

MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION / COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU Michael Satre, Chair

February 14, 2012

I. CALLED TO ORDER

Chair Satre called the meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC)/Committee of the Whole (COW), held in the Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building, to order at 5:00 p.m.

Commissioners present: Karen Lawfer, Jerry Medina, Benjamin Haight, Nathan Bishop, Marsha Bennett, Nicole Grewe, Dan Miller, Dennis Watson, Michael Satre

A quorum was present.

Staff present: Dale Pernula, CDD Director; Greg Chaney, Beth McKibben, Benjamin Lyman, CDD Planners

II. REGULAR AGENDA

AME20120003

Willoughby District Land Use Plan (WDLUP) – A text amendment to adopt portions of the WDLUP as part of the CBJ Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan).

Staff recommendation: That the COW review the proposed amendments to the draft plan, and discuss Commissioner Bennett's comments.

COW discussion

Mr. Pernula said the Title 49 Committee reviewed the WDLUP, which is being presented to the COW for review. Ms. Grewe said she is speaking on behalf of the committee, stating that the PC was previously presented with an overview of the plan by the CBJ Lands and Resources Division staff and their consultant. For the new Commissioners that were not yet serving at that time, she explained that some of the Commissioners were surprised by the content, quality, and vision of that plan. At that time, the PC referred the plan to the committee for closer review, and to provide comments because the plan will be incorporated into the Comp Plan so it could have significant ramifications. Therefore, she requested staff to only provide certain portions of the plan to the PC tonight, so she requested at the last meeting for the new Commissioners to download this plan in its entirety to review prior to this meeting. Most of the revisions to the plan are provided via tracked changes that the committee recommended, which are not very significant, and staff incorporated a few minor technical revisions as well.

Ms. Marlow referred to Attachment B (a memorandum she provided to Mr. Pernula, dated January 27, 2012) that provides three categories of amendments to the WDLUP. The first category relates to bonus points on building height. The committee discussed other tools that

may be available, such as an overlay, changing the Table of Dimensional Standards (TDS), or having a certain building height be outright allowed. The second category expanded on the connection for the grid network in Figure 7 termed the “blueprint pieces.” She noted where additional streets would provide new connections through the district. The committee opted as an alternative the connection of Capitol Avenue continuing through the brown quonset at the Salvation Army site, and then connecting to another street. Ms. Grewe said it is somewhat controversial to identify a road over a structure that is already built, but the committee opted to provide the best vision for the district while realizing they cannot force that to happen, but it makes sense in this area for the transportation and pedestrian flow. It was ironic that Ms. Marlow informed the committee this was an option they had before, but they removed it. Ms. Marlow said the third category relates to language revisions that better represents the intent of the WDLUP to be flexible over time.

Ms. Grewe stated that Ms. Bennett was unable to attend the last meeting, so she provided written comments via email that articulates her overall historical perspective and cultural appropriateness of the WDLUP, and to honor Juneau’s attachment to outlying communities in the region. Ms. Bennett added that her written comments are in relation to forming a vision. She somewhat disagrees about the Salvation Army issue, although she understands that the main vision is to provide connectivity to and within that area. The ebb and flow of travel in association for family get-togethers in the region, including the lifestyle of people arriving from smaller communities then to superimpose an urban homogenous “Oregon-style development” in this district to the current way of living. These connections go back to the last century when mining was first developed in this area, which is when people started moving to this location from Auke Village. This provides a long history in this community that should not be neglected. People travel to town and patronize the Salvation Army Thrift Store on a regular basis, which ties into the Andrew Hope building, the senior housing, and Zach Gordon Youth Center. This connection relates to a portion of the community that started out quite poor, so those poverty-related services exist in that district for a reason.

Ms. Marlow said they held two meetings with the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska (CCTHITA), which included elders and people who reside on Village Street for about a total of 20 people. In reviewing past plans for this area, they found that the planning vision started in 1950, which has moved forward through the governors of the State of Alaska and commissioned planning efforts for the Capital. This has also moved along through Comprehensive Plan efforts, which the City has adopted over the years, including other master plans the CCTHITA adopted as well that at times have been integrated into the Comp Plan. There is an interest by certain landowners to be a part of redeveloping the Willoughby District. A recommendation at the last meeting was to complete a neighborhood plan for the WDLUP. The CCTHITA expressed interested in working with City staff to accomplish this. The CCTHITA has access to funds that will allow them to develop the vision and identify improvements they foresee in that area, particularly in terms of housing. This is not to be exclusive, or to change the socio economic status of the area by trying to move them out through gentrification, pricing them out of the neighborhood, or changing services that exist. Rather it will be an integrated plan that does not displace anyone. CCTHITA is very interested in seeing Whittier Street improved to provide a gateway to Village Street, which was not built to its best design. This will assist in showcasing the connection to Centennial Hall for the annual Celebration that consists of 4,000-6,000 people. The thought of integrating and working with CCTHITA to achieve this vision is very much apart of the concept behind the plan; Ms. Bennett said this is good news. Mr. Bishop voiced support, stating that they need to work with the native

community to develop an implementation plan in the form of a timeline of activities as an immediate project, which should be a high priority item in regard to the WDLUP.

Ms. Grewe stated that when the WDLUP was first provided to the committee in its full form she was quite shocked, as she felt improvements need to happen in that area, but what she viewed was fairly radical. However, she now feels that the Commissioners have a unique opportunity where the land ownership in that area is concentrated with one of the community members being the State Office Building, and other major buildings. Therefore, with this being the case, and with CCTHITA having resources, both of these aspects provide a unique opportunity.

Ms. Marlow said where the Zach Gordon Youth Center is located has been considered since the 1950s as the Capitol Complex. When she started working on the WDLUP, there was a proposal to reconstruct the north parking garage of the State Office Building. She does not think that effort has completely gone to the wayside, which includes the upcoming State, Library, Archives, and Museum (SLAM) project. In viewing the land use and the Capitol Complex in that district, it is for the highest and best use of that property. The Zach Gordon Youth Center consists of a single-story building with several public buildings surrounding it with visions of them transitioning over time. Her concern for the Zach Gordon Youth Center is that it will end up being isolated mid-block as a single-story building surrounded by multi-story buildings up to 3-6 stories tall if they provide parking underneath them. If so, the Zach Gordon Youth Center would quickly be in a wind and/or shadow situation causing it to be isolated mid-block, which she does not believe is the vision that Zach Gordon had for the youth center, nor would it be a healthy and productive environment for youth attending that facility. She tried to take into consideration this area being redeveloped over a 20-year timeframe with much larger buildings surrounding the Zach Gordon Youth Center, and when she talked to them about this they too shared her concerns. They held an open dialog on how best to plan for the Zach Gordon Youth Center. They are very committed to remaining at that location and being apart of the Capitol Complex. Therefore, in working with staff and meeting with several of the Zach Gordon Youth Center Board members, they ended up encapsulating in the WDLUP. They want multiple generations and land use activities taking place during evenings and weekends of civic interchange. The Zach Gordon Youth Center fulfills those The Zach Gordon Youth Center leases land from the City, and they have to acknowledge that at some point the City may decide to have a higher and better use for that property, so in that event the question is what the planning concepts they should be cognizant of are. To that end, they worked with the Zach Gordon Youth Center Board and staff to identify critical needs or wants in the event they were relocated, which is when the Zach Gordon Board members endorsed the language included in the WDLUP regarding that facility.

Mr. Watson stated that the Salvation Army building is actually a church. He was involved with the movement of a different church in another community, which became a very passionate topic by the inhabitants it served in that area. He explained that the Salvation Army is the only entity who reinvested in that area when they installed a Thrift Store. The reason the Salvation Army did so was because their valley store turned out to be an absolute failure, which they did not foresee. He noted that representatives of St. Vincent de Paul are present who run a thrift store in the valley now, but that entity operates slightly different. He wants to ensure that this body is not talking about potential taking or eminent domain situations because he served as Chair for the Salvation Army for several years and knows its history, as well as Ms. Bennett, including one of the members of the Assembly who previously served on that board. He explained that he does not necessarily share the same opinion as Ms. Bennett, as he believes that this area is declining,

so he is glad that they are doing something about it because there has been very little reinvestment toward improvements at least from the private sector. Ms. Grewe stated that at the committee level they attempted to honor property ownership, history, and culture in providing the best vision and no one mentioned taking or eminent domain situations. She feels that the role of the Commissioners is to keep this district in mind as to what is best for the community as a whole, not just one sector, church, or entity, but if someone wants to do so that should happen at the Assembly level.

Ms. Lawfer said she is concerned about removing building height restrictions in terms of potentially blocking existing views from other buildings. However, she does not know enough about the bonus point processes. She has tried to figure this out by looking at all the different plans. Also, she is wondering if it is possible, through an engineering process, to direct vehicular traffic movement in a one-way fashion in that district, rather than having two-way streets. In addition, possibly providing for parking on both sides of the street, including a few one-way streets that might be more beneficial if certain property owners have commercial uses on the first floor of buildings, and then residential throughout the remaining floors. Ms. Marlow referred to Figure 5 - Building Heights and Viewsheds, stating that she anticipates that the CDD staff will work closely with the PC to change Title 49 to incorporate some type of tool to address the height issue via an overlay, bonus points, or a change to the TDS. She pointed out where a slide in relation to the bonus point provision, which states that "Height increases up to 50-60 feet should only be allowed after consideration of building design, facade, roof form, modulation, and location on lot through a public process." The PC is that public process, and they recently reviewed the SLAM project where bonus points were applied, so they will start to see more of those types of cases being presented on a project-by-project basis in the future. She doubts the CDD staff will propose to do a blanket height in that area for proposals presented to the PC in the future. In regards to the streets and traffic (she referred to Figure 7), they hired a traffic consultant as part of the project team. The consultant found in the Willoughby District during the regulatory hour between the 4:30-5:30 p.m. peak hour traffic fails. This is due to traffic backing up on Willoughby Avenue to the Foodland area from the 10th/Egan intersection, including from Gold Creek to Egan Drive. The traffic consultant advised that in order to increase the capacity of the street network, they have to provide more streets to hold those vehicles, including additional intersections to disperse them out of the district onto Egan Drive. The DOT provided proposals for one-way traffic couplets through that district as part of the 10th/Egan improvements, which were provided to the Assembly. The DOT asked the Assembly whether to pursue those as traffic solutions, and the Assembly chose not to because doing so would cause too much change that had the potential to alter the interface of businesses with existing customers, so the solution chosen was to increase capacity of the street network and the number of connections to Egan Drive.

Mr. Medina complimented staff, the consultant, and the Title 49 Committee for their work on the WDLUP. He likes the plan and feels it is well thought out, and he would like to see the plan implemented because that area has historic significance with room for improvement. He requests that the PC forward the WDLUP with a recommendation of approval to the Assembly.

Mr. Pernula said the proposal for a build-to line for buildings in the Willoughby District would be within 0' to 10' from the front property line with parking provided in the rear, beside, and/or below them, so buildings would no longer be set back with parking in front of them. This is counter to some of the existing development in the area, including the new Salvation Army building, which would have to be moved forward with its parking relocated to the rear. This is a

departure from what currently takes place. Mr. Bishop asked if doing so would also be implemented in the overlay district. Mr. Pernula said that might be one way to incorporate this into the Mixed Use 2 (MU2) zone, but it would have to be codified to truly utilize it, although the MU2 zone is not spread throughout the community. Mr. Haight stated that in the process of creating built-to configurations is that they tend to close the community in, which ends up causing the loss of important contact with significant components in an area. Even so, it might also provide important attributes, which is why they have to apply the build-to line application very carefully. He explained that the whole beginning of this community started in that village where the shoreline used to be located, which he feels is the focal point of the entire layout. He views what the CCTHITA brought forward in that they like the idea of developing Whittier Street because it is very important to the layout as a whole, which is a lead-in to the village area. He believes Whittier Street should be broadened in order to provide a view all the way from the village to the water. Ms. Marlow explained that they started researching examples of where built-to lines are used via planning for other jurisdictional areas, and found that they provide for exceptions, with the primary being to incorporate a plaza (civic space) in front like the SLAM project, rather than having canyon or overshadowing impacts to public places. Therefore, in talking to CBJ Engineering and Capital Transit staff about their visions for Whittier Street, their thought is to bring the downtown streetscape to Whittier Street. This will include wider sidewalks, nice lighting standards, benches, flowers, flags, and so on, including starting to integrate more of a civic and thoroughfare experience at the front of the SLAM, the Centennial Hall, and the Zach Gordon Youth Center building areas. The area would then connect back to the village to provide more of a boulevard or main street appearance, so this area would become more of an “axis” of connection between the waterfront and the village. Chair Satre said he appreciates Mr. Haight bringing this topic up, as he wants to ensure that these connection aspects are appropriately dealt with in the plan.

Ms. Marlow said the planning area has a MU2 zoning designation that allows for 60 dwelling units per acre, which is a significant underutilization of residential potential. The goal of the WDLUP is to create 300-400 housing units within the next 20 years where they currently have 67. Therefore, she does not believe they need any more density in the MU2, and achieving the goal of 300-400 housing units will provide a surplus of density to achieve in the future. She conducted a housing stock inventory of that area, and found that most is located within Fireweed Place, the Malaspina Apartments, and the Gold Lodge. They have been working with those property owners who are interested in reinvesting in their properties, including possibly expanding housing provisions, and they want the City to engage and help them to achieve the City’s vision for those properties. Therefore, the City, through low-interest loans or some other district authority is going to need to revisit implementation to assist in achieving that housing component.

Mr. Watson said he was a representative in a previous renaissance project that took place in the downtown area of Salem, Oregon when they instituted a plan very similar to the WDLUP in getting all the property owners to work together, which included fairly large corporations, and now that downtown area is thriving. The only problem they are having at this time is the lack of parking, which consists of a 700-person waiting list for people who work in the Capitol Building that are currently being shuttled, but he does not believe they will experience this issue in the Willoughby District.

Chair Satre said the WDLUP would be presented to the PC to provide a formal public hearing, and then they would forward a recommendation to the Assembly. The PC appreciates the time

Ms. Marlow, Ms. McKibben, and others spent working with the Title 49 Committee on the vision for what is best for the Willoughby District.

BREAK: 5:53 – 5:58 p.m.

AME20100002

An Ordinance to Increase Residential Density Limits and Amend the Table of Dimensional Standards (TDS).

Staff recommendation: That the COW review the information above and discuss how best to accomplish the goal of promoting in-fill development at higher residential densities than are currently permitted in much of the borough, particularly along transit corridors (TCs), both existing and potential. In particular, staff requests that the COW provide direction on the following:

1. Should the MU2 zoning district height limit at CBJ 49.25.400 be increased from 35 feet, or should development bonuses be the only means for a developer to exceed that height limit?
2. Is the approach of increasing residential density limits exponentially, and adjusting to create the best fit possible (R2 value as close to 1 as possible), appropriate in the CBJ?
3. If the best-fit approach is appropriate for the CBJ, or even if it is not but allowable Commercial densities should nevertheless be increased from the current 18-unit/acre limit, should the LC or the GC zone be denser?
4. Would it be appropriate to create a new high-density residential zoning district for future application? If so, what density would be appropriate for this zone?
5. Is it appropriate to increase the residential density limits of given zoning districts, the LC and GC in particular, or should increased residential densities only be allowed through development bonuses?

Staff report

Mr. Lyman said in terms of the TDS, there are various impediments to obtaining denser development in parts of Juneau identified in the Comp Plan, which they have heard in previous discussions while viewing the WDLUP so staff is attempting to rectify some of those barriers.

An email was provided as a Blue Folder item from Dan Austin of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, dated February 13, 2012, who is present at this meeting. Mr. Austin is engaged in a project to provide single-room occupancy units in a General Commercial (GC) zone, which allows 18 dwelling units per acre so they would be limited to 400 square foot dwelling units with shared facilities. A new tool was created that counts as half the density in development applications, which would allow for up to 36 units of single-room occupancy (SRO). For clarification, he noted that Mr. Austin's email states, "Federal and state budget constraints have changed the paradigm. Low-income affordable housing can no longer rely on government rent subsidies to meet operating costs of inefficient projects. 18 units or even 36 units to the acre (the density limit in the General Commercial Zone) cannot support a non-subsidized, low-income affordable project. We recommend a density of 60 units per acre as in the Mixed Use Zone. Higher density housing in the GC zone allows residential development close to transportation, retail and community services. It also contributes to a greater variety and mix of housing types in the GC Zone."

He explained that the Willoughby District used to have higher parking requirements, which was a barrier. To that end, they recently extended the PD-1 overlay zone to drastically reduce off-street parking in a transit-oriented area where 60% of the residents walk, bike, or take transit to work. The next barrier they have to address is in relation to building height in order to achieve the desired density. They intend to revise the TDS for the MU2 zone perhaps in regards to building height, setback, and built-to line requirements. The WDLUP calls for design standards and other changes as well. The Comp Plan has one GC land use designation, but code and zoning maps have three commercial zones. Aside from Waterfront Commercial (WC), it leaves LC and GC that have historically been treated as being consistent with the GC designation in the Comp Plan, but with regards to zoning staff has applied finer aspects of LC versus the GC designation. During a rezone of a previous case near St. Paul's Cathedral Church, the Department of Law informed staff that they have to adhere to the zoning maps in the Comp Plan for rezoning. Therefore, the question has been whether they would ever be able to rezone parcels to LC in the future in order to differentiate between GC and LC, which the Commissioners will find in their upcoming review of the Comp Plan where staff suggests changing some of the zoning names to reduce this confusion. For the time being, he will be using "land use designation" to mean "Comp Plan map," and "zone" to mean "zoning designation." In the land use designation in the Comp Plan it states that they will have "...residential densities ranging from 18- to 60-[residential] units per acre," but in order to achieve this the density in those zones have to be increased. He referred to page 4 showing the Maximum Density graph, and explained that the $R^2 = 0.9305$ is a tool that relates to how well the data fits within a line that approximates it in the form of an exponential curve plotted with the existing densities adopted in the Comp Plan. In doing so, he adopted an arbitrary number of 140 dwelling units for the MU zone. In D-18, LC and GC they flat line with the density, which they do not approximate, as it is merely a tool used to look at the data. They currently use Euclidian zoning for Juneau by having particular uses allowed in certain zones, and they are able place conditions on permits. A form-based type of zoning that transects is used in other communities, which provides where certain zoning is appropriate next to other zones that gradually change the impacts. Juneau has a very linear topography pattern, rather than being a radial city from its downtown core into the suburbs. This is a tool to review respective impacts of density on the neighborhood, so it is done at more of a gradual level in Juneau. By increasing the maximum allowable densities of the LC and GC districts to 30 and 50 dwellings units per acre, and the MU2 district to 80 dwelling units per acre, the overall fit is much better as shown on the chart with the value being closer to an $R^2 = 1$. The next is transit oriented development (TOD) in the Comp Plan that relates to TCs, mixed use, high-density residential, Transit First, and an Affordable Housing Overlay District, but there is no map in the Comp Plan delineating where this type of development is appropriate. These phrases are generally referred to as clustering development along TCs where public utility infrastructure efficiently serves large populations, including where automobile use is not necessary. To rectify this, the CDD staff developed a Transit Oriented Corridor (TOC) map, which is proposed to be included in the update of the Comp Plan.

The reason staff is reviewing density in Juneau is due to the lack of flat and relatively dry land near urban services. Urban services can be provided more efficiently to denser development in proximity to residential uses, which reduces travel time and cost while increasing viable options for the travel mode supported in the Comp Plan. The opportunities consist of a linear development pattern along the backbone of Glacier and Douglas Highways with existing transit service along those routes, including the high demand for housing with low vacancy rates. The obstacles consist of low building height limits of roughly 3-stories in most zones of 35', although 45' is allowed in GC and WC, with no height limit provided in Industrial and MU zones. The

parking requirements consist of two parking spaces per residence at 300 square feet per parking space, which takes up quite a bit of area when there is limited land to develop. When development consists of mixtures of types, such as retail on the ground floor, offices on the next floor, with residences above it's the urban ideal in TCs providing for walkable neighborhoods. However, traditional financing does not support this very well, but more tools are forthcoming as lenders become more familiar with the successes of TCs, and they realize those properties are able to command higher rental income. The residential density limits in most zones tend to top out at 18 dwelling units per acre, except in downtown Juneau where they have 60 dwelling units per acre in the Willoughby District, and no limit in the MU downtown core location. A couple of strategies include TCs where they could increase building height and density limits, and reduce parking requirements within ¼ mile of transit. On the other hand, they could outright increase the height limit in appropriate zones and not worry about the relationship to TCs independent of where transit is. They might also adopt bonuses for height and density increases, and parking reductions where they are not offered outright. The comment provided by Ms. Lawfer stating that the bonus provisions are headache inducing—he has been working on re-writing all of the bonus provisions so he empathizes with her. He believes there is a reason Fireweed Place and the recent SLAM project are basically the only developments in Juneau that have ever used the existing bonus provision system, which staff intends to continue to work on.

He referred to attachment A of a slide showing the existing frequent transit service alignment route, not particular bus stops. He referred to attachment B of a slide showing the GC designated parcels in red within the bus route from the Comp Plan land use designation, not zoning. This shows another GC designation of the Mike Hatch Jeep dealership and rock quarry on North Douglas, noting that only a portion of each of those parcels are designated as being in the GC zone, with the other portions either being in the Urban Low- or Medium-Density Residential zone. Except for the Mike Hatch property, every other GC designated parcel is within ¼ mile of a transit route, and therefore he believes they do not have to worry about the transit-oriented overlay for GC zones. He referred to attachment D of a slide that shows GC in red and LC in green of the zoned parcels, which are also within ¼ mile of the bus route, except for Mike Hatch and the rock quarry parcels in North Douglas that leads him to believe they can simply increase the allowable density in GC and LC. In addition, when they incorporate the TOD overlay they can exclude these zones at that time, if need be, and a benefit of doing so would allow for faster permitting processes. He referred to attachment C of a slide showing Medium-Density Residential (MDR) designated parcels, and aside from North Douglas and a few City owned parcels they virtually all have other MDR or transition to MDR designated parcels within a ¼ mile of the existing transit route. With all these factors in mind, staff developed a couple of draft TOC maps shown in attachments E and F. On attachment E, it shows two different types of TOCs, with the first being in yellow that were on previous slides, and the “transition” to TOC in pink where they have transit service not yet to the level of other TOCs in the areas of Auke Bay, Riverside Drive, and North Douglas. He explained that Ms. McKibben pointed out that the Comp Plan is aspirational in nature for rezoning “transition” zones, which they might contemplate doing with regards to transitioning to TOCs. The appropriate place to address such details would be in the code, which they can discuss further when the PC reviews the Comp Plan.

The borough has roughly the same number of lots in LC and GC zones ranging from 277-284 in a total area of roughly the same size ranging from 291.7-acres in LC and 288.5 in GC. However, the dwelling units are drastically different with nearly 500 units in LC and 200 in GC, which has an average density development of 1.6 dwelling units per acre in LC and only .67 dwelling units

per acre in GC. The height limits are 35' in LC, and 45' in GC. If they had a single-acre developed at the higher density of 30-60 dwelling units per acre, it would provide for additional housing units in the borough, but developers are unable to do so if they are not provided the proper tools.

He requested the Commissioners to review pages 6-10 of the staff report that reference pertinent Comp Plan guidelines, which support increased density to MU along TOD and TCs. He noted that staff listed five questions in the staff recommendation on page 10, and he requests the Commissioners to provide direction on them. Chair Satre requested that the COW hear from Dan Austin prior to providing staff direction to those questions, to which the PC agreed.

Public Testimony

Dan Austin, representing St. Vincent de Paul Society, said he is impressed with the work that has been done in an attempt to increase residential density limits. Statistically, Juneau is the most homeless city in Alaska with a per capita rate three times that of Los Angeles County. The people who are homeless in Juneau generally have sufficient low income, with 41% of the households at 50% of area median income or below. The wait-list for St. Vincent de Paul consists of about 250 people, which is for 103 apartments with 65% of them being single-occupancy units. The population growth of the Juneau community is primarily among the aging. He is from the second-year baby boomer generation, which consists of 75 million other people and over the next 10-year period this is where the housing market is probably going to be heading for Juneau, including other communities around the country. As a developer, he knows that the only method in which they can efficiently develop affordable housing for people and not to have to rely on government rent subsidies is to be able increase the density. He explained that the advantages of higher density housing it is that the efficiencies of denser construction reduces costs to residents, which is a simple equation of economies of scale. There is no way they can approach affordable housing in this community without reducing the housing cost per unit. The subsidies they have depended upon for generations to meet those costs are currently limited and will no longer be available, which is part of the federal budget debate happening right now. The US Housing and Urban Development will no longer have the 202 and 811 programs that supported building housing for low-income seniors and the disabled. The last supportive low-income housing project for seniors is the one St. Vincent de Paul constructed in 1998, which was also the last investment of this type in Juneau. With the development they are proposing, it will allow them to meet the challenge of providing low-income housing to people without subsidies, but they have to increase density in order to accomplish this. Chair Satre thanked Mr. Austin, stating that the PC appreciates him advocating for higher density, which the Commissioners have been trying to move forward as well.

Mr. Miller said in response to question 1) of staff's recommendation, he believes the reason developers are not constructing multi-family housing is due to the cost per square foot because the existing density is too expensive, so there is no profit for them to do so. To assist in making this happen, they might consider increasing the height limit of buildings so additional floors could be added to existing buildings while retaining the same foundations, roofs, and possibly heating and/or HVAC systems. He is a proponent of doing so, but not in a "blanket" type of fashion, which probably should be looked at on an area-by-area basis in the future.

Ms. Bennett said she likes the idea Mr. Lyman suggested to view the different aspects of the Comp Plan in relation to TOD because it is fairly obvious that this is all becoming too complex. Possibly larger cities other than Juneau might warrant such complexity of overlays, bonuses, and

so on, but she believes they should keep it as simple and flexible as possible so developers can make a profit and provide additional housing.

Mr. Medina asked Mr. Austin what the square footage is of the existing housing units at St. Vincent de Paul. Mr. Austin said a total of 103 units are under management in four different locations, with 26 shelter dwelling units consisting of 240 square feet each.

Public testimony was closed.

COW discussion

Mr. Lyman said many numbers in the TDS for the MU2 zone are confusing, so he picked six downtown developments using photographs from the Assessor's database. The Mt. Roberts apartments on Gastineau Avenue has six townhouses with parking underneath, and then each side shares a stairway, including space under the building in the event of landslides, which is at a density of 30 dwellings units per acre. The Ewing Way project (the large yellow building) also on Gastineau Avenue has 49 dwelling units per acre, and a rarely used parking deck that takes up much of that property. The MacKinnon Apartments on 3rd Street is a refurbished historic building that has 128 dwelling units per acre in a three-story building, which is not a mixed-use building—only apartments. This shows it is possible to provide dense housing development onto a small lot, and in this case there is no onsite parking, landscaping, or other amenities. A historic building in downtown, which legally remains a six-plex has two bottom units not currently being used, but the upper units were remodeled as luxury condos and are on the market for about \$280,000 each, and that building was developed at 107 dwelling units per acre with minimal open space and no parking. The Marine View Building has retail on the first floor, offices on floors 2-4, with the upper floors being developed at 142 dwellings units per acre, which was after some conversion, and that site also has its own parking garage. In the Mendenhall Tower with a parking deck to the left, it consists of a very tall building that contains mixed uses being a barber shop, union offices, including 371 dwelling units to the acre, which is still considered as being a fairly attractive place to reside in Downtown Juneau. For the footprint of that building, it contains about 99 dwelling units and is much less than an acre in size.

Mr. Miller said his thoughts in regards to question 2) of staff's recommendation on increasing LC and GC in the MU2 zones. He likes the example provided by Mr. Lyman on page 4, which makes sense and they should continue to pursue doing so in that suggested manner.

Mr. Bishop said he generally echoes Mr. Miller's sentiments to increase density in LC and GC in the MU2 zones with the curve shown on page 4 rationalizing doing so, which fits the Juneau community. He believes the height limit of buildings has to be increased. He thinks that the idea of installing a TOD corridor would not work very well in this community, and he would be more inclined to go with transit oriented nodes. They should provide appropriate subareas for doing so when the PC reviews the Comp Plan. This might consist of rational areas in the community for transit oriented nodes while seeking means of accommodating and promoting them with outright allowances for increased building height limits and density. In addition, they should also continue to work on allowing bonus provisions around the community in rational places, so the PC has to "hit these on all fronts." Chair Satre commented that it is an interesting concept of transit oriented nodes rather than corridors, which may ultimately work better.

Mr. Haight said he supports the comments by his fellow Commissioners. In terms of lower density areas, those tend to consist of larger dwellings that populate with greater numbers of

people per dwelling. In the higher density areas it would be more typical to have smaller dwelling populations, so he does not believe that increasing density in such areas would be very effective given this natural occurrence.

Mr. Lyman said he has basically heard the following direction from the Commissioners in reaction to the questions listed on page 10 under staff's recommendations:

- 1) Once the WDLUP is adopted, then maybe a 45' building height limit would be appropriate, but beyond that they could work with bonus provisions.
- 2) The response is favorable.
- 3) LC and GC contain differing aspects that perhaps they should spend more time reviewing. Mr. Chaney previously voiced a concern that high-density residential uses are not necessarily where they have a lot of SROs of individual people residing in them, but fairly large apartment buildings with many families residing within them provides greater impacts to neighborhoods. Therefore, it is possible these types of uses should be separated, such as not placing a LC zoning adjacent to a D-5, which perhaps should instead take place in a GC type of heavier use area, with LC being increased slightly beyond 18. He will leave this as an open question. Chair Satre agrees, as this will eventually have to be explained to the public in terms of possible impacts. Mr. Pernula said the LC zone was always meant to have a fairly light density, which is even though some of the commercial uses permitted are fairly heavy. Therefore, they should keep LC fairly light density in the proximity of the residential uses in the area that they serve because if they make it too heavy of a density, staff and the PC are going to receive a lot of opposition.
- 4) Mr. Lyman said he defers asking for guidance to this question, as it will be part of the Comp Plan review discussion.
- 5) Some combination of increased residential density limits in both GC and LC outright, and perhaps provide height and parking restrictions through bonuses. Chair Satre said they must foster denser development without question, but on a very careful and systematic basis. Ms. Bennett stressed that if the density bonus provisions are too cumbersome, they should be simplified.

III. OTHER BUSINESS - None

III. REPORT OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES - None

IV. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: *by Mr. Bishop, to adjourn the PC/COW meeting.*

There being no objection, it was so ordered and the PC/COW meeting adjourned at 6:58 p.m.