Agenda
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Ben Haight, Chairman
September 13, 2016

I. ROLL CALL

Ben Haight, Chairman, called the Regular Planning Commission 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; Bill Peters, Michael LeVine, Percy Frisby, (telephonically), Nathaniel Dye, Matthew Bell, Carl Greene

Commissioners absent: Paul Voelckers, Kirsten Shelton-Walker

Staff present: Rob Steedle, CDD Director; Beth McKibben, Planning Manager; Eric Feldt, Planner 1

Assembly members: Debbie White, Jerry Nankervis

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- August 23, 2016 Regular Planning Commission Meeting

MOTION: *by Mr. Peters, to approve the August 23, 2016, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes with any minor changes by Commission members or by staff.*

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - None

IV. PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON REPORT

Assembly Liaison to the Planning Commission Debbie White reported that $4.3 million in a budget shortfall was addressed by the Assembly. They will address the school district shortfall at its November 9, (2016) meeting. There was some talk that the Governor did not have authority on some school issues, and a lot of it was due to school bond debt reimbursement, said Ms. White. The practice has been that municipalities pay for 30% of school construction and the State will pay for 70%. The State said it was not going to do that this year which left the City and Borough of Juneau with about a $4.5 million deficit, said Ms. White. She said that

$500,000 of that will be covered by some unexpected sales tax revenue and $500,000 through departments trimming their budgets. The Assembly decided to pull money back it had allocated for deferred maintenance. The remaining $2.6 million deficit was taken care of through bond fund balance money, not the budget reserve, said Ms. White.

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

AME2016 0011: A proposed rezone of a vacant lot near the end of St. Ann's in Downtown Douglas from D-5 to D-18 zoning district.
Applicant: R & M Engineering
Location: St. Ann's Avenue

Staff Recommendation
Staff recommends the Planning Commission recommend the Assembly approve the subject rezone application, changing the zoning district from D-5 to D-18.

This item is for the rezone of a vacant lot near the end of St. Ann's in downtown Douglas from a D-5 to a D-18 zoning district, said Mr. Feldt. A zoning change is initiated by a private property owner, said Mr. Feldt, and the zone change requests are limited to the months of January and July, he said. This request came to the staff in July, he said. Public notice has been provided, said Mr. Feldt, in addition to a voluntary neighborhood meeting proposed by the staff. This meeting was held in mid-August, he said.

The applicant is proposing that this lot be expanded into the D-18 zoning district, said Mr. Feldt. If the Planning Commission provides a positive recommendation it then proceeds to the Assembly for action following public meetings, said Mr. Feldt. If the Commission votes to deny the rezone application, said Mr. Feldt, that decision is final and it does not go any further to the Assembly.

The property owner requests the rezone in order to develop the property by subdividing it into three small lots, said Mr. Feldt. There would then be a total of three homes, said Mr. Feldt. One lot would be a single family detached home and lots two and three would be two common wall dwellings, said Mr. Feldt.

On the subject site the owner may have up to two dwelling units, said Mr. Feldt. If the rezone request was approved it could have a maximum of up to six dwelling units, he said. The building height for both zones is 35 feet and the maximum amount of land that can be covered by buildings is the same for both zones at 50 percent, he said. For a D-5 zone home with an accessory apartment three parking spaces would be required, said Mr. Feldt. If the rezone was granted the parking would be calculated on a per bedroom basis, he said. The rear yard setback for a D-18 zoning district is 10 feet instead of the 20 feet required for a D-5 zoning district, said Mr. Feldt.

If the lot was developed at its current zoning of D-5 the traffic would be more similar to existing lots, said Mr. Feldt. The Public Works and Streets Division was consulted about the impact of additional traffic generated by the rezone and it indicated that the trip count on a six plex could be accommodated by the neighborhood streets, said Mr. Feldt.

The proposal meets the submittal requirements and the rezoning initiation, zone change restrictions and procedural requirements of the CBJ Land Use Code, said Mr. Feldt. The rezone to D-18 from D-5 substantially conforms to the Comprehensive Plan and will not cause negative impacts to the adjacent property, said Mr. Feldt. The rezone expands the existing D-18 district to the subject site.

Mark Pusich of R & M Engineering said he was representing the applicant for the rezone request to D-18. They are unclear, he said, why the D-5 zoning district jumped across the street in the first place. This subdivision was created through a U.S. Mineral Survey and not part of the Douglas town site plan, said Mr. Pusich. He said he believes that is why it was designated as a natural park in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. LeVine said if they granted the rezone they would be giving authority for the construction of more units than the applicant is proposing to build. He asked how many units they could realistically construct on the property.

Mr. Pusich said it would depend on the size of the dwelling units. Adding more dwelling units than those proposed would trigger more stringent parking requirements, he said. He said in his opinion three was a comfortable and safe number for the development.

Applicant Guy Russo said he co-owned the property with his brother. He said he wanted to build a single family dwelling and his brother wanted to build a common-wall house on the property.

MOTION: *by Mr. Peters, to approve AME2016 0011 and accept the findings, analysis and recommendations of the staff.*

Roll Call Vote:

Yeas: Greene, Dye, Frisby, Bell, Peters, LeVine, Haight

Nays:

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

X. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - None

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

Information Item: 8/10/16 Decision on Haven House appeal

Mr. Steedle said the court's decision on the appeal of Haven House was that the Planning Commission and the Assembly acted properly and it upheld their actions in granting the Use Not Listed two years ago.

XII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT - None

XIII. REPORT OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES - None

XIV. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS - None

XV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 p.m.