

Planning Commission
Auke Bay Implementation Ad Hoc Committee

Friday May 17, 2018

12:00 PM

Marine View Building
4th Floor Large Conference Room

Call to order 12:05

I. Roll Call

Planning Commission

Dan Miller (Chair)

Paul Voelckers

Dan Hickok

Nathaniel Dye

Assembly Member Loren Jones

Staff

Beth McKibben, Planning Manager, CDD

Allison Eddins, Planner II, CDD

Bhagavati Braun, Administrative Assistant, CDD

Members of the public were in attendance – see sign in sheet

II. Approval of Agenda

Approved with changes including reordering of the agenda and the addition of public comment (all changes reflected below).

II. Approval of Minutes

A. April 13, 2018 Draft Minutes

Mr. Dye moved to approve the minutes with no edits

The motion was approved

IV. Agenda Topics

A. Auke Bay Ownership Map

Ms. Eddins gave an overview of the maps created by the Auke Bay Area Plan Steering Committee. The two maps show different boundaries for the “Center” of Auke Bay. One is in the plan adopted by the Assembly. The other was adopted by members of the Auke Bay Steering Committee after the plan was adopted; this map was not approved by any official body other than the Steering Committee (both maps are in the meeting packet). Ms. Eddins stated

that both of these maps are a good starting point for Commissioners to use when making their determination on where to focus the “Center” of the Auke Bay Area for the purposes of this Committee. The Auke Bay Area Plan has a definition and design standards for the “Center” which could help the committee decide where to rezone.

The Center – *This area is the focal point of Auke Bay, where all roads, trails, sidewalks and marine routes intersect. It is an area intended to create a setting for a new “small town center” containing multi-story buildings with a mixture of uses with an emphasis of ground floor commercial and residential above. Although this area provides efficient vehicular access, it also provides safe and accessible pedestrian access to nearby uses such as Statter Harbor, UAS, and nearby neighborhoods. A new local grid street network is envisioned in the Center to provide a framework for future pedestrian-oriented building facades and streetscapes.*

Mr. Voelckers asked for clarification on the status of the Auke Bay Steering Committee stating that members of the public have disputed the standing of the Steering Committee as the voice of the Auke Bay Area. He stated that the Committee should be cognizant of this and whether the Steering Committee was an official or a more self-selected body of interested parties. It was clarified that the Steering Committee was a somewhat informal body whose membership changed throughout the process. Once the Area Plan was adopted the body’s primary mission was over and they are no longer active as the Auke Bay Area Plan Steering Committee. The members of the Auke Bay Steering Committee who were active at the time of the plans adoption were generally the same members who approved the second map (listed above).

Mr. Miller allowed public testimony at this time.

Gerald Quigg – 3870 Bayview Ave

Mr. Quigg pointed out that the rights-of-way in Tanner Terrace subdivision are substandard and any higher density would cause issues on the road, as well as at the ingress/egress from the subdivision, stating that the increase in traffic from the 8-plex that was built in the subdivision has caused some parking and other road-related issues. He pointed out that if a higher density is desired it could go in undeveloped areas of Auke Bay, suggesting the empty land around the elementary school. He stated that he would be happy if the subdivision remained in its current zoning, and requested that the Committee keep this in mind whatever they decide.

Mark Schwan – 12090 Cross St

Mr. Schwann stated his preference for keeping the Tanner Terrace subdivision a neighborhood like it is now, adding that it would be nice to stay a bit separate from the commercial entities. He voiced his support for the newer boundaries that put Tanner Terrace just outside the Auke Bay Area “Center”.

Jeremy Woodrow – 3875 Seaview Ave

Mr. Woodrow pointed out the potential impact on the assessment and real value of the property, stating that the established neighborhood, the views, etc. were all a part of the value of their homes. A change of zone, he stated, would change property values.

He also voiced concern about “piecemeal” rezoning, which is how he regarded the recent rezone request (AME2017 0013). He stated that it would be good for prospective property owners to know what the probable future zoning for their property or nearby properties would be to aid in making a sound financial decision.

He also stated that more “visible public involvement” (Mr. Woodrow’s words) was asked for by members of the Assembly. He voiced his disagreement with this statement, but noted that his presence in the room was because of it.

Mr. Quigg added that the homeowners present were there because of a phone call he had placed the night before. If the group had known about the meeting earlier, he stated, there would likely be more than five homeowners present.

Debbie Ballam – 10090 Cross St

Ms. Ballam expressed concern for the potential of losing views, stating that the view is one of the reasons she loves her home. She expressed concern about losing both monetary and personal value of her home by losing the view. She also echoed comments above about parking and circulation on the roads in the subdivision, highlighting issues with entering onto Glacier Highway from the subdivision.

Mr. Miller stated that the Planning Commission wanted to study the area further before approving any zone changes. He outlined this Committee’s goal and process through potential adoption of a new zoning district by the Assembly adding assurances that there will be many opportunities for public comment and participation. “Hopefully we’ll get it right and you’ll express your support!”

The Committee shared their agreement that established neighborhoods should remain undisturbed. Discussion ensued about where exactly the “Center” should be. Mr. Hickok suggested that the Caroline Street neighborhood be left outside of the “Center” as well. Mr. Voelckers voiced questions about extending the “Center” to the east of Glacier/Mendenhall Loop Road. Mr. Miller agreed, stating that Mendenhall Loop Road makes a natural boarder to the “Center”.

After some discussion about current zoning as compared to Comprehensive Plan maps Ms. McKibben stated that the Comprehensive Plan maps are meant to be aspirational, not legislative, they should give an idea of what to look for when rezoning. She added that the current maps in the Comprehensive Plan mostly show what is on the ground and don’t have much aspiration. Ms. McKibben also clarified that through this process the Auke Bay Area Plan maps, current zoning maps, and Comprehensive Plan maps should all be reviewed and amended accordingly, emphasizing the need to be thoughtful throughout the process so it gets

done right. Mr. Miller suggested that this be brought up with the Comprehensive Plan Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. Voelckers suggested that Staff reach out to the University of Southeast Alaska (UAS) to see what their aspirations are and how they intend to use the land they have been acquiring into the future.

Mr. Voelckers moves that the diagram presented by Mr. Dye (attached) represents a tentative starting point for the boundaries for the “Center” of the Auke Bay Area Plan.

Discussion: some discussion on exact boundaries and refinement of the map ensued. The Committee excluded Tanner Terrace and Caroline Street from the boundary, added some of CBJ undeveloped land to the West of the Elementary school land, and extended the south boundary toward Auke Creek. There was some discussion of including more of the UAS land and some other areas which were not incorporated, some of the reasoning here was to create the transition zone from the “Center” to less dense development.

Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioners asked if there had been a decision about how many zones were being considered. Staff reminded the Committee that that had not been determined firmly at this time, but the direction the Committee has set was to look at one or two new zoning districts with an overlay.

Ms. Eddins proposed asking UAS to participate in the next meeting which the Committee agreed would be appropriate. She outlined her goals for the next meeting: looking at current density compared to proposed new density; discussing staff’s recommendations about zoning regulations vs overlay district regulations, including what should be mandatory and what should be optional, and how to incentivize things like building design, screening, and landscape standards. Ms. McKibben asked the Committee to think about Mixed Use and whether they would like to require or incentivize it in the new zone(s). Mr. Dye asked if staff could compile a list of successful incentives for the Committee to review. Staff answered that the incentives (bonuses) in CBJ code are difficult to interpret and are not used well, however Ms. Eddins said she has heard from developers who have said they would use the incentives if they were clear and easy to understand. Mr. Voelckers suggested that looking at the bonuses area of code would be a good priority for the Title 49 Committee.

Mr. Voelckers brought up viewsheds asking if there were certain points of geometry in the Auke Bay Area Plan or any height restrictions etc. He suggested the Committee take some time to think about viewsheds and what mechanism they can use to address this issue. Ms. McKibben suggested that a condition could be required the new zone that would require buildings over a certain height to apply for a Conditional Use Permit, she suggested that this would put the onus

on the applicant. Mr. Voelckers added that the onus would also be on the Planning Commission and that there would need to be quantifiable ways of assessing viewsheds. Ms. Eddins added that the Auke Bay Area Plan doesn't give very clear guidance on this, though viewsheds are highlighted in the plan.

Staff showed the members of the public how to access the CBJ meeting schedule as well as Novus to see the upcoming packets.

B. Mandatory Regulations vs. Opt-In

C. Public Comment

D. Zoning vs. Overlay: Where Regulations Should Live

E. Planning Area Boundary Maps and Definitions

V. Committee Member Comments and Questions

Next meetings June 7 and June 28 noon

VI. Adjournment

1:16