be needed in the future.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Yea: Dye, Winchell, Alper, Pedersen, Arndt, Voelckers, LeVine

No: Hickok

Motion Passed 7-1

WCF2021 0010: Modification to an approved facility
Applicant: Vertical Bridge, LLC
Location: 10020 Crazy Horse Drive

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Wireless Communication Facility Special Use Permit. The permit would

allow the development of a self-supporting Wireless Communications Facility Tower.

STAFF PRESENTATION by Planner Meyers

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Mr. Arndt asked if the Planning Commission was only looking at the modification of this permit, and not the rest. If the Planning Commission denied the modification, the applicant could still build the monopole as originally approved.

Mr. Meyers stated that this was correct, but the applicant doesn't have the tools necessary to complete the project in an affordable manner, which is why they are applying for the modification.

Mr. Arndt asked why this case needed to be heard on the Regular Agenda, as opposed to the Consent Agenda.

Ms. Maclean stated that department policy is to place an item on the Regular Agenda if anyone makes a comment regarding the item. While the comment received about this item was not necessarily about the modification, the department felt it was important for the public to have a chance to speak.

Mr. LeVine also noted that having the item on the Consent Agenda may add an additional burden to the member of the public, since they would have to ask to have the item pulled from Consent and have a full public hearing. He suggested this could be discussed more outside of a Planning Commission meeting, if needed.

Mr. Pedersen asked when the original application had been approved.

Mr. Meyers stated that it was approved in 2019.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION – Matt Grugan presented further information about the project and the need for a modification.

QUESTIONS FOR THE APPLICANT

Mr. Dye asked if the monopole foundation would be feasible without the extra antennas.

Mr. Grugan stated that the three necessary antennas made up about 75% of the weight, so while the depth may be able to be reduced some, a large hole and large equipment would still be needed to build the tower.

Mr. Pedersen asked if this particular tower design required cables.

Mr. Grugan stated that the tower design would be free-standing and there would be no guiding anchors.

Mr. Voelckers noted that there had been more soils investigation done to determine if there was a practical alternative and asked if this was correct.

Mr. Grugan replied that this was correct. The proposed location would need to be cleared and their team doesn't want to unnecessarily disturb the land until necessary. The team didn't drill until further analysis could be done.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Mr. Dye asked if the Notice of Decision for the original permit was available.

Ms. Maclean stated that the original permit was approved in March of 2020 and a Building Permit was applied for in July of 2021, so this modification is still timely.

MOTION: *by Mr. Pedersen to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve WCF2021 0010.*

The motion passed with no objection.

AT EASE 8:17 P.M. – 8:25 P.M.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2021 Legislative Capital Priority List

Mr. LeVine stated that there was a letter in the packet regarding the Legislative Capital Priority List and the Commission's action at this time was to decide to either send the letter with Commissioner approval or modify the letter.

Ms. Pierce noted she had nothing to add and that Mr. Arndt was the Chair of the committee that put the letter together, so she would let him discuss the letter.

Mr. Arndt stated that the committee met and reviewed and discussed the list of projects from the Director of Engineering and Public Works. They felt these projects stood out and recommend they move forward.

Mr. LeVine noted that the projects fall into three categories: big and visionary (the second crossing to Douglas), smaller projects (the Lemon Creek multimodal project), and something that wasn't on the list, but the committee felt was important (deferred maintenance).

Mr. Arndt stated that after looking at the governmental funding, it's transportation related and that's another reason these projects rose to the top of the list.

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to adopt the letter and forward to the Assembly for additional action.*

The motion passed with no objection.

B. CIP Review

Ms. Pierce stated that when the committee met, they discussed the CIP process in previous years. The committee agreed to send the same letter as last year, because things really haven't changed. CIP projects are due from the nominating departments to the Engineering Department on December 17. In the New Year, draft CIP list will be issued, then the committee will meet again to go over everything in more detail. The Commission's purview this evening is to review the list for conformity with adopted plans and make a recommendation to the Public Works and Facilities Committee. In the past, the committee performed a very detailed and exhaustive review of the list. Last year, the committee looked at the new projects or the projects that were highlighted, but the committee considered projects that were just straight maintenance to fall under the section of the Comprehensive Plan that discusses maintaining existing infrastructure. Ms. Pierce suggests the committee continues this way. Irene Gallion will be taking over the CIP committee, as this is Ms. Pierce's last Planning Commission meeting as Planning Manager.

Mr. Arndt noted that the Public Works and Facilities Committee would be drafting the list in its entirety, then the Commission would be able to comment on it after the fact. However, Mr. Arndt felt it would be better to try to work together.

Mr. LeVine noted that this had been an issue for six or seven years now and the Commission would like to see that change. This is why the CIP Committee was developed, allowing the Planning Commission to engage more and play a more important role in this process. Mr. LeVine suggested that the CIP Committee revisit this discussion with Ms. Gallion at the next CIP Committee meeting.

Mr. Winchell stated that he would like to be more involved in future events working through this process.

Mr. LeVine stated that all Commissioners would be made aware of all future CIP Committee meetings, so they have the opportunity to participate.

Ms. Pierce noted that ability to get the Planning Commission's priorities into the CIP really comes with the nominating departments, less so than Engineering. Most of the CIP is maintenance, but when other departments are nominating projects that are new, they should come from somewhere. The logical places for those to come from are the adopted plans. Some people understand that and want to see that happen, so it's really a matter of working together on a process that works, also recognizing that the burden of maintenance in the CIP and the difficulties that surround that. As we're looking at new capital projects, no one should be nominating a project based on personal preference. Having a paper trail in the CIP process that shows where the nominations are coming from would be helpful.

Mr. Voelckers felt another issue to be aware of is that the institutional practice has a lot of inertia to it, too, so the new projects aren't the only areas that need more scrutiny. There can be blind spots sometimes and the Planning Commission has a valuable role in helping shine a light on areas that have been overlooked and underrepresented.

Mr. Winchell agreed, but noted that at the joint Assembly and Planning Commission meeting, the Assembly stated that they are in favor of seeing the Planning Commission bring new ideas forward. Therefore, the Planning Commission does have a part in the process that is more contributive.

Mr. LeVine suggested that the Planning Commission seek more advice from Ms. Pierce down the road.

C. APL2021 0006: An appeal related to BLD2021 0765

Mr. LeVine stated that this is an usual appeal, as it is an appeal of the Director's determination for a Building Permit. Both Staff and the attorney's office are conflicted out from assisting the Planning Commission. However, due to current staff in the CBJ Law department, it has been agreed that Ms. Layne can walk the Planning Commission through the process, but she cannot provide advice about what to do or answer questions that are not strictly related to the procedural requirements. Mr. LeVine asked Ms. Layne to walk the Planning Commission through the steps and decisions needed at this time.

Ms. Layne stated that, at this time, the Commission needed to decide whether they are going to accept the appeal or not. The options are to accept the appeal, certify it and send it to the Assembly, or don't accept it. However, there are very few circumstances where you can deny an appeal. These circumstances are listed in 49.21.10. If the Commission decides to hear the appeal, they also need to decide if they are going to hear the appeal on the record or de novo, and

appoint a hearing officer. The person appealing, or an aggrieved party, also has the opportunity to speak to the Commission on why the appeal should be accepted.

Mr. LeVine asked if there was any prefatory information needed before deciding to hear the appeal.

Ms. Layne replied that the only determination needed is to determine that the appeal is timely, and CDD has already done that.

Ms. LeVine asked Ms. Layne to read the code section with reasons why an appeal will or will not be accepted.

Mr. Voelckers asked Ms. Layne to clarify the distinction between on record and de novo and if she has a recommendation on either of those.

Mr. LeVine stated that Ms. Layne would not be able to make a recommendation for the Commission.

Ms. Layne clarified that on de novo means everything is new for the Commission and everyone presents their evidence. Whereas, on the record means the Commission would look at the full record that CDD presents and used to make their decision.

Mr. LeVine noted that the vast majority of appeals heard by the Commission are heard on the record.

INFORMATION FROM THE APPLICANT

Mr. LeVine stated that the information coming from the applicant should not be about the substance of the appeal, the Commission will make no decision at this time on the merits of the appeal, and testimony needs to be strictly limited to whether the Commission should accept the appeal.

Mariya Lovishchuk stated that she was available for questions, but did not have any information to present at this time.

Mr. LeVine asked Ms. Layne if the Commission had the ability to ask Ms. Lovishchuk questions at this time.

Ms. Layne replied that the code does not say anything about asking the applicant questions.

Mr. LeVine stated the Commission could ask questions at this time if they had any.

Mr. Dye noted that the applicant, or an aggrieved party, also has the opportunity to recommend if the Commission hears the appeal on the record or de novo, and, in the past, the Commission has been advised not to ask questions until a later time.

Mr. Winchell asked if the Commission was allowed to ask the applicant what they are requesting from the Commission.

Mr. LeVine replied that this was not permitted, and can only ask questions about the procedure. Mr. LeVine asked Ms. Lovishchuk if she had any preference on hearing the appeal on the record or de novo.

Ms. Lovishchuk stated that she did not have a preference.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Mr. Winchell stated that he had questions about the density and the changing of the density with the subject property, and that he has grave reservations about hearing the appeal de novo. He feels that hearing the appeal on the record is important.

Mr. LeVine stated that the density questions could not be discussed at this time.

MOTION: *by Mr. Dye to accept APL2021 0006 and hear it on the record in its entirety and appoint Mr. Arndt as the hearing officer.*

The motion passed with no objection.

ROLL CALL VOTE

YEA: Dye; Winchell; Hickok; Pedersen; Alper; Arndt; Voelckers; LeVine

NO: ---

Motion Passed 8 Yea – 0 No

XII. STAFF REPORTS

- Ms. Maclean congratulated Ms. Pierce on her new position as the Tourism Manager and thanked her for her hard work with CDD. The new plat reviewer position has been filled and will be starting on December 27, 2021; he will be working on most of the subdivision review. Staff hopes this will bring consistency with the review process and build strong relationships with the development community. The Planner II position has also been filled and she will be starting on January 3, 2022. The new Administrative Officer has started, as well, and believe she will be invaluable and bring a lot of great information to the department. The parking ordinance is being reviewed by the Law department. The

Alternative Development Overlay District ordinance will be coming back to the Planning Commission. Accessory Apartments is moving forward again. Commission Dye had flagged a possible systemic racism issue, which we believe we have addressed, so we are working with the Law Department on that to make sure the policies presented to the Planning Commission are strong enough.

- Mr. Dye noted a section of a map in the parking information in the additional materials packet that needed a small edit.

XIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

- Mr. Dye stated that the Title 49 Committee had met 2 weeks prior and discussed stream sides, and would be meeting later in the week to discuss stream sides again and coastal zone management. The Housing and Development Task Force is also moving forward.
- Mr. Voelckers stated that the Public Works and Facilities Committee met and had a presentation from the City Manager. The fund balance is good, but current projects were facing serious budget overruns. There was also a discussion on a new City Hall and where it might be located, with Lemon Creek being the top ranked area and Downtown being the second option. There was also a presentation given on waste management and efforts on how to keep the issues with the landfill odors under control. The Housing and Development Task Force may meet twice in January.

XIV. LIAISON REPORTS

- Ms. Hughes-Skandijs reported that the Assembly had met the night before and approved the purchase of the land for the University of Alaska Southeast and Docks and Harbors. The Assembly moved forward with funding another piece of the Seawalk downtown, and appropriated more funding for Statter Harbor Phase III. The Meadow Lane improvement project was approved. The Assembly had their retreat the first weekend in December and reviewed their objectives and goals from the prior year. Ms. Hughes-Skandijs felt it was worth noting that an implementing action that did not make it into the final cut was to work existing area plans into decision-making process.

XV. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

XVI. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Voelckers asked if there was any information on how the Planning Commission meetings would be held in the New Year, whether they would still be held via Zoom, or if they would be a hybrid-style meeting, or in person.

Mr. LeVine replied that there were many discussions about this topic and the biggest challenge at this time is CDD's staffing situation and not having enough people on board to effectively manage the technology for hybrid meetings. Now that more staff is coming on board, there will be training and hybrid meetings will likely be starting, as long as everything keeps progressing well.

XVII. EXECUTIVE SESSION

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT – 9:10 P.M.

DRAFT

**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA**

February 22, 2022 Draft Minutes, Regular Planning Commission - APPROVED

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Upload Date	Type
▣	February 22, 2022 Draft Minutes, Regular Planning Commission	3/11/2022	Minutes

Minutes
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Michael LeVine, Chairman
February 22, 2022

I. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT read by Chair LeVine

II. ROLL CALL

Michael LeVine, Chairman, called the Regular Meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held virtually via Zoom Webinar and telephonically, to order at 7:02 P.M.

Commissioners present: All Commissioners present via video conferencing – Michael LeVine, Chairman; Paul Voelckers, Clerk; Travis Arndt, Deputy Clerk; Ken Alper; Dan Hickok; Mandy Cole; Josh Winchell; Erik Pedersen

Commissioners absent: Nathaniel Dye, Vice Chairman

Staff present: Jill Maclean, CDD Director; Irene Gallion, CDD Planner; Sherri Layne, Law

Assembly members: Alicia Hughes-Skandijis

III. REQUEST FOR AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA –
Ms. Cole added CSP2021 0007 to items for reconsideration

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Draft Minutes January 25, 2022, Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to approve the January 25, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes.*

V. BRIEF REVIEW OF THE RULES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

VI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

VII. ITEMS FOR RECONSIDERATION –

CSP2021 0007 as added by Ms. Cole. Mr. Alper did not participate as he was not in attendance at the February 8 meeting when this was originally discussed and he has not watched the meeting to be fully informed.

MOTION: *by Ms. Cole to reconsider **CSP2021 0007**.*

Mr. Voelckers asked if CBJ could reapply for the AASHTO waiver if it fails. It was clarified that it can.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Yea: Cole; Arndt; Pedersen; Hickok; Winchell; LeVine

No: Voelckers

Motion Passed 6 Yea to 1 No

MOTION: *by Ms. Cole to reopen public testimony and Commissioner discussion and make an informed decision on the AASHTO waiver in **CSP2021 0007**.*

Mr. Winchell voiced support saying it is important to get input from the public.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Yea: Cole; Pedersen; Hickok; Winchell; Arndt; Voelckers; LeVine

No:

Motion Passed 7 Yea to 0 No

MOTION: *by Ms. Cole to continue **CSP2021 0007** to the March 8 meeting.*

****Recording started 7:18 p.m.****

The motion passed with no objection.

Mr. Alper asked if he would be able to participate when it is brought up at the March 8 meeting. Mr. LeVine confirmed that so long as he reads the packets and is up to date on the subject, he can take part in the reconsideration. Mr. LeVine also encouraged Mr. Alper to listen to the prior meeting discussion to be fully informed.

VIII. CONSENT AGENDA – None

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

X. REGULAR AGENDA

AME2018 0004: Revision to the Alternative Development Overlay District
Applicant: City & Borough of Juneau
Location: Downtown Juneau

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission provide feedback on the following issues:

- How would the Commission like to proceed on lot size:
 - Eliminate lot size requirement for the ADOD, and require that subdivision meet the

lot size requirements of underlying code.

- Continue with reduced lot size.
 - Any modifications to the current proposal?
- How would the Commission like to proceed on the issue of sight distances:
 - Traffic Engineer review?
 - Proposal developed at this meeting?
 - Other?
 - Should staff investigate the possibility of damage waivers for road reconstruction and/or other maintenance, such as snow removal?
- How would the Commission like to proceed regarding modifications to setback exemptions, in existing code and in the proposed ADOD code:
 - Simplify the exemption for parking decks, and provide a definition.
 - Simplify and clarify restrictions on sight-obscuring trees, and provide a definition.

STAFF PRESENTATION by Planner Gallion

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Mr. Alper asked if the 25 miles per hour suggestion was based in Code or an arbitrary number. Ms. Gallion explained that the speed limit in residential areas is 25 miles per hour unless otherwise posted.

Mr. Arndt asked whether the section addressing fences and vegetation was based on comments from engineering and public works. Ms. Gallion said it was based on a comment from the Law Department.

Mr. Voelckers asked how the setbacks apply to the nearby MU zones where it seems setbacks are not required and buildings are allowed to come right to the corner. Ms. Gallion said if they were to have structures with no or very limited setback, then they would need to consider setting lower speed limits in those areas. She added the AASHTO standards reduce risk and they are considered a goal to aim for but are not requirements.

Mr. Alper asked what the average or typical setback is in the nearby areas. He said it seems the surrounding neighborhood is already largely nonconforming. Ms. Gallion said it was something that had included in earlier presentations on this ADOD but it was not something she had looked at this time and she did not have updated information on that. If the commission needed that information, she could get that for them.

Mr. LeVine referred to slide number 9 with the AASHTO sight requirements diagram on the neighborhood lots and asked if the corner lots would have to be constrained in both directions to be in compliance. Ms. Gallion confirmed the corner lots could have larger setback requirements according to AASHTO standards.

Mr. LeVine asked if the AASHTO restrictions would apply to alleyways as well as driveways opening into the streets. They do not apply.

Mr. LeVine asked if the reason for allowing a three-foot hedge or fence to the edge of the property line is because it is assumed that a driver in a car would be able to see over that height. Ms. Gallion confirmed that is the case.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Greg Chaney – 715 6th Street – spoke in support of advancing this ADOD revision saying it has been in process for a number of years. He would like to see it passed and then if it needed to be adjusted later, that could be addressed. He suggested keeping the lot size requirement at 3,000 to 4,000 square feet with ten-foot front setback.

Ms. Cole asked for clarification of Mr. Chaney's concerns regarding the three-foot setbacks. Mr. Chaney said it was in reference to the Engineering and Public Works comments that a three-foot setback would cause the need for construction waivers and issues with sight distances. He did not think it made sense for the PC to be in a position of going against the Engineering and Public Works department. He added that while there are already several houses built that way, this would be for new construction.

Mr. Voelckers commented that the setbacks seemed to be an issue at the corners and asked Mr. Chaney if he had the same or lesser concerns away from the corners. Mr. Chaney said it is less of a concern but added that a three-foot setback is very close to the road and would be a challenge to road crews and snowplowing.

Mr. LeVine asked if homeowners should not be allowed to put fences or hedges within ten feet of the right of way. Mr. Chaney explained he was trying to match the vegetation setback limitation already in code.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Mr. Pedersen asked when the original Land Use code was adopted for this part of town. Ms. Gallion said that was 1957 and most of the homes in the area were built prior to that.

Mr. Voelckers asked if lot size had to be dealt with right now or could the commission leave it alone for now. Ms. Gallion said it could be looked at separately. She added when Title 49 determined the 3000 square foot verbiage, it was to create opportunities for infill in the downtown area. Ms. Maclean added the lot size at 3000 square feet makes a number of the lots conforming for lot size.

During the presentation, it was pointed out the Law Department had an issue with adding an effective date clause to the ADOD. Mr. Arndt said his understanding of including a date was to make all the lots existing today conforming to allow the owners to subdivide. Otherwise, they will need to subdivide first under the existing rules of subdivision and THEN they can apply ADOD to the parcel. Mr. LeVine added his understanding of the question of lot size was solely for subdivision saying for existing lots there is no

minimum lot size but the Commission needs to decide if they want to allow subdivision for parcels using the relaxed ADOD requirements. His understanding now, without the date included, it is a one or the other choice for landowners. (Either their lot is allowed to be conforming OR they can subdivide).

Mr. Arndt asked how many parcels would be left out if the size limits were left in place. Ms. Gallion estimated about 250 would be out.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Mr. Alper stated he has no desire to give deference to AASHTO standards for sight distances saying their purpose behind creating the ADOD standards in the downtown area was to acknowledge the fact that the built area is already largely nonconforming and predates automobile traffic. Considering what is already there it does not make sense to impose modern engineering standards.

Ms. Cole said she is unwilling to give up subdivision. If she has to choose one or the other, she will fall on the side of subdivision.

Mr. Pedersen spoke in support of Mr. Alper's statement regarding sight distances and asked if there is any advantage to keeping the lot sizes.

The discussion moved to address the specific questions presented by Staff:

- How would the Commission like to proceed on the issue of sight distances:

Mr. Arndt asked if they could say for all lots except corner lots, you can use the ADOD and leave the corner lots in the existing underlying zoning district. Ms. Gallion said the setbacks for in the underlying district is up to 25 feet, depending on the zoning. Ms. Cole pointed out that there are a number of corner lots that would be affected. Mr. Voelckers suggested setting a setback limit for corner lots within the ADOD. Ms. Maclean asked if this would also be considered arbitrary similar to the date issue. Ms. Layne said it could be unless the PC could articulate a discrete reason for it. Mr. LeVine asked if conformance with AASHTO standards could be reason enough. Ms. Layne thought that would work. Mr. Pedersen supported leaving sight distance out of the discussion saying on-street parking is causing more of a sight issue than anything built or grown on the lot.

- *How would the Commission like to proceed on lot size:*

Mr. Arndt said he would rather give the opportunity to subdivide with a nonconforming certificate than to not allow it at all. Mr. LeVine asked why 3000 square feet was chosen as the minimum lot size saying he thought it was selected as a way to make the majority of the lots conforming. Mr. Arndt said 3000 square feet was selected because 73% of the lots in the area already meet that and those lots are proof that 3000 square feet is a lot size that can work.

Mr. Voelckers agreed with Mr. Arndt that 3000 is a defensible number but he was unclear about the issue brought up by Law. Ms. Layne said the date issue was arbitrary. Mr. Arndt suggested deleting the lines that read, "... the lots that existed prior to or as of January 1 2022...there is no minimum lot size."

Mr. LeVine said he does not support this suggestion. As he understands it, the ADOD is not about creating more substandard lots but about allowing those with substandard lots to utilize them.

- How would the Commission like to proceed regarding modifications to setback exemptions, in existing code and in the proposed ADOD code:

Mr. LeVine addressed the issue of changing “primary” to “permissible” under the height limitations. He said he does not support this change and said it undermines the meaning of the provision. For example, the height limitation is thirty-five feet for a primary use and twenty-five feet for auxiliary or secondary use, both of which are permissible uses.

Mr. Arndt spoke to the vegetation section and said he would lean toward leaving it ‘as is’ for now. Mr. Voelckers said any items affecting safe sight lines should be considered together.

MOTION: *by Mr. Winchell to accept staff’s findings, analysis and recommend forwarding AME2018 0004 subject to the assembly following conditions:*

- Delete two lines of Section A regarding minimum lot size and the date
- Minimum lot size be established as 3000 square feet
- Removal of sight distance requirements

MOTION to Amend: *by Mr. Alper to change the word ‘permissible’ back to ‘primary’.*

The motion to amend passed with no objection.

Mr. LeVine spoke in opposition to the amended motion saying it is not ready for assembly review.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON AMENDED MOTION

Yea: Winchell; Hickok; Alper; Pedersen

No: Cole; Arndt; Voelckers; Levine

Amended Motion Failed 4 Yea to 4 No

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to remand AME2018 0004 back to Title 49 for final wordsmithing*

MOTION to Amend: *by Mr. Alper to have Title 49 discuss this and bring it back to the PC as quickly as reasonably possible*

Mr. Arndt asked Director Maclean how soon that could happen. Ms. Maclean said it would be several weeks and suggested March 24th would be a likely date.

The motion to amend passed with no objection

The amended motion passed with no objection

AT EASE 8:54 P.M. – 9:00 P.M.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

A. New City Hall Update

CBJ Engineering and Public Works Director Katie Koester presented on the new City Hall site selection process. The PWFC is recommending building atop the DTC parking garage or 450 Whittier location.

Mr. Voelckers asked for elaboration as to which location would best serve the public. Ms. Koester said public services most utilized were CDD, public meetings, paying bills and voting. She said wherever it is located, having all of the departments in a common location would be convenient for the public.

Mr. Winchell asked if the cost of building atop the DTC be covered by the amount of expected rent savings. Ms. Koester said the costs are around \$30,000,000 for the recommended locations. CBJ is currently spending \$750,000 per year on rental space. That amount would pay for a \$12,000,000 bond over 30 years.

Mr. Winchell suggested one upside of building atop the transit center is that it might encourage employees to use public transportation.

Mr. Hickok asked if the City Hall was moved out of the downtown core, how many parking spaces would that free up. Ms. Koester said that number would be easy to determine since CBJ issues parking passes to employees.

Mr. Arndt said that when he added together survey responses supporting the old Walmart building and those supporting Lemon Creek in general, the survey seemed to show a majority of respondents support relocating City Hall to Lemon Creek locations. Based on that, he asked if there is any other CBJ owned land that could be considered. Ms. Koester explained that the survey allowed people to select more than one location. Therefore, one could reasonably assume that if someone selected Walmart, they might also select Lemon Creek in general. She said they had considered other sites in Lemon Creek but they were either industrial or residential sites or otherwise not as viable as Walmart.

Mr. Alper asked to clarify if the City Hall was built atop the DTC, would the top tier parking be kept as parking with the new construction above that. Ms. Koester explained that top tier of parking would become part of the city hall and no longer be parking.

Mr. LeVine asked what would happen to the current city hall building if it is not kept as city hall. Would it become just an empty building? Ms. Koester explained there is currently not a use decided for that but the CBJ could opt to sell the land and building as it is a prime waterfront parcel or somehow otherwise develop it.

Mr. LeVine expressed concerns that Lemon Creek should be developed and felt members of the PC share his concerns. Ms. Koester said she would communicate their concerns with the Assembly.

Mr. Arndt said he feels the 450 Whittier location is best considering the amount of work they have done regarding parking. If building atop the parking garage removes spaces, then he does not support the DTC location.

Mr. Voelckers spoke in support of building in Lemon Creek and in the Walmart location in particular. He felt the best solution is to adapt and transform an existing building when possible rather than creating new construction.

Mr. Winchell referenced Ms. Koester's slide regarding the 50-year lease of the Walmart building and asked if they had considered a longer term (75- or 99-year leases, for example). Ms. Koester said they have not been able to contact the land owner but the building owner has recently reaffirmed the 50-year lease and there has not been flexibility on that so far. Mr. Winchell asked about building atop the police station. Ms. Koester answered police stations have restrictions and security issues limiting who can enter the building and she added the land in that area includes much non-buildable soil.

Mr. Alper felt strongly that city hall should be located in downtown saying, "... otherwise, what is the purpose of downtown?" He also said he prefers the parking garage option and it looks as though the new construction would be adding two new levels above the current parking levels.

Mr. LeVine recapped the position of the PC includes a strong desire for investment in Lemon Creek and they would like a clear explanation for why this would not be an opportunity for that development. Secondly, whichever location is selected, parking needs to be a consideration so parking is not negatively impacted. Third, they need to understand the underlying financial costs and benefits of the location selections. He added he also personally would like to see the existing City Hall building made into a centerpiece in downtown.

Mr. LeVine said commissioners should send their comments to the email provided by Ms. Koester. (newcityhall@lists.ci.juneau.ak.us) and asked that they CC: him on those emails. Ms. Maclean voiced a concern that those comments would be considered public comments and not necessarily reflect the will of the commission. Her concern was that the commission would be submitting public comments after the public comment period was closed. Mr. LeVine clarified with Ms. Koester that the public was still able to contact the department and make their comments. With that, it was determined that it would be appropriate for commissioners to add their comments.

XII. STAFF REPORTS

Director Maclean reported:

- The Alaska State Planning Conference is March 22-24. Typically, the department sends three commissioners to attend in person. It will be held virtually this year and they may be able to send more to that. Ms. Wallace will send an email with the dates and times and commissioners need to respond to let her know if they would like to attend.
- The March 22 meeting will be cancelled due to lack of quorum.
- The April 12 meeting will be in Chambers. There will be a Committee of the Whole at 6:30 p.m. before the Regular 7 o'clock meeting.

Commissioner Hickok asked to be added to the email list for the Title 49 Committee.

XIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Ms. Cole reported the Lands Housing and Urban Development forwarded the Franklin Foods sale to the Assembly and they voted to enlarge the no parking area to include 2nd street.

Ms. Maclean added the parking ordinance will be before the Assembly on February 28 and it has been expanded to the archipelago as well.

XIV. LIAISON REPORTS

Assembly Member Hughes-Skandijs reported the Committee of the Whole met on February 14 and discussed the landslides maps, dock electrification, the gondolas at Eaglecrest and Assembly Rules of Procedure.

Mr. Voelckers asked if there had been any consideration of the consultant expanding scope regarding the landslide and mass wasting study. Ms. Hughes-Skandijs said it had not come up but she would mention it. Ms. Maclean said there was a meeting coming up with the City Manager where this would be discussed and then brought to the Assembly.

XV. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

XVI. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Ms. Maclean reminded Commissioners to regularly check email and respond timely to the Department.

XVII. EXECUTIVE SESSION – None

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT – 10:01 P.M.

Next Regular meeting scheduled March 8, 2022 7:00 P.M.

**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA**

March 8, 2022 Draft Minutes, Regular Planning Commission - APPROVED

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Upload Date	Type
▣	March 8, 2022 Draft Minutes, Regular Planning Commission	3/22/2022	Minutes

Minutes
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Michael LeVine, Chairman
March 8, 2022

I. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT Read by Chair LeVine

II. ROLL CALL

Michael LeVine, Chairman, called the Regular Meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held virtually via Zoom Webinar and telephonically, to order at 7:01 P.M.

Commissioners present: All Commissioners present via video conferencing – Michael LeVine, Chairman; Nathaniel Dye, Vice Chairman; Paul Voelckers, Clerk; Travis Arndt, Deputy Clerk; Ken Alper; Mandy Cole; Erik Pedersen

Commissioners absent: Dan Hickok; Josh Winchell

Staff present: Jill Maclean, CDD Director; Jennifer Shields, Planner II; Adrienne Scott, Planner I; Sherri Layne, Law

Assembly members: Alicia Hughes-Skandijs

III. REQUEST FOR AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA – None

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Draft Minutes February 8, 2022, Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to approve the February 8, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes.*

V. BRIEF REVIEW OF THE RULES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – Chair LeVine gave a brief description of the public participation process for Zoom format meetings.

VI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

VII. ITEMS FOR RECONSIDERATION – None

VIII. CONSENT AGENDA

USE2022 0003: A Conditional Use Permit for Sunny Slope Organic Farm – Nursery, Landscaping, & Retail
Applicant: William & Danielle Brown-Farrell
Location: 10025 North Douglas Highway

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Conditional Use Permit. The permit would allow continued operation of a Nursery, Landscaping, and Retail business.

The approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Parking spaces shall be a minimum of 8.5 feet by 17 feet. Wheel stops shall be placed in the customer parking area to define the location of parking spaces prior to commencement of the proposed use.
2. One accessible parking space shall be at least 13 feet by 17 feet, including an access aisle area of at least 8 feet by 17 feet. A blue wheel stop and CBJ-approved signage shall be posted for the space prior to commencement of the proposed use.
3. Customer parking shall not impede ingress or egress within the recorded easement area.
4. Exterior lighting shall be designed and located to minimize offsite glare.

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve USE2022 0003.*

The motion passed with no objection.

USE2022 0001: A Conditional Use Permit for a marijuana retail store with on-site consumption of edible marijuana products
Applicant: Blissful Awakenings LLC
Location: 216 2nd Street

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS the requested Special Use Permit. The permit would allow the development of a marijuana retail store with on-site consumption of edible marijuana products.

The approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to issuance of a CBJ marijuana retail store license, the applicant shall submit a retail license from the State of Alaska with an on-site consumption endorsement; by approval of this Special Use Permit, the Planning Commission does not take a position as to whether the application to the State satisfies the requirements of the Endorsement, including if the facility is housed within a freestanding building.

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve USE2022 0001.*

The motion passed with no objection.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

X. REGULAR AGENDA – None

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. CSP2021 0007: Withdrawal of Roadway Construction Standards Waiver for Harris and Seventh Streets AASHTO Compliance

Director Maclean explained the Department has withdrawn the waiver request saying after further analysis, it was found the waiver is not required. The project will now go to the Assembly for approval.

- B. CIP Update –

Director Maclean offered to answer questions. Mr. Arndt, CIP Committee chair, said the Committee has not had the chance to see the memo and will not meet again before it goes to the Assembly on April 5th. He wondered what role the CIP Committee or the PC has in the process. Mr. LeVine explained that as a result of staffing issues and other delays, the PC did not have the opportunity to participate in the process this year and they may not have any role at this point. The PC will see it again after it goes to the Assembly.

XII. STAFF REPORTS

Director Maclean reported

- Title 49 is scheduled for March 31 at Noon. Topics will include:
 - Pre-application opt-in ordinance
 - Downtown ADOD
 - Coastal Management

- The Planning Commission meeting scheduled for March 22 is cancelled due to lack of quorum
- The next PC meeting on April 12 will be a hybrid of in-person/Zoom format with a Committee of the Whole at 6:30 P.M. before the 7:00 P.M. meeting. Masking is required for Staff but optional for members and public. Please be respectful if somebody asks people to wear a mask.
- Alaska Planning Conference will be held March 20 and April 24 as virtual meetings. There is funding available for all members to attend
- Current and upcoming department recruitments include a Housing & Land Use Specialist (Senior Planner) and a Planner I/II position will be posted soon

Jennifer Shields was welcomed as a new CDD Planner.

XIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Chair LeVine reported there was no Title 49 meeting due to lack of quorum and emphasized the importance of communicating with members if you cannot attend a meeting.

Mr. Dye asked for an update on the status of the Blueprint committee. Ms. Maclean said Mr. Ciambor has made final revisions and it has been sent to the CBJ Print Shop.

Mr. Voelckers reported JCOS met last week. They are trying to obtain a dock electrification grant.

XIV. LIAISON REPORTS

Assembly member Hughes-Skandijs reported

- Last night Assembly COW met with the School Board and Airport Board
- Assembly has met and discussed the New City Hall two preferred locations

Mr. Arndt asked if Lemon Creek was considered as part of the City Hall discussion. Ms. Hughes-Skandijs said the two preferred locations were considered but the department did communicate the PC comments regarding development of Lemon Creek.

Mr. Arndt asked the status of scheduling the joint PC/Assembly meeting.

Mr. LeVine expressed the PC is very interested in developing Lemon Creek.

XV. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

XVI. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS –

Mr. LeVine asked Mr. Arndt for an update on the Glory Hall appeal. Mr. Arndt said the time frame for other parties to weigh in have come and gone. It is expected to come before the PC in May. A tentative appeal hearing is scheduled for May 24th at 7:00 P.M.

Mr. Voelckers commented on the CIP list regarding the Teal Street new Glory Hall location asking if any of the new sidewalks or other infrastructure is included in that list.

XVII. EXECUTIVE SESSION – None

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT – 7:55 P.M.

Next scheduled meetings – April 12 Committee of the Whole Meeting 6:30 P.M.; Regular Meeting 7:00 P.M.

DRAFT

**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA**

CSP2022 0001: CBJ Land Disposal - 1 Acre to Brian Maller - REMOVED FROM CONSENT AND
APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF TO RECOMMEND THE ASSEMBLY APPROVE
THE LAND DISPOSAL

AGENDA ITEM:

Case No.: CSP2022 0001
Applicant: City & Borough of Juneau & Brian Maller
Location: Fritz Cove Road
Proposal: CBJ Land Disposal - 1 Acre to Brian Maller

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and forward a recommendation of APPROVAL to the CBJ Assembly for the approximately one-acre land disposal.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Upload Date	Type
☐ Staff Report for CSP2022 0001	4/4/2022	Staff Report
☐ Presentation for CSP2022 0001	4/12/2022	Presentation



PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT
CITY PROJECT REVIEW CSP2022 0001
HEARING DATE: APRIL 12, 2022

(907) 586-0715
 CDD_Admin@juneau.org
 www.juneau.org/CDD
 155 S. Seward Street • Juneau, AK 99801

DATE: April 4, 2022

TO: Michael LeVine, Chair, Planning Commission

BY: Jennifer Shields, Planner II *Jennifer L. Shields*

THROUGH: Jill Maclean, AICP, Director

PROPOSAL: Applicant requests a City State Project Review for disposal of approximately one acre of CBJ-owned land off of Fritz Cove Road.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR REVIEW:

- Disposal of approximately one acre of a 416-acre CBJ lot.
- Purchasing party's lot directly to the west is undeveloped, with steep slopes that constrain development without additional acreage.
- Lands, Housing, & Economic Development Committee supports the proposed land disposal.

GENERAL INFORMATION		
	Land Disposal Party	Purchasing Party
Property Owners	City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ)	Brian & Chelsy Maller
Applicant	Dan Bleidorn, Lands and Resources Manager	
Property Address	N/A	TBD – Fritz Cove Road
Legal Description	USS 3817 Lot 1	USS 3262 Lot 57
Parcel Number	4B2301010170	4B2301010070
Zoning	D1(T)D3 and RR	D1(T)D3
Land Use Designation	Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR)	Rural Low Density Residential (RLDR)
Lot Size	18,149,708 square feet (416.66 acres)	48,787 square feet
Water/Sewer	Public water / on-site sewer	Public water / on-site sewer
Access	Fritz Cove Road Glacier Highway Engineer's Cutoff Road	Fritz Cove Road
Existing Land Use	Wireless Telecommunications Facilities (multiple), Blueberry Trail	Vacant
Associated Applications	N/A	N/A

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

1. **Amend:** amend the recommendation to include conditions and recommend approval to the Assembly.
2. **Deny:** recommend denial of the proposed project. Planning Commission must make its own findings.
3. **Continue:** continue the hearing to a later date if determined that additional information or analysis is needed to make a decision, or if additional testimony is warranted.

ASSEMBLY ACTION REQUIRED:

A Notice of Recommendation will be forwarded to the Assembly for further action.

STANDARD OF REVIEW:

- Quasi-judicial decision
- Requires five (5) affirmative votes for approval
- Code Provisions:
 - 49.10.170 (Land Disposals)
 - 49.15.580 (City Project Review)
 - 53.09.260 (Negotiated Sales)


The Commission shall hear and decide the case based upon the following:

CBJ 49.10.170(c) Planning Commission Duties: *The commission shall review and make recommendations to the assembly on land acquisitions and disposals as prescribed by Title 53, or capital improvement project by any City and Borough agency. The report and recommendation of the commission shall be based upon the provisions of this title, the comprehensive plan, and the capital improvements program.*


CBJ 49.15.580(a) – CBJ Project Review: *The commission shall review all proposed City and Borough capital improvement projects estimated to cost \$500,000 or more for consistency with this title. The commission may review, at the director's discretion, all proposed City and Borough capital projects estimated to cost more than \$250,000 but less than \$500,000. The commission may recommend conditions on and modifications to any project reviewed by the commission through a notice of recommendation. The notice of recommendation shall be forwarded to the assembly for further action.*

CBJ 53.09.260 (b) – Negotiated sales, leases and exchanges: *Review and approval process. Upon satisfactory progress in the negotiation or competition undertaken pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, after review by the planning commission for disposals other than leases, after review by the assembly lands committee, and authorization by the assembly by ordinance, the manager may conclude arrangements for the lease, sale, exchange, or other disposal of City and Borough land. The final terms of a disposal pursuant to this section are subject to approval by the assembly unless the minimum essential terms and the authority of the manager to execute the disposal are set forth in the ordinance enacted pursuant to this subsection. The disposal may not be executed until the effective date of the ordinance.*

CURRENT ZONING MAP



LAND USE DESIGNATION MAP



SURROUNDING LAND USES AND ZONING


Direction	Zoning District	Land Use
North	D1(T)D3	Residential & Undeveloped
South	D1(T)D3	Residential & Undeveloped
East	D1(T)D3	Undeveloped
West	D1(T)D3	Residential

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project Description – CBJ Lands and Resources Division proposes selling approximately one acre of land to an adjacent property owner (**Attachment A**). The purchasing party has requested land from CBJ to facilitate a longer driveway for future development of the lot.

On January 24, 2022, the CBJ Lands, Housing, and Economic Development Committee unanimously passed a motion to forward the land disposal application to the CBJ Assembly, with a motion of support for the negotiated sale (**Attachment B**).

If the disposal is ultimately approved by the CBJ Assembly, the purchasing party would be required to submit a Minor Subdivision application per CBJ 49.15.401(a)(4): *“Lot line adjustments. The minor subdivision process shall be used to review adjustments to any number of lot boundary lines if the subdivision does not result in an increase in the number of lots.”* Minor Subdivisions are approved by the Director. The current application is solely to obtain a land disposal recommendation from the Planning Commission.



Background – CBJ Lot 1


The table below summarizes relevant history for CBJ Lot 1.

Year	Item	Summary
1965	Plat	Auke Bay, Alaska Subdivision #455 splitting off 3.373 acres.
1992	Conditional Use Permit & Building Permit	USE1992 0043 and BLD0801501 approval for a 150-foot tall communications tower.
1996	Conditional Use Permit	USE1996 0020 approval for a 40-foot tall communications tower.
2003	City Project Review	CSP2003 0004 approval for a 40,000 square foot land lease for a 30-foot tall communications tower.
2015	City Project Review	CSP2015 0005 approval for a 40 foot tall communications tower.
2019	Pre-Application Conf. & Wireless Communication Facility	PAC2019 0035 and WCF2019 0007 review and approval for a 40-foot tall communications tower for the Juneau Police Department.
2022	Building Permit	BLD2022 0025 issued for communications equipment.

Current Conditions – CBJ Lot 1

The northern portion of the Mendenhall Peninsula comprises over four hundred acres of undeveloped forest with varied slopes. The land requested for disposal is part of a tract platted in 1960 as U.S. Survey 3817, Lot 1 (**Attachment C**). Two smaller, partial subdivisions of Lot 1 have taken place since that time (see map, right). The northern portion of the lot has also been known as Pederson Hill, although it should not be confused with the newer Pederson Hill Subdivision area on the east side of Glacier Highway.

Site features include a CBJ Public Works water reservoir in the northeastern area of the lot; an isolated, elevated area with numerous communication facilities in the southern area of the lot; and Blueberry Trail, a public use trail which can be accessed off of Engineer's Cutoff Road and leads uphill to the communications site.



Background – Purchasing Party Lot 57


The table below summarizes relevant history for the purchasing party's Lot 57.

Year	Item	Summary
1953	Plat	U.S. Survey 3262 (Attachment D).
2017	Record of Survey	Survey #2017-07 of Lots 57-59 of U.S. Survey 3262 (Attachment E).
2017	Building Permit	BLD2017-0658 grading of the lot for future development.

Current Conditions – Purchasing Party Lot 57

Lot 57 was platted in 1953 (**Attachment D**). The majority of lots in this residential subdivision are already developed or under construction. Since Lot 57 is undeveloped, it does not yet have an assigned address.

Grading and removal of vegetation on Lot 57 began in 2017. The purchasing party has provided a sketch of potential development of the property if the approximate one-acre area of land is approved for disposal.



ZONING ANALYSIS

49.05.100 - Purpose and intent. The purpose and Intent of Title 49 Land Use Code is:

- (1) *To achieve the goals and objectives, and implement the policies, of the Juneau comprehensive plan, and coastal management program;*
- (2) *To ensure that future growth and development in the City and Borough is in accord with the values of its residents;*
- (3) *To identify and secure, for present and future residents, the beneficial impacts of growth while minimizing the negative impacts;*
- (4) *To ensure that future growth is of the appropriate type, design and location, and is served by a proper range of public services and facilities such as water, sewage, and electrical distribution systems, transportation, schools, parks and other public requirements, and in general to promote public health, safety and general welfare;*
- (5) *To provide adequate open space for light and air; and*
- (6) *To recognize the economic value of land and encourage its proper and beneficial use.*

Service	Summary
Urban Service Boundary	Within
Water/Sewer	CBJ Water / On-Site Sewer
Fire Service Area	Within
Schools	No CBJ school is directly impacted by this project.
Recreation	No recreation facility is directly impacted by this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL, CONSERVATION, HISTORIC, AND ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The below table summarizes resources which may be affected by the approximate one-acre land disposal.

Resource	Summary
Conservation Areas	No
Wetlands	No
Anadromous	No
Impaired Waterbodies	No
Historic	Unknown
Archeological	Unknown
Comprehensive Plan View sheds	No

CONFORMITY WITH ADOPTED PLANS

2013 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN VISION: *The City and Borough of Juneau is a vibrant State Capital that values the diversity and quality of its natural and built environments, creates a safe and satisfying quality of life for its diverse population, provides quality education and employment for its workers, encourages resident participation in community decisions and provides an environment to foster state-wide leadership.*

2013 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – The proposed land disposal is in compliance with the 2013 Comprehensive Plan.

Chapter	Page No.	Item	Summary
4	37	Housing Policy 4.2	The proposed land disposal supports Policy 4.2 by facilitating residential development. <i>POLICY 4.2. TO FACILITATE THE PROVISION OF AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF VARIOUS HOUSING TYPES AND SIZES TO ACCOMMODATE PRESENT AND FUTURE HOUSING NEEDS FOR ALL ECONOMIC GROUPS.</i>
10	130	Land Use Policy 10.2	The proposed land disposal supports Policy 10.2 by facilitating residential development within the Urban Service Area. <i>POLICY 10.2. TO ALLOW FLEXIBILITY AND A WIDE RANGE OF CREATIVE SOLUTIONS IN RESIDENTIAL AND MIXED USE LAND DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE URBAN SERVICE AREA.</i>
10	131	Land Use Policy 10.3	The proposed land disposal supports Policy 10.3 by facilitating the development of an underdeveloped and constrained area on the Mendenhall Peninsula, where approximately only 15% of the land is buildable (page 35). <i>POLICY 10.3. TO FACILITATE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS OF VARIOUS TYPES AND DENSITIES THAT ARE APPROPRIATELY LOCATED IN RELATION TO SITE CONDITIONS, SURROUNDING LAND USES, AND CAPACITY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.</i>
17	226	Community Development Policy	The proposed land disposal supports Policy 17.2 by providing Land Funds which can be used to supplement affordable housing, workforce housing, or other CBJ supported projects.

2013 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – The proposed land disposal is in compliance with the 2013 Comprehensive Plan.			
		17.2	<i>POLICY 17.2. TO HOLD CERTAIN LANDS IN THE PUBLIC TRUST, AND TO DISPOSE OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR PRIVATE USE WHEN DISPOSAL SERVES THE PUBLIC INTEREST.</i>

2016 LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN – The proposed land disposal is in compliance with the 2016 Land Management Plan.			
Chapter	Page No.	Item	Summary
CBJ Land Holdings	50	Mendenhall Peninsula LND-0510	Retain/Dispose. NOTE: “Retain/Dispose” are appropriate for disposal, but there are sections (such as stream corridors, high value wetlands, etc.) that may be retained for a public purpose. This designation is particularly common for larger parcels.

AGENCY REVIEW

CDD conducted an agency review comment period between March 9, 2022 and March 17, 2022. No agency comments have been received.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

CDD is not required to conduct public review for a CSP. The applicant has performed their own public outreach efforts. For this case, a public notice sign was posted on site two weeks prior to the scheduled hearing (**Attachment F**). No public comments have been received as of the date of this staff report.

FINDINGS

In accordance with CBJ 49.15.580, staff finds the proposed CBJ land disposal of approximately one acre of land within U.S. Survey 3817, Lot 1 complies with Title 49 Land Use Code and is in general conformity with adopted plans, specifically the 2013 Comprehensive Plan and the 2016 Land Management Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and forward a recommendation of APPROVAL to the CBJ Assembly for the approximately one-acre land disposal.

STAFF REPORT ATTACHMENTS

Item	Description
Attachment A	Application Packet
Attachment B	Minutes: Lands, Housing, and Economic Development, January 24, 2022
Attachment C	U.S. Survey 3817
Attachment D	U.S. Survey 3262
Attachment E	Survey #2017-07
Attachment F	Public Notice Sign Photo



DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION

NOTE: Development Permit Application forms must accompany all other Community Development Department land use applications.

To be completed by Applicant	PROPERTY LOCATION		
	Physical Address 0 FRITZ COVE RD;		
	Legal Description(s) (Subdivision, Survey, Block, Tract, Lot) USS 3262 LT 57, USS 3817 LT 1		
	Parcel Number(s) 4B2301010070 , 4B2301010170		
	☐ This property located in the downtown historic district ☐ This property located in a mapped hazard area, if so, which _____		
	LANDOWNER/ LESSEE		
	Property Owner City and borough of Juneau / Brian A Maller	Contact Person Dan Bleidorn	
	Mailing Address (Brian Maller) 9574 MEADOW LN, JUNEAU AK 99801	Phone Number(s) 586-5252	
	E-mail Address dan.bleidorn@juneau.org / bmaller@colaska.com		
	LANDOWNER/ LESSEE CONSENT Required for Planning Permits, not needed on Building/ Engineering Permits		
I am (we are) the owner(s) or lessee(s) of the property subject to this application and I (we) consent as follows: A. This application for a land use or activity review for development on my (our) property is made with my complete understanding and permission. B. I (we) grant permission for officials and employees of the City and Borough of Juneau to inspect my property as needed for purposes of this application.			
X <u><i>Daniel Bleidorn</i></u> <u>02/01/2022</u> Landowner/Lessee Signature Date			
X _____ _____ Landowner/Lessee Signature Date			
NOTICE: The City and Borough of Juneau staff may need access to the subject property during regular business hours and will attempt to contact the landowner in addition to the formal consent given above. Further, members of the Planning Commission may visit the property before the scheduled public hearing date.			
APPLICANT If the same as OWNER, write "SAME"			
Applicant City and Borough of Juneau	Contact Person Dan Bleidorn		
Mailing Address 155 S. Seward Street	Phone Number(s) (907) 586-5252		
E-mail Address dan.bleidorn@juneau.org			
X <u><i>Daniel Bleidorn</i></u> <u>02/01/2022</u> Applicant's Signature Date of Application			

-----DEPARTMENT USE ONLY BELOW THIS LINE-----

This form and all documents associated with it are public record once submitted.

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

For assistance filling out this form, contact the Permit Center at 586-0770.

Attachment A - Application Packet

Intake Initials <i>AS</i>	Date Received <i>2/7/22</i>
Case Number <i>CSP 2022 0001</i>	



CITY/STATE PROJECT AND LAND ACTION REVIEW APPLICATION

See reverse side for more information regarding the permitting process and the materials required for a complete application.

NOTE: Must be accompanied by a DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION form.

PROJECT SUMMARY

December 2021, Brian Maller submitted an application to purchase City property adjacent to his property located on Fritz Cove Road. The application states that the additional land will allow a length to be added to the driveway to reduce the steepness to allow for a safe access to the higher elevation of the property and space for building a home. 5

TYPE OF PROJECT REVIEW:



City Project Review



City Land Acquisition /Disposal



State Project Review

PROJECT NUMBERS ASSOCIATED WITH PROPOSAL:

Is this project associated with any other Land Use Permits?



YES

Case No.: _____



NO

Capital Improvement Program # (CIP) _____

Local Improvement District # (LID) _____

State Project # _____

ESTIMATED PROJECT COST: \$ _____

ALL REQUIRED MATERIALS ATTACHED



Complete application



Pre-Application notes (if applicable)



Narrative including:



Current use of land or building(s)



Proposed use of land or building(s)



How the proposed project complies with the Comprehensive Plan



How the proposed project complies with the Land Use Code (Title 49)



Site Plan (details on page 2)

To be completed by Applicant

NOTE: This application is required even if the proposed project is associated with other Land Use permits.

-----DEPARTMENT USE ONLY BELOW THIS LINE-----

CITY/STATE PROJECT FEES	Fees	Check No.	Receipt	Date
Application Fees	\$ _____			

This form and all documents associated with it are public record once submitted.

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

For assistance filling out this form, contact the Permit Center at 586-0770.

Attachment A - Application Packet

Case Number

CSP20220001

Date Received

2/7/22

City/State Project and Land Action Review Information

City and State project review is outlined in CBJ 49.15.580

Each application for a City/State Project is reviewed by the Planning Commission at a public hearing. The permit procedure is intended to provide the Commission the flexibility necessary to make recommendations tailored to individual applications.

Application: An application for a City/State Project Review will not be accepted by the Community Development Department until it is determined to be complete. The items needed for a complete application are:

1. **Forms:** Completed City/State Project Review Application and Development Permit Application forms.
2. **Fees:** No fee required for projects that cost less than \$2.5 million. For projects costing more than this amount, the fee is \$1,600.00. All fees are subject to change.
3. **Project Narrative:** A detailed narrative describing the project.
4. **Plans:** All plans are to be drawn to scale and clearly show the items listed below:
 - a. Plat, site plan, floor plan and elevation views of existing and proposed structures and land;
 - b. Existing and proposed parking areas, including dimensions of the spaces, aisle width and driveway entrances;
 - c. Proposed traffic circulation within the site including access/egress points and traffic control devices;
 - d. Existing and proposed lighting (including cut sheets for each type of lighting);
 - e. Existing and proposed vegetation with location, area, height and type of plantings; and,
 - f. Existing physical features of the site (i.e. drainage, eagle trees, hazard areas, salmon streams, wetlands, etc.)

Document Format: All materials submitted as part of an application shall be submitted in either of the following formats:

1. Electronic copies in the following formats: .doc, .txt, .xls, .bmp, .pdf, .jpg, .gif, .xlm, .rtf (other formats may be preapproved by the Community Development Department).
2. Paper copies 11" X 17" or smaller (larger paper size may be preapproved by the Community Development Department).

Application Review & Hearing Procedure: Once the application is determined to be complete, the Community Development Department will initiate the review and scheduling of the application. This process includes:


Review: As part of the review process the Community Development Department will evaluate the application for consistency with all applicable City & Borough of Juneau codes and adopted plans. Depending on unique characteristics of the permit request the application may be required to be reviewed by other municipal boards and committees. Review comments may require the applicant to provide additional information, clarification, or submit modifications/alterations for the proposed project.

Hearing: All City/State Project Review Permit Applications must be reviewed by the Planning Commission. Once an application has been deemed complete and has been reviewed by all applicable parties the Community Development Department will schedule the requested permit for the next appropriate meeting. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation based on staff's analysis and forward it to the Assembly for final approval/denial.

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

Maller Request to Purchase City Property





Maller Request to Purchase City Property

- The City received a completed applicant from Brian Maller in December 2021 to purchase City property adjacent to his property located on Fritz Cove Road
- The application states that the requested property will be used to create driveway access to an area of the applicant's property that currently has no vehicle access do to the steep terrain
- Given the nature and location of this request, it is not appropriate to solicit competition for this disposal.
- If approved the applicant will be responsible for all costs associated with the minor subdivision and acquisition of this property including the fair market value of the land. Proceeds from this proposed request will be deposited in to the Land Fund.



Maller Request to Purchase City Property

City Code 53.09.260 states that the Assembly must determine “whether the proposal should be further considered and, if so, whether by direct negotiation with the original proposer or by competition after an invitation for further proposals. Upon direction of the Assembly by motion, the Manager may commence negotiations for the lease, sale, exchange, or other disposal of City and Borough land.”

Staff request that the Lands, Housing and Economic Development Committee forward this application to the Assembly with a motion of support for working with the original proposer for the negotiated sale of City property.





Attachment A - Application Packet

1/10/22, 12:12 PM

CBJ Land Sale Applicants – City and Borough of Juneau



City and Borough of Juneau Land Purchase Applicants

Edit Entry

Applicant Information

Business / Individual *

Brian Maller

Address *

9574 Meadow Lane

Street Address

Juneau

City

AK

State / Province / Region

99801

ZIP / Postal Code

Phone *

(907) 723-7989

Email

bmall@colaska.com

☐ Add Another Business/Individual

CBJ Land Information

The CBJ Assessor's Database will provide information regarding site address and legal description. The CBJ Parcel Viewer tool can provide necessary maps needed to complete this application.

Site Address *

Attachment A - Application Packet

1/10/22, 12:12 PM

CBJ Land Sale Applicants – City and Borough of Juneau

3145 Fritz Cove Road

Legal Description *

USS 3262 LT 57 - Is the property in front of the land proposed for Purchase

Provide Brief Description of Your Proposal *

I am proposing the purchase of one acre of CBJ land adjacent to property I already own. The additional land will be used to create driveway access to an area of my property that currently has no vehicle access due to steep terrain. The additional land will allow for length to be added to the driveway to reduce the steepness to allow safe access to the higher elevation of the property and space for building a home.

Provide a Map of CBJ Land you wish to Purchase *

Land-Purchase-Application-Map-Brian-Maller.pdf  

Have you mailed the \$500.00 filing fee? *

☒ Yes

☐ Not Yet

Applications can only be processed when the \$500 fee is received. All checks are made out to "The City and Borough of Juneau" and can be sent to:

*The City and Borough of Juneau
Attn:Lands and Resources Division
155 S. Seward St.
Juneau, AK 99081*

Additional Comments for CBJ Staff to Consider

More details and a rough site map can be provided if needed upon request. Thank you for your consideration.

Upload Supporting Documents (optional)

Drop files here or

SELECT FILES

Accepted file types: pdf, doc, docx, Max. file size: 50 MB.

CBJ-Land-Sale-Application-Brian-Maller.pdf  

Attachment A - Application Packet

1/10/22, 12:12 PM

CBJ Land Sale Applicants – City and Borough of Juneau

"By submitting this form, I agree all information is accurate. Submission of this request is NOT approval by the City and Borough of Juneau. I understand that staff will review my application and follow up with questions. Once staff have reviewed my application, ultimate determination of my request to purchase City property will be made by the City Assembly."

Legal Representative of Business / Individual *

Brian

First

Maller

Last

UPDATE

CANCEL

DELETE

MEMORANDUM

CITY/BOROUGH OF JUNEAU

Lands and Resources Office
155 S. Seward St., Juneau, Alaska 99801
Dan.Bleidorn@juneau.org
(907) 586-5252

TO: Michelle Hale, Chair of the Assembly Lands Housing and Economic Development Committee

FROM: Dan Bleidorn, Lands and Resources Manager *Daniel Bleidorn*

SUBJECT: Maller Request to Purchase City Property

DATE: January 19, 2022

In December 2021, Brian Maller submitted an application to purchase City property adjacent to his property located on Fritz Cove Road. The application states that the requested property will be used to create driveway access to an area of the applicant's property that currently has no vehicle access do to the steep terrain. The application continues by stating that the additional land will allow a length to be added to the driveway to reduce the steepness to allow for a safe access to the higher elevation of the property and space for building a home.



City Code 53.09.260 states that the Assembly must determine "whether the proposal should be further considered and, if so, whether by direct negotiation with the original proposer or by competition after an invitation for further proposals. Upon direction of the Assembly by motion, the Manager may commence negotiations for the lease, sale, exchange, or other disposal of City and Borough land."

Given the nature and location of this request, it is not appropriate to solicit competition for this disposal. The applicant will be responsible for all costs associated with the minor subdivision

and acquisition of this property including the fair market value of the land. Proceeds from this proposed request will be deposited in to the Land Fund.

Staff request that the Lands, Housing and Economic Development Committee forward this application to the Assembly with a motion of support for working with the original proposer for the negotiated sale of City property.

**ASSEMBLY STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES
LANDS HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA
January 24, 2022, 5:00 P.M.**

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**
- III. ROLL CALL** - Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.
Members Present: Acting Chair Greg Smith, Wade Bryson, Wáahlaal Gíidaak
Members Absent: Michelle Hale
Liaisons Present: Chris Mertl, Parks and Recreation; Lacey Derr, Docks and Harbors
Liaisons Absent: Dan Hickok, Planning Commission
Other Assembly Members Present
Some Members of the Public Present: Brian Maller, Loren Jones
Staff Present: Dan Bleidorn, Lands Manager; Roxie Duckworth, Lands & Resources Specialist; Jill Maclean, CDD Director
- IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – The agenda was approved as presented.
- V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** - November 29, 2021 Draft Minutes were approved as presented.
- VI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** - No public participation.

VII. AGENDA TOPICS

A. 2021 City Foreclosure Property Disposal

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic. Wáahlaal Gíidaak asked when making contact, how often and by what means. Mr. Bleidorn replied that our involvement at Lands is that we are not involved until we have the Clerks deed. Prior to that it is with the City tax office, in which they try to do whatever they can to get a hold of the property owners, Lands does the same. For example, last week I received a name of somebody who might know the property in the Flats. This came in as we were evaluating the property and we do everything we can to reach out to the previous owners or anybody who would know anything about them. Our goal is to get the property tax value back, and if we can avoid foreclosing or if the previous owners can work with another entity to come to an agreement with property taxes, we generally try to go that approach, and then, if all else fails, then we will sell the property.

Mr. Mertl asked if we make this motion does it automatically trigger the disposal or are the various City staffs consulted first, is that just that concept encapsulated into the motion. Mr. Bleidorn replied that we've already spoken with the City departments and the motion we're requesting tonight is based on those comments. It has been determined that there's no real public use for the City to retain these properties and we are requesting a motion to work towards disposal.

Motion passed to direct the attorney to draft and introduce ordinances that authorize disposal of these properties because of delinquent property taxes. No objections.

B. Maller Request to Purchase City Property

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic. Wáahlaal Gíidaak asked to clarify this in terms of our land use plan, if this doesn't impact anything that we have planned moving forward or if we are clear in terms of any plans we have for the City property, as it looks like it carves out like an interesting

chunk of the large area that the City owns. Mr. Bleidorn replied that is a significant piece of property when you are looking at it closely up but looking at the topography it still makes sense. It doesn't negatively affect what we plan on doing out there in the long term. I can see some roads on the spine of the Mendenhall Peninsula and with housing and future City needs with design, I don't see this negatively affecting that.

Mr. Mertl asked who manages this land. Mr. Bleidorn replied to Lands and Resources. Mr. Mertl asked if access is off of Fritz Cove Road, as you go up it becomes steep as you move from left to right across the yellow piece of property. Is it their intent to put their house on the yellow property or their house on the red because I am not quite tracking the request that getting this upper piece of property is going to allow them to put in better driveway access. Mr. Bleidorn replied that based on the topography of the property, having more square footage would allow to better meander the driveway up there, whereas without this, you have to use a majority of the lot for the driveway. I'm not certain if the house will be built on what is currently City property now or built on what is the current yellow outline privately held property. That being said, it doesn't necessarily change my opinions of this property, if the house ends up being built on the flat area that is the City property towards the top or if it's somewhere between the two. Mr. Mertl followed up by commenting that as a planner and a landscape architect he sees that this person likely is going to put a house up in this red area, it is not being used for a driveway that is his gut feeling could be wrong. Is it possible to request a preliminary site plan so we understand why we are potentially selling this piece of property. I guess I just get concerned that this sets up, in my mind, a precedence that we're now going to start getting a flurry of land sale requests on City property from people to expand and develop their residential lots. We've been difficult with other people in the past, having been on this Committee for many years, where we have not allowed development because lot sizes are too small. I'm all for housing development, but I'm concerned about the precedence, this may set for selling additional City properties so people can use it for development.

Mr. Bryson commented that he agrees with Mr. Mertl and from an Assembly seat, as people have requested small slivers of land to make their project or their property more developable, we have set the precedence, or have generally tried to work with the original applicants, at least during my time on the Assembly. This was common to some of the other request that we have had. There was one on North Douglas where we added a sliver land. Reading the brief description of this proposal, and it does say that he is going to increase his driveway size so it will not be as steep and to allow safe access to the higher elevation of the property to build a home. He is saying that he is going to build up there and the additional land will allow for a lower angle driveway, which is what was in the description from Mr. Bleidorn.

Wáahlaal Gíidaak commented that she appreciates the points raised and hadn't considered those. She wanted to know how much land is being considered. Mr. Bleidorn replied that he's requesting about an acre, which is a significant amount and not a sliver of land like the examples on Douglas.

Mr. Bleidorn addressed some of Mr. Mertl's comments. There have been times in the past, where the City was apprehensive to work with an adjacent neighbor if the City property is managed by the Parks and Recreation. We have people who are adjacent to public parklands, open spaces, or green belts that encroach onto City property. They push their fence line in or other issues, and it is not appropriate to cut away at parkland in that manner. If this property was managed by Parks and Rec, I would be recommending against because we don't create saw tooth property lines and we don't

slowly peck away at parkland. Generally speaking, if it's property that's on our disposal list, managed by Lands, and it's made available for future developments, we try to work with the property owners. For new Committee members, when we sell property it goes into the Lands Fund, which can be used to supplement affordable housing or to work on other developments. As much as this is probably a high value property, the funds from it can be used to help facilitate Assembly goals towards workforce housing.

Wáahlaal Gíidaak followed up to ask if the lots to the left and the right of this property can also make this request to also have an extension into city property and would that negatively impact our land use plan or have an impact at all, because I can see, neither of those properties are developed either, and could have the potential to also make this similar request if the terrain is similar to the property and question. Mr. Bleidorn replied that when determining how to move forward with this that is something that we consider. Looking down the whole line of houses, that's something that we would allow for, and I think in this situation, yes, and a lot of times it's almost better when you have a few applicants that have a shared property line because, for them, they can share costs. For us it doesn't create this saw tooth property line. We occasionally get phone calls from people who are curious about this and it's not uncommon for us to field those questions. As this moves forward, we'll do some public notice, and we might have people call us and requesting information on that. If people come forward and want to do something similar, I think, in this case, it would be welcomed, and we will work with them as well.

Motion passed that the Lands, Housing and Economic Development Committee forward this application to the Assembly with a motion of support for working with the original proposer for the negotiated sale of City property. No objections.

VIII. STAFF REPORTS - No Staff Reports

IX. COMMITTEE MEMBER/LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS - None

X. STANDING COMMITTEE TOPICS

- A. Status of Title 49 Update – Ms. Maclean gave an update. There will be a Planning Commission meeting on Tuesday, January 25, 2022, that will take up downtown parking, a topic the Assembly has been excited to see worked on, I'm happy to report that it is moving forward and hopefully it will be well received when it gets to the Assembly. We have a couple of last questions for the Commission to sort out in tomorrow evening, but I do expect it to be forwarded on to the Assembly. The Planning Commission will also be taking up the Housing and Development Task Force that CDD and Law have worked on updating the pre-application ordinance at the request of some of the developers. The ordinance is being amended to make pre-application conferences optional and not mandatory. Ms. Maclean does have some concerns and will be discussing those more at the Planning Commission. It is the intent that it will streamline the permitting process, my concerns lay mostly with the developers or the applicants if they don't know or understand the process upfront, their applications may not be complete which then may inadvertently extend the review time or the intake process. We'll work through that tomorrow evening, and we'll see how the Committee feels about that.

The other item that we have taken up is an ordinance to amend the marijuana ordinance. Staff is recommending that the five year renewal for conditional use permits for marijuana be

stricken to be deleted. We went through, last year, the first five-year review period and I can appreciate when that marijuana ordinance was written that there were concerns about what the potential impacts would be to the neighbors and other businesses. Working through this process now for over five years with the annual inspection and the renewal of city and state licenses each year, I think that more than ensures that the businesses are operating appropriately and complying. Any instances we've had have been resolved before the five year renewal. My hope is that we can strike that because every time they come up, we have to write a staff report. The applicants have to apply, we have to schedule it on the Planning Commission agenda, and it just takes up time that could be better used elsewhere.

I would also like to make the committee aware that we are still continuing to work on the stream ordinance and hoping to wrap that up, or at least have it before the Planning Commission, probably March. We are continuing to work on coastal zone management at the Title 49 Committee and we will be looking at that on March 3. It's spaced out a little bit because we continue to work on streams and we're onboarding a lot of new staff. I have some travel coming up and we are just trying to wrap up what we have on our plates before we start on new items. We are continuing to work on the accessory apartment ordinance, and you should be seeing that soon, probably around the March timeline for the Planning Commission.

Scott Ciambor has been promoted to Planning Manager. We are really excited to have that position filled and with someone of Scott's caliber. We have now completely filled every staff position that we had vacant we have just hired a brand new permit tech that will be starting in a couple of weeks. We have our two new planners, one the plat reviewer and a Planner II. We now Breckan Hendricks as our new administrative officer who's also just a rock star so she's working on a great permitting presentation, so hopefully we'll have some real numbers for you soon on the number of building permits issued, the number of single family homes, accessory apartments, and everything you've been asking for that we just haven't been able to get to and so I'm really excited that all of this is starting to come together and, hopefully, in a few more months when all the new staff is trained up we'll just keep pushing ahead and getting work done on Title 49.

B. Status of Housing Initiatives - None

XI. NEXT MEETING DATE – February 14, 2022

XII. ADJOURNMENT - Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 5:30 PM.

U. S. SURVEY
No. 3817, ALASKA
embracing
Lots 1 and 2


SITUATED
ON THE NORTHERN PORTION OF MENDENHALL PENINSULA
ADJOINING H.E.S. NO. 159
AND
U.S. SURVEYS NOS. 3262, 3261, 2672, 2515,
2390, 2136, 1536, 3260, 2386, 3274 AND 2741,
ABOUT 13 MILES NORTHWESTERLY FROM JUNEAU, ALASKA

APPROXIMATE GEOGRAPHIC POSITION
LATITUDE 58°22' N LONGITUDE 134°38' W

AREAS: LOT 1 --- 416.66 ACRES
LOT 2 --- 0.58 ACRES
TOTAL --- 417.24 ACRES

SURVEY EXECUTED BY
ROBERT Q. PICKERING, CADASTRAL SURVEYOR
JUNE 9 TO JULY 25, 1960

UNDER SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS
DATED MARCH 14, 1960
AND
APPROVED MAY 5, 1960



Magnetic Declination
30°30' E

COURSES AND DISTANCES

LINE 7 - 8

S 13°53' W	0.348
S 15°57' W	0.348
S 16°18' W	0.129
S 14°01' W	0.525
S 9°51' W	0.525
S 6°50' W	0.524
S 2°28' W	0.524
S 0°47' E	0.55
S 5°09' E	0.55
S 7°46' E	0.188
S 7°08' E	0.447
S 4°24' E	0.445
S 1°39' E	0.445
S 1°06' W	0.445
S 3°50' W	0.445
S 5°57' W	0.515
S 8°55' W	0.515
S 11°53' W	0.515
S 13°22' W	0.436
S 17°02' W	0.356
S 25°54' W	0.356
S 34°46' W	0.356
S 43°38' W	0.356
S 48°50' W	0.023
S 45°22' W	0.265
S 36°43' W	0.265

MEANDERS

Lot 1

1. S 2°02' W	6.19
2. S 5°41' E	4.34
3. S 10°45' E	2.21
4. S 38°18' E	0.76

MEANDERS

Lot 2

5. S 59°44' E	2.99
6. S 48°38' W	2.45
7. S 82°44' W	1.44
8. N 11°40' E	3.38

U S SURVEY No 3817

Lot 1
416.66 acres

Packet Page 61 of 140

COURSES AND DISTANCES

LINE 11 - 12

S 39°11' E	0.80
S 21°31' E	0.80
S 3°51' E	0.80
S 5°01' W	2.225

LEGEND

- BRASS CAPPED IRON POST
- STONE CORNER MONUMENT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Washington, D.C. October 12, 1962


This plat is strictly conformable to the approved
field notes, and the survey, having been correctly ex-
ecuted in accordance with the requirements of law and
the regulations of this Bureau, is hereby accepted.

For the Director

E. J. Remington
Chief, Division of Engineering

0 5 10 15 20 25 30
CHAINS

ORIGINAL




U. S. SURVEY
No. 3262, ALASKA
and
DEPENDENT RESURVEY
OF A PORTION OF U. S. SURVEY NO. 2120
Situated
on the Fritz Cove Road on Mendenhall Peninsula
approximately 12½ miles northwest of Juneau, Alaska
Area: 16.12 Acres
Latitude 58° 22' 47" N. Longitude 134° 38' 29" W.
At Corner No. 1
Surveyed By
Johh M. Short, Cartographer (Cadastral)
June 22 to 26, 1953
Under Special Instructions Dated
December 29, 1952 and Approved
January 15, 1953

○ INDICATES AN IRON POST WITH A BRASS CAP
OTHER MONUMENTS ARE WOODEN POSTS

FOR BEARINGS AND DISTANCES ON THE BOUNDARY
OF LOT 64 (FRITZ COVE ROAD) SEE FIELD NOTES

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Washington, D. C. April 21, 1954
This plat is strictly conformable to the approved
field notes, and the survey, having been correctly
executed in accordance with the requirements of law
and the regulations of this Bureau, is hereby accepted.
For the Director
Ronald B. Clement
Assistant Chief, Division of
Cadastral Engineering






Attachment F - Public Notice Sign Photo

CSP2022 0001

CBJ Land Disposal

of approximately one acre
off of Fritz Cove Road



Planning Commission Regular Meeting – April 12, 2022

Planning Commission Review

CBJ 49.10.170(c) Planning Commission Duties:

The commission shall review and make recommendations to the assembly on land disposals as prescribed by Title 53, or capital improvement projects by any City and Borough agency.

3

Project Description

- ❖ One acre land disposal.
- ❖ Supported by Lands, Housing, and Economic Development Committee.



5

Future Project Design



6

Conformity with Adopted Plans

The proposed land disposal conforms with the:

- ❖ 2013 Comprehensive Plan
- ❖ 2016 Land Management Plan



7

Public Notice and Comments

- ❖ Public notice sign posted on site
- ❖ One public comment opposed to the project.



8

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

9

CSP2022 0001

Questions?

Thank you!

Contact Information:

Jennifer Shields, Planner II

Jennifer.Shields@juneau.org

(907) 586-0753 ext. 4139



**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA**

AME2021 0010: A rezone of 2.6 acres from D10 to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Light Commercial (LC) - APPROVED AS AMENDED, RECOMMENDING REZONE FROM D10 TO LIGHT COMMERCIAL TO THE ASSEMBLY FOR ADOPTION

AGENDA ITEM:

Case No.: AME2021 0010

Applicant: Edward Rivera

Location: Glacier Highway

Proposal: A rezone of 2.6 acres from D10 to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Light Commercial (LC)

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and forward a recommendation of APPROVAL to the Assembly for the requested rezone for 2.6 acres from D10 to Neighborhood Commercial (NC).

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Upload Date	Type
☐ Staff Report for AME2021 0010	4/5/2022	Staff Report
☐ Presentation for AME2021 0010	4/12/2022	Presentation



PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT
REZONE AME2021 0010
HEARING DATE: APRIL 12, 2022

(907) 586-0715

CDD_Admin@juneau.org

www.juneau.org/community-development

155 S. Seward Street • Juneau, AK 99801

DATE: April 5, 2022
TO: Michael LeVine, Chair, Planning Commission
BY: Irene Gallion, Senior Planner
THROUGH: Jill Maclean, AICP, Director

PROPOSAL: Applicant requests a rezone for 2.6 acres from D10 to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Light Commercial (LC).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of APPROVAL to the Assembly from D10 to NC.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR REVIEW:

- Neighborhood Commercial is preferred, Light Commercial is a second choice.
- Neighborhood Commercial densities of 15 units/acre conforms to Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designation of Medium Density Residential of 5-20 units/acre.
- Neighborhood Commercial supports commercial use consistent with residential uses.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Property Owner	Catholic Community Service
Applicant	Edward Rivera
Property Address	1801/1803/1805 Glacier Highway
Legal Description	USS 3871 & USS 667 FR
Parcel Number	7B0801030060
Zoning	D10
Land Use Designation	Medium Density Residential (Map K)
Lot Size	113,256 square feet, 2.6 acres
Water/Sewer	Yes
Access	Glacier Highway
Existing Land Use	Social services, offices, and facilities
Associated Applications	N/A

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

1. **Amend:** recommend an amended rezone boundary; recommend an alternative zoning district; or recommend conditions.
2. **Deny:** recommend denial of the requested rezone. Planning Commission must make its own findings.
3. **Continue:** continue the hearing to a later date if determined that additional information or analysis is needed to make a decision, or if additional testimony is warranted.

ASSEMBLY ACTION REQUIRED:

Assembly action is required for this rezone.

STANDARD OF REVIEW:

- Quasi-legislative decision
- Requires five (5) affirmative votes for approval
- Code Provisions:
 - o 49.75.120
 - o 49.10.170(d)
 - o 49.80

The Commission shall hear and decide the case per 49.75.120 - Restrictions on rezoning. Rezoning requests covering less than two acres shall not be considered unless the rezoning constitutes an expansion of an existing zone. Rezoning requests which are substantially the same as a rezoning request rejected within the previous 12 months shall not be considered. A rezoning shall only be approved upon a finding that the proposed zoning district and the uses allowed therein are in substantial conformance with the land use maps of the comprehensive plan.


SITE FEATURES AND ZONING




SURROUNDING ZONING AND LAND USES	
North (D10)	Vacant
South (D10)	Vacant
East (Glacier Hwy)	Residential (D5)
West (Egan Drive)	Egan Expressway

SITE FEATURES	
Anadromous	No
Flood Zone	AE, 23 feet
Hazard	None mapped
Hillside	Yes
Wetlands	Yes
Parking District	No
Historic District	No
Overlay Districts	No

CURRENT ZONING MAP



LAND USE DESIGNATION MAP



BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project Description – Catholic Community Services (CCS) seeks to rezone the site from D10 to a zoning that accommodates more office development. The applicant prefers rezoning to Neighborhood Commercial (NC), but could find Light Commercial (LC) acceptable (**Attachments A, B, C, and D**).

The applicant originally applied for LC. Meanwhile, AME2021 0001 (North Douglas Highway) had experienced delays during the approval process due to discussions regarding rezoning Medium Density Residential (MDR) to commercial use. Staff and the applicant paused pursuit of the CCS property rezone to assess implications of the North Douglas Highway rezone discussions. During the pause, the NC zoning was developed. NC better fits the intent of the applicant, while supporting residential opportunity. When NC was approved by the Assembly on February 7, 2022, staff and the applicant planned a public meeting for after the effective date of the ordinance, 30 days later.

This is the first proposal to use NC zoning since it was established on March 7, 2022. MuniCode has been updated (https://library.municode.com/ak/juneau/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_TIT49LAUS).

LC has been found to comply with the Comprehensive Plan land use designation of MDR in Assembly decisions on AME2021 0001 (North Douglas Highway) and AME2013 0006 (Atlin Drive).

Background – Assessor documents estimate structures on the site were constructed in the 1940s.

The site has accommodated residential uses in the past. 1801 Glacier Highway included residential apartments. 1803 Glacier Highway included residential apartments with the Bridge Adult Day Center.

As client needs have evolved, so has CCS. Currently, the apartments at 1803 Glacier Hwy have been remodeled to offices for services and programs. 1805 Glacier Highway houses operations and dispatch for Capital AKcess.

CCS no longer provides residential services, and would like to remodel 1801 and 1803 Glacier Highway for additional office and program space. They currently rent space in St. Anne's Center downtown, and would like to be able to consolidate their operations.



Permit and Site History – The below table summarizes relevant history for the lot and proposed development.

Item	Summary
BLD2013 0503	Change of use from apartments to day care, office space, and 3-bedroom respite apartments.
USE2013 0030	Day care center for children with behavioral health issues in grades pre-K through 5 th .
BLD2005-00054	Main floor change of use with office addition, and sprinkler for entire structure.
BLD2005-00043	Remodel ground floor of north structure into three apartments.
BLD2004-00767	Remodel existing garage space into office space for Care-a-Van Transit center.
USE2004-00020	Transit center for Care-a-Van offices.
BLD2000-00423	Major interior renovation, from day care center into bed and breakfast.
Hazard District Modification	2000, removal from the moderate hazard zone.
BLD1997-00489	Grading permit for approximately 3,000 cubic yards of fill to construct storm drain.
BLD-0306001	1988, Remodel for use as daycare.
BLD-0016801	1986, Approximately 700 cubic yards of fill.
1997 Storm Drain Easement	To CBJ to maintain a 30-inch storm outfall pipe and rock lined drainage ditch.
CU-15-88	Conditional Use Permit for daycare for up to 75 children.
1987 As-built	Representative of current conditions.

Zoning History – The below table summarizes zoning history for the lot.

Year	Zoning	Summary
2006	D10	New zoning map, same zoning.
1987	D10	The D10 residential district is intended to accommodate primarily multi-family residential development at ten units per acre. These are relatively low-density multi-family districts.
1969	CWR	This district was primarily for waterfront apartments and service-commercial uses oriented to the marine element of the community and was designed to be located in close proximity to residential districts. This district recognized the community's increasing interest in water-related activities and was designated on zoning maps as further need developed.

ZONING ANALYSIS

CBJ29.25.200 Zoning Districts Defined – Note that the intent of both CWR (original zoning, see above) and NC (preferred proposed zoning) is for commercial uses that complement residential uses.

Current Zoning – D10	Proposed Zoning – NC	Alternative – LC
The D10 residential district is intended to accommodate primarily multi-family residential development at ten units per acre. These are relatively low-density multi-family districts. [CBJ 49.25.210(e)]	The NC, or Neighborhood Commercial, zoning district is a new district (February 7, 2022) 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 multi-family residential zoning districts. [CBJ 49.25.230(c)]	The LC, or Light Commercial, zoning 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 the 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 height and setback restrictions. Residential development is allowed in mixed- and single-use developments in the light commercial district. [CBJ 49.25.230(a)]

CBJ 49.25.300 Table of Permissible Uses Comparison – CCS has used the property as housing and office space, with ratios varying in response to community need.

Use No.	Use Description	D10 Approval Level	NC Approval Level	LC Approval Level
1.300	Multi-family housing ≤ 8 units	Director	Director	Director
1.300	8 units < multi-family housing ≤ 12 units	Commission	Director	Director
1.300	12 units < Multi-family housing	Commission	Commission	Commission
3.050	Offices ≤ 1,000 square feet	Commission	Director	Director
3.100	1,000 sf < Offices ≤ 2,500 square feet	Commission	Director	Director
3.400	2,500 < Offices < 10,00 square feet ^A	Not permissible	Director	Director
3.400	10,000 sf ≤ Offices ^A	Not permissible	Commission	Commission

A: While the Table of Permissible Uses describes a use of offices over 2,500 square feet, the approval level is dependent on the definition of major development versus minor development for the zoning district. The definition of major versus minor development varies between residential and commercial districts [CBJ 49.25.300(c)(3)(C) and (D)]. For the uses above, the Director makes the approval decision for minor development, and the Commission for major development. Note that Director decisions are delivered through the building permit process.

The site appears to be nonconforming for use (a Nonconforming Situation Review is not required for a rezone). A rezone to either NC or LC would bring the site into conformity for use.


CBJ 49.25.400 Dimensional Standards – The site is made up of five lots. However, the analysis below considers the five lots as one site.

The height restriction in NC is preferable to LC because of consistency with current zoning under D10 and the surrounding residential uses.

Standard		Existing Parcel	D10	NC	LC
Minimum Lot	Size	113,256	6,000	3,000	2,000
	Width	620	50	40	20
Setbacks	Front, min	8.19 ^A	20	0	25
	Front, max	8.19 ^A	N/A	15	N/A
	Rear, min	53.6	20	0	10
	Side	50.88	5'	0	10
Maximum Lot Coverage		6%	50%	None	None
Maximum Height	Permissible	~ 35	35	35	45
	Accessory		25	25	35

A: Garage, per 1987 as-built survey (Attachment E).

The site is nonconforming for front setback. Regardless of ownership, further development would require each lot to meet setback standards under current code. Discussed below is how this situation developed, considerations in future development, and impacts to conformity.



History: The first documents available for lots B and E indicate retention as private access to Egan Expressway from the uphill lots. Lots B and E are described in transfer documents from 1975 and 1976, which is when Egan Expressway was platted. Lots B and E are 20 feet wide. This would result in no buildable width in LC, and 10 feet of buildable width in D10.

An existing structure (1805 Glacier Highway, which houses Capital AKcess) crosses the lot line between Lots B and D.

The history of Lot C is unknown, but seems to have been transferred after platting of Egan Expressway.

Future Development: CCS has expressed interest in remodeling 1801 Glacier Highway.

- Lot consolidation is not required for internal remodel. A Nonconforming Certification would be required as part of the development.
- Lot consolidation is required for any exterior construction or modification on a structure that crosses a lot line. 1801 Glacier Highway does not cross a lot line.

Conformity: Consolidation of Lots B, C, and D would bring the new lot into conformity with the setback requirements of NC. D10 and LC do not provide a path to setback conformity unless the Capital AKcess structure (1805 Glacier Highway) is demolished.

CBJ 49.25.500 Density – The site is 2.6 acres. There are no existing residences.

	Current Zoning (10 DU/Acre)	NC (15 DU/Acre)	LC 30 DU/Acre)
Maximum Number of Dwelling Units	26	39	78

Potential for Subdivision – Subsequent subdivisions could be considered if proposed lots met dimensional standards. Development patterns, including structures and off-street parking, have used the flatter areas. Undeveloped areas have slopes of approximately 30 percent.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

Level of Service information for Glacier Highway is unavailable.

Access	Roadway Classification	Current AADT*
Glacier Highway	Arterial	1,010

**2020 Average Annual Daily Traffic Counts, provided by Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities.*

Eventual traffic impacts would be analyzed when developed in the future.

For context, under current zoning the property could support 26 residences, as single-family or multi-family structures. The Institute of Traffic Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (6th edition) estimates approximately 10 average annual daily traffic (AADT) per single-family unit, or 260. Single-family units have the highest AADT of the residential types.

Under NC or LC, the property could support 10,000 square feet of office space without a Conditional Use Permit. ITE estimates 11 AADT per 1,000 square feet of general office space, or 110 AADT. Expansion beyond 10,000 square feet of office space would require a Conditional Use Permit, and may trigger a traffic impact analysis.

Non-motorized transportation – Glacier Highway is the sole corridor for cyclists travelling between downtown and locations north of Juneau Douglas High School (**Attachment F**). Use of Egan Expressway is for highway-legal vehicles only due to safety concerns.

Proximity to Public Transportation – Capital City Transit stops for both inbound and outbound transit users approximately 975 feet to the east and 400 feet to the west of the driveway for the site. See yellow ovals in the figure below.



COMMUNITY SERVICES

The table below summarizes community services that may be affected by the proposed rezone.

Service	Summary
Water/Sewer	CBJ
Fire Service	Juneau Fire Station (800 Glacier Avenue)
Schools	Juneau Douglas High School, Yaakoosge Daakahidi Alternative High School, Harborview Elementary, Montessori Borealis

ENVIRONMENTAL, CONSERVATION, HISTORIC, AND ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The table below summarizes Conservation, Historic, and Archeological Resources which may be affected by the proposed rezone.

Resource	Summary
Conservation	Closest Comprehensive Plan-designated stream corridor is across the channel (Map K)
Wetlands	None mapped. Wetlands on lot next to Egan Expressway.
Anadromous	No.
Historic	The structures are over 50 years old.
Archeological	Unknown.

CONFORMITY WITH ADOPTED PLANS

2013 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN VISION: *The City and Borough of Juneau is a vibrant State Capital that values the diversity and quality of its natural and built environments, creates a safe and satisfying quality of life for its diverse population, provides quality education and employment for its workers, encourages resident participation in community decisions and provides an environment to foster state-wide leadership.*

2013 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN -			
Chapter	Page No.	Item	Summary
10	140	Policy 10.13	Encourage mixed use development (SOP 1). Utilize appropriate zoning standards (SOP 2). Rezone for mixed use (IA1).
11	147	Map K	Medium Density Residential: Urban residential lands accommodating multi-family structures with densities from 5-20 units per acre. Commercial development must be consistent with residential uses.

Other plans are mute to the value of rezoning.

The Juneau Economic Development Plan (2015) recognizes the importance of the “Senior Economy” and establishing support services to keep seniors in Juneau (page 54). Future CCS plans for the property and services provided would support this plan element.

CCS services are integral to Juneau's Coordinated Entry protocols for housing people experiencing homelessness. Supportive services are critical to keeping vulnerable populations housed once housing is found.

AGENCY REVIEW

CDD conducted an initial agency review comment period between September 1, 2021 and September 13, 2021. A notification was sent to commenters on March 23, 2022 to advise them that the proposed zoning was changing from LC to NC, and asking for any additional comments. Agency review comments can be found in **Attachment G**.

Agency	Summary
CDD Building Division	No issues at this time.
Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities	When uses change, please contact ADOT&PF to confirm compliant access onto Glacier Highway.
CBJ Capital City Fire and Rescue	No code or department concerns.
CBJ Engineering and Public Works	General Engineering has no concerns.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

A public meeting was hosted on March 10, 2022 (**Attachment H**). No public attended.

CDD conducted a public comment period between March 11, 2022 and April 4, 2022. Public notice was mailed to property owners within 500 feet of the proposed rezone (**Attachment I**). A public notice sign was also posted on site two weeks prior to the scheduled hearing (**Attachment J**). Public comments submitted at the time of writing this staff report can be found in **Attachment K**.

Name	Summary
Paul Khera	Questions about taxation.

ZONE CHANGE OPTIONS AND ALTERNATIVES

As stated in CBJ 49.75.130(a), the Commission may recommend approval, approval with modifications or denial of a rezone request. The Commission may recommend approval to the Assembly for different zoning districts than what is requested by the applicant or recommended by staff. Additionally, the Commission can recommend modifications to the boundaries of the area to be rezoned. This means that if the Commission wishes to do so, the zoning district boundary line may be moved from its current location, as long as it is found to be in substantial conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and Title 49 – Land Use Code. Zoning district boundary lines are intended to follow property lines, centerlines of streets, alleys, and streams (CBJ 49.25.110(f)).

Staffs analysis above includes the LC zoning district as an alternative to the applicant's preferred zoning of NC.

FINDINGS

In accordance with CBJ 49.75, the Director makes the following findings on the proposed rezone:

1. *Was the rezone application filed timely in accordance with CBJ 49.75.110?*

Analysis: No additional analysis required.

Finding: **Yes.** The rezone application was filed in July of 2021.

2. *Was adequate public notice provided in accordance with CBJ 49.75.110?*

Analysis: CDD staff held a public meeting on March 10, 2022; mailed written notice to property owners within 500 feet of the proposed rezone; and a public notice sign was posted on the site two weeks prior to the scheduled hearing.

Finding: **Yes.** Adequate public notice was provided in accordance with CBJ 49.75.110.

3. *Is this request for an area covering more than two acres or an expansion of an existing zoning district as required by CBJ 49.75.120?*

Analysis: The rezone is proposed for 2.6 acres.

Finding: **Yes.** The proposed rezone meets the minimum area.

4. *Has a similar request been made within the previous 12 months as required by CBJ 49.75.120?*

Analysis: No additional analysis required.

Finding: **No.** No similar rezone request has been filed within the previous 12 months.

5. *Is the proposed zoning district and the uses allowed therein found to be in substantial conformance with the land use maps of the comprehensive plan and policies of the comprehensive plan, in accordance with CBJ 49.75.120?*

Analysis: The NC zoning is consistent with the MDR Land Use designation proposed in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan in that the emphasis is on densities of 15 units per acre, and neighborhood scale commercial use.

Finding: **Yes.** The proposed rezone is in substantial conformance with the land use maps and policies of the comprehensive plan.

6. *Is the proposed zoning district and the uses allowed therein found to be in substantial conformance with Title 49 – Land Use Code, in accordance with CBJ 49.75.120?*

Analysis: The proposed rezone supports the purpose of Title 49 by rezoning for mixed use that conforms to density standards established in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan.

Finding: **Yes.** The proposed rezone is in substantial conformance with Title 49 – Land Use Code.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and forward a recommendation of APPROVAL to the Assembly for the requested rezone for 2.6 acres from D10 to Neighborhood Commercial (NC).

STAFF REPORT ATTACHMENTS

Item	Description
Attachment A	Application Packet
Attachment B	Ordinance 2014-14(c)am
Attachment C	Proposed Rezone Ordinance (Pending)
Attachment D	Map of Rezone Area (Pending)
Attachment E	As-built 1987
Attachment F	Bike Routes
Attachment G	Agency Comments
Attachment H	Neighborhood Meeting notice
Attachment I	Abutters Notice
Attachment J	Public Notice Sign (Pending)
Attachment K	Public Comments



DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION

NOTE: Development Permit Application forms must accompany all other Community Development Department land use applications.

To be completed by Applicant	PROPERTY LOCATION		
	Physical Address 1801/1803/1805 Glacier Highway Juneau Alaska 99801		
	Legal Description(s) (Subdivision, Survey, Block, Tract, Lot) USS3871 ER ; USS667 FR		
	Parcel Number(s) 7B0801030060		
	☐ This property located in the downtown historic district ☐ This property located in a mapped hazard area, if so, which _____		
	LANDOWNER/ LESSEE		
	Property Owner Catholic Community Service	Contact Person Edward Rivera	Phone Number(s) 907-465-6153
	Mailing Address 1803 Glacier Highway Juneau AK 99801		
	E-mail Address edward.rivera@ccsjuneau.org		
	LANDOWNER/ LESSEE CONSENT Required for Planning Permits, not needed on Building/ Engineering Permits		
I am (we are) the owner(s) or lessee(s) of the property subject to this application and I (we) consent as follows: A. This application for a land use or activity review for development on my (our) property is made with my complete understanding and permission. B. I (we) grant permission for officials and employees of the City and Borough of Juneau to inspect my property as needed for purposes of this application.			
X <u><i>Jennifer Carson</i></u> <u>7/27/2021</u> Landowner/Lessee Signature Date			
X _____ Landowner/Lessee Signature Date			
NOTICE: The City and Borough of Juneau staff may need access to the subject property during regular business hours and will attempt to contact the landowner in addition to the formal consent given above. Further, members of the Planning Commission may visit the property before the scheduled public hearing date.			
APPLICANT If the same as OWNER, write "SAME"			
Applicant Edward Rivera	Contact Person Edward Rivera	Phone Number(s) 907-465-6153	
Mailing Address 1803 Glacier Highway Juneau AK 99801			
E-mail Address edward.rivera@ccsjuneau.org			
X <u><i>Ed Rivera</i></u> <u>July 19, 2021</u> Applicant's Signature Date of Application			

-----DEPARTMENT USE ONLY BELOW THIS LINE-----

This form and all documents associated with it are public record once submitted.

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

For assistance filling out this form, contact the Permit Center at 586-0770.

Intake Initials ANE
Case Number AME21-10 Date Received 7/27/21



ZONE CHANGE APPLICATION

See reverse side for more information regarding the permitting process and the materials required for a complete application.

NOTE: Must be accompanied by a DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION form.

To be completed by Applicant	PROJECT SUMMARY Change existing D10 zone to Light Commercial (LC)	
	IS THIS AN EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING ZONE? ☐ Yes ☒ No	
	Total Land Area of Proposed Change <u>2.6</u> acres	Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation <u>MDR</u>
	Current Zone(s) <u>D 10</u>	Comprehensive Plan Map Letter <u>K</u>
	New Zone Requested <u>Light Commercial LC</u>	
	TYPE OF ZONE CHANGE REQUESTED ☒ Regular ☐ Transition	
Has this or a similar zone change been requested in the previous 12 months? ☐ Yes Case # _____ ☒ No		
UTILITIES AVAILABLE WATER: ☒ Public ☐ On Site SEWER: ☒ Public ☐ On Site		
ALL REQUIRED MATERIALS ATTACHED ☒ Complete application ☒ Pre-Application Conference notes ☒ Narrative including: ☒ Purpose of the requested zone change ☒ Any potential impacts to public infrastructure (streets, water, & sewer) ☒ How the requested zone change comply with the maps and policies of the Comprehensive Plan ☒ Site Plan and/or map of proposed zone change (details on reverse side)		

DEPARTMENT USE ONLY BELOW THIS LINE

ZONE CHANGE FEES	Fees	Check No.	Receipt	Date
Application Fees	\$ <u>600</u> ⁰⁰			
Admin. of Guarantee	\$ _____			
Adjustment	\$ _____			
Pub. Not. Sign Fee	\$ <u>50</u> ⁰⁰			
Pub. Not. Sign Deposit	\$ <u>100</u> ⁰⁰			
Total Fee	\$ <u>750</u> ⁰⁰			

This form and all documents associated with it are public record once submitted.

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

For assistance filling out this form, contact the Permit Center at 586-0770.

Case Number <u>AME21-10</u>	Date Received <u>7/27/21</u>
--------------------------------	---------------------------------

Zone Change Application Information

Zone changes are outlined in CBJ 49.75 article I

Pre-Application Conference: A pre-application conference is encouraged prior to submitting an application. The applicant shall meet with City & Borough of Juneau (CBJ) staff to discuss the Zone Change process and analysis. To schedule a pre-application conference, please contact the Permit Center at 586-0770 or via email at Permits@juneau.org.

Application: An application for a Zone Change will not be accepted by the CBJ until it is determined to be complete. Zone Change may only be applied for during January and July. The items needed for a complete application are:

1. **Forms:** Completed Zone Change Application and Development Permit Application.
2. **Fees:** The fee for Zone Change Application is \$600.00. No work can be approved with a Zone Change. All fees are subject to change.
3. **Project Narrative:** A detailed narrative describing the purpose for the requested zone change.
4. **Plans:** A site plan showing the following information:
 - A. The boundaries of the existing and proposed zone change and proposed buffers;
 - B. The location of existing structures (i.e. buildings, fences, signs, parking areas, etc.); and
 - C. The location of existing physical features of the site (i.e. drainage, topography, eagle trees, hazard areas, salmon streams, wetlands, etc.).
5. A traffic study may be required for zone changes.

Document Format: All materials submitted as part of an application shall be submitted in either of the following formats:

1. Electronic copies in the following formats: .doc, .txt, .xls, .bmp, .pdf, .jpg, .gif, .xlm, .rtf (other formats may be preapproved by the Community Development Department).
2. Paper copies 11" X 17" or smaller (larger paper size may be preapproved by the Community Development Department).

Application Review & Hearing Procedure: Once the application is determined to be complete, the Community Development Department will initiate the review and scheduling of the application. This process includes:

Review: The Community Development Department will evaluate the application for consistency with all applicable City & Borough of Juneau codes and adopted plans. Depending on unique characteristics of the Zone Change request, the application may be required to be reviewed by other municipal boards and committees. During this review period, the Community Development Department will coordinate the review of this application by other agencies, as necessary. Review comments may require the applicant to provide additional information, clarification, or submit modifications/alterations for the proposed Zone Change.

Hearing: Once an application has been reviewed by all applicable parties the Community Development Department will schedule the zone change for the next appropriate Planning Commission meeting. All Zone Change Applications will be reviewed by the Planning Commission who will send a recommendation to the Assembly. Following a recommendation of approval by the Planning Commission, the Community Development Department will coordinate the zone change review by the Assembly. In order for zone changes to become effective, they must be adopted by ordinance by the CBJ Assembly.

Public Notice Responsibilities: All Zone Change requests must be given the following public notice as outlined in CBJ 49.15.230:

Community Development Department: Will give notice of the pending Planning Commission meeting and its agenda in the local newspaper a minimum of 10-days prior to the meeting. Furthermore, the department will mail notices to all property owners within 500-feet of the project site.

The Applicant will post a sign on the site at least 14 days prior to the meeting. The sign shall be visible from a public right-of-way or where determined appropriate by CDD. Signs may be produced by the Community Development Department for a preparation fee of \$50, and a \$100 deposit that will be refunded in full if the sign is returned within seven days of the scheduled hearing date. If the sign is returned between eight and 14 days of the scheduled hearing \$50 may be refunded. The Applicant may make and erect their own sign. Please contact the Community Development Department for more information.

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED



(907) 586-0715
 CDD_Admin@juneau.org
 www.juneau.org/CDD
 155 S. Seward Street • Juneau, AK 99801

Glacier Highway rezone

Case Number: PAC2021 0024

Applicant: Edward Rivera

Property Owner: Catholic Community Services

Property Address: 1801, 103, and 1805 Glacier Highway; one PCN, 7B0801030060

Parcel Code Number: one PCN for all three addresses: 7B0801030060

Site Size: 2.6 acres

Zoning: D-10

Existing Land Use: Social Services

Conference Date:	April 7, 2021
Report Issued:	April 16 2021

List of Attendees

Note: Copies of the Pre-Application Conference Report will be emailed, instead of mailed, to participants who have provided their email address below.

Name	Title	Email address
Edward Rivera	Applicant	Edward.rivera@ccsjuneau.org
Teri Camery	Planning	teri.camery@juneau.org
Kyle Paw	Permit tech	Kyle.paw@juneau.org

Revised 01/29/18

Pre-Application Conference Final Report

Conference Summary

Questions/issues/agreements identified at the conference that weren't identified in the attached reports. The following is a list of issues, comments and proposed actions, and requested technical submittal items that were discussed at the pre-application conference.

Planning Division

1. **Zoning** – D-10, proposed for LC
2. **Setbacks** – D-10 setbacks are 20' front, 20' rear, 5' side; LC setbacks are 25' front, 10' rear, 5' side
3. **Height** – D-10 maximum height is 25' feet for both permissible and conditional uses; proposed LC maximum height is 45' for permissible uses and 25' for accessory uses
4. **Access** – Glacier Highway
5. **Minimum Lot Size** – 6,000 square feet for D-10; 2,000 square feet for LC
6. **Minimum Lot width and minimum lot depth** – 85' min lot depth and 50' min lot width for D-10; 80' min lot depth and 20' min lot width for LC
7. **Maximum Lot Coverage** – 50 percent for D-10; no maximum lot coverage for LC
8. **Minimum vegetative Coverage** – 30 percent for D-10, 15 percent for LC
9. **Hazard/Mass Wasting/Avalanche/Hillside Endorsement** – The proposed rezone area is within a moderate landslide/avalanche area.
10. **Wetlands** – No mapped wetlands exist on this lot.
11. **Habitat** — Check with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife on the presence of eagle nests in the area. The presence of eagle nests may impact construction scheduling. No anadromous waterbodies are on the subject parcel, or within 50 feet.
12. **Flood** – Portions of the parcel are within the AE flood zone, with a base flood elevation of 25 feet. Any new structures proposed within this zone will need to comply with applicable CBJ Land Use Code flood regulations in 49.70 Article IV, and a Floodplain Development Permit will be required.
13. **Nonconforming situations** – The CBJ GIS map indicates that the parcel includes at least three legal lots. Some of these lots do not meet appear to meet minimum lot size, minimum lot width, and/or minimum lot depth requirements for the current D-10 zoning district. CDD recommends a lot consolidation as the easiest method to bring these lots into conformance. In the absence of a lot consolidation, a Non-Conforming Certificate must be applied for and issued prior to issuance of a building permit. This applies to the property in its current status.

If LC zoning is approved, it appears—but would need to be verified by a licensed surveyor—that the lots would meet the smaller minimum lot size of LC which is 2,000 square feet. However the lots still may not meet the minimum lot width and lot depth requirements for the LC zoning district, as listed in Item 6 above. Lot consolidation would again be the easiest method to resolve the issue. In the absence of a lot consolidation, a Non-Conforming Certificate must be applied for and issued prior to issuance of a building permit.

Proposal

The applicant proposes to rezone the 2.6 acre parcel from D10 residential zoning to Light Commercial zoning. CBJ Code 49.75 Article 1, included below, describes the rezone process. Code dictates that *"A rezoning shall only be*

Pre-Application Conference Final Report

approved upon a finding that the proposed zone district and the used allowed therein are in substantial conformance with the land use maps of the comprehensive plan. The 2013 Juneau Comprehensive Plan land use map future land use designation designates this area as MDR, Medium Density Residential. The Comprehensive Plan definition of Medium Density Residential allows for commercial development "at a scale consistent with a residential neighborhood." This indicates that the Light Commercial has the potential to "substantially conform" with the Comprehensive Plan designation. Community Development Department review of the rezone application will include a review of the uses and requirements of the existing and proposed zoning districts, a review of the Comprehensive Plan designation, and a review of the surrounding neighborhood.

The parcel is adjacent to D-5 residential zoning, so it is not an expansion of an existing zone. However the parcel is over the two acre minimum requirement for rezones, therefore the proposal meets the minimum requirement to be accepted. CDD is working on a subarea plan for downtown Juneau, Blueprint Downtown (BPDT). BPDT may make recommendations to change land use designations and zoning. It may be prudent to wait and see what BPDT recommends in this area before requesting a rezone. For questions regarding BPDT, please contact Beth McKibben, Senior Planner, at 586-0465.

Rezone applications may only be accepted during the months of January and July. Applications require a recommendation from the CBJ Planning Commission and a final decision by the CBJ Assembly. The full process typically takes 3-6 months.

Rezone process/criteria: CBJ 49.75 Article I, *Rezoning*s.

CBJ 49.75.110. Initiation. A rezoning may be initiated by the director, the commission or the assembly at any time during the year. A developer or property owner may initiate a request for rezoning in January or July only. Adequate public notice shall be provided by the director to inform the public that a rezoning has been initiated.

*CBJ 49.75.120. Restrictions on Rezoning*s. Rezoning requests covering less than two acres shall not be considered unless the rezoning constitutes an expansion of an existing zone. Rezone requests which are substantially the same as a rezoning request rejected within the previous twelve months shall not be considered. A rezoning shall only be approved upon a finding that the proposed zone district and the used allowed therein are in substantial conformance with the land use maps of the comprehensive plan.

Link for Blueprint Downtown and 2013 Juneau Comprehensive Plan
[CDD -- Plans and Studies -- City and Borough of Juneau](#)

Building Division

14. Building

15. Outstanding Permits –

- a. BLD20140036 – Boiler replacement for 1803 Glacier Hwy
- b. BLD-0349001 – Disconnect switch box and change inside box new breaker system
- c. BLD-0401101 – New roof over flat room, new rafter & sheeting @ bed & Breakfast

Pre-Application Conference Final Report

- d. BLD1998-00345 – Change out windows; paint exterior on southernmost building
- e. BLD20130503 – Change of use from apartments to daycare, office space, and 3 bedroom respite apartments at 1801 Glacier Hwy.

List of required applications

Based upon the information submitted for pre-application review, the following list of applications must be submitted in order for the project to receive a thorough and speedy review.

- 1. Development Permit Application
- 2. Zone Change Application

Additional Submittal Requirements

Submittal of additional information, given the specifics of the development proposal and site, are listed below. These items will be required in order for the application to be determined Counter Complete.

- 1. A copy of this pre-application conference report.
- 2. A map of the parcel, and a Project Narrative including the purpose of the rezone, why the existing zoning designation of D-10 is inadequate, an explanation of how the requested zone change substantially complies with the maps and policies of the 2013 Juneau Comprehensive Plan, and how the proposed zone change is compatible with the existing neighborhood.

Exceptions to Submittal Requirements

Submittal requirements staff has determined not to be applicable or not required, given the specifics of the development proposal, are listed below. These items will not be required in order for the application to be reviewed.

- 1. N/A

Fee Estimates

The preliminary plan review fees listed below can be found in the CBJ code section 49.85.

Based upon the project plan submitted for pre-application review, staff has attempted to provide an accurate estimate for the permits and permit fees which will be triggered by your proposal.

- 1. Zone change and comprehensive plan amendments - \$600.00
- 2. Public Notice Sign: \$50 plus \$100 refundable deposit.

For informational handouts with submittal requirements for development applications, please visit our website at www.juneau.org/cdd.

Submit your Completed Application

You must submit your application(s) in person with payment made to:

City & Borough of Juneau, Permit Center
230 South Franklin Street
Fourth Floor Marine View Center
Juneau, AK 99801

Phone: (907) 586-0715

Pre-Application Conference Final Report

Fax: (907) 586-4529
Web: www.iunEAU.org/cdd



Catholic Community Service, Inc.

Dignity • Care • Compassion

Diocese of
Juneau



Southeast Senior Services • Children & Family Services • Hospice & Home Care of Juneau

July 15, 2021

City & Borough of Juneau, Permit Center
230 South Franklin Street
Fourth Floor Marine View Center
Juneau, AK 99801

To whom it may concern,

Catholic Community Service (CCS) would like to rezone our properties of 1801/1803/1805 Glacier Highway Juneau Alaska 99801 from residential D-10 to Light Commercial. Previously, the property of 1801 was a residential building that included several apartments that were rented by CCS to tenants. In the past, 1803 was also a residential building with some apartments in addition to TheBridge Adult Day Center. The apartments have now been converted into offices for several CCS employees and programs. The property of 1805 is currently the base of operations and dispatch office for the Capital AKcess program that is provided by Capital Transit and operated by CCS.

Since we no longer have any residential apartments or tenants in any of the buildings, we would like to rezone and be able to rehabilitate buildings 1801 and 1803 in order to create additional offices and program space. We currently rent several offices and office space at the St Ann's Building in downtown Juneau, and we would like to be able to stop renting space at that location in order to locate all of our employees and programs on the same property.

The rezoning of our property is compatible with the existing neighborhood, since nothing new will be built on the property, and we are solely planning to renovate the buildings and turn the existing apartments into offices/program space for our employees. Our closest neighbor at the location is Design North Roofing, which is a small local business, so we do not anticipate that renovations or improvements will disturb any private residents and is compatible with the growth of the existing neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time and reviewing our application. If you have any questions or need anything else, please don't hesitate to call me at 907-465-6153 or through email at edward.rivera@ccsjuneau.org.

Sincerely,

Edward Rivera
Fleet and Facilities Specialist
Catholic Community Service/Southeast Senior Services



1803 Glacier Hwy. Juneau, AK 99801 Telephone: (907) 463-6100 Fax: (907) 523-6207 www.ccsjuneau.org
Find us on Facebook@CatholicCommunityServiceInc



CATHOLIC COMMUNITY SERVICE



Memorandum

To: Board of Directors
Senior Staff

From: Erin Walker-Tolles
Executive Director

Date: July 27, 2021

RE: Delegation of Authority

I am working remotely and variable hours through August 4.

I am appointing Jennifer Carson as Acting Executive Director in my absence.

Jennifer has full authority to take action on personnel, legal, and programmatic business, as well as take action on financial business, as needed for daily operations for Catholic Community Service as Acting Executive Director in my absence.

Please feel free to contact her in my absence, or for immediate assistance call 463-6100

Thanks so much,

Erin

Cc: Anneka Morgan
Susan Loseby

Presented by: The Manager
 Introduced: 05/19/2014
 Drafted by: A. G. Mead

ORDINANCE OF THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA

Serial No. 2014-14(c)am

An Ordinance Amending the Land Use Code Relating to Rezoning Procedures.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA:

Section 1. Classification. This ordinance is of a general and permanent nature and shall become a part of the City and Borough of Juneau Municipal Code.

Section 2. Amendment to Section. CBJ 49.75.130 Procedure, is amended to read:

49.75.130 Procedure.

A rezoning shall follow the procedure for a major development permit except for the following:

(a) The commission shall make a recommendation to the assembly to approve, approve with modifications, or deny a rezoning request. The commission shall prepare written findings in support of its recommendation. The commission's notice of recommendation shall be posted on the department's website within 10 days of the public hearing on the proposed rezone. If the commission recommends approval of the rezoning request or approval with modifications, the director shall forward the commission's written recommendation to the assembly with an ordinance to amend the official zoning map in accordance with the recommendation. If the commission recommends denial, the amendment shall be deemed disapproved unless the applicant files a notice of protest in accordance with CBJ 49.75.130(b).

(b) Protests.

- (1) An applicant may protest the commission's recommendation to deny the rezoning by filing a written statement with the municipal clerk within 20 days of the commission's written notice of recommendation for denial, requesting that an ordinance amending the zoning map as set out in the application be submitted for action by the assembly. The director shall, within 30 days of the filing of the protest with the municipal clerk, prepare a draft ordinance to be appended to the notice of recommendation for consideration by the assembly.
- (2) Any person may protest the commission's recommendation to approve a rezoning request or approve a rezoning request with modification by filing a written protest


with the municipal clerk within 20 days of the commission's written notice of recommendation.

- (3) In the case of a timely filed protest and after introduction of the proposed ordinance at a regularly scheduled assembly meeting, the assembly shall hold a public hearing on the proposed rezoning. At the close of the hearing, the assembly shall approve the zoning map amendment as recommended by the commission, approve the zoning map amendment with modifications, or deny the zoning map amendment. If approved with modifications, the ordinance shall become effective only with the written consent of the owner(s) of the property to be rezoned.


(c) All rezonings shall be adopted by ordinance, and any conditions thereon shall be contained in the ordinance. Upon adoption of any such ordinance, the director shall cause the official zoning map to be amended in accordance with the adopted ordinance.

Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be effective 30 days after current, outstanding appeals are resolved.

Adopted this 29th day of September, 2014.


Merrill Sanford, Mayor

Attest:


Laurie J. Sica, Municipal Clerk

Presented by:
Introduced:
Drafted by: I. M. Gallion DRAFT 1

ORDINANCE OF THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA

Serial No. 2018-XX

An Ordinance Amending the Official Zoning Map of the City and Borough to Change the Zoning of Catholic Community Services Property: USS 3871, USS 667 FR and private right-of-way lots; Located at 1801, 1803 and 1805 Glacier Highway, from D10 to Neighborhood Commercial zoning (NC).

WHEREAS, the area of the proposed rezone to Neighborhood Commercial zoning, located near Wickersham Avenue, is currently zoned as D10; and

WHEREAS, the CBJ Comprehensive Plan maps this area for Medium Density Residential, and

WHEREAS, the proposed rezone conforms to the Medium Density Residential designation, and

WHEREAS, the proposed rezone has been determined compatible with nearby D5 and D10 lots, and

WHEREAS, the proposed rezone provides for medium density residential, and commercial uses that are compatible with residential uses,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED BY THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA:

Section 1. Classification. This ordinance is of a general and permanent nature and shall become a part of the City and Borough of Juneau Municipal Code.

Section 2. Amendment to the Official Zoning Map. The official zoning map of the City and Borough, adopted pursuant to CBJ 49.25.110, is amended to change the zoning of USS 3871, USS 667 FR and private right-of-way lots; located at 1801, 1803 and 1805 Glacier Highway; from D10, to Neighborhood Commercial zoning.

The described rezone is shown on the attached Exhibit "A" illustrating the area of the proposed zone change.


Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be effective 30 days after its adoption.

Adopted this _____ day of _____, 2017.


, Mayor

Attest:

Laurie J. Sica, Municipal Clerk



AME20210010 Zone Change for USS 3871 & USS 667 FR from D10 (residential) to NC (neighborhood commercial)	0 125 250 500 Feet
--	---------------------------




Received
on

3 2000

CBJ
Permit Center

7B0801030060

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct plat;
that all walks, roads, easements, and improvements thereon
are as shown and that all overlaps and encroachments are
as shown to the best of my knowledge.



AME2021 0010
ATTACHMENT E, page 1

DRAN	R.M.H.
CHICAF	J.W.B.
7-30-07	
J-III	
1"=50'	
	J.W. BEAN
	PROFESSIONAL SURVEYOR
	3803 KIOWA DRIVE
	JUNEAU, ALASKA
	907-789-0590
	SURVEYOR - PLANNER

As-Built Survey of:
2-PARCEL R.O.W.,
TRACT A & TRACT B, FRACTIONS
OF U.S. SURVEY NO. 667, and
Remaining Portion of A.T.S. 389,
U.S.S. 3871




Figure 3: Twin Lakes and Lemon Creek Area - Existing

Juneau

Non-Motorized

Transportation Plan

Source data: City and Borough of Juneau GIS
USGS National Elevation Dataset
Date: 4/20/2009
Drawn By: GAG
Datum: Nad 27
Projection: Alaska State Plane Zone 1



0 1,000 2,000 4,000 Feet
0 0.5 1 Miles

Information originally obtained from the CBJ GIS was used to create this product. The CBJ assumes no responsibility for the completeness or accuracy of the data contained within.

Irene Gallion

From: Jeffrey Hedges
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 8:23 AM
To: Irene Gallion
Subject: RE: AME21-10: Rezone for Catholic Community Services

Morning,

The Building division has no issues with the rezone at this time.

Thanks,

Jeff Hedges, MCP, CBO, CSP | Building Inspector III
Community Development Department | City & Borough of Juneau, AK
Location: 230 S. Franklin Street, 4th Floor Marine View Building
Mailing: 155 S. Seward Street, Juneau, AK, 99801
Office: 907.586.0767 x4137 | Cell: 907.321.4361



Fostering excellence in development for this generation and the next.

From: Irene Gallion <Irene.Gallion@juneau.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 7:35 AM
To: Charlie Ford <Charlie.Ford@juneau.org>; Jeffrey Hedges <Jeffrey.Hedges@juneau.org>; Dan Jager <Dan.Jager@juneau.org>; Alec Venechuk <Alec.Venechuk@juneau.org>; John Bohan <John.Bohan@juneau.org>; Mark Millay <Mark.Millay@juneau.org>
Subject: AME21-10: Rezone for Catholic Community Services

Hello team,

Attached is an application to rezone 2.6 acres on Old Glacier Highway from D10 to Light Commercial. You might best know the location as that of The Bridge adult day care center.

Please let me know if you have comments by September 13, 2021 at 8:00 am (that's a Monday). If you need more time let me know, I can work with you on that.

Thanks!



Irene Gallion | Senior Planner

[Community Development Department](#) | City & Borough of Juneau, AK
Location: 230 S. Franklin Street | 4th Floor Marine View Building
Office: 907.586.0753 X2



Fostering excellence in development for this generation and the next.

Irene Gallion

From: Bizzarro, Caleb T (DOT) <caleb.bizzarro@alaska.gov>
Sent: Thursday, September 2, 2021 11:03 AM
To: Irene Gallion
Cc: Schuler, Michael K (DOT)
Subject: RE: AME21-10: Rezone along Old Glacier Highway
Attachments: AME_21-10_Agency Comments Form.pdf; APP_AME21-10.pdf

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

Thank you Irene,

Whenever a change in use occurs (rezoning) it triggers examination of any approaches within the rezone area. If the applicant is approved for this rezone to Light Commercial, then they should reach out to DOT&PF SCR ROW to request driveway permits to certify their access is compliant.

Best Regards,

Caleb Bizzarro
 Right Of Way Agent
 Department of Transportation & Public Facilities
 Southcoast Region Design & Engineering Services
 Ph: (907) 465 4519
 Email: caleb.bizzarro@alaska.gov

From: Irene Gallion <Irene.Gallion@juneau.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 3:56 PM
To: Bizzarro, Caleb T (DOT) <caleb.bizzarro@alaska.gov>
Subject: AME21-10: Rezone along Old Glacier Highway

Hi Caleb,

Attached is an application to rezone 2.6 acres on Old Glacier Highway from D10 to Light Commercial. You might best know the location as that of The Bridge adult day care center.

Please let me know if you have comments by September 13, 2120 at 8:00 am (that's a Monday). Let me know if you need more information. If you need more time let me know, I can work with you on that.

Thanks!



Irene Gallion | Senior Planner

[Community Development Department](#) | City & Borough of Juneau, AK

Location: 230 S. Franklin Street | 4th Floor Marine View Building

Office: 907.586.0753 X2



Fostering excellence in development for this generation and the next.



(907) 586-0715
CDD_Admin@juneau.org
www.juneau.org/CDD
155 S. Seward Street • Juneau, AK 99801

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT - REQUEST FOR AGENCY COMMENT

DEPARTMENT: Fire
STAFF PERSON/TITLE: Daniel Jager, Fire Marshal
DATE: 9-2-2021
APPLICANT: Catholic Community Services
TYPE OF APPLICATION: Rezone

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Rezone 2.6 acres from D10 to Light Commercial, to accommodate program and office space.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: USS 3871/USS677FR
PARCEL NUMBER(S): 7B0801030060
PHYSICAL ADDRESS: 1801/1803/1805 Glacier Highway
SPECIFIC QUESTIONS FROM PLANNER:

AGENCY COMMENTS:

No fire code or fire department concerns for this request.

AGENCY COMMENTS (CONTINUED):

Irene Gallion

From: Mark Millay
Sent: Friday, September 3, 2021 1:38 PM
To: Alec Venechuk; Charlie Ford; Irene Gallion; Jeffrey Hedges; Dan Jager; John Bohan
Subject: RE: AME21-10: Rezone for Catholic Community Services

No issues here.
 Thanks Mark

From: Alec Venechuk <Alec.Venechuk@juneau.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 2, 2021 12:56 PM
To: Charlie Ford <Charlie.Ford@juneau.org>; Irene Gallion <Irene.Gallion@juneau.org>; Jeffrey Hedges <Jeffrey.Hedges@juneau.org>; Dan Jager <Dan.Jager@juneau.org>; John Bohan <John.Bohan@juneau.org>; Mark Millay <Mark.Millay@juneau.org>
Subject: RE: AME21-10: Rezone for Catholic Community Services

General Engineering has no issue with the rezone request, unless Joh Bohan or Mark Millay want to speak out next week.

Alec

From: Charlie Ford <Charlie.Ford@juneau.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 2, 2021 7:59 AM
To: Irene Gallion <Irene.Gallion@juneau.org>; Jeffrey Hedges <Jeffrey.Hedges@juneau.org>; Dan Jager <Dan.Jager@juneau.org>; Alec Venechuk <Alec.Venechuk@juneau.org>; John Bohan <John.Bohan@juneau.org>; Mark Millay <Mark.Millay@juneau.org>
Subject: RE: AME21-10: Rezone for Catholic Community Services

Hi Irene,

Buildings has no issues with this rezone request.
 Thanks,

Charlie Ford | Building Official

[Community Development Department](#) | City & Borough of Juneau, AK
 Location: 230 S. Franklin Street, 4th Floor Marine View Building
 Office: 907.586.0767



From: Irene Gallion <Irene.Gallion@juneau.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 7:35 AM

To: Charlie Ford <Charlie.Ford@juneau.org>; Jeffrey Hedges <Jeffrey.Hedges@juneau.org>; Dan Jager <Dan.Jager@juneau.org>; Alec Venechuk <Alec.Venechuk@juneau.org>; John Bohan <John.Bohan@juneau.org>; Mark Millay <Mark.Millay@juneau.org>
Subject: AME21-10: Rezone for Catholic Community Services

Hello team,

Attached is an application to rezone 2.6 acres on Old Glacier Highway from D10 to Light Commercial. You might best know the location as that of The Bridge adult day care center.

Please let me know if you have comments by September 13, 2120 at 8:00 am (that's a Monday). If you need more time let me know, I can work with you on that.

Thanks!



Irene Gallion | Senior Planner

[Community Development Department](#) | City & Borough of Juneau, AK
Location: 230 S. Franklin Street | 4th Floor Marine View Building
Office: 907.586.0753 X2




Fostering excellence in development for this generation and the next.

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

March 10, 2022, 6:00 pm

Project details at: [juneau.org/community development/short term projects](http://juneau.org/community%20development/short%20term%20projects)



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

155 S. Seward Street Juneau, Alaska 99801

TO:

The Community Development Department has received an application to rezone 2.6 acres at 1801, 1803 and 1805 Glacier Highway (Catholic Community Services) from D10 to Neighborhood Commercial (NC, preferred) or Light Commercial (LC, second choice) to accommodate office expansion. We are hosting a public meeting for those who are interested in learning more about the proposal.

This virtual meeting will be by video and telephonic participation only.

To join the Webinar, visit: <https://juneau.zoom.us/j/88291460906> . The Webinar ID is: 882 9146 0906 .

To join by telephone, call: +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 929 436 2866 and enter the Webinar ID.

If you are not able to attend this meeting but have questions or comments, please contact **Irene Gallion**, CDD Planner, at (907) 586-0753 ext. 4130 or irene.gallion@juneau.org.


This project is scheduled for review by the Planning Commission on April 12, 2022. All property owners within 500 feet of the proposed rezone will receive a separate notice with details on how and where to submit comments or testify before the Commission.

Case No.: AME2021 0010
Parcel No.: 7B0801030060
CBJ Parcel Viewer: <http://epv.juneau.org>

Invitation to Comment

On a proposal to be heard by the CBJ Planning Commission

Your Community, Your Voice



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

155 S. Seward Street Juneau, Alaska 99801

TO:

An application has been submitted for consideration and public hearing by the Planning Commission for a **rezone of 2.6 acres from D10 to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Light Commercial (LC) at Glacier Highway.**

TIMELINE

Staff Report expected to be posted **April 4, 2022** at <https://juneau.org/community-development/planning-commission>. Find hearing results, meeting minutes and more here as well.

Now through Mar. 21	Mar. 22	noon, Apr. 8	HEARING DATE & TIME: 7:00 pm, Apr. 12, 2022	Apr. 13
Comments received during this period will be sent to the Planner, Irene Gallion , to be included as an attachment in the staff report.	Comments received during this period will be sent to Commissioners to read in preparation for the hearing.		This meeting will be held in person and by remote participation. For remote participation: join the Webinar by visiting https://juneau.zoom.us/j/88987928148 and use the Webinar ID: 889 8792 8148 OR join by telephone, calling: 1-253-215-8782 and enter the Webinar ID (above). You may also participate in person in City Hall Assembly Chambers, 155 S. Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska.*	The results of the hearing will be posted online.

FOR DETAILS OR QUESTIONS,
 Phone: (907)586-0715 ♦
 Email: pc_comments@juneau.org
 Mail: Community Development, 155
 S. Seward St, Juneau AK 99801
 Printed March 11, 2022

**Please note that under current Covid-19 Mitigation strategies, Chambers has a limit of 50 people total, including commissioners and staff. Overflow standing room is provided in the lobby of City Hall.* AME2021 0010

Case No.: AME2021 0010
Parcel No.: 7B0801030060
CBJ Parcel Viewer: <http://epv.juneau.org>

Irene Gallion

From: Edward Rivera <edward.rivera@ccsjuneau.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 2:42 PM
To: Irene Gallion; Marianne Mills
Subject: RE: AME21-10: Public Notice Sign and Question
Attachments: CCS rezone public notice sign 2.jpg; CCS rezone public notice sign.jpg

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

I've attached two pictures to show that the sign is up and visible. Please let us know if there is anything else you need. Thank you for all your help.

Edward

From: Irene Gallion <Irene.Gallion@juneau.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 9:07 AM
To: Edward Rivera <edward.rivera@ccsjuneau.org>; Marianne Mills <marianne.mills@ccsjuneau.org>
Subject: AME21-10: Public Notice Sign and Question

Hi Edward and Marianne,

A Public Notice Sign is ready for you to pick up from the permit center (4th floor of the Marine View). The fee is \$150, and \$100 is refundable if the sign is returned by the Monday after the meeting. Please check in with Permit staff before taking the sign, they have some paperwork for you to fill out.

Post the sign where it can be seen from the road, and will not be obscured by snow removal (maybe we are done with that concern for the year?)

Send me a picture of the sign when you have posted it. The e mail will be used to date stamp the sign posting. Note that the sign needs to be up by Tuesday, March 29, 2022.

And as for the question: Do you guys have an estimate on how much office space you'd like to establish? An approximation is fine.

Thanks!

Irene Gallion | Senior Planner

Community Development Department | City & Borough of Juneau, AK
 Location: 230 S. Franklin Street | 4th Floor Marine View Building
 Office: 907.586.0753 X2



Fostering excellence in development for this generation and the next.





Irene Gallion

From: Irene Gallion
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 9:00 AM
To: Paul Khera
Cc: Irene Gallion
Subject: RE: Rezone of 1801, 1803, and 1805 Glacier Highway

Hi Paul, see answers below.

How will this affect property taxes?

The property being rezoned is classified as "charitable exempt," so our Assessor's Office does not value it. If the property was transferred to a non-exempt entity, taxes could possibly go up, it would depend on the "highest and best use of the property."

Catholic Community Services intends to retain the property.

The rezone will not change how the Assessor's Office values neighboring property.

Will the rezone require a higher property tax for the applicant?

The Applicant does not pay taxes.

What infrastructure will be needed to support this increased office space and how will that affect my property taxes?

Under both Neighborhood Commercial and Light Commercial, office space up to 10,000 square feet is allowed. The Commission will determine if improvements to city infrastructure are required. ADOT&PF has reviewed the proposal, and stated that if the applicant changes the use of the area they should reach out to ADOT&PF to verify their driveway access is complaint.

Will the increase in office space cause additional traffic congestion and highway safety issues for us residents?

Under current zoning, the property could support 26 residences. The Institute of Traffic Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation Manual estimates approximately 10 average annual daily traffic (AADT) per unit, or 260.

Under proposed zoning, the property could support 10,000 square feet of office space without a Conditional Use Permit. ITE estimates 11 AADT per 1,000 square feet of general office space, or 110. Expansion beyond 10,000 square feet of office space would require a conditional use permit, and an associated public process.

Again, ADOT&PF has reviewed the proposal, and stated that if the applicant changes the use of the area they should reach out to ADOT&PF to verify their driveway access is complaint.

Will the applicant provide parking for all persons using this facility or can we expect more roadside parking along the bike path?

The Applicant will need to accommodate parking on their lot, or receive a parking waiver. The parking waiver would require Planning Commission approval and an associated public process.

Let me know if you have further questions or comments. Thanks for participating!

Irene Gallion | Senior Planner

[Community Development Department](#) | City & Borough of Juneau, AK

Location: 230 S. Franklin Street | 4th Floor Marine View Building
Office: 907.586.0753 X2



Fostering excellence in development for this generation and the next.

From: Paul Khera <alaskakhera@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, March 12, 2022 4:55 PM

To: Irene Gallion <Irene.Gallion@juneau.org>; PC_Comments <PC_Comments@juneau.org>

Subject: Rezone of 1801, 1803, and 1805 Glacier Highway

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

Questions/Comments:

1. How will this affect property taxes?
2. Will the rezone require a higher property tax for the applicant?
3. What infrastructure will be needed to support this increased office space and how will that affect my property taxes?
4. Will the increase in office space cause additional traffic congestion and highway safety issues for us residents?
5. Will the applicant provide parking for all persons using this facility or can we expect more roadside parking along the bike path?

Sincerely,
Paul Khera

AME2021-0010

Rezone of Catholic Community Services land on Glacier Highway
From D10 to
Neighborhood Commercial or Light Commercial

Location and background


- First application of NC zoning



Comp Plan guides

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

- Urban residential lands
- Multi-family
- Density of 5-20 units per acre
- Commercial development must be consistent with residential



Neighborhood Commercial – 1st Choice

- ✓ Emphasis on Medium Density Residential
- ✓ Neighborhood scale commercial use
 - Buffer between residential and commercial/industrial
- ✓ Density of 15 units/acre
 - Office space under 10,000 allowed, over requires a CUP

Light Commercial 2nd Choice

- Less intensive than commercial areas
- Next to residential areas
- Density 30 units per acre
- Office space under 10,000 allowed, over requires a CUP



Some other uses?

USE	D10	NC	LC
Single family home	Yes	No	Yes
Light manufacture	No	Yes	Yes
Recreational facilities	No	Yes	Yes
Recycle	No	Yes	Yes
Vet/Kennel	No	Yes	Yes
Laundry/Dry Cleaning	No	Yes	Yes
Marijuana retail/restaurant/bar	No	Yes	Yes
Marijuana cultivation	No	No	Yes
Vehicle Repair	No	No	Yes
Stables/Zoos	No	No	Yes
Corrections/Sobering Center	No	No	Yes

Dimensional Standards

	Actual	D10	NC	LC
Minimum lot size, square feet	113,256	6,000	3,000	2,000
Minimum lot width, linear feet	620	50	40	20
Maximum lot coverage	6% ^B	50%	None	None
Maximum height, permissible	33-40 est. ^C	35	35	45
Maximum height, accessory		25	25	35
Minimum front yard setback	8.19 ^A	20'	0	25
Maximum front yard setback			15	
Minimum rear yard setback	53.6	20	0 ¹¹	10
Minimum side yard setback	50.88	5	0 ¹¹	10


11: Additional setbacks apply when lot abuts a multi-family or single family residential zoning district.

A: Garage

B: 6,484 scaled off 1987 plat

C: Three story "dormitory," built on slope.

Dimensional Standards



Recommend APPROVAL to Assembly

- Meets Comprehensive Plan requirements
- Provides flexibility needed by owners
- Complementary to development in the area

Erin Walker-Tolles, Executive Director
Catholic Community Services

**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA**

Additional Materials for April 12, 2022 Planning Commission

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Upload Date	Type
Additional Materials for April 12, 2022 Planning Commission	4/11/2022	Miscellaneous

Additional Materials

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Virtual Meeting Only

7:00p.m.

Meeting Date: April 12, 2022

1. CSP2022 0001:

- a. Public Comment – Alice Tersteeg (page 2)
- b. Response from Applicant on Public Comment (page 3)

2. CIP Update

- a. Memo from Scott Ciambor, Planning Manager (page 4 – 10)

3. North Channel Crossing Project Update

- a. Memo from Irene Gallion, Senior Planner (page 11)

To: Planning Commission

From: Alice Tersteeg. Property owner



Date: April 3, 2022

Subject: Maller Application

It has come to our attention that Brian Maller has applied to purchase CBJ property above his lot on Fritz Cove Road:

“...to create driveway access to an area of the applicant’s property that currently has no access [due] do the steep terrain. The applicant continues by stating that the additional land will allow a length to be added to the driveway to reduce the steepness to allow for a safe access to the higher elevation...”

We hope that all of the members of the Planning Commission who are involved in reviewing and deciding about this application PLEASE drive by this site BEFORE making up your mind. When you enter Fritz Cove Road this lot will be immediately obvious. In the two years since the Catherine Alter Trust property was sold the whole area was clear cut and one lot has been extensively excavated by non-stop hydraulic and other heavy equipment.

Anyone looking at the aerial view will see:

1. This is NOT a current photo. His property and the adjacent lots have been clear cut and are now filled with heavy equipment and building materials (as well as a container that has been parked in the public easement for weeks). This clear cut has significantly changed wind patterns and resulted in some devastating “blow down” of trees in adjacent areas of forestation and wildlife habitat.
2. The area the applicant wants to purchase from CBJ is ABOVE his lot and he obviously wants to build his house on it or there would be no reason he would “need” it for a driveway. Unless he does a LOT of blasting his driveway will still be very steep coming down from whatever building pad(s) he is able to create.
3. If this purchase is approved by CBJ then it “opens the door” for everyone wanting to purchase CBJ land for their own development whether it is a “driveway,” trailer court, or just more clear cutting of old growth trees that most of the property owners in this area have been careful to “save” for aesthetic reasons and/or to stabilize their property to prevent landslides and avalanches.

We would hope all the members of the Planning Commission consider this purchase very carefully and visit this site in person to compare it to the existing neighbor’s properties before they approve such and ill-thought-out proposal.

RECEIVED

APR 06 2022

Permit Center/CDD

To: Planning Commission

From: Brian Maller, Applicant 

Date: April 8th, 2022

RE: Alice Tersteeg

It is apparent that Mrs. Tersteeg is concerned about the development of the properties adjacent to her own. A few comments about the concerns raised in her letter of opposition to the commission:

1. I am not sure which photo Mrs. Tersteeg is referring to for sure, but I assume it is the one I used to mark-up for the development plan. This is not a current photo, but it is the most current one available on Google Earth. There are five individual lots adjacent to each other in this area, and they are all being developed independently by their respective owners. Trees were removed by the property owners in their own developments. The heavy equipment and building materials she refers to that are currently on my neighbors lots are necessary for the construction of their homes. Trees were removed and similar heavy equipment and building materials would have been used to build Mrs. Tersteeg's existing home two lots over from my property. It seems a little narrow minded to criticize her neighbors trying to build nice homes in a good area of town, similar to her own. The container parked in the public easement is not mine and is not relevant for this decision, I don't believe.
2. The area I would like to purchase will be used for driveway access to the top of the existing lot, and a house will be constructed somewhere near the existing property line, once a new property line is established. This is evident in the site plan I have submitted. I am seeking the additional land to make the drive less steep, and this may involve some rock chipping and blasting to accomplish. This will be sorted out in the grading permit process with the city, once approved. I am a licensed blaster with 10-years of experience and have many professional colleagues to assist in design and execution of this type of work. I understand Mrs. Tersteeg's concern, but I don't believe this is relevant to the application.
3. This purchase, if approved, may interest other private homeowners to develop land to build a home. This application process coupled with zoning requirements, and review of development plans will eliminate the unintended and undesired use of land sold to private owners through this process.

If the reviewing members are interested in a site visit, I would be happy to arrange one and walk them through the development plan on-site.



(907) 586-0715
CDD_Admin@juneau.org
www.juneau.org/community-development
155 S. Seward Street • Juneau, AK 99801

April 11, 2022

From: Scott Ciambor, Planning Manager, Community Development Department

To: Planning Commission

Subject: FY2023-FY2028 Capital Improvement Program Update

This memo provides an update on the [FY2023-FY2028 Capital Improvement Program](#). Currently, the CIP process is moving along according to the schedule below.

- 4/4 Regular Assembly – [Introduction of CIP Resolution 2975](#)
- 4/12 Planning Commission Meeting
- 4/13 Assembly Finance Committee – CIP Presentation
- 4/25 Regular Assembly – Public Hearing on CIP Resolution
- 5/11 Assembly Finance Committee – CIP for Action
- 5/18 Assembly Finance Committee – CIP for Final Action (if needed)
- 6/13 Regular Assembly – Adoption of CIP Resolution

Recommendation:

- A. The Planning Commission to comment on FY2023-FY2028 CIP, specifically on projects proposed for funding in FY2023, for the April 25, 2022 Assembly meeting (FY2022 Planning Commission Recommendation Memo attached).
- B. Planning Commission to schedule CIP subcommittee meetings immediately after the adoption of the FY2022-FY2027 CIP to review and make recommendations on Years 2-6 of the CIP. This will help meet critical deadlines for next year's program and allow for meaningful participation in the CIP review.

Key deadlines include:

- a. October – Guidance letter from the Planning Commission to the Public Works and Engineering Director at the start of the CIP process when the Director begins to collect priority lists and budget information from CBJ Departments and the Manager's Office.
- b. February – Review of the CIP resolution for projects proposed for funding in the current Fiscal Year, and for changes and/or additions made during the CIP process. The goal is for Planning Commission feedback to be available for the Public Works and Engineering Committee meeting that focuses on projects selected for funding in the current fiscal year.

Presented by: The City Manager
 Introduced: April 4, 2022
 Drafted by: Engineering & Public Works Department

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA

Serial No. 2975

A Resolution Adopting the City and Borough Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2023 through 2028, and Establishing the Capital Improvement Project Priorities for Fiscal Year 2023.

WHEREAS, the CBJ Capital Improvement Program is a plan for capital improvement projects proposed for the next six fiscal years; and

WHEREAS, the Assembly has reviewed the Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 2023 through Fiscal Year 2028, and has determined the capital improvement project priorities for Fiscal Year 2023.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA:

Section 1. Capital Improvement Program.

(a) Attachment A, entitled "City and Borough of Juneau Capital Improvement Program, Fiscal Years 2023-2028," dated **June 1, 2022**, is adopted as the Capital Improvement Program for the City and Borough.

(b) The following list, as set forth in the "City and Borough of Juneau Capital Improvement Program, Fiscal Years 2023 - 2028," are pending capital improvement projects to be undertaken in FY23:

FISCAL YEAR 2023 GENERAL SALES TAX IMPROVEMENTS		
DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	FY23 BUDGET
Eaglecrest	Deferred Maintenance /Mountain Operations Improvements	\$ 275,000
Manager's Office	JPD and CCFR - Radio System Replacement - seed money	150,000
Parks & Recreation	Deferred Building Maintenance	725,000
Parks & Recreation	Park & Playground Deferred Maintenance and Repairs	100,000
Parks & Recreation	Sports Field Resurfacing & Repairs	100,000
Parks & Recreation	Trail Maintenance	350,000
General Sales Tax Improvements Total		<u>\$ 1,700,000</u>

**FISCAL YEAR 2023
AREAWIDE STREET SALES TAX PRIORITIES**

DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	FY23 BUDGET
Street Maintenance	Pavement Management	\$ 800,000
Street Maintenance	Sidewalk & Stairway Repairs	750,000
Street Maintenance	Areawide Drainage Improvements	200,000
Street Maintenance	Teal St (supplemental increase from FY22)	992,000
Street Maintenance	Cedar Lane - Mend to Columbia - Surfacing and Utility Rehabilitation	360,000
Street Maintenance	Calhoun Avenue Phase 2 Surfacing and Utility Rehabilitation	1,750,000
Street Maintenance	Tongass Phase 2 (supplemental increase from FY22)	540,000
Street Maintenance	Crow Hill Drive Surfacing and Utility Rehabilitation	2,973,000
Street Maintenance	7 Mile Fleet Garage Bay Canopy Addition	100,000
Street Maintenance	Gold Creek Flume rehabilitation	200,000
Capital Transit	Bus Shelters Improvements	60,000
	FTA Grant Match - Install Additional Elect. Bus Charger Infrastructure - Bus	
Capital Transit	Barn	750,000
	FTA Grant Match - Install Elect. Bus Charger Infrastructure at Valley Transit	
Capital Transit	Center	450,000
Managers Office	Zero Waste Program	100,000
Managers Office	Lemon Creek Multi Modal Path Scoping and Planning	150,000
Engineering	Juneau Douglas North Crossing PEL Study - CBJ Staff time for project	175,000
Engineering	Road and Utility Project Designs for FY24	100,000
Engineering	Contaminated Sites ADEC Follow up Reporting	50,000
Areawide Street Sales Tax Priorities Total		<u>\$ 10,500,000</u>

**FISCAL YEAR 2023
TEMPORARY 1% SALES TAX PRIORITIES
Voter Approved Sales Tax 10/01/18 - 09/30/23**

DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	FY23 BUDGET
Manager's Office	Affordable Housing Fund	\$ 400,000 *
Manager's Office	IT Upgrades	400,000
Wastewater Utility	JDTP Decant Station	2,750,000
	Facilities Planning (Infiltration and Inflow, ABTP long term study, solids	
Wastewater Utility	digester)	300,000
Wastewater Utility	JDTP SCADA and Instrumentation Upgrades	150,000
Parks & Recreation	Deferred Building Maintenance	1,400,000
Parks & Recreation	Centennial Hall Upgrade / Deferred maintenance	2,800,000
School District	JSD Buildings Major Maintenance / Match	800,000
School District	MRCS Boiler Room Renovation	900,000
Airport	FAA Project Match	600,000
Temporary 1% Sales Tax Priorities Total		<u>\$ 10,500,000</u>

* Operating Budget Funding

**FISCAL YEAR 2023
STATE MARINE PASSENGER FEE PRIORITIES**

DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	FY23 BUDGET
Managers Office	Cirulator Plan	\$ 100,000
Docks	Real Time Weather Monitoring Station	55,000
Docks	Dock Electrification	2,640,000
Managers Office	Seawalk Expansion	1,000,000
Parks & Recreation	Refillable Water Bottle Station	50,000
Parks & Recreation	Marine Park Improvements Planning and Design	250,000
State Marine Passenger Fee Priorities Total		<u>\$ 4,095,000</u>

**FISCAL YEAR 2023
BARTLETT HOSPITAL ENTERPRISE FUND**

DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	FY23 BUDGET
Bartlett Hospital	Deferred Maintenance	\$ 3,000,000
Bartlett Hospital Enterprise Fund Total		<u>\$ 3,000,000</u>

**FISCAL YEAR 2023
LANDS & RESOURCES FUND**

DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	FY23 BUDGET
Lands & Resources	Pits and Quarries Infrastructure Maintenance and Expansion	\$ 150,000
	Lands & Resources Fund Total	\$ 150,000

**FISCAL YEAR 2023
WASTEWATER ENTERPRISE FUND**

DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	FY23 BUDGET
Wastewater Utility	MWWTP SCADA	\$ 1,500,000
Wastewater Utility	Outer Drive and West Juneau Pump Station Upgrades	500,000
Wastewater Utility	MWWTP Treatment Upgrades - SBR Tank Rehab/Full Floor Aeration	500,000
Wastewater Utility	MWWTP Influent Piping Reconfiguration/Valve Upgrades	500,000
Wastewater Utility	Teal St (supplemental increase from FY22)	150,000
	Cedar Lane - Mend to Columbia - Surfacing and Utility Rehabilitation	
Wastewater Utility	(supplemental increase from FY22)	45,000
Wastewater Utility	Calhoun Avenue Phase 2 Surfacing and Utility Rehabilitation	35,000
Wastewater Utility	Tongass Phase 2 (supplemental increase from FY22)	60,000
Wastewater Utility	Collection System Lift Station Upgrades	250,000
Wastewater Utility	Crow Hill Drive	50,000
Wastewater Utility	Dudley Street (Loop Rd to End)	50,000
Wastewater Utility	Lower D and 1st Street (Douglas) -- Sewer Replacement	50,000
Wastewater Utility	Stairway Sewer Improvements	250,000
Wastewater Utility	Areawide Collection System Improvements	150,000
Wastewater Utility	Road and Utility Project Designs for FY24	50,000
Wastewater Utility	Pavement Management Program-Utility Adjustments (frames &lids)	25,000
	Wastewater Enterprise Fund Total	\$ 4,165,000

**FISCAL YEAR 2023
WATER ENTERPRISE FUND**

DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	FY23 BUDGET
Water Utility	Glacier Highway (Lena Loop) Water System Condition Scoping	\$ 150,000
Water Utility	Cope Park Pump Station Upgrades, New Pumps, Motors, Communications	1,000,000
Water Utility	Water Pipeline Assessment	200,000
Water Utility	Crow Hill Drive (Douglas Hwy to End)	520,000
Water Utility	Lower D and 1st Street Douglas Water System Replacement	225,000
Water Utility	Teal St (supplemental increase from FY22)	70,000
	Cedar Lane - Mend to Columbia - Surfacing and Utility Rehabilitation	
Water Utility	(supplemental increase from FY22)	45,000
Water Utility	Calhoun Avenue Phase 2 Surfacing and Utility Rehabilitation	230,000
Water Utility	Tongass Phase 2 (supplemental increase from FY22)	105,000
Water Utility	PRV Station Improvements / Upgrades, Crow Hill, 5th St Douglas, W Jnu	100,000
Water Utility	Areawide Water System Repairs	100,000
Water Utility	Road and Utility Project Designs for FY24	50,000
Water Utility	Pavement Management Water Utility Adjustments	8,000
	Water Enterprise Fund Total	\$ 2,803,000

ORDINANCE 2022-06 CAPITAL PROJECTS FUNDING TOTAL

\$ 36,513,000

ORDINANCE 2022-06 OPERATING BUDGET FUNDING TOTAL

\$ 400,000 *

** Operating Budget Funding*

(c) The following list, as set forth in the "City and Borough of Juneau Capital Improvement Program, Fiscal Years 2023-2028," are capital improvement projects identified as priorities proposed to be undertaken beginning in FY23, but are dependent on other unsecured funding sources. As the sources are secured, the funds will be appropriated:

**FISCAL YEAR 2023
AIRPORT UNSCHEDULED FUNDING**

DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	
Airport	Construct Terminal Area (121/135) Apron Rehab & North ramp lighting & fencing	\$ 7,400,000
Airport	26 MALSR (FAA F&E Project)	3,900,000
Airport	Channel Flying Property Acquisition (FAA compliance)	1,500,000
Airport	Taxilane Improvement (East) non-FAA eligible portions	225,000
	Airport Unscheduled Funding Total	<u>\$ 13,025,000</u>

**FISCAL YEAR 2023
UNSCHEDULED FUNDING**

DEPARTMENT	PROJECT	
Capital Transit	FTA Grant - Install additional Elect. Bus Charger Infrastructure	\$ 3,200,000
Capital Transit	FTA Grant Match - Instal Elect. Bus Charger Infrastructure at Valley Transit Center	1,500,000
Parks and Recreation	Hank Harmon Public Range Hunter Safety Access Grant (unscheduled)	600,000
Parks and Recreation	Eagle Valley Center Heat Pump and Energy Efficiency (unscheduled)	300,000
Harbors	UAS Downtown Property Purchase	3,000,000
Harbors	Cost Share w/ ACOE - Statter Breakwater Feasibility Study	500,000
Street Maintenance	Calhoun Avenue Pedestrian Bridge Rehabilitation -Replacement - FED Hwys Bridge Rehabilitation Grant	350,000
Managers Office	JPD and CCFR - Radio System replacement	12,000,000
Managers Office	DEU Building Expansion - Alaska High Intensity Drug Trafikking Area Initiative (HIDTA) Grant	70,000
	Unscheduled Funding Total	<u>\$ 21,520,000</u>

Section 2. Fiscal Year 2023 Budget. It is the intent of the Assembly that the capital improvement project budget allocations as set forth in the FY23 pending Capital Improvements List in Section 1(b), above, not already appropriated, shall become a part of the City and Borough's Fiscal Year 2023 Budget.

Section 3. State and Federal Funding. To the extent that a proposed CIP project, as set forth in Section 1(c), above, includes state funding, federal funding, or both, the amount of funding for that project is an estimate only, and is subject to appropriation contingent upon final funding being secured. It is the intent of the Assembly that once funding is secured, these items will be brought back to the Assembly for appropriation.

Section 4. Effective Date. This resolution shall be effective immediately upon adoption.

Adopted this _____ day of **June**, 2022.

Beth A. Weldon, Mayor

Attest:

Elizabeth J. McEwen, Municipal Clerk



Planning Commission

(907) 586-0715
PC_Comments@juneau.org
www.juneau.org/plancomm
155 S. Seward Street • Juneau, AK 99801

Date: February 26, 2021

From: Michael LeVine, Chair
Planning Commission

To: Katie Koester, Engineering & Public Works Department
Assembly Public Works and Facilities Committee

Subject: Planning Commission Review, 2022 CIP Draft List

BACKGROUND

Each year, the Planning Commission is tasked with recommending to the Assembly whether to approve the CBJ six-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). This review is intended to ensure that the CIP is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other City and Borough plans, such as the Land Use Master Plan, Juneau Economic Development Plan, and Climate Action and Implementation Plan.

As part of that process, the Planning Commission reviewed the draft list of 2022 CIP projects at its February 23, 2021 regular meeting.

The following comments and recommendations summarize the discussion from that meeting:

CIP 2022 List

1. The general CIP project approach, with its emphasis on maintenance, rather than new construction, is appropriate, given the economic challenges facing the Borough.
2. To the extent practical, projects and their benefits should be evenly allocated across the Borough. For example, distribution of street and sidewalk improvements should be allocated equitably across the Borough.
3. More than \$2,000,000 in major parks maintenance is scheduled, similar to past years. The Commission noted this amount and the contrast to the minimal parks expenditures in the Lemon Creek area, in spite of Area Plans and Recreation plans identifying the non-equitable access to recreational opportunities in Lemon Creek.
4. The Commission recommended that alternate sources, such as heat pumps, should be considered as the City works to replace the oil boiler in Mendenhall River School. Heat pumps may offer a life cycle cost advantage, and help meet CBJ goals of fossil fuel use reduction.

Assembly Public Works and Facilities Committee


CIP Recommendations

February 25, 2121

Page 2 of 2

5. The \$12,000,000 unfunded request for JPD and CCFR radio system replacement was discussed. The Commission expressed concern that the system is not meeting minimum safety standards, and it was suggested that alternatives to this major expenditure, perhaps using cell technology, might be considered.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael", followed by a large, stylized loop or flourish.

Michael Levine, Chair
Planning Commission



(907) 586-0715
CDD_Admin@juneau.org
www.juneau.org/CDD
155 S. Seward Street • Juneau, AK 99801

April 5, 2021

MEMO

From: Irene Gallion, Senior Planner 

To: Leadership, City and Borough of Juneau

Through: Jill Maclean, AICP, Director, Community Development Department
Scott Ciambor, Planning Manager, Community Development Department
Katie Koester, Director, Engineering and Public Works

RE: REVISED PUBLIC OUTREACH DATES: North Channel Crossing: Planning and Environmental Linkages Project Update

Below is a summary of scheduled public participation events for this project. Opportunities for the general public to participate are in **BOLD**. Updated dates are underlined. Website is in development.

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting: April 25, 2022 (rescheduled from April 19)

Committee members include government, regulatory and resource agencies, and planning organizations with direct involvement in the PEL study.

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting: April 27, 2022 (rescheduled from April 22)

Includes government agencies, businesses and public whose interests may be positively or negatively affected by the execution or completion of the project.

Public Meeting #1: May 11, 2022 (rescheduled from May 3rd)

This meeting will summarize the project and consider alignments proposed in the past. Public notice through post cards, the State of Alaska web site, Juneau Empire advertisement, e mail lists, and the ADOT&PF facebook page. Public feedback encouraged.

Travelling Open House/Listening Post: May 21-22 (rescheduled from May 28)

Engages members of the public who might not otherwise attend meetings by setting up at popular locations, such as grocery stores or malls. A less formal version of the Public Meeting #1. Public feedback encouraged.

Alternatives Development Workshop/Advisory Committee Meeting: June 21, 2022 (rescheduled from June 16)

Analysis of feedback received through processes above.