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

I. Roll Call

Planning Commission
Paul Voelckers, Acting Chair
Dan Hickock
Ben Haight

Staff
Rob Steedle, CDD Director
Beth McKibben, Planning Manager, CDD
Allison Eddins, Planner, CDD
Brenwynne Grigg, Administrative Officer, CDD
Bhagavati Braun, Administrative Assistant, CDD
Alan Steffert, Engineering & Public Works
Rob Palmer, Law Department
Greg Chaney, Lands Manager
Dan Bleidorn, Deputy Lands Manager

II. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Voelckersgave an overview of what is the Committees objective and each agenda item. No comments or changes were requested.

III. Approval of Minutes

A. January 31, 2018 Draft Minutes

Approved with unanimous consent

IV. Agenda Topics

A. Potential road and pedestrian routes

Mr. Voelckers gave a short overview of the Comprehensive Plan and the Auke Bay Area Plan's relationship to the Comp. Plan. He stated that this committee will be looking at how to break down the details of the Auke Bay Area Plan to make the plan useful, outlining two parts: the physical layout/street grid and zoning changes. Mr. Voelckers added that this committee intended for the drawings presented to be a way to start a conversation, emphasizing that none of these changes are solid, and to have something to look at for private sector property owners.

Mr. Voelckers invited the members of the public in attendance to contribute.
Don Howell, owner of Squires – Stated that the Auke Bay Area Plan was pushed by the staff and Steering Committee, and there was low buy-in from the community. Mr. Howell doesn't agree with the grid plan it"seems a little ridiculous when they're pushing a walking community but then create streets on a half-acre of my land". He expressed concerns about limiting development and adding to cost, and about excluding people and uses. He stated "it was a waste of time and money and I have no intention of following it. But I'm going to have to go to the Assembly to get anything overridden when planners say my idea doesn't conform to the plan. It's just way out of line."
Mr. Haightasked, if Mr. Howell had any suggestions about what could improve use of his property. Mr. Howell replied that aroad to the school that would connect to the University would be helpful, as would using city land for parking for the School and the University. Mr. Haight stated that traffic has been something the Committee has been considering a lot.
Mr. Howell added that the improvements he has made to his property would make road construction easier than unimproved land. Mr. Voelckers responded by stating that if there was a creation of right-of-ways Mr. Howell could have the potential of increased frontage and usability which could create more business potential. He continued that more valuable frontage, in exchange for right of way, is what the committee was considering; the Assembly has passed this plan and the Planning Commission and staff are bound by it. Some of the plan is not usable until this process is completed. We want to make this the best it can be with the legal mechanisms we have.
Mr. Howell voiced that he has a problem with the idea of reduced parking, continuing that "codes have a parking requirement for a reason, your customers/etc will suffer because people need to park. That was a big problem on my lot until the harbor parking opened up. Reduction in parking is a bad idea. Auke Bay could be fixed by the buildings having enough parking now."
Eric Eriksen, representative from AEL&P – was supportive of development planning but wanted to express concerns about AEL&Ps fuel storage and generation in the area:"portions of the property has lots of infrastructure that isn't visible". AEL&P is concerned about a roadway crossing over certain areas. He added that drainage can be difficult there stating that it is"hard to envision being able to maintain some of those systems and a roadway with some of those slope changes that might happen here."
Mr. Voelckers thanked Mr. Eriksen for bringing this to the Committee's attention, and emphasized again that the drawings were meant as a starting point for discussion, not set in stone. He added that Mr. Steffert would have more knowledge about the area and could address these issues if these plans were to go forward.
Mr. Eriksencontinued that the AEL&P property in the area houses a High Voltage switch yard in the building and between buildings as well as fuel lines,"we're concerned that there isn't an easy solution here. The equipment here is supported by our large trucks; one of these proposed roads is a main roadway we use with our large trucks, and there are a lot of industrial things going on there." He continued by stating that AEL&P have

buried infrastructure in the area which could be a problem for this proposed road. Mr. Ericksen also stated that AEL&P plans to continue to maintain the site for "100 years, and to tie in more in the near future" adding that the site is very important because it's one of the only generators on that side of Lemon Creek. Additionally, sound and air quality should be considered, the facility there makes some noise and pollution, it doesn't operate all the time, but would be good to note. On a personal note Mr. Eriksen stated that he is a long time resident of the area and supports the Committees efforts.
Mr. Voelckers introduced Alan Steffert, from CBJ Engineering & Public Works, and asked him to respond. Mr. Steffert stated that the drawing in front of the Committee was a quick paper feasibility study based on Mr. Voelckers drawing. Mr. Steffert outlined some of the concerns that he took into mind while creating the drawing. His assessment found that it would be physically possible to build a road in the area, but he did not have all pertinent information, so elements of the road could affect buildings and more in the area.
Mr. Voelckers stated that he sees the issues with this proposed road to be a 6 on a scale of 1-10 of how difficult it would be to build these roads. "It may be worth it, could be easier, and could be more difficult. But it still may be the best way to do it."
Mr. Haight thanked Mr. Eriksen for bringing these items to light, "the cost versus benefits is good for us to know moving forward."
KarlaAllwine, property owner in the area, started by noting that"staff did an excellent job on the Auke Bay AreaPlan". She and other property owners have been waiting for a zone change. She voiced concerns about the recent DOT change to the curve of the road for increased traffic speed, stating that the Steering Committee wanted traffic to slow down to create a boutique community with a lot of walkability. She also suggested that "maybe the city would make a park-and-ride to help keep it a quiet walking community." Adding "I think all along part of the plan was to open up some of the City land, and they are going to have to be accessed. Parking talks were about keeping parking off the road and not in front of buildings."

B. Traditional Town Center/Overlay Mechanics

Ms. Eddins introduced the section and spoke a bit about how creating this district would work and how it would fit into Title 49. Mr. Voelckers asked if staff has a preference on the cleanest vehicle. Ms. Eddins stated that staff prefers the creation of a new Traditional Town Center (TTC) zone and an overlay for the Auke Bay area. Ms. McKibben added that the Committee would have to go through the process of applying the new TTC zone to all of the areas that would fit that zone, so that the zone would be general enough that it could apply to all the areas. Ms. Eddins continued that the overlay would be more specific to Auke Bay, and overlays could be created for other areas as well. She clarified that this method would keep the number of individual zones low. Ms. McKibben added that creation of a new TTC zone would create a new column in the Table of Permissible Uses (TPU) and would have its own setbacks and uses. The things that the Comprehensive Plan associates with TTC would be integrated in this

new zone. Some items that would be specific for Auke Bay could include height restrictions and frontage windows.

Mr. Haight stated that he liked the idea of a generalized TTC zone with an Auke Bay overlay,stating that it would probably be the easiest to maneuver. Mr. Haight asked how this combination would work in contrast to a typical zone application. Ms. McKibben answered that the new zone would be created and added to the TPU, and the overlay would be created with distinct boundaries. The new TTC zone could be introduced in a few ways:

1. It could be applied to wherever TTC is called for in the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The Planning Commission could do a further review of each area before changing the areas to TTC.
3. Areas could be rezoned upon request.

Ms. Eddins added that the overlay for Auke Bay would live in the special district area, similar to the Historic District.

Mr. Hickok asked about restrictions that might result: will it designate what kind of business you can have? Will it promote economic development? He added that the area will need an economic draw if we're going to make walkways, etc. Ms. Eddins replied that proposed uses for TCC and for an Auke Bay overlay will be reviewed by the Committee. Incentives that would increase development potential might include higher density, smaller setbacks, increased maximum heights in certain areas, height maximums in places that have a view – all of these could give property owners more "bang for your buck."

Mr. Voelckers emphasized that density and uses lead to development. He stated that the Committee seems to be in favor of a new zone, but suggested that the group might want to look at the Mixed Use (MU) zone, which is probably closest to TTC.He suggested that the Committee might just use the MU zone and have an overlay for the Auke Bay area. Ms. McKibben stated that the current zones that exist in code seem to have a gap that could be filled by the future TTC Zone.

C. Traditional Town Center Potential Uses

D. Dimensional Standards

Mr. Voelckers asked if anything had to have a maximum, referencing the 5,000 sq. ft. maximum for retail/office space. Ms. Eddins stated that these items are pulled straight from the TPU, they might be something you want to consider, and the intent here is to limit big box stores and to breakup large buildings. All of this information presented here is based on public comment from the process. Ms. McKibben added that these are all questions that we are presenting to the Committee to help guide staff. All of the ideas are from different public processes, and are presented for you all to consider

V. Committee Member Comments and Questions

Mr. Voelckers asked Mr. Palmer if it is possible to imagine the Committee and staff sitting down with the immediate property owners and doodling in a less formal setting?

Mr. Palmer replied that it is a little unusual to have a work session with public input, but it's at the Committee's discretion. Staff can have discussions with members of the public as well. If there are three or more Commissioners atany meeting, that meeting would have to be noticed. Mr. Voelckers stated that he would like an at-ease conversation to hash out ideas. Mr. Steedle stated that he thinks it's a good idea. Ms. McKibben added that we could host a larger gathering with other owners and people from the area. Mr. Voelckers asked the members of the public if they would be interested in these types of events. Mr. Eriksen stated that an informal iterative process would be his preference. Mr. Howell stated that it would be good to invite people and try to get them thinking that this is a bigger deal than just another city meeting. Mr. Voelckers stated "I see two informal informational sessions: with property owners and heavy stakeholders, then moving outward, to more property owners."

VI.Adjournment