

Planning Commission Ad Hoc Auke Bay
Implementation Committee
Thursday, March 22, 2018
1:30-2:30 PM
Marine View Building
4th Floor Large Conference Room

Call to order 1:41

I. Roll Call

Planning Commission

Paul Voelckers, Acting Chair

Dan Hickok

Nathaniel Dye

Assembly Member: Loren Jones

Staff

Beth McKibben, Planning Manager, CDD

Teri Camery, Senior Planner, CDD – via telephone

Brenwynne Grigg, Administrative Officer, CDD

Bhagavati Braun, Administrative Assistant, CDD

Rob Palmer, Law Department

II. Approval of Agenda

Approved

III. Approval of Minutes

A. February 22, 2018 Draft Minutes

Approved

IV. Agenda Topics

Mr. Voelckers gave an overview of the previous efforts of this Committee in relation to the adopted Auke Bay Area Plan, and outline the purpose for the agenda items below. He noted that a conversation with the area property owners is forthcoming.

A. Traditional Town Center Potential Uses

Ms. McKibben gave an overview of the Traditional Town Center (TTC) designation and how this group is looking at it. She stated that TTC could be applicable around the borough and overlays could be created for the specific needs of different areas. This approach could be used in Auke Bay and other areas of the Borough. Some elements that might be specific to Auke Bay include street furniture and some marine uses on the channel side of Glacier Highway. Ms. McKibben stated that this is a good solution because it makes the code work smarter, not harder, and

allows better alignment between our code and the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. McKibben reviewed the chart briefly, outlining changes from the previous meeting.

Mr. Voelckers asked Ms. McKibben to expand on the Mixed Use 2 (MU2) zoning district which has no setbacks and clarify how it relates to TTC.

Ms. McKibben again mentioned the floating setback in TTC. The front setback would be 0-20 feet which provides flexibility for the developer, allows them flexibility in deciding the most practical use of the property, provide some flexibility in parking, and create visual consistency throughout the district.

Mr. Dye asked if the extra space, from the floating setbacks, would then change setbacks on other sides of the property. Ms. McKibben answered that the TTC zoning is not fully fleshed out and that staff were trying to stay close to what we currently have, she asked the Committee members to give staff guidance to move forward.

Mr. Voelckers asked if perhaps a zone like Mixed Use (MU) or MU2 could accomplish the same thing as TTC, such as encourage building faces to be near the front of the property. He added that there may be other strategies for this outcome than focusing on setbacks. Ms. McKibben agreed, citing vegetative cover and other elements as tools to reach that desired outcome. Mr. Voelckers asked further if it would be possible to use one of the existing zoning districts and put an overlay on it instead of creating a new district. Ms. McKibben replied that that could be an option. She continued that there are a few things that the Comprehensive Plan calls for in a TTC zone that merit creating a new district, but MU could be used as a starting point. TTC could bring out some new concepts to consider or incentivize mixed used development.

Mr. Voelckers stated that in the zoning standards chart there seem to be only minor differences between MU and TTC. The Committee asked staff to consider the question what are the advantages to creating a new zone with an overlay versus using an existing zone (MU or MU2) and creating an overlay for specific areas? Suggesting a memo comparing the two approaches. The Committee looked at the zoning standards chart, specifically lot coverage and vegetative coverage. Ms. McKibben stated that the Auke Bay Area Plan calls for landscaping and vegetative covering so this should be considered in this process.

Mr. Hickok clarified that not every overlay has a sunset period, so a potential overlay could be in place in perpetuity. He continued that flexibility is important. The view is very important to the Auke Bay Area and it should be protected.

The Committee asked what coverage might mean for some of the large lots in this area, would the lots have to be subdivided before they could be developed with a 45-90% lot coverage requirement? A 200,000 square foot lot would have to have a very large building to meet that lot coverage.

Mr. Hickok asked what the vegetative coverage for the new parking lot at the harbor is, for a reference of what percentage coverage looks like. Staff replied that they didn't have the number on hand but would find out.

Ms. McKibben stated that the Auke Bay Area Plan called for landscaping and vegetative cover, the Comprehensive Plan may speak to those items as envisioned in TTC areas, this would be an important area to look at in comparisons as well. Ms. Camery added that an analysis of TTC is included in the staff report for AME2018 0002.

Mr. Voelckers asked Carla Hart, a member of the public who was on the steering Committee and was present at the meeting, if she would like to add thoughts at this time. Ms. Hart echoed the sentiment that vegetative coverage was an important element outlined in the charrettes, and that they wanted surfaces not to all be hard. She added the idea that screening for parking could be made of vegetation versus hard fencing. She voiced concerns about losing the "heart of the plan". Mr. Voelckers replied with questions about proscriptive language, asking how the code might allow flexibility while also leading to a design aesthetic that the community has stated they want.

Mr. Voelckers suggested that the forthcoming comparison between MU, MU2, and TTC go into some detail on vegetative cover, landscaping, minimum and maximum lot coverage, and look at density issues. Specifically how the density should be concentrated, and how desired density can be diminished for properties that are further from the "village center."

Discussion ensued about where the TTC designation, or the "village center" should be including looking at some of the maps that were included in the plan. Ms. Hart voiced concern about the recent proposed rezone (AME2018 0002), stating that she didn't imagine the TTC or village area to extend as far west as that proposal. Staff and Committee members agreed that rezoning an area where development already exists is a difficult task that they do not take lightly.

Ms. McKibben asked how comfortable the Committee Members were with the idea of creating a zone that uses concepts not currently used in Juneau. The Committee members voiced that they would be happy to consider new ideas, as long as they will suit the community well. Walkability, parking in back, encouraging development, Glacier Highway (as a street that is not pedestrian friendly), and practicability of requirements, and working with current property owners were concerns brought forth by Commissioners at this time.

VI. Adjournment