MINUTES

Planning Commission Regular Meeting

CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU

Mike Satre, Chairman

December 22, 2015

I. ROLL CALL

Mike Satre, 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 7:01 pm.

Commissioners present: Mike Satre, Chairman; Dennis Watson, Vice Chairman; Bill Peters, Michael LeVine, Nicole Grewe, Paul Voelckers,

Commissioners absent: Ben Haight, Matthew Bell, Dan Miller

Staff present: Rob Steedle, Interim Planning Director and Deputy City Manager; Beth McKibben, Planning Manager; Laura Boyce, Senior Planner; Jill Maclean, Senior Planner; Jonathan Lange, Planner II; Greg Chaney, Lands and Resources Manager; Dan Bleidorn, Deputy Lands and Resources Manager

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- November 24, 2015 – Planning Commission Committee of the Whole Meeting
- November 24, 2015 – Regular Planning Commission Meeting
- December 8, 2015 – Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Motion: *By Mr. Peters, to approve the November 24, 2015, Planning Commission Committee of the Whole meeting minutes, the November 24, 2015 Regular Planning Commission meeting minutes, and the December 8, 2015, Regular Planning Commission meeting minutes with any minor corrections by staff or commission members.*

The motion was approved with no objections.

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS- none

IV. PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON REPORT- none

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

AME2015 0015:	Review and Recommendation to the Assembly of the 2015 Land Management Plan Update.
Applicant:	City and Borough of Juneau
Location:	Boroughwide

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to the Assembly that AME2015 0015, 2015 Land Management Plan Update is consistent with Title 49, Title 53, and the 2013 Comprehensive Plan.

Land Management Plan Update
Mr. Chaney told the Commission he'd be providing a swift review of the draft Land Management Plan Update, essentially showing that following requested edits had been incorporated into the draft Plan by staff:

Page Number	Description of change
Page 57 - 59	LND-1011, LND-1020, LND-1089, and LND-1103 changed to retain/dispose for direction of additional housing in the CBJ's Land Holding Table
Page 47	LND-0203 additional text to show land should be managed and protected in a manner that is sensitive to the cultural heritage of the A'ak'w Kwa'an people
Page 72	A summary of zoning capabilities and strategy
Page 93	A general outline of disposal plans for Industrial Land as resources are used
Page 104	Goals for property acquisitions outlined
Page 112	Incorporating new plans as they are adopted into the Land Management Plan

Commission Comments and Questions
Mr. Voelckers asked for an overview relative to the Auke Bay Area Plan with this process. Mr. Chaney responded that the Auke Bay Area Plan has been adopted as a portion of the Comprehensive Plan and will be used to provide direction for land use in that area. The City does not own much property in the area, said Mr. Chaney, the property that they do hold is proposed to be a new town center and the City will participate in the rezone when it occurs as it would be a benefit to the community as a whole.

Mr. Voelckers asked if there was an issue with access to a portion of the Auke Bay school site. Mr. Chaney responded that a trail may be created that links to an adjacent property that is planned for private development, but as discussed at the last meeting the guidance that the Comprehensive Plan provides through the Auke Bay Area Plan is adequate and not necessary to add to the Land Management Plan.

Mr. Voelckers asked when the implementation portion of the Auke Bay Area Plan would be surfacing as it seemed that there were inquiries from other CBJ entities that were waiting on movement regarding land that was related to the Plan. Ms. McKibben responded that the Land Management Plan provides guidance for solely city-owned properties whereas the Auke Bay Area Plan is the vision for the community, including both public and privately owned land. Ms. McKibben explained that the implementation process was taking staff longer than anticipated to provide language for Commission review, but that the Title 49 Committee should see said language within the next few months.
Mr. LeVine stated his thanks for staff addressing the Commission's concerns in this way; the process of reviewing the draft Plan as a whole document worked well.

Mr. Watson noted that land may be given to the school district for affordable housing below fair market value and asked how the value of the land is determined. Mr. Chaney responded that an appraisal is done to determine fair market value.

Mr. Voelckers commented that page seven of the draft Plan showed that goal four under Goals and Objects still has a bullet for creating a goals and acquisitions and should be removed per the last Commission discussion. Mr. Chaney stated he would reword the sentence to acknowledge other adopted plans acquisition lists. Mr. Voelckers stressed that, if reworded, it should provide internal consistency.

Motion: *by Mr. Peters, to approve AME2015 0015 to be forwarded to the Assembly with the noted corrections and comments.*

The motion was approved with no objections.

CSP2015 0017:	Planning Commission Review for Proposals to go on the FY2017 CIP.
Applicant:	City and Borough of Juneau
Location:	Boroughwide

Overview
Mr. Lange began the presentation by providing a background of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Revised each fiscal year, the CIP guides investment of public funds for maintenance, repair, construction and acquisition of facilities and equipment. Each project is prioritized with a specific criteria list to ensure that policy makers are responsible to the residents and businesses of the community in respect to the expenditure of public funds. The lists from each CBJ department will be reviewed by the Public Works and Facilities Committee in February, and then forwarded back to the Commission in March for consistency review before final review and adoption by the full Assembly in April.

CBJ Boards and Commission Comments
Staff asked various CBJ boards and commissions to make recommendations to be placed on the FY17 list. The first group to provide comments was the Auke Bay Steering Committee, whose project recommendations were as follows:

- ✓ Construction of streets within the core area to promote development,
- ✓ Additional off-street parking,
- ✓ Additional parking at Auke Lake,
- ✓ Pedestrian crossings to the Don D. Statter Harbor,
- ✓ Bike paths and lanes,
- ✓ Pedestrian crossing and improvements at UAS and Mendenhall Loop Road “Back Loop Road”,
- ✓ Improvement of Auke Elementary joint use facility trail,
- ✓ Pedestrian friendly lighting on sidewalks,
- ✓ Wayfinding signage, and
- ✓ Gateway treatment upon entering the Auke Bay area.

Staff solicited the Affordable Housing Commission, which is jointly staffed by the Community Development Department and the Lands and Resources Division, for comments on the proposed projects. The Lands and Resources Division had drafted their own recommendations regarding the FY17 CIP list, which has been endorsed by the Affordable Housing Commission.

- ✓ Development of Pederson Hill in various phases,
- ✓ Acquisition of UAS land for Pederson Hill subdivision,
- ✓ Stabbler’s rock quarry infrastructure and expansion, and
- ✓ Switzer land development and subdivision in Lemon Creek area.

Additional projects that were mentioned were Willoughby District parking and a future rock quarry.

The Juneau Commission on Sustainability provided a letter to the Commission as well with recommendations that the following encouraging language be incorporated into proposals:

- That projects might reduce cost,
- Lower resource consumption,
- Reduce emissions, and
- Allow for opportunities for energy conservation, efficiency, and renewable resources.

The Commission also provided a list of projects that could be added to the list:

- ✓ Electric vehicles such as busses and fleet vehicles,
- ✓ Development of a district heating pilot project,
- ✓ Cruise ship dock electrification,
- ✓ Purchase of electric vehicle to test for fleet use,
- ✓ Compositing feasibility study, and
- ✓ Projects from the *Non-Motorized Transportation Plan* be included, such as covered crosswalks, intersection improvements, pedestrian connections and bicycle infrastructure throughout the borough.

Commission Comments and Questions

Through the Chair, Mr. Voelckers expressed confusion regarding the process steps and flow of information with proposals. He asked what exactly the Commission's role is. Mr. Lange explained that each department within the city compiles their own priority list for items that could be on the CIP. CDD creates their list by asking each of the Commissions it staffs which projects they wish to include. As the Planning Commission, you may review the proposals provided by each of the boards and commissions and adopted plans, and include those in your recommendations and/or offer your own.

Chair Satre clarified that the Commission's role is to review the final list of projects for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Voelckers asked Mr. Lange if tonight is the deadline for recommendations or if more time can be provided to create conversation of potential projects. Mr. Lange said that staff was hopeful of a recommendation this evening for the Public Works and Facilities Committee before their review in February. After that discussion, that Committee will create the final list that will come back to the Commission for review and recommendation to the Assembly in April.

Mr. Voelckers remembered in past review that the inclusion of the five-year list of projects was helpful and was not included in this report. Mr. Voelckers did not feel that sufficient background was provided for a recommendation this evening, but the Commission could start a conversation at the least.

Mr. Steedle asked to speak regarding the general CIP process and explained that did not seem to work well at this time. Next year, the Commission will see the proposals much earlier so that more meaningful input can be provided into the process, said Mr. Steedle.

Ms. Grewe asked to review the list from 2014 and do a cross reference of which projects made the final list and which were not, and if not, what was the reason that they were not accommodated. Mr. Lange said that he was the assigned staff person for this effort last year, and that unfortunately most of the recommendations did not make the final list.

Mr. Watson added that only included item that was for the funding of sub-area plans, noting that the Auke Bay Area Plan was completed. Other than that item, said Mr. Watson, no other recommendations seemed to have made any progress within the program.

Ms. Grewe remembered that in the past that the city department section of the CIP included the Community Development Department's internal needs and asked if this was missing in her packet or if the department did not supply any requests. Mr. Steedle explained that the CDD has been late for several years in adding their requests to the program.

Mr. LeVine thanked Commission Voelckers for asking for clarification of the process. Mr. LeVine then asked what exactly the 2014 list was and who had input in creating it. Mr. Lange explained that it was a list completed by the Planning Commission last year and it was provided this year as an example as to what types of projects the program is looking for.

Mr. LeVine stated the he read through the Commission on Sustainability's bluefolder item, a letter, which discussed an energy savings regarding Eaglecrest improvements and asked where this information had come from. Ms. McKibben answered that she was unfamiliar of where the information had come from, that the Commission had provided it themselves through a study and it was not from the CIP.

Mr. LeVine noted that after seeing both parts of the CIP process that it much easier and helpful to review the CIP as a five-year process to anticipate what may be required by the city and what would be a thoughtful contribution. Chairman Satre concurred that reviewing the program in its entirety is important in forecasting what projects may be added to the list. It seems as though the Commission is not ready at this time to provide staff with a recommendation, but perhaps after more conversation and background information that one could be provided in January. Chairman Satre asked for Mr. Lange to provide the six-year plan to be provided via email to the Commission and then a more detailed discussion can occur at the next meeting.

Chairman Satre also added that he hoped the Commission might recommend including an engineer study of the hazard areas throughout the Borough. He related the topic with the recent Sitka landslides, and that this type of report may be helpful with future CBJ development. Mr. Watson discussed an avalanche plan that was reviewed but not adopted by the Assembly in 1997 and agreed that these reports are essential in identifying viable areas for development. Mr. Chaney added that there were some errors in the study and that funds were not later appropriated for that effort.

Mr. Voelckers added a final note as an aspirational comment through Mr. Steedle that there seems to be an opportunity to approach the CIP review process earlier and encourage lateral communication between CBJ entities.

X. <u>BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT-none</u>

XI. <u>OTHER BUSINESS</u>

Designation of Interim Chair
Chairman Satre clarified with staff that until the next election of officers with the new Commissioners that an Interim Chair is required. Mr. Steedle responded that yes, he was correct, and that it was his understanding that in past practice the person that was designated was with most seniority. Chairman Satre agreed, and asked for nomination for Ms. Grewe from the Commission.

<u>Motion:</u> *by Mr. Watson, to nominate Commission Grewe to Interim Chair until the election of officers at the first Planning Commission meeting in January.*

The motion was approved with no objections.

XII. <u>DIRECTOR'S REPORT</u>

Mr. Steedle informed the Commission that currently there are not many cases in queue and that staff anticipates the January 12, 2016 meeting may go quickly. With a lighter schedule, said Mr. Steedle, it may be an opportunity for staff to do some planning. For example, legislation pertaining to frontage and access with provided shortly regarding the recently approved Subdivision Ordinance. Staff is also working towards legislation to address Variances and zoning ordinances to partially implement the Auke Bay Area Plan.

Mr. Steedle noted that he had hoped to discuss an upcoming joint meeting with the Assembly but that date has not been set, however he is hopeful for February. He added that the department will be kicking off planning efforts for the Lemon Creek Neighborhood Plan in January and that a Committee of the Whole will be scheduled for January 26, 2016 to discuss marijuana.

Chairman Satre asked for clarification regarding the guidelines for subarea neighborhood plans. Mr. Steedle explained that that item is really an information item and is an internal working document. He thanked the Commission for their feedback and said that in a review of the document with the CBJ Law Department that some verbiage had been changed and direction for citizens to initiate area plans had been added.

Commission Comments and Questions

Ms. Grewe noted that there has not been many Variance applications in the past year and was curious if this is where the emphasis should be at this time. Ms. McKibben noted that there had been several Variance applications filed and concurrently withdrawn with the department recently.

Mr. Voelckers asked Mr. Steedle about a public comment at last night's Assembly meeting relating to the Landscape Alaska Conditional Use Permit and if there was merit in the comment or if language for conditions needs to be clarified. Mr. Steedle said he felt the pivotal question was what it means to substantially conform and this seems to bring forth a lot of "gray" area. Mr. Watson agreed that during his time with the Commission that question had never been solved.

XIII. REPORT OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Chairman Satre provided an update regarding the last Marijuana Committee meeting; the final Tile 49 updates were agreed upon and the Commission should be seeing it shortly. The local licensing portion was a split vote and noted that this section will be especially important in the Commissions review. The moratorium ends at the first of the year and that may create a sense of urgency for permitting.

Ms. Grewe added that as the Chair of the Title 49 Committee that the review of the licensing and the draft ordinance for marijuana will be forwarded straight to the Committee of the Whole. She encouraged the Commissioners to review the draft ordinance carefully so that progress can be made quickly at that meeting.

Chairman Satre emphasized the importance of incorporate licensing into the Conditional Use Permitting process to ensure public process is adequately met. Mr. Watson made a follow-up comment that the public participants for this effort are well informed and come prepared to such meetings, so the Commission should come prepared to address tough questions.

Mr. Peters gave thanks to Commissioners Satre and Watson for their years of service.

Chairman Satre gave thanks to staff and expressed his appreciation for their professionalism. He noted his utmost respect for their efforts. This comes back to the need for an enforcement officer, said Chairman Satre, the inability to enforce code impedes the meaning of the Commission's work. He emphasized that pushing for the support of that position is extremely important and encouraged people to advocate through letters, Assembly meetings, and the CIP.

XIV. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

XV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.