

Agenda
PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Ben Haight, Chairman
January 10, 2017

I. ROLL CALL

Ben Haight, Chairman, called the Regular Meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held in the Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building, to order at 7:02 p.m.

Commissioners present: Ben Haight, Chairman; Paul Voelckers, Vice Chairman; Michael LeVine, Dan Miller, Percy Frisby, Dan Hickok, Kirsten Shelton-Walker, Carl Greene

Commissioners absent: Nathaniel Dye

Staff present: Rob Steedle, CDD Director; Beth McKibben, Planning Manager; Brenwynne Grigg, Administrative Officer; Jill Maclean, Senior Planner, Eric Feldt, Planner II; Robert Palmer, Assistant Attorney II

Assembly members: Debbie White, Jerry Nankervis

Swearing in of New Planning Commission Members:

Returning Commission member Dan Miller and new Commission member Dan Hickok were sworn into office by Robert Palmer.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. December 13, 2016, Draft Minutes – Regular Planning Commission Meeting

MOTION: *by Mr. LeVine, to approve the Regular Planning Commission meeting minutes of December 13, 2016, with any minor corrections by staff or Commission members.*

The motion passed with no objection.

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

IV. PLANNING COMMISSION LIASON REPORT

Nestler Appeal Withdrawn

Assembly Liaison to the Planning Commission Ms. White reported that the Nestlers who had appealed the decision by the Planning Commission to the Assembly have withdrawn their appeal.

Homeless Population

There has been an alternate piece of land identified as a possible site for housing those within the homeless population and the Department of Law is working on that. The Assembly is in support of providing lodging for the homeless population of Juneau, noted Ms. White. The Assembly also has to protect the rights of the home owners and taxpayers within the Borough who shop within the downtown area, she noted.

Commission Comments and Questions

Mr. Voelckers asked if there were any new developments with the Olmo appeal.

The Assembly has conducted its hearing and made its decision, said Ms. White, but they are awaiting the publishing of that decision from the Department of Law.

V. RECONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS - None

VI. CONSENT AGENDA - None

VII. CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS - None

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

IX. REGULAR AGENDA - None

X. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - None

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Election of Officers and Planning Commission Committee Assignments

The Commission office positions of Chair, Vice Chair, Clerk and Vice Clerk were up for nomination, noted Chairman Haight.

MOTION: *by Mr. LeVine, for Chairman Haight to remain as Chair of the Planning Commission.*

The motion passed with no objection.

MOTION: *by Mr. LeVine, to nominate Mr. Voelckers to remain in his seat as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission.*

The motion passed with no objection.

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers, to nominate Mr. LeVine as Clerk of the Planning Commission.*

The motion passed with no objection.

MOTION: *by Mr. LeVine, to nominate Nathaniel Dye as Vice Clerk of the Planning Commission.*

The motion passed with no objection.

Juneau Commission on Sustainability

Meets on second and fourth Wednesdays at 5:30 in the downtown library.

Lands Committee

Meets in the Chambers on Monday nights prior to Assembly Committee of the Whole meetings at 5:00.

Public Works Committee

Meets at noon in the Assembly Chambers on the same days as regular Assembly meetings are scheduled.

Rules Committee

To be scheduled.

Wetlands Review Board

Scheduled for one meeting around the middle of each month.

Subdivision Review Committee

Scheduled as needed.

Title 49 Committee

Currently scheduled for the third Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. once a month.

Mr. LeVine said perhaps there is enough work on the Title 49 Committee to split into two committees.

Chairman Haight said there has been some discussion with the CDD Director that some work on the Title 49 Committee be directed to the Planning Commission Committee of the Whole involving the entire Commission on some of those items.

Mr. LeVine said he felt that was a good idea.

TENTATIVE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS	
COMMITTEE	Commission Member(s)
Juneau Commission on Sustainability	Mr. LeVine
Lands Committee	Mr. Voelckers
Public Works Committee	Mr. Greene
Rules Committee	Mr. Greene Mr. Voelckers Mr. Dye
Wetlands Review Board	Mr. Miller Mr. Frisby
Subdivision Review Committee	Mr. LeVine Mr. Frisby Mr. Dye Mr. Hickok Mr. Miller (alternate)
Title 49 Committee	Mr. Miller Ms. Shelton-Walker Mr. Greene Mr. Voelckers Mr. Hickok (alternate)

Adoption of 2017 Planning Commission Calendar

Ms. McKibben suggested there may be certain weeks or time periods when it may be difficult to get a quorum due to travel of Commission members. She asked the Commission if it really wanted to schedule a meeting for December 26, as it is slated on the 2017 calendar. If the Commission decided this was not a date they really needed to conduct a meeting, they could schedule another meeting in the month if it was needed, she said. She said she has also served commissions which scheduled a week off during the summer so Commission members could schedule their vacations around that time period. She said sometimes it was difficult to obtain a quorum during the week of Thanksgiving or the week of spring break, for example.

Commission Comments and Questions

Mr. Voelckers concurred that December 26, (2017) was not an optimal day to schedule a meeting of the Planning Commission.

Mr. LeVine said he liked the suggestion offered by Ms. McKibben to eliminate one or two meetings in the summer if it could be optimally planned ahead of time.

Mr. Steedle said a time in the summer for Commission members to be free of meetings could be scheduled but did not need to be decided this evening.

Mr. Miller said he had a different perspective on dropping meetings for the Commission. He said if he was in applicant and was attempting to move his project forward that he would not be in favor of action on his project being postponed due to a week taken off by the Commission. He said the Commission has two meetings scheduled every month and that he felt they should be held to those meetings if possible.

Mr. Frisby concurred with Mr. Miller. He added that they should not simply drop the December 26, (2017) meeting without adding a floating date in December to make up for the missed December 26, (2017) meeting, so if necessary they could conduct a second meeting in December.

Due to the school holidays, Mr. Greene commented that scheduling a meeting any time during the Christmas holidays may present a problem for obtaining a quorum.

Mr. Steedle suggested that the Commission adopt the calendar as it currently exists and make adjustments to the calendar as needed in the future. He added that he appreciated Mr. Miller's point that applicants should be able to expect that the Commission deal with their issues in a timely manner.

The Commission approved the calendar for 2017 as it is written.

c. Title 49 Update Priorities

Mr. Steedle presented the Commission with a list of pending Title 49 amendments to be dealt with in the forthcoming year:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ✓ Variances | ✓ Urban Agriculture |
| ✓ Eagles | ✓ Auke Bay zoning |
| ✓ Stream side setbacks | ✓ Junk, salvage yards, recycling |
| ✓ Parking waivers | ✓ Bonus provisions |
| ✓ Panhandle lots | ✓ Street reconstruction |
| ✓ Planned unit developments | ✓ Street standards |
| ✓ Cottage housing | ✓ Signs |

The above list consists of areas of the code that are either currently being addressed by staff and the Title 49 Committee, or items that they intend to address in the forthcoming year, said Mr. Steedle. Variances, eagles, stream side setbacks and parking waivers have all been to the Title 49 Committee, noted Mr. Steedle, and are in various stages of development.

Ms. McKibben is anxious to tackle Panhandle lots, which Mr. Voelckers is interested in, said Mr. Steedle, and Ms. Boyce is ready to address Planned Unit Developments. The staff believes that Cottage Housing would also fit under the umbrella of Planned Unit Developments, said Mr. Steedle. The Commission on Sustainability has spent some time working on the issue of chickens and roosters within the community, said Mr. Steedle, and that will be coming before the Commission, he noted.

Auke Bay zoning represents the implementation of the Auke Bay Area Plan, said Mr. Steedle. Junk, salvage yards, and recycling the staff had initially felt just needed some cleaning up, but the staff now thinks this is an issue which could take off in other directions, noted Mr. Steedle.

Having bonus incentives to spur the vision and subsequent development of Auke Bay could prove to be very helpful, said Mr. Steedle. The staff currently has nothing to bring before the Commission on Street reconstruction and they hope to have this ready in the future, said Mr. Steedle. Two years ago there was a Supreme Court decision called the Gilbert Decision that had a strong effect on what a municipality can do to limit signs, said Mr. Steedle. Independent of the constitutionality of the CBJ sign code, it could use some improvement, he said.

These items will be addressed with the Borough Assembly at the joint meeting between the Assembly and the Planning Commission later this month, said Mr. Steedle.

Mr. Voelckers said he was excited to see bonus provisions on the list and that he agreed with Mr. Steedle's reference to bonus provisions and Auke Bay development. He said bonus provisions may have even greater implications for the downtown area. This could be a tool the City could use to get behind some of the active recommendations as presented by the McDowell Group or in the Housing Action Plan, for example, he said.

Mr. Miller said he was pleased to see Planned Unit Developments on the list, and that he was looking forward to join the Title 49 committee to help that along. He said he was only aware of

three Planned Unit Developments in the community, and that included one which he believed was planned for Douglas. A cottage housing development has not yet successfully been executed in the community, said Mr. Miller.

Mr. Miller said he would also like to see accessory apartments in duplexes added to the list. He said he felt this was low hanging fruit for affordable housing in Juneau.

Chairman Haight asked if the items had been assigned an order in terms of implementation.

Mr. Steedle said he would like to see the number of variances reduced which come before the Commission, but as the Title 49 committee has stated, they need to be able to provide some flexibility with stream-side setbacks, with eagles, and perhaps some other areas as well.

Mr. Voelckers said he felt that eagles and stream-side setbacks were well underway in their development. He asked the staff if they could elaborate on any areas in which the Law Department had expressed an interest.

Ms. McKibben said there is some work to do by the Law Department on the eagle ordinance, and after that was accomplished they may either bring it back to the Title 49 committee or directly to the Commission.

The Title 49 committee has vetted the concept of stream-side setbacks, said Ms. McKibben, but the staff has not yet crafted the language to present to the Title 49 committee for review.

Mr. Frisby asked if the pending Title 49 amendments were prioritized.

Mr. Steedle responded that the items are not prioritized.

XII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Steedle told the Commission he wanted to clarify that it was his error that the wrong packet was sent out to the Commission last week and that it was not a staff error. He apologized for any confusion this may have caused.

Joint Meeting with Assembly

The Commission will participate in a joint meeting with the Borough Assembly on January 30, (2017) said Mr. Steedle. There was one other item on the agenda for that meeting which is time critical, said Mr. Steedle, which is the acquisition of property at Auke Bay. The federal government is surplussing the property it owns in Auke Bay, said Mr. Steedle. Both the university and the CBJ are interested in acquiring the property, he said. The building is located on over four waterfront acres, he noted. They will be discussing how to move ahead with that acquisition and how to partner with the University, said Mr. Steedle.

Lemon Creek Plan

The Lemon Creek plan is underway, with Mr. Voelckers as the Commission liaison for that group, noted Mr. Steedle. They are making good progress with the Lemon Creek plan, he said. The staff is now beginning to focus on the downtown plan, said Mr. Steedle.

Ms. McKibben said the staff has begun its work on the downtown plan with a discussion on what the downtown plan might look like and what the staff needs to do to develop that plan. She said the very first step would be to define the boundaries of the downtown area. There are many steps which need to be implemented including the Docks and Harbors management plans in the downtown area which they are working on. They plan on using the same chapters that are in the Lemon Creek plan for consistency, said Ms. McKibben. They may add an additional chapter specific to the public realm such as street furniture and plazas and other public spaces that may be implemented, she noted.

The staff has also considered utilizing the American Planning Association Community Assistance Planning Team or the American Institute of Architects Regional Urban Design Assistance Program, said Ms. McKibben, for part of the planning process. These programs are not free, she noted, but it would provide a fresh perspective for the project, she said.

It may also be possible to coordinate with a university program to assist with some of the initial planning process, said Ms. McKibben. It could provide a low-cost alternative for obtaining fresh perspective, she said. She said there is the possibility that they may request funds through the budget process for part of the downtown plan, said Ms. McKibben. They could not afford to contract out for the entire planning process, she added.

Commission Comments and Questions

Mr. Voelckers asked if a general timeline has yet been developed or if it would be put in abeyance until the Lemon Creek planning project was completed.

Ms. McKibben said they have had some discussion about the downtown plan but they have not made any decisions as of yet. Lemon Creek would at least need to be in the public review process and close to coming before the Planning Commission before the staff could take on the downtown planning project. The downtown plan will be challenging in many ways, said Ms. McKibben. There are a lot of competing interests at stake which will need to come together to create a unified vision, she added. It could be as early as the fall of 2017, she said.

Mr. Frisby asked how much of the downtown plan will overlap with the phase II road upgrade.

Ms. McKibben said it would probably depend upon the boundaries drawn for the downtown planning area. They have been working with the Department of Transportation while formulating the Lemon Creek plan, said Ms. McKibben.

a. PRESENTATION ITEM – AME2016 0013: Text amendment to Title 49 to provide for reductions in parking requirements borough-wide via waiver(s).

This item was initiated last summer when a convenience store in downtown Douglas tried to open for business and was prevented from doing so because it could not meet the parking requirement, said Ms. Maclean. The convenience store was required to have three parking spaces for the store and two parking spaces for the apartments above, said Ms. Maclean. They could not meet this requirement, she said. The staff looked at the parking area and compared it to similar areas in downtown Juneau and presented this information at a public meeting in the downtown Douglas area, she said. The public came out resoundingly against a parking district. The staff proposed a 50% reduction in the parking requirements for the area, she said. The public felt in some instances this would still be too onerous of a burden to place upon business owners, she said, and public commenters' also said the plan did not provide enough flexibility, said Ms. Maclean.

The staff was asked at the meeting to look at waivers or to figure out a way where this could be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, said Ms. Maclean. The staff met with the Title 49 committee which also agreed that it did not make sense to impose regulations just in downtown Douglas. They felt this is something that should be opened up for further discussion, said Ms. Maclean.

The staff also had a meeting with the Lemon Creek Steering committee which also came out in favor of the waivers, said Ms. Maclean. The downtown committee came out in favor of the waivers, said Ms. McLean. No one attended the meeting in the Valley, she said. A variance is for parties seeking relief from an existing zoning ordinance, said Ms. Maclean. A variance runs with the structure, the use or the lot, she said. That is transferable from owner to owner, she added.

In this instance the waiver or the exception would run with the use and the location, she said. A different location would require another waiver, she said. They are not recommending that the parking district be considered at this point, she said. The next decisions would be whether these exceptions would be made solely by the CDD Director, or by the Planning Commission or by some combination of the two, said Ms. Maclean.

If the decision was made by the Planning Commission it would be appealable to the Assembly, or if the decision was made by the CDD Director, it would be appealable to the Planning Commission, she said. If it went before the Planning Commission it would require the full public hearing process, she noted. Certain criteria would have to be met in order for the waiver to be granted, said Ms. Maclean. If it was up to the Director then there would be no public hearing process, she said.

The intent to exclude the downtown and the fee in lieu parking districts from the waiver is because these districts have already been studied and they already receive an automatic reduction in their parking as it stands, said Ms. Maclean.

A waiver would be granted if a need could be demonstrated and if the impacts to the surrounding areas would be acceptable, she said. Both the staff and the Title 49 committee are in agreement on these points, said Ms. Maclean. The waivers would be appealable, and they may be permitted borough-wide excluding Parking Districts One and Two and the fee in lieu district, she said. The Title 49 committee had also asked staff to review the transit systems in the area that it serves and perhaps somehow tie the parking waiver process to the transit system. For example, perhaps application would only be accepted if it was within a certain radius of the transit system, said Ms. Maclean. However the staff found that would only extend to the urban service area primarily and would therefore leave out areas such as Thane road, North Douglas and Auke Bay, she said.

The staff and Title 49 committee felt they have seen quite a few instances where topography may prevent the provision of parking areas. The staff felt it best to leave the waivers on a case-by-case basis, she said, and not leave it just to areas within the transit system. The waiver may be permitted within any zoning district, and for any use providing that it is found that the impacts do not create an undue burden on the surrounding properties. For uses: Multi-Family, Commercial, Retail or Industrial, the staff and Title 49 Committee recommend that if the number of parking spaces can meet the number of spaces listed in the code, the applicant may ask for a waiver if the applicant can reasonably demonstrate that the proposed use does not require the minimum parking. The applicant would also need to provide reasonable public amenities such as bike or pedestrian improvements, a bus shelter, etc., said Ms. Maclean.

The parking standards for Juneau are similar to the national parking standards across the country, said Ms. Maclean. Therefore they are not custom-made for this community and therefore do not fit any area well, she said. For example a retail business which carries with it the requirement of 40 parking spaces could show that it really only needed 25 parking spaces even though it had enough land for 40 parking spaces. It could feasibly instead construct only 25 parking spaces and in addition install a public improvement such as a bus shelter, said Ms. Maclean. Ms. Maclean said she was not sure if the Title 49 committee was behind that recommendation or not.

Following the last Title 49 committee meeting the staff diverged in some of its recommendations, said Ms. Maclean. At that last meeting the CDD Director was to approve all waivers, said Ms. McLean. Upon further review and in its work with the Law Department the staff felt if the applicant was coming before the Commission any way for a Conditional Use Permit, for example, it did not make sense for the Director in a separate action to approve a waiver for the same use, she said. Therefore the staff suggests that the Director approve all

applications for a minor development, and that the Planning Commission would be responsible for providing a waiver for all major development, said Ms. Maclean.

The staff felt that notification used in the minor subdivision developments be used which is that the department shall mail written notice of the application to the owners of property within a 250 foot radius, said Ms. Maclean, following the Director's determination that the application is complete, she said. To grant the waiver the CDD Director would need to ascertain that the reduction is consistent with public health, safety, and that the reduction promotes a public benefit, said Ms. Maclean.

The parking exception would run with the use and with the location, and could not be transferred to another location or applied to another use at the same location, said Ms. Maclean. That was recommended both by the staff and the Title 49 committee, she said. A request for the waiver would cost \$400 and if it is filed in conjunction with a major subdivision permit separate public notice would not be required and the exception fee would be reduced by 20 percent, she said. This is the same fee as a variance and the staff felt it would require about the same amount of review of the surrounding neighborhood, and its impacts on the abutting properties, said Ms. Maclean. They felt if it was requested in conjunction with another permit it could be reduced by 20 percent, she explained.

It is recommended that the proposed ordinance include the following sections:

-  Childcare homes and centers
-  Nonconforming developments
-  Mobile Home and recreational vehicle parks
-  Single-Family Homes

The staff does recommend that cottage housing and Planned Unit Developments be excluded since they already have separate parking standards in place, said Ms. Maclean.

Commission Comments and Questions

Mr. Frisby asked for the difference between minor and major subdivisions.

Ms. McKibben explained that those differences are outlined in the Table of Permissible Uses and distinguished by a number one or number three. A "one" is a minor development and can be approved administratively, and a number "three" is a major development and requires Planning Commission approval through a Conditional Use Permit, she said. It is based upon the square footage of the building or the area of the lot, she said. For multi-family development more than 12 units would require a Conditional Use Permit, she said. There are a few zoning districts where the threshold is eight units, she added.

Mr. LeVine said the Title 49 committee had talked about smaller developments where bus shelters or bike racks would not be appropriate. The Title 49 committee was fine with this as long as the word “reasonable” or “appropriate public amenities” was in the language. There was some discretion for the Director to waive the amenities requirement, he said.

Mr. Voelckers said that he concurred with Mr. LeVine but that he was always a little uncomfortable when it was completely open-ended about what an applicant should or should not do. He said he agreed with Mr. LeVine that there should be significant Director discretion which should not be punitive or arbitrary.

Ms. Shelton-Walker said this addressed her concerns. Otherwise requirements could become unduly burdensome to the developer, she said. There should be some parameters regarding Director discretion, she said.

The next step would involve the drafting of an ordinance by the staff for the next meeting, said Ms. Maclean.

Mr. Voelckers asked for another recap of the items which had not been decided at the Title 49 committee level.

There was the distinction between major and minor subdivisions, and the addition of the mobile home parks and the RV parks, and also the notification requirement. The Title 49 committee had discussed requiring the applicant to obtain support from the abutting properties, said Ms. Maclean. The staff has been advised by the Law Department that they cannot base a land-use decision on public opinion, she said. This takes care of notifying the public, putting the onus on the CDD department and not the applicant, she explained.

Mr. Voelckers said that this makes sense.

Mr. LeVine commented that this was a good solution.

b. PRESENTATION ITEM – AME2015 0010: Auke Bay Area Plan Implementation Update

Ms. Grigg told the Commission that she has worked with Eric Feldt, the Project Manager for the Auke Bay Plan, behind the scenes, and that she directed the video on Auke Bay which would be shown to the Commission this evening. The Auke Bay Area Plan has been adopted, said Ms. Grigg. The next step is implementation of that plan, she said. The development of design guidelines is part of that implementation process, said Ms. Grigg. The community was in support of design guidelines, she said. They wanted some firm guidelines that were written in code and were not negotiable, but they also wanted guidelines that were more visionary and more suggestive in nature, she said. They did not want design guidelines that would hinder development or create a financial burden on the applicants, she said.

Some property owners in the area offered funds to help make the video feasible, said Ms. Grigg. They made the video to provide a visual and auditory representation of what development in the Auke Bay Town Center area could look like, said Ms. Grigg. They wanted to represent a visual representation of the code guidelines, she said.

The video represents the vision for the Auke Bay area balanced by the reality of the area and the landscape, she said. Therefore it contains a lot of conceptual images, explained Ms. Grigg. The video displays existing businesses with businesses which may exist in the area in the future and existing roads along with roads which may be constructed in the future, she explained. The existing property owners of any of the businesses portrayed in the video have been involved in the planning discussions and the vision for the area, she said.

They will be showing this video to various groups within the community such as the Chamber of Commerce, the Juneau Economic Development Council, the Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau, the real estate groups, Southeast Alaska Living magazine, and the University of Alaska Southeast to name a few, she said. They will also develop a presentation package to distribute to local and outside investors, said Ms. Grigg.

As they view this video, Ms. Grigg told the Commission to imagine that they are a developer looking for a lucrative investment. Or that they are moving to Juneau, and are trying to figure out what area of town they would like to reside in, or that they are a visitor exploring a vacation location within the community. The video will serve many varied needs, said Ms. Grigg.

Their goal for the Auke Bay community is for residents to spend an entire day within the Auke Bay town center area and have all of their needs met, said Ms. Grigg. She ran the Commission through what could be a typical day in the community for a family, beginning with a morning cup of coffee at the local coffee shop, a walk to work followed by lunch at a local café, and after work relaxing through a yoga class at the local gym. The children would then be picked up at the area day care followed by shopping at the neighborhood store with an ice cream cone obtained at the local ice cream shop after dinner, she said. This is the vision for the Auke Bay town center, said Ms. Grigg.

The video portrays a flourishing and unique town center, said Ms. Grigg.

Following the video, Mr. Feldt told the Commission that while the tourist industry in Juneau portrays beautiful scenery and wildlife in Juneau that this is the first video of its kind which shows a vision of a neighborhood. This is a vision of planned growth and cohesive development for a new small town center, said Mr. Feldt. The video takes the neighborhood supported policies for the area and displays them in a cohesive and organized environment, he said. While conceptual in nature, the video helps people experience the small town center vision by

moving through new streets, along new businesses, and buildings while, also recognizing the familiar landmarks in Auke Bay.

The town center will be financially supported by investment from local residents, businesses, nonprofit and government agencies, said Mr. Feldt. The video has been made possible by Northwind Architects, Alaska Robotics and Kit Burroughs.

The activities outlined by Ms. Grigg are supported by the Auke Bay Area Plan and from numerous individuals who attended the Auke Bay meetings, said Mr. Feldt. The Auke Bay area plan implementation starts with a vision for the community, a framework for the area, and an ordinance with design standards in place that are agreeable and not a barrier to development, he said. They need the bones in place to guide the development of the small town center, said Mr. Feldt.

Based upon the recommendations of the Auke Bay Steering Committee, the Planning Department staff has drafted two new zoning districts for the core of Auke Bay, said Mr. Feldt. The Planning Commission can expect this draft in the upcoming months, said Mr. Feldt. Mr. Feldt said he believes it is truly the excitement of the Auke Bay neighborhood which will carry this vision forward into implementation.

Commission Comments and Questions

Mr. Frisby said he felt they did an excellent job on the video.

Mr. Greene asked how well the actual footprint in Auke Bay fits the vision portrayed in the video.

The projects displayed in the video closely match the topography in the area, said Mr. Feldt. They used LIDAR components to form the contour data upon which Northwind Architects based their model portrayed in the video, he said.

Mr. Hickok asked if there was still a plan by the Department of Transportation (DOT) to bypass the core Auke Bay area with a new road.

That road is still in the DOT adopted plan, said Mr. Feldt. That is still probably 30 years into the future, he said.

Mr. Hickok asked if neighborhood land owners are on board with the proposed development plans.

One of the future roads runs along the RV site and CBJ Fire Station. Both land owners are on board with this future road. There is a large tract of land behind the RV site which is CBJ owned, so the City will be a player in the development process as well, said Mr. Feldt.

XIII. REPORT OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Lemon Creek Steering Committee

Mr. Voelckers reported that the Lemon Creek planning is going well and that the group is working through chapters on schedule and that there has been good dialogue on the landfill area.

Lands Committee

The Lands Committee will meet next week, said Mr. Frisby.

Public Works Committee

Chairman Haight reported that he attended the Public Works committee meeting as an observer and that there were presentations about a memorial establishment and that DOT made a presentation about the speed limit in the Auke Bay area which primarily entailed the crossing from the University to the University recreational facility. He said that Michelle Elfers gave a presentation on the recycle works project, and that City staff talked about the process involved to stabilize the Mendenhall River. Ms. Elfers also gave a presentation on the downtown street improvements project, said Chairman Haight. In addition, Mr. Healy, of Public Works, gave an overview of projects currently under review and up for bid and design.

Commission Comments and Questions

Mr. Hickok asked what the role was of an alternate on a committee.

Chairman Haight said in the past alternates have participated in committee meetings to some extent, and that when the full body of the committee is present then the alternate is in an observational role. When the regular committee body lacks a quorum then the alternate steps in as a voting member.

Mr. Miller added that the alternate is expected to attend all meetings and the presence of an alternate gives a better guarantee that a quorum will be obtained, he said.

Mr. LeVine added that the meetings are relatively informal and that from his observation alternates are welcome to participate in the dialogue.

Mr. Greene asked if a Title 49 meeting is scheduled.

He was informed by staff that there is a meeting scheduled for January 18, (2017) in the Community Development Department at 3:00 p.m. Ms. McKibben announced that the Juneau Commission on Sustainability meets January 11, and that it has its annual retreat on Saturday, January 28, (2017). The committee members said the existing 3:00 p.m. time would work for them as well.

Committee members are reminded by email of the forthcoming meeting dates and times, said Chairman Haight.

Ms. McKibben reported that January 11, (2017) is the next Lemon Creek Steering Committee meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m. at Gruening Park and that the housing chapter will be up for discussion.

XIV. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS - None

XV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.