

Minutes  
**Planning Commission**  
***Committee of the Whole***  
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU  
*Michael LeVine, Chairman*  
September 14, 2021

**I. ROLL CALL**

Michael LeVine, 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 5:36 P.M.

**Commissioners present:** All Commissioners present via video conferencing – Michael LeVine, Chairman; Nathaniel Dye, Vice Chairman; Paul Voelckers, Clerk; Ken Alper; Josh Winchell; Erik Pedersen; Mandy Cole

**Commissioners absent:** Dan Hickok, Travis Arndt

**Staff present:** Jill Maclean, CDD Director; Alexandra Pierce, Planning Manager; Irene Gallion, Senior Planner; Sherri Layne, Law

**Assembly members:** None

**II. REQUEST FOR AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA – None**

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None**

**IV. BRIEF REVIEW OF THE RULES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – None**

**V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None**

**VI. ITEMS FOR RECONSIDERATION – None**

**VII. CONSENT AGENDA – None**

**VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None**

**IX. REGULAR AGENDA**

- A. Parking code revision, which includes reorganization, establishing a “town center” parking standard, revised parking district boundaries, and allowing parking waivers downtown

STAFF PRESENTATION - Planner Gallion briefly explained the proposed Parking code revisions as described in the Memo dated September 9, 2021.

## Discussion

Vice Chairman Dye explained the Title 49 Committee found the parking table to be in need of improvements as it does not adequately address all categories of activities. He pointed out the intent of the proposal tonight is not to encourage or discourage particular types of activities. Rather, the committee determined the requirements in the existing parking table were generally too high which then created the need for parking waivers and other reduction methods. Using that assumption, they considered individual uses and proposed parking requirements by type of use.

Chair LeVine noted the changes in the table appear to represent approximately a 60% reduction across the board. He asked if tonight's meeting results in changes to the proposals in the table, would the Title 49 committee expect to get it back and reevaluate each line item? Mr. Dye did not feel that would be necessary. Overall, he felt the members present have sufficient expertise to discuss and agree to suggestions for changes and move it from the committee tonight.

Mr. LeVine asked where the numbers in the original parking space table had come from. Staff did not have information on the original numbers. Ms. Maclean said she was familiar with the assisted living and senior housing requirements as they are recent additions to the tables.

It was decided by Chair LeVine that they would go line by line and would make changes live to the document. Planner Gallion kept track of the changes.

### Single-Family and duplex –

- Originally: 2 per each dwelling unit
- Title 49 recommendation: 2 per each dwelling unit

Mr. LeVine noted the first line suggests no change to the Single family and duplex requirement. Ms. Cole and Mr. Voelckers were in support of a 60% reduction from 2 spaces per dwelling unit. Mr. LeVine suggested reducing it 50% to create a whole number (1) requirement. Mr. Winchell and Mr. Dye concurred.

- COW decision: 1 per each dwelling unit

Ms. Pierce spoke up to remind the members that when determining a requirement, code states that parking calculations are rounded to whole numbers.

### Rooming houses, boardinghouses, single room occupancies –

- Originally: 1 per 2 bedrooms
- Title 49 recommendation: 1 per 5 bedrooms

Mr. Dye suggested a larger reduction would be acceptable considering the occupants of these facilities are more likely to be travelers or tourism employees and would be less likely to need parking so this may be requiring too many spaces. Mr. LeVine felt a rooming house or boardinghouse might need several spaces and said halfway houses or group homes could qualify for waivers.

- COW decision: 1 per 5 bedrooms

Single-Room Occupancies (SRO) with private facilities –

- Originally: 1 per each SRO plus 1 additional per each increment of four SRO with private facilities
- Title 49 recommendation: 2 per 5 SRO plus 1 additional per each increment of ten SRO with private facilities

Mr. Voelckers felt this category could be further reduced. Mr. Winchell agreed saying SROs are crucial in the downtown area. Mr. Dye agreed and suggested requiring one space for each five SRO with an additional space for each increment of ten.

- COW decision: 1 per 5 SRO, plus 1 per each increment of ten SRO with private facilities.

Accessory Apartments–

- Originally: 1
- Title 49 recommendation: 1 per each unit

Mr. Winchell felt the 60% reduction should be applied to accessory apartments similarly to the other categories. Mr. Dye explained that only one accessory apartment is allowed in a home so they had the option of requiring one or zero spaces. He felt it best to require one space and allow the homeowner to obtain a waiver if they felt the space was not needed. Mr. Pedersen, Ms. Cole, and Mr. Winchell all felt comfortable with requiring zero spaces. Mr. LeVine was not in support of the reduction to zero. Mr. Voelckers supported a reduction to zero and asked staff what happens with ADA requirements with a waiver reduction. Ms. Gallion explained ADA requirements only apply to multifamily units and not single-family situations. She further explained when there is an ADA requirement, it cannot be waived or reduced. Mr. Voelckers followed up asking if the ADA requirement is based on the number of required spaces before a waiver or the number of required spaces after a waiver is granted. Ms. Maclean explained ADA requirements are based on the table of parking space requirements and whatever that table says. If the table creates a requirement for ADA spaces, those spaces will be required whether or not a waiver is granted for other spaces.

- COW decision: 0 per each unit

Motel/Hotel –

- Originally: 1 per each unit in the motel and 1 per each four units in a hotel

- Title 49 recommendation: 2 per each 5 units in the motel and 1 per each 10 units in a hotel

Mr. Dye suggested a reduction to one per each twelve units in both hotels and motels. Ms. Maclean explained the difference between Hotels and Motels are that Hotels can have restaurants and conference rooms.

- COW decision: 1 per each 12 units for Motels and Hotels

Hospitals and nursing homes –

- Originally: 4 per 5 beds OR one per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area
- Title 49 recommendation: 2 per bed OR one per 400 square feet of gross floor area

Mr. Dye felt strongly that because hospitals have a public safety component, there should be no reduction. Mr. LeVine and Mr. Voelckers agreed.

- COW decision: 4 per 5 beds OR one per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area

Senior housing –

- Originally: 0.6 per dwelling unit, plus 1 guest parking space for each ten units, plus 1 parking space per employee
- Title 49 recommendation: 1 per four dwelling units, plus 1 guest parking space per 25 units, plus 2 parking spaces per 5 employees

Ms. Cole expressed concerns regarding the required number of spaces per employee. She was not sure how a developer could be expected to know the number of employees that would be in a facility and did not feel that was a reasonable requirement. Ms. Maclean explained this was a best practice standard in the industry. Mr. LeVine felt he could support a reduction to the number of spaces per dwelling units but would argue in favor of leaving the requirement for guest and employee parking. Mr. Voelckers agreed and Mr. Dye agreed with leaving the guest parking in place but felt they could support a reduction to the requirement for employee spaces. Ms. Cole said it felt as though senior housing is being singled out as there is not a per employee requirement at any other category in the table. Mr. Voelckers and Mr. Winchell agreed with Ms. Cole. Mr. LeVine agreed that it did seem there was an inconsistency but removing the per employee requirement and then arbitrarily increasing visitor parking didn't seem any better. Mr. LeVine suggested leaving the proposed language as is and having staff review to find alternative options to get rid of the employee parking requirement.

- COW decision: No change proposed. Staff will take a look at this one and try to find an equitable way to remove the per employee parking requirement.

Assisted Living Facility -

- Originally: 0.4 per maximum number of residents

- Title 49 recommendation: 0.16 per maximum number of residents

Mr. LeVine said the parking at this facility would be visitors and employees and questioned if a reduction made sense in this case. Mr. Voelckers felt the requirement should not be reduced for the same reasons that were used for keeping the requirements for hospitals. Mr. Dye felt the requirement should be reduced but felt 0.2 per maximum number of residents was more reasonable. Ms. Cole felt nursing home and assisted living facilities are essentially so similar that they should be treated the same. Since there was no reduction to hospitals and nursing homes, she felt there should be no reduction to assisted living facilities either. Mr. Winchell agreed with Ms. Cole. Mr. Pedersen pointed out they are considering parking in the downtown center area and the assumption is there are options for transportation and walkability in the area and for these reasons, he supports a reduction to the required parking.

- COW decision: 0.4 per maximum number of residents

#### Sobering center -

- Originally: 1 space per 12 beds, plus 1 visitor space
- Title 49 recommendation: 1 space per 24 beds, plus 1 visitor space

Mr. LeVine said it is unlikely there would be a 24-bed sobering center in the downtown area and suggested changing the requirement to 1 parking space plus one visitor space or two parking spaces total. Mr. Dye noted sobering centers are allowed in MU and MU2 and wondered if it was appropriate to have these activities in those districts.

- COW decision: 1 space, plus 1 visitor space

#### Medical or Dental clinics -

- Originally: 1 per 200 square feet of gross floor area
- Title 49 recommendation: 1 per 500 square feet of gross floor area

Mr. Dye suggested reducing the required spaces to 1 per 400 square feet of floor area.

- COW decision: 1 per 400 square feet of gross floor area

#### Mortuaries -

- Originally: 1 per six seats based on maximum seating capacity in main auditorium
- Title 49 recommendation: 1 per fifteen seats based on maximum seating capacity in main auditorium

Mr. Dye felt there should not be a reduction. Mr. Voelckers supported the 60% suggested reduction saying it is unlikely a mortuary would be built in the downtown center. Mr. LeVine felt there should not be a mortuary in the downtown center zoning district and could support using parking to keep them out. However, he felt there were other ways to do that such as with zoning. Mr. Winchell, Mr. Pedersen and Ms. Cole supported the suggested reduction. Mr. Dye suggested

changing the title from Mortuaries to Funeral Homes. Ms. Maclean and Ms. Pierce explained a Mortuary can have a crematorium but a funeral home cannot. Since crematoriums are not allowed downtown, it makes sense to change the title.

- COW decision: Change the title to FUNERAL HOME and 1 per fifteen seats based on maximum seating capacity in main auditorium

Restaurants and alcoholic beverage dispensaries -

- Originally: 1 per 200 square feet of gross floor area
- Title 49 recommendation: 1 per 200 square feet of gross floor area

Mr. LeVine felt a further reduction would be appropriate in this case. Mr. Dye suggested 1 space per 750 square feet similar to shopping centers and banks.

- COW decision: 1 space per 750 square feet of floor area

Swimming pools serving general public -

- Originally: 1 per 4 persons based on pool capacity
- Title 49 recommendation: 1 per 10 persons based on pool capacity

Mr. Dye felt public pools are community owned and have a public draw and the parking should not be reduced. Ms. Cole supported the reduction for the sake of consistency. Mr. Voelckers, Mr. Winchell and Mr. Pedersen agreed with Ms. Cole.

- COW decision: 1 per 10 persons based on pool capacity

Convenience Stores -

- Originally: 1 per 250 square feet of gross floor area
- Title 49 recommendation: 1 per 625 square feet of gross floor area

Mr. LeVine suggested 1 per 750 square feet in line with shopping centers and malls. Ms. Gallion spoke up saying she thought there were some incentives available to convenience stores and that may have an affect on what they can require.

- COW decision: Ms. Gallion will follow-up and, if possible, will change this to 1 per 750 square feet. Otherwise, will leave it as recommended.

Watercraft moorages -

- Originally: 1 per 3 moorage stalls
- Title 49 recommendation: 2 per 15 moorage stalls

The committee is waiting to hear back from the CBJ Docks and Harbors before finalizing a decision.

- COW decision: Wait for Docks and Harbor input and consider changing to 1 per 6 moorage stalls

### Libraries and Museums -

- Originally: 1 per 600 square feet gross floor area
- Title 49 recommendation: 1 per 1,500 square feet gross floor area

Mr. Dye felt a larger reduction was warranted considering libraries and museums have large open areas. He suggested 1 per 2,500 square feet. Mr. Voelckers felt that might be too large a reduction and cited events like first Fridays and speaker events and evening meetings that might draw larger crowds. Mr. Pedersen was comfortable leaving it at 1 per 1,500 square feet. Mr. Winchell pointed out that every library in CBJ is on public bus routes and supported the larger reduction. Ms. Cole also supported the reduction to 2,500. Mr. LeVine supported leaving it as recommended.

- COW decision: 1 per 1,500 square feet gross floor area

Mr. Alper joined the meeting at about 7:02 p.m.

### Schools -

- Originally:
  - Elementary: 2 per classroom
  - Middle and Junior High: 1.5 per classroom
  - High School: minimum of 15 spaces per school; one per four auditorium or assembly area seats; one additional per classroom
- Title 49 recommendation:
  - Elementary: 0.8 per classroom
  - Middle and Junior High: 0.6 per classroom
  - High School: minimum of 6 spaces per school; one per ten auditorium or assembly area seats; two additional spaces per five classrooms

Mr. Dye felt the numbers should not be reduced for the same reasons as hospitals (public gathering and safety).

- COW decision:
  - Elementary: 2 per classroom
  - Middle and Junior High: 1.5 per classroom
  - High School: minimum of 15 spaces per school; one per four auditorium or assembly area seats; one additional per classroom

### College, main campus/College, satellite facilities -

- Originally:
  - Main campus: 1 per 500 square feet gross floor area, or where auditorium or 1 per 4 seats or auditorium or general assembly area, whichever is greater

- Satellite: 1 per 300 square feet gross floor area, or where auditorium or 1 per 4 seats or auditorium or general assembly area, whichever is greater
- Title 49 recommendation:
  - Main campus: 1 per 1,250 square feet gross floor area, or where auditorium or 1 per 10 seats or auditorium or general assembly area, whichever is greater
  - Satellite: 1 per 750 square feet gross floor area, or where auditorium or 1 per 10 seats or auditorium or general assembly area, whichever is greater

Mr. Dye said that it is highly unlikely a college would be built in a downtown center area and he would be comfortable with leaving parking as required or reducing it. Mr. Voelckers felt the numbers should not be reduced as proposed. Ms. Gallion said the University was comfortable with the suggestion so long as they have the option to request a waiver later.

- COW decision:
  - Main campus: 1 per 500 square feet gross floor area, or where auditorium or 1 per 4 seats or auditorium or general assembly area, whichever is greater
  - Satellite: 1 per 300 square feet gross floor area, or where auditorium or 1 per 4 seats or auditorium or general assembly area, whichever is greater

Repair/Service Station -

- Originally: 5 spaces per bay. Facilities with two or more bays, up to 60% of the required parking spaces may be in a stacked parking configuration
- Title 49 recommendation: 5 spaces per bay. Facilities with two or more bays, up to 60% of the required parking spaces may be in a stacked parking configuration

Mr. Dye saw no need for a reduction saying the point of a service station is for people to bring their cars there to get them worked on. Mr. Voelckers disagreed saying he's seen shops in cities where the stations function with a very small parking space with flexible scheduling. He would support a reduction. Ms. Cole and Mr. Pedersen also supported a reduction. Mr. Dye was persuaded and suggested changing the recommendation. Mr. Winchell also voiced agreement.

- COW decision: Three spaces per bay. All but two of the required non-accessible parking spaces may be in a stacked configuration.

Open air food service: -

- Originally: 1 per 400 square feet of gross floor area
- Title 49 recommendation: No parking requirement

Mr. Dye did not agree with the reduction to zero spaces saying there should be at least minimal parking to accommodate employees and loading. Mr. Winchell agreed that there should be at least minimal parking. Mr. Pedersen pointed out that if there is even one space required then there will be an ADA requirement as well. Mr. Voelckers suggested requiring one space per 1,200

square feet which would allow a requirement of zero for very small businesses. Ms. Cole suggested either zero or make it the same as a restaurant. Mr. Dye felt one space per 1,500 square feet would be appropriate. Mr. LeVine proposed zero spaces for the first 1,500 square feet and 1 per each 1,500 above. Mr. Winchell agreed.

- COW decision: Zero up to 1,500 square feet, then one space per 1,500

Mr. LeVine opened discussion of rounding when the number of required spaces is less than 1. Ms. Maclean explained 49.40.210(a) states the number of spaces shall be calculated to the nearest whole number. Zero is a whole number so if the requirement is less than 0.5 then it would result in zero required spaces. Mr. Dye felt the requirements based on square footage should be a minimum of one space and beyond that, numbers should be rounded down. Ms. Cole pointed out the purpose of the work they've done is to encourage downtown uses without prohibitive parking requirements and, therefore, it should be allowable to round down to zero. Mr. Voelckers strongly agreed with Ms. Cole. Mr. Alper also voiced agreement. Mr. Pedersen agreed with rounding down to zero but was not comfortable with tying the parking to change in use. Mr. Voelckers was in agreement with Mr. Pedersen that a change in use should not trigger parking requirements that there isn't room for. He would like to see a statement that a change in use does not trigger new parking requirements.

Mr. Winchell reminded members for the record that many of the facilities downtown are building parking underground and to keep that in mind.

\*AT EASE 7:40 – 7:50 p.m.\*

Mr. LeVine suggested staff look further at the possibility of some concentrated areas within the district where it would make sense that no parking would be required.

#### B. Discussion of Adopting Land Acknowledgment

Mr. LeVine introduced the discussion stating he felt it would be appropriate to make an acknowledgement that we are on land occupied by others before we came here. The School Board and the Assembly currently do this at each meeting.

Mr. Voelckers and Mr. Winchell asked when it would be read and by whom. Mr. LeVine explained it would be read at the beginning of each Committee of the Whole and Regular Commission meeting and Special Commission meetings and it would be up to the chairpersons whether to read it at committee meetings. Mr. Winchell said this is overall a positive cultural acknowledgement. However, not all land uses have been positive. (In particular, indigenous people and their lands have not been respected. In particular, the burning of the village on Douglas) If this is adopted, Mr. Winchell felt the Systemic Racism Review Board should hear testimony and take evidence in that incident. Mr. LeVine agreed that the Commission may decide

to hold meetings to expand on the verbiage currently used by the Assembly but for tonight, he suggested adopting what is currently in use and it could be changed later.

Mr. Voelckers asked if this is the same language as used by the Assembly. Mr. LeVine said he believes it is also used by the School Board. Ms. Maclean explained the verbiage comes from the First Alaskans Institute.

Mr. LeVine suggested it would be added to the agenda following the Call to Order and he would start by reading it at the beginning of the next meeting and then it would rotate between members at each successive meeting. Seeing no objection, the land acknowledgment discussion is moved to the next regular Commission meeting.

**X. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – None**

**XI. OTHER BUSINESS – None**

**XII. STAFF REPORTS**

Ms. Maclean reported the ADOD overlay zoning has been moved to the October 19 Assembly meeting so Law could review the language and make sure it is correct.

The rezone for Honzinger Pond and grant funding for the downtown historic district are on consent and will be before the Lands committee on Monday.

Hazard mapping will be heard by the Committee of the Whole. The consultants will also be at that meeting and interested commissioners should attend if they are able.

Coastal Zone management was adopted by the Assembly last night. The assembly made it clear that the expect Title 49 and staff to look at the remainder of Coastal Management.

**XIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Mr. Voelckers reported the Assembly Public Works and Facility Committee met recently and representatives from the landfill presented on odor mitigation and the remaining life of the landfill.

**XIV. LIAISON REPORT – None**

**XV. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None**

**XVI. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS – None**

**XVII. EXECUTIVE SESSION – None**

**XVIII. ADJOURNMENT – 8:15 P.M.**