

MINUTES
Planning Commission
Committee of the Whole
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Mike Satre, Chairman

October 27, 2015

I. ROLL CALL

Dennis Watson, Vice Chairman, called the Committee of the Whole Meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held in the Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building, to order at 5:22 pm.

Commissioners present: Dennis Watson, Vice Chairman; Bill Peters, Ben Haight, Matthew Bell, Paul Voelckers

Commissioners absent: Mike Satre, Chairman; Michael LeVine, Nicole Grewe, Dan Miller

Staff present: Rob Steedle, Interim Planning Director and Deputy City Manager; Beth McKibben, Planning Manager; Teri Camery, Senior Planner; Laura Boyce, Senior Planner; Jonathan Lange, Planner II; Greg Chaney, Lands and Resources Manager; Dan Bleidorn, Deputy Lands and Resources Manager; Robert Palmer, Assistant Municipal Attorney

II. REGULAR AGENDA

- Review of 2015 Land Management Plan Update.

Mr. Chaney told the Commission the Lands Department had received a fairly lengthy memo on the draft Land Management Plan from the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee (PRAC) regarding property that they own or wish to manage. The PRAC reviewed the draft Land Management Plan that was presented to it at its September 8, 2015 meeting.

The PRAC recommended that LND-0665 which is the Smith Park Subdivision III Greenbelt be put up for disposal, as well as LND-1406, at Three Mile North Douglas Highway, which is False Creek; and LND-0837 which is the Subdivision Mountainside which encompasses the parcels at the bottom of the hill, said Mr. Chaney.

LND-0665 would most likely be offered to the adjacent property owners, said Mr. Chaney. LND-1406 is land which the City owns which does not actually contain the creek, said Mr. Chaney. It may be worth considering the disposal of the part of this land which is outside of the buffer zone for the creek, said Mr. Chaney. LND-0837 are such small land portions that homes could not be built upon them, so if the land was disposed of it would need to be disposed of to adjacent property owners, said Mr. Chaney.

The PRAC also provided a list of land managed by Parks and Recreation where disposal would be appropriate with the opportunity to trade for new park land managed by other departments. For these properties Parks and Recreation proposed that it maintain lands for stream and trail corridors, and for large tracts, maintain a portion of lands for future neighborhood parks and trails to be connected to adjacent corridors and park land, noted Mr. Chaney in his memo to the Commission.

Mr. Chaney noted that the trading of lands is not as easy as some might believe. There must be two properties of roughly equal value for the trade, he noted.

The lands it identified for this proposal are:

- ✓ LND-0020 Pearl Harbor Shoreline - planning includes 96 acres of waterfront property between Amalga Harbor and Pearl Harbor. Mr. Chaney said it would be difficult to subdivide since the property does not have road access.
- ✓ LND-0114 Portion of South Tee Harbor along the existing right-of-way, maintaining the Shoreline trail. The land is already subdivided, said Mr. Chaney. The lots could be relatively to sell, he said.
- ✓ LND-0118 Western portion of the Peninsula - to get the maximum value out of this land it would need to be subdivided, noted Mr. Chaney.
- ✓ LND-0315 Auke Bay Elementary School and the Spaulding Meadows Trail, keeping a portion as the trail corridor
- ✓ LND-0435 West Valley Wild Meadow Park (west parcel) - this land is largely wetlands, and because of having so many conditions attached to it, it would be difficult to dispose of for development purposes, said Mr. Chaney.

Mr. Voelckers asked if there is any specificity currently outlined for the bypass corridor through Auke Bay.

There currently exist six potential routes across the hillside, said Mr. Chaney.

- ✓ LND-0520 Mendenhall Smuggler's Cove - this is a large property composed of over 340 acres, said Mr. Chaney. Disposing of this land would be tricky because there is no current right-of-way access, he noted. With no water or sewer service in place either, it would be a very expensive property to dispose of at this time, he said.

Mr. Watson said he felt this acreage would be a pretty good candidate for some development.

- ✓ LND 0610 Base of Thunder Mountain requiring a trail corridor to the existing trail - Mr. Chaney said that he did not feel that development of this large property which lies at the base of Thunder Mountain would be a good idea. The land is composed of 226 acres and is comprised of a lot of land hazards, he said. In addition, there is an anadromous stream at the base combined with another stream and flood hazards, he said. There are also large portion of wetlands involved, said Mr. Chaney.
- ✓ LND-0867 White Subdivision, Norway Point - Mr. Chaney said there is no way that he would want to recommend the disposal of this land. It is one of the most dangerous residential areas in the nation, he said.
- ✓ LND-1007 North Franklin Parking
- ✓ LND-1019 West 6th Street, Juneau
- ✓ LND-1021 Calhoun Avenue, greenbelt above the Governor's Mansion
- ✓ LND-1079 East Park above Gastineau Avenue

Lands managed by other CBJ departments that would be desirable for management transfer to Parks and Recreation:

- ✓ LND-0812 Land behind the prison, North Lemon Creek - retain for possible ATV Park The City is developing its new gravel pit in this area, said Mr. Chaney. Because it would cause less noise to bleed over into residential areas than the other proposals, said Mr. Chaney, he said he felt this would be the best proposed area for an ATV Park

- ✓ LND-0829 RSH Subdivision, Lemon Creek - retain for possible ATV Park
- ✓ LND-0830 HDK subdivision behind Home Depot - retain for possible ATV Park
- ✓ LND-1420 8 mile North Douglas Highway, Fish Creek Road - retain and make parks
- ✓ LND-1430 4 mile North Douglas Highway, Southeast of Bonnie Brae Subdivision
- ✓ LND-1450 .75 mile Fish Creek Road, access road to Fish Creek quarry
- ✓ LND-1470 North West Douglas Island, Outer Point, Shaman Island
- ✓ LND-1500 34 to 38 Mile North Glacier Highway, Cowee Creek, Bridge Cove Greenbelt
- ✓ LND-1200 Large lots above Glory Hole - make historic parks
- ✓ LND-1210 Douglas above Crow Hill - make parks
- ✓ LND-1290 Mining claims around Gloryhole - make historic parks

While the Airport Board Committee did not recommend any land for disposal, at its September 25, 2015 Airport Board Operations Committee meeting, the Committee made a motion that the following properties be recommended for future acquisition *if funding and the land were to become available*:

1. Land adjacent to the airport property at the north east quadrant which is located near the Mendenhall state game refuge.
2. The parcel surrounded by airport property; on Yandukin drive near the current sand/chemical building and east of terminal and car rental lot.
3. Interchangeable priority with number four is the north Greenbelt east along the Jordan Creek corridor.
4. Interchangeable priority with number three is the north Greenbelt west along the Jordan Creek corridor.
5. The triangular parcel abutting the northwest corner of the airport property on La Perouse Avenue; adjacent to the tank farm and impound lot.

Docks and Harbors would like what is known as the Archipelago property, said Mr. Chaney.

Commission Comments and Questions

Mr. Voelckers commented that the Planning Commission is the agency through which all of the different City land plan structures are coordinated. He said to him this means that the Commission needs to sit back and take a look at what this means in terms of process. He said this would probably involve a subcommittee of the Planning Commission to work with the staff through some of these areas. He said he felt it would be helpful to have a strategy on how to make all of this come together instead of addressing it in a piecemeal fashion.

Mr. Chaney said at this juncture he has been attempting to meet with all of the different boards, collect their comments and present those to the Commission. He said once adopted, the Land Management Plan will be coming around again in two years for an update, and at that time any neglected pieces could be interjected into the Plan if that was the wish of the Commission.

Mr. Watson said the draft Land Management Plan before them is the best tool that they have been presented with. He said Mr. Voelckers had a good point as far as coordination of the different pieces, and that he felt that coordination should come through the Lands office.

Mr. Chaney said if the Commission would like to provide him with any direction on how to relate and coordinate with the other boards, that he would be happy to follow that direction.

Mr. Voelckers said he felt that active participation of the Commission via a committee, for example, in the current process of identifying lands for disposal and retention would be a more effective way to accomplish this rather than the Lands Department going out and collecting information from the various departments and then presenting that to the Commission.

Mr. Bell commented that he felt that the Lands Management Plan is amazing and that it also puts into perspective just how big of a task this is.

In answer to Mr. Voelckers' question about where funds from land disposal would go, Mr. Chaney said any sale of Parks and Recreation land would go back to the Lands Fund but any sale of airport property would go back to it, as would land sold by Docks and Harbors revert back to Docks and Harbors.

Mr. Watson said this issue needed to come back before the full Planning Commission, and hopefully before the current Commission before three new members took their places on the Commission in a few months.

Mr. Voelckers said he felt two or three months of coordinating the facets of the plan before it came back to the Commission for approval was a good idea.

Mr. Chaney asked the Commission members for their specific instructions on what they would like brought back to the Commission in a few months' time.

Mr. Voelckers said he thought they would get the overview of what the other boards had presented tonight with subsequent meetings of a subcommittee working with the appropriate staff to discuss some of these focus areas in the plan such as 6th Street in Douglas, which would help Mr. Chaney come back to the Commission in a few months' time with a more fleshed out lands plan.

Mr. Haight said he agreed that the next step would be to start meeting with staff on a subcommittee basis to better unify the Plan. He said it was up to the Commission to see that there was balance in the Plan.

Mr. Watson said he felt for the next Commission meeting they could be presented with a more condensed version of what the various boards are proposing regarding land disposals and acquisitions. It is a daunting task, said Mr. Watson, noting that it took seven years to accomplish the subdivision review.

Mr. Chaney said that he understood that they would be scheduled for the next available Planning Commission meeting and at that time present to the Commission a general overview memo regarding what they had achieved in terms of gathering comments since the draft Land Management Plan has been provided.

The staff noted that this item has been scheduled for the November 10, (2015) Planning Commission meeting.

- Subdivision access and frontage

The staff has been working hard on the complicated topic of shared access roads, said Ms. Boyce. CDD has been approving subdivisions with shared access when it is not outlined in the Code that this can be done, she added. Currently the only parcels of land that can have shared access are panhandle subdivisions, said Ms. Boyce.

CDD over the years has been approving subdivisions of three to four lots that might share one driveway, said Ms. Boyce. In order to codify this practice, Ms. Boyce said the Code needs to be amended. The Assembly directed the CDD staff to work with the Planning Commission on this issue, said Ms. Boyce. The staff met with the Subdivision Review Committee in July along with representatives from the Department of Transportation (DOT), as well as representatives from the Department of Law and the Manager's office, she said.

Since that meeting the staff has been working with the Law Department to come up with some concepts to be discussed with the Commission tonight before Code language is developed to be

presented to the Commission, said Ms. Boyce. In the newly modified Subdivision Ordinance the only place where a privately maintained access road would be allowed is as a public right-of-way only outside of the urban service area boundary, and it would be applicable for minor subdivisions. It could be a gravel road with a minimum of 20 feet which would meet international fire code standards, said Ms. Boyce. It could serve no more than 13 lots or 211 average daily trips, she explained.

They are proposing to allow privately maintained access for no more than three lots borough-wide. This could be a 50 foot easement which could be reduced. The lot would not have to meet the frontage requirement, said Ms. Boyce. Each lot must have a minimum of 30 feet of frontage on a publicly maintained street, she said. This is supposed to be direct and practical access from the street to the lot, explained Ms. Boyce.

They are proposing that in some cases the lots would not have to meet that frontage requirement, said Ms. Boyce. Instead the lots could front on the shared access easement, she said, not on a dedicated Street. If the grade of the road would exceed 10% the staff proposes that it would be paved to ensure safe access, said Ms. Boyce.

These options would not be available in all instances but under circumstances such as when DOT limits access points to the street which has recently been a fairly common practice, said Ms. Boyce. The shared access would also be considered when direct access to the street posed a safety hazard, said Ms. Boyce.

This would only apply to single-family zoned residential subdivisions which includes rural reserve, D-1, D-3 and D-5 zoning, said Ms. Boyce. Access roads would also not be allowed if it would hinder street connectivity, said Ms. Boyce. The use would be limited to one single family home with an accessory apartment, said Ms. Boyce.

They are presuming that this would be a new type of permit which would be sought at the time of the subdivision approval, said Ms. Boyce. It would be up to the CDD Director to approve this type of permit, said Ms. Boyce. It would be the responsibility of the owners to maintain these access roads, said Ms. Boyce. They are also proposing that should a public street be made available to serve these lots, that the owners could automatically abandon their rights to the easement and instead be served by the public street, said Ms. Boyce.

Commission Comments and Questions

Mr. Voelckers asked if to meet the fire code standards if the access road would need to have a turn-around for fire equipment.

This would be determined through the Fire Department review for each individual application, explained Ms. McKibben.

Mr. Voelckers said that is something that could be worked on because it would obviously make a much larger access road requirement if the fire equipment turnaround was required.

Mr. Haight said that he could see the value of reviewing Fire Department access to the access roads during the individual review of each permit. If the access road was short enough a turnaround for the fire Department would not be necessary, said Mr. Haight.

Mr. Palmer noted that the Fire Code states that a turnaround is likely required if the private access is longer than 150 feet.

In answer to Mr. Watson's question, Ms. Boyce responded that these Code adjustments would apply borough-wide, not just in North Douglas. In answer to Mr. Watson's second question Ms. Boyce stated that many lots do currently exist within the Borough which are landlocked. This provision as proposed could not move forward if it would create a parcel behind it that would be landlocked, said Ms. Boyce.

Mr. Voelckers asked if with a variance if this could be allowed for up to four residences, for example.

Mr. Palmer responded that this would be a question for the Commission to resolve and for the Assembly to ultimately decide. He said that his understanding is that the Assembly has directed that the CDD is to look through the Code to make standards easier and practicable, and at the same time limit the application of variances.

Mr. Watson said if a request was made outside of the Code, that he did not see why a party could not request a variance, which did not mean that they would be granted one.

Mr. Haight said he knows of one subdivision on North Douglas that exceeds the access currently under discussion.

Ms. Boyce answered that currently within the Code the only places within the Borough that could subdivide with access only for an easement and not through right-of-way would be in remote subdivisions. The property under question would not be able to subdivide unless it applied for a variance, she added.

Consideration of shared access will next be presented to the full Commission.

III. OTHER BUSINESS - None

IV. REPORT OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES – None

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:47 p.m.