

## MINUTES

### PLANNING COMMISSION CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU

Michael Satre, Chair

### REGULAR MEETING

March 13, 2012

#### **I. CALLED TO ORDER**

Chair Satre 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 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners present: Karen Lawfer, Jerry Medina, Nathan Bishop, Benjamin Haight, Marsha Bennett (via teleconference), Nicole Grewe, Dennis Watson, Michael Satre

Commissioner absent: Dan Miller

A quorum was present.

Staff present: Dale Pernula, CBJ Community Development Department (CDD) Director; Greg Chaney, Beth McKibben, Benjamin Lyman CDD Planners

#### **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

February 28, 2012 – Regular Meeting

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Watson, to approve the February 28, 2011 regular PC meeting minutes, with corrections.*

There being no objection, it was so ordered.

#### **III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - None**

#### **IV. PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON REPORT**

Carlton Smith, Assembly Liaison to the PC, stated that the Assembly is working on the budget and scheduled a joint meeting tomorrow night with the School Board. In addition, the Assembly has a high interest in the density topic that will be discussed by the PC tonight, including the update of the 2008 CBJ Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan).

#### **V. RECONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS - None**

#### **VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

Chair Satre announced that there are two items on the Consent Agenda, and inquired if there is public comment on them. No one from the public had comments. Ms. Lawfer informed PC that she has a conflict of interest in regards to VAR20120002, as she serves on the Resurrection Lutheran Church Council. Chair Satre asked staff if Ms Lawfer is required to be recused from the entire Consent Agenda; Mr. Pernula said Ms. Lawfer is able to abstain solely from VAR20120002.

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Watson, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, with Ms. Lawfer abstaining from VAR20120002.*

There being no objection, it was so ordered and the two cases below were approved by the PC as presented, with Ms. Lawfer abstaining from VAR20120002.

**AAP20120002**

A Conditional Use permit (CUP) for an accessory apartment attached to a single-family dwelling on a substandard lot not served by city sewer.

Applicant: David Phillips

Location: 12590 Glacier Highway

**Staff recommendation:** That the PC adopt the Director's analysis and findings and grant the requested Accessory Apartment permit. The permit would allow the development of a one-bedroom Accessory Apartment on the ground floor of a single family dwelling on a substandard lot with an onsite waste water system. The approval is subject to the following condition:

1. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy the applicant shall provide approval from DEC for the on-site wastewater treatment system.

**Advisory Conditions:**

1. The applicant shall apply for a building permit for the existing accessory apartment.
2. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) for the accessory apartment all building code requirements must be met.
3. If approval from Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation is not granted; the accessory apartment cannot be occupied and the kitchen shall be removed and inspected by a CBJ Building Inspector.

**VAR20120002**

A Variance request to reduce the street side yard setback from 17 feet to 8.5 feet for an addition.

Applicant: Resurrection Lutheran Church

Location: 740 West Tenth Street

**Staff recommendation:** That the Board of Adjustment (BA) adopt the Director's analysis and findings and approve the requested Variance, VAR2012 0002. The Variance permit would allow for an addition within the street side setback, specifically the street side setback would be reduced from 17 feet to 8.5 feet. The approval is subject to the following condition:

1. Prior to CO an As-Built Survey shall be submitted showing the addition no closer than 8.5 feet to the West Tenth property line and eaves no closer than 5.5 feet to the West Tenth property line.

**VII. CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS** – Items reordered

Chair Satre requested Mr. Pernula to describe work staff has undertaken in regards to the Comp Plan, including how it relates to a Text Amendment that will be proposed by Mr. Lyman tonight. Mr. Pernula stated that the first four chapters of the Comp Plan were reviewed by staff that was provided to the PC in the packet. The first three chapters have very few changes. Chapter 4 deals with housing, which Ms. McKibben will discuss in more detail. In addition, staff provided in the Blue Folder an Agenda and packet for the March 20, 2012 PC/Committee of the Whole (COW) to review regarding Chapters, 5, 6, 9, and 12-18 of the Comp Plan. He explained that Chapter 7 relates to Natural Resources and Hazards, which staff continues to incorporate formatting revisions. Chapter 8 deals with Transportation, Chapter 10 relates to Land Use, and Chapter 11 is in regards to the Land Use Maps, which all requires additional work by staff based on what takes place at this PC meeting, and therefore those latter four chapters will be presented in the near future.

### **AME20120006**

A Text Amendment to initiate review of the Comprehensive Plan update.

Applicant: CBJ Community Development

Location: Boroughwide

### **Staff report**

Mr. Pernula described staff's recommended track changes to Chapters 1-4 of the Comp Plan as follows, with comments being provided by the PC on them:

#### Chapter 1: Introduction and Background

He said very minor edits were made.

Ms. Bennett referred to page 4, fourth paragraph, citing the first two sentences, which she believes to be inaccurate. She also believes it is inappropriate to gloss over this topic. She made a list of eight or nine important segments of the economy to provide a better understanding of what this community is and how it functions. Chair Satre requested Ms. Bennett to forward her list to staff so they could provide future consideration of such edits to this section that mirrors the actual economy in the Comp Plan; Ms. Bennett offered to do so as well as possibly draft an improved paragraph. Mr. Pernula said he is sure there are many other elements to the local economy, but this paragraph states it is "dominated by" those listed in this section, although there may be other economic forces in Juneau as well. Ms. Bennett said the largest private employer in Juneau is the mining industry. Chair Satre clarified that in terms of sheer numbers, the paragraph lists Juneau's economy being dominated by government, which is an accurate statement. However, this paragraph is somewhat dated because many changes have transpired in the mining and seafood industries, which this paragraph is attempting to call out as well as in terms of the private sector so staff should contemplate expanding it or creating a table to better describe this. Ms. Lawfer said the Comp Plan mentions the 2010 Census, which is available so it would be fairly simple to craft a table mirroring the economy of the CBJ. Chair Satre said there are also the latest State Department of Labor (DOL) statistics that could be used to garner local economy data. Therefore, the PC wishes staff to expand this paragraph potentially by incorporating census and DOL data, and a table showing the diversity of economic interest within the federal, state, and local government in the general sense.

Ms. Grewe said she does not find much language in terms of Juneau being the regional hub, which is in the context that Juneau is the largest of communities within the region

and the high majority of them are in population decline, with Juneau being the service center. A hardship was experienced with the prior state administration when a significant employee base was recently lost, which is not mentioned in this section of the Comp Plan, but the second paragraph on this same page mentions a plummet of oil prices in 1986. Mr. Pernula stated that Chapter 5 deals with Economic Development, and Chapter 1 is only the Introduction and Development of the Comp Plan that provides a setting for Juneau. Therefore, this section of Chapter 1 may have a few words missing, but if the Commissioners wish to get into more depth on the economy in regards to Chapter 5, that is where that discussion should take place. Mr. Satre said the PC previously spent a great deal of time updating the Comp Plan a couple of years ago. However, the introduction provides people who are new to this community, or applying for a seat on the PC, etc., an idea of the Juneau community so it might be more helpful to flesh out the other chapter changes of the Comp Plan during this review for those Commissioners who were not involved in the previous update, and then potentially edit the introduction of the Comp Plan after such a review is done.

Ms. Bennett stressed that this section of Chapter 1 is rather dated, which has to be more thoughtfully constructed. Chair Satre stated that staff incorporated track changes to typos they found to Chapter 1, and the PC provided comments on them so it is now best to set this aside in order to review upcoming chapters.

Mr. Lyman noted, e.g., on pages 4 and 5 of Chapter 1 are where vertical lines are located on the left side of some of the paragraphs where he had added an Index to the end of the Comp Plan that caused a formatting change, and he had not had time to go through the document again to accept those formatting changes. He apologized for the confusion.

## Chapter 2: Sustainability

Mr. Pernula referred to page 11, stating that the only change of substance is Implementing Action (IA) 2.1.IA4 that was deleted, but new verbiage was provided that was not available in 2006-08 when the current plan was updated, which he cited. Ms. Lawfer said community education was more definitive in the deleted verbiage, as the newly added verbiage states, "...reduce Juneau's energy consumption and carbon footprint, and community education," but "community education" is not defined. Ms. McKibben explained that the new verbiage probably could have been defined better, but the Juneau Climate Action and Implementation Plans provide many recommendations regarding community education, which is what she was attempting to incorporate. Ms. Lawfer requested Ms. McKibben to add, "per those plans" at the end of this IA.

Mr. Watson said great emphasis was previously placed on Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating standards by the City for green building designs. However, he does not find this in the Comp Plan, so such language should be provided. Ms. McKibben said an IA in another chapter of the Comp Plan that refers to improving energy efficiency of City buildings. The CBJ adopted an ordinance requiring all City projects valued greater than \$5million to meet the LEED-Juneau rating standard specifications. She explained that she felt the general language remained sufficiently appropriate, rather than going straight to LEED. In addition, when two architects served on the PC they held previous discussions as to whether LEED was the appropriate target, as there are a variety of programs available to use to arrive at different levels of energy efficiency, which the Juneau Commission on Sustainability (JCOS) was involved in as

well. Mr. Watson commented that he would keep this discussion in mind as the PC further reviews the Comp Plan. Chair Satre commented that although an energy efficiency ordinance has been adopted in regards to City buildings, it is possible that a policy should also be included in the Comp Plan to provide for greater reference framework.

### Chapter 3: Community Forum

Mr. Pernula referred to pages 14-18, stating that staff provided minor edits. Chair Satre said it is his understanding that the intention is to retain the Transition (T) zoning designation on the Zoning Maps, but remove such references in the narrative of the plan. Mr. Pernula said yes, explained that the Zoning Maps contain zones, e.g., D-3(T)D-15, or D-3(T)D15, which automatically assumes sewer systems will be installed, and then those parcels would be rezoned to higher densities after that infrastructure is in place. The Comp Plan Maps are supposed to be forward-looking so it would not be necessary to provide the D-3 designation on the maps in the Comp Plan, rather than just including the D-5 designation. However, because the sewer system would not yet be installed, the Zoning Maps would still provide for the D-3(T)D-15, or D-3(T)D15 zoning designation. Chair Satre said doing so should alleviate confusion people have had in this regard when reviewing the Comp Plan Maps in terms of (T) zoning; Mr. Pernula said that should be true. Mr. Bishop encourages staff to incorporate these changes to the Comp Plan Maps. Mr. Lyman commented that they will discuss (T) zoning in more detail when the PC reviews the Land Use Designation section of Comp Plan.

Mr. Bishop requested staff to revise a section of the first paragraph on page 15 for further clarification in regards to the edited text. Ms. Bennett requested that it be revised to state, "...above or within a garage, or located separately on the property." Mr. Pernula offered to do so.

Mr. Watson referred to Transit Oriented Development (TOD), explaining that at a recent Public Works & Facilities Committee (PWFC) meeting a couple Assembly members became rather animated about concerns over public transit. Therefore, the PC might want to re-review this chapter after they have had a chance to review subsequent chapters of the plan; Mr. Pernula said that's fair.

Ms. Bennett said no mention was made of the draft Willoughby District Land Use Plan (WDLUP) in the second paragraph on page 19 under TOD. Mr. Satre said that paragraph is specifically referencing the 2008 Capital Transit Development Plan. It does not refer to any active plans in place now, but the PC will keep this in mind as further discussion ensue in regards to this topic.

Ms. Bennett referred to page 22 under Suburban and Urban Area Development, stating that the last sentence is an exact duplicate of what is found in another area of the Comp Plan, although she is unable to find the exact location of the first insertion at this time; Mr. Pernula offered to look into this. Ms. Lawfer referred to the same page under 3.1.IA1 to revise the Land Use Code, and asked if they intend to change verbiage in relation to (T) zoning that is already in the ordinance. Chair Satre said the placement of (T) zoning is a "map" issue, so he asked staff if this IA took that into account; Mr. Pernula said it did not, which would be a change where (T) rezones would be implemented by staff and no longer by the PC. Mr. Bishop asked if that would also

require action by the Assembly; Ms. McKibben said it would not as current (T) rezones to higher density are approved by the PC to date. Mr. Pernula added that this proposal is just to have the CDD Director approve (T) rezones in the future and not hold PC hearings on them. He explained that some of the confusion regarding this was when about half of the more recent rezones were completed in North Douglas, but some of them required action by the PC including by the Assembly for parcels that were not previously designated as being (T) zoning, but about half of the other properties were where the PC was able to take action on those.

Chair Satre commented that there would be time provided in the future for the Commissioners to give further input to staff regarding these four chapters as they move forward with their Comp Plan review.

Ms. Bennett referred to the third paragraph on page 25, stating that she found no mention of the access road, port, or Kensington Mine transportation facilities. Chair Satre asked if the verbiage “resource-related industrial development” addresses this, or if Ms. Bennett is requesting additional details to be incorporated. Ms. Bennett said this paragraph also references the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA), which is too brief and does not do justice to all the things that have been accomplished. Chair Satre said he believes the last sentence of this paragraph addresses a whole variety of options that may be available for some of those tracks of New Growth Area, which range from residential to industrial types of development. Ms. Bennett said quite a bit of information is provided on the New Growth Area topic in order to be more factual and explicit about part of Juneau’s economy run by Native corporations, which is minimally discussed throughout the Comp Plan, but this has much more variables than is being mentioned. She was surprised at how much attention was spent on these aspects that have more immediate concern, which is relative to some of the other elements. Chair Satre stated that when the PC later discusses economics, the Commissioners might choose to provide additional details in regard to these aspects.

#### Chapter 4: Housing Element

Ms. McKibben said this chapter provides a general overview in regards to housing. Most of staff’s recommended changes relate to updating statistics. When this plan was updated a couple of years ago, it was done using the 2000 US Census data. Staff had newer census and survey information available to use to try to update the plan, but it proved to be somewhat challenging. She explained that staff was unable to simply update the older census numbers with the new survey and census data, which is why this chapter involved substantial editing. She used a number of resources to edit this chapter, but unfortunately the 2010 Census is not a full report with all the data so the premise of this update is that staff was unable to update much of the information in Chapter 4. The first set of changes have to do with adding new information from the 2008 American Community Survey by the US Census reports that about 4,000 Juneau households spent more than 30% of their income to maintain them in 2008, which means that housing is not affordable in this community. She said 1,350 spent more than 50% of their income on household costs, which is fairly substantial. The 2010 Housing Needs Assessment report states that 38% of Juneau renters and 39% of homeowners do not have affordable housing. Ms. Bennett cited the last sentence in the first paragraph of deleted text on page 28, stating that it is fairly good information that should not be deleted; Ms. McKibben said agreed; and Mr. Pernula said that information should be updated to 2010.

Mr. Watson referred to the third paragraph on page 28, which was edited by staff that states, "In 2010, the average assessed value of a single-family home was \$25,711," but they probably meant \$257,000 or so; Ms. McKibben offered to correct that figure.

She updated the homelessness with the Point in Time Homeless Count to the most recent data compiled in 2012. Ms. Grewe requested staff to incorporate a sentence describing how the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC) identified 183 people as being homeless of the 187 surveyed, including whether those are individuals or families or well-known homeless folks. This should also include if there might be more, or whether that might be a significant undercount of Juneau's total homelessness population, and so on. Ms. McKibben said it probably is because to obtain a Point in Time Homeless Count the AHFC conducted their survey by offering haircuts, and a variety of other service providers handed out information to people who walked in. Ms. Grewe said with that being the case, she requests staff to provide a statement in this paragraph stating how this might likely be an undercount because it was a voluntary survey of the high-risk homeless population. Ms. McKibben noted that Mr. Chaney pointed out that the letter from the Juneau Homeless Coalition in the packet states that the count from 2011 is significantly higher than the 1-day count in 2012, which she referenced in the Comp Plan. Ms. Grewe said the number tends to become unclear when taking into consideration couch surfers, and so on, which is important to include even if it ends up being an over-estimate. Chair Satre said comments are provided in the deleted sections of pages 28 and 29 that reference this topic, but it is good for the PC to make an attempt to acknowledge that this is a grandeur problem. Ms. Lawfer said it should be fairly easy to include data by services that are being provided by St. Vincent de Paul, Gastineau Human Services, and Aware. Where the verbiage states that they provided it in 2006, she wonders if this means that they are no longer doing so any more, or whether the numbers might have changed since then. She referred to page 29, stating that the data from the *2006 Roof Over Every Head in Juneau: Community Plan to End Homelessness* report data was used. That data estimates a need of 300 units of low-income permanent housing, 50 units of supported and transitional housing for youth, and 40 units of supported housing for high-risk and chronically homeless tenants.

Mr. Medina asked what the average rent is for an accessory apartment in Juneau; Ms. McKibben said they do not have that level of detail.

She referred to the Assisted-Housing Inventory section on page 30, stating that the first paragraph was updated with information using the 2010 Juneau Housing Needs Assessment report, which she cited. Ms. Lawfer said the range of "special needs" encompasses behavior health to ADA, which probably needs to be defined; Ms. McKibben offered to research this.

Ms. Lawfer said throughout the chapter it mentions "low-income families," but organizations define this differently so she believes "lower-income housing" might more appropriate instead of stating "homeless and low-income." She explained that some folks might be at the 30% range, and if not, they may be at the 35-40% range but they might not qualify for low-income housing, including other instances where 80% might qualify for Section 8 housing. Chair Satre said he believes there's a big difference in the minds of people between low-income housing versus affordable housing, but as Ms. Lawfer is

stating that they instead are referring to affordable housing. He explained that folks who spend 30-45% of their income for housing might not meet many of those low-income standards. Therefore, as much as they can skew it towards that without getting in the midst of having to define all the definitions and numbers from other organizations, these are good comments for staff to take into consideration. Mr. Medina agrees, but he requests staff to craft a table with those definitions because he struggles with the different levels of housing need types as well. Ms. McKibben stated that the Affordable Housing Commission (AHC) targets market-rate homes of \$250,000 because they found that renters could afford to buy at that price level. However, Juneau has very few homes within that price range so providing them would open up a rental market for people to move up in housing type, and therefore crafting a table might be an appropriate approach.

Ms. Bennett cited the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 30, stating that mobile and manufactured homes in neighborhoods are in need of rehabilitation or redevelopment, which is under-emphasized in terms of the whole issue of affordable housing. Many local trailer parks have dilapidated trailers within them, so she wonders if any attempt was made to regulate this by requiring those people to update that housing type. In addition, they should provide a greater focus on this in the plan because low-income folks often choose mobile or manufactured homes because they're the most affordable, although if they are allowed to run down it might place certain citizens at risk. Chair Satre asked if federal government regulations required restocking of these home types over the years. Mr. Pernula stated that staff does not inspect those existing home types in Juneau now so they do not have a comprehensive review of them, which he would have to research. Chair Satre said lending institutions must have certain requirements for those housing types, including for owners of such parks. Mr. Pernula said he knows that improvements to mobile homes and parks are being proposed all the time, which has included energy efficiency upgrades as well. Mr. Chaney said the existing available new mobile and modular homes are much better than the old style, but Juneau still has a large inventory of those antiquated housing types that are still being used. He believes whole park neighborhoods of these types could be rehabilitated, but the question is who should fund those projects; Chair Satre said it is still important to call these aspects out in the plan. Mr. Watson said mobile and modular homes being termed as affordable is a misnomer because the current space rent runs about \$400/month, including the mortgage payment, which are generally only able to be financed under similar terms as vehicles on a 5-year basis so those loans are generally for >\$25,000 that makes for rather high monthly payments. Some owners of larger mobile and manufactured parks in Juneau have informed him that they have regulations in place now where once a mobile home reaches a certain age they can require it to be removed, which has been done, but he is unable to speak in relation to this about smaller parks. Even so, once the older units are removed, it assists with bringing such parks up to scale.

Chair Satre referred to Table 1: CBJ Housing Distribution by Type on page 31, and asked if an update of the data to this 2005-2006 table is going to be provided; Ms. McKibben said the CDD does not have access to updated information. Ms. Lawfer said it would be great if they were able to address the number of units needed. She explained that where it lists 5,042 single-family dwelling units, it doesn't mean anything unless a person has read all the narrative in relation to that. Ms. McKibben asked if Ms. Lawfer is requesting that some of the earlier information in the plan where the needs are addressed in narrative form for staff to craft that into a table format. Ms. Lawfer said it might be possible to add



an additional column that speaks to the percentage of need; Ms. McKibben said she believes she is able to do this. Chair Satre said he believes such data could be extracted from the Assessor's database, including other parts of the table that requires additional work for changes that have taken place since 2005-2006. Ms. McKibben said certain portions of the table could be updated fairly easily, but others portions will not. Mr. Pernula stated that the CDD used to conduct an annual Vacancy Rate Survey, but since there was a reduction in staff they stopped doing so a couple of years ago, although he could reinstate doing so if it is deemed important by the PC.

Mr. Watson stated that under the "Avg. Assessed Value of Housing" column the problem is that units in Juneau are under-assessed, i.e., the difference between assessed price versus trying to sell units for a higher price, which happens all the time so the average assessed value in many cases understate the real purchase price of property. Furthermore, in terms of the "Vacancy rate" staff might consider contacting the Board of Realtors who have access to all houses sold for the past few years, and only a couple of companies in Juneau handle the majority of rental properties that could provide a good idea of what the local vacancy rate is, which is broken up into segments by geographic area. He noted that vacancy rates are a moving target, as they depend upon the economy. With a tough economy, the vacancy rate increases because homeowners are typically unable to sell their homes so they rent them.

Ms. Grewe stated that the assessed versus market values are problematic for Mr. Watson, but she is compelled to stick with assessed value, which is the method the CBJ uses. In regards to Ms. Lawfer's comments about the need for different housing types, she believes an easy solution is possibly to just list the housing units in order of ascendancy under the "Avg. Assessed Value of Housing" column. She explained that the PC knows that homes of \$250,000 or less are needed in Juneau, which is the affordable range. Anything less would be a bonus, and she does not need to know how many units are needed in each of those categories. Even so, her suggestion might provide more clarity for an at-a-glance reviewer of the plan. She explained that this specific table does not group like units together, but it does like prices, which is what they are supposed to be working towards. Whenever they mention affordable housing, she always comments that she has a 1974 poster hanging in her office of a CBJ Affordable Housing Workshop so they are able to count units since then, but the end product is for homes of \$250,000 or less, which is what the Commissioners need to think about when making decisions.

Mr. Haight said both the "No. of units" and the "Vacancy rate" data are important. Regardless of what type of housing it is, when he views a vacancy rate of 3% that means one thing, but when it is <1% that means something else. Furthermore, the table shows an assessed value of \$865,229 for a multi-family apartment, but he knows that number is not right so he requests that this be revised as a per unit value in order to relate that to other types of housing. Chair Satre agreed, stating that this appears as though it is per a building rather than per a unit type of number.

Ms. Bennett said she agrees with her fellow Commissioners regarding the table as it de-emphasizes what the PC is really working on, so substantial changes have to be incorporated in order for it to appropriately reflect their values of what the Commission is concentrating on in terms of housing. She referred to the third paragraph under Loss of Housing on page 31, stating that the fact has to be included in this portion of the plan that

much of the downtown housing has been pre-empted by businesses, offices, lobbyist, and governmental agencies, which has been ongoing for quite some time. Ms. Grewe added that there has been talk about buildings in the Juneau Downtown Historic District that are deteriorating or being abandoned, so she wonders if there is a method in which they could easily determine how much of the housing stock is locally owned. She explained that since she has served on the PC similar questions such as this have arisen in relation to permits for essentially boarding houses in the upland area of downtown. These issues might not be relevant to the Comp Plan, but it seems as though these are not just issues of deterioration and abandonment of buildings in the downtown area versus changing ownership patterns, so she asked staff if they are able to research these types of aspects. She explained that she is somewhat neutral regarding this, but previous permits have been brought forward regarding this. Mr. Pernula said he is unaware if any type of study that has been conducted in this regard, which might just be general knowledge of what staff anecdotally knows. Even so, if staff does such a study it would require defining the specific area of downtown beforehand, although more costs would be incurred for a larger area.

Chair Satre said the PC would like to see Table 1 updated with usable information by adding a benchmark to the housing units, including vacancy rate data, which will set the stage for the remainder of the chapter.

Ms. McKibben referred to page 32, Table 2 under Housing Production Trends, stating that this was updated by staff using the US Census and community survey to the extent they could. She added rows to the table for 2008 and 2009, including updating the Population numbers. In 2010, she added the Housing Units number from the community survey and US Census data.

She referred to page 33, stating that this section contains fairly substantial changes, and cited the last sentence of newly added verbiage of the first paragraph. She also cited the third paragraph, which is new, stating that she needs to correct a typo from “meeting” to “meet.” Ms. Bennett commented that this update by staff is very commendable. Ms. Lawfer said it is possible that staff might incorporate this type of newly added data into Table 1, including to the \$250,000 or less affordable housing unit cutoff. Ms. McKibben agreed, stating that such information is available and a table would be a great method in which to display such information. Ms. Lawfer added that in terms of rental rate information, what she considers as residential versus seasonal rental data would address some of the issues associated with housing availability in the downtown area. Ms. McKibben said it would be nice if staff had a new census to work from, although she offered to discuss this with people who might know where she might be able to obtain that type of information. Mr. Medina stated that he believes seasonal rentals are subject to sales tax, so the staff might view those City records. Mr. Chaney said the last time he requested to view that data, it was considered confidential and the sales tax staff was very protective of it and reluctant to share any information.

Mr. Watson said the third paragraph mentions the 2010 Juneau Housing Needs Inventory, and he asked if this refers to an overall community need or just low-income and affordable housing needs. Ms. McKibben said that inventory assessed the overall need for homeless people to market-rate housing. Mr. Watson said he believes the numbers of housing needs listed appears to be rather low, but staff should include the verbiage

stating, “overall housing needs.” He explained that the US Coast Guard (USCG) provided a presentation to the Alaska Committee on housing shortages in regards to their concern as a military organization for Juneau’s ability to serve their needs. The USCG currently has eight families with children residing in local hotels for the past three months. He explained that there are many stipulations that property owners place on rental properties, which rule many families out, but there is no method to measure that data. The math makes sense, but when they take into consideration the actual availability of rental property or housing in this community it becomes rather complicated. The situation these families might be experiencing this winter could change when the USCG undergoes their annual transfer in/out of Juneau during April and May of 2012. Ms. Bennett asked to what extent hotels and extended-stay establishments are factored into the rental-housing inventory; Ms. McKibben offered to research whether this is specifically called out in the inventory data.

She referred to the section on the same page titled Adequate Supply of Land for Housing, stating that staff updated the acreage numbers in the first paragraph with property that has been rezoned. She explained that in doing so staff was unsure as to how the original numbers were derived.

Ms. Grewe cited the first sentence of the second paragraph, stating that a question frequently is asked by the public and the Commissioners is whether private or CBJ owned land should be disposed of for housing. Therefore, a table should accompany the narrative of this section so readers are able to at-a-glance see what land is actually vacant in the borough versus what is available for building upon. She believes a common myth by most people is that the CBJ owns a lot of property that should be disposed of for development, which also includes other privately owned acreage. This narrative states there are 847 parcels of a ¼-acre or more in size that are underutilized or vacant. Therefore, a new pie chart might include data, i.e., 847 parcels, less privately owned parcels, which would provide a summation of publicly owned parcels that might be protected as green space, etc., and it would end up with the total number of publicly available acres should the PC choose to go that route. This is in light of the fact that the COW recently reviewed the land management-related ordinance. The PC might also contemplate adding how the borough might participate in encouraging private development because out of 847 parcels only 119 are CBJ owned, so the vast majority is outside of public ownership, and therefore affordable housing is not just a public sector problem, which needs to be reflected in this section. During the recent land disposal and acquisition discussion, she was contemplating just how much disposable land the borough actually owns, but she would like to know what that actual percentage is.

Ms. Lawfer said most of the developable lots range from \$150,000 to \$200,000 in the valley. Another misnomer that should be addressed is that the City has disposed of land in the past, although some of those parcels are not being bid on because they are probably cost-prohibitive, and therefore there is a costs associated with that as well. Chair Satre said this comes into play with the fact that the <\$250,000 for affordable housing is nearly impossible to build unless the concept of a typical house drastically changes in order to meet that threshold. Ms. Lawfer asked staff to craft a paragraph at the end of this section on page 34, which states that there are X amount of vacantly owned parcels with an average assessed value of \$X, so people are able to understand what this means in terms of available disposable land within the borough. Mr. Pernula said when the PC was

updating the Comp Plan in 2006-08 he recalls they mainly concentrated on CBJ owned parcels because they had access to that information in relation to topography, wetlands, soil surveys, etc., which were conducted to determine which sites were readily available. They did not go into great detail on private parcels because they did not have direct access to them, but some of those might have the same limitations that the CBJ parcels have as well. Ms. Lawfer said verbiage should be added that the CBJ plans should address affordable housing, e.g., the draft WDLUP and other City approved plans. Mr. Pernula commented that Juneau has a lack of flat and dry land close to the downtown, so they could partially address this issue by permitting higher densities and mixed uses in commercial zones, which will be discussed later this evening.

Chair Satre suggested that the Commissioners shelve the discussion on final section of Chapter 4 regarding their review of the IAs and SOPs to a subsequent meeting in order to review Text Amendment that staff is proposing, which may pertain to those IAs and SOPs of the Comp Plan. Ms. Lawfer requested staff to invite the AFC and the Juneau Economic Development Council (JEDC) to provide input regarding the IAs and SOPs beforehand in regards to the affordable housing issue. Ms. McKibben said Scott Ciambor, who was the staff person for the AFC before he moved on, reviewed Chapter 4 and did not provide specific recommendations for changes to the IAs beyond addressing the Affordable Housing Fund so it was of his opinion that they were still fairly relevant, which is the reason she did not incorporate many changes to them, but staff did not provide this to the JEDC. Ms. Grewe requested staff to provide this to the JEDC who is still in the affordable housing business as a council of the borough, so she wants them on the record regarding anything housing related for the Comp Plan. Ms. McKibben said JEDC staffs the AFC. Ms. Grewe said she understands, but stressed that if CBJ funds are being provided to JEDC to conduct affordable housing work they should be weighing in and commenting on the Comp Plan. However, they have not and are absent most of the time, so she does not know what the CBJ is doing with those funds that are being paid to them when they are not in attendance for decision-making reasons on affordable housing issues. Therefore, as a Commissioner and a prior board member of the JEDC, she is disappointed with them. Even if the Comp Plan is presented to them, and whether they do or do not respond she wants that on the record. Chair Satre said there are other organizations in this community that should provide input on the Comp Plan as well, so staff should ensure that it is circulated to them.

**BREAK:** 8:28 - 8:39 p.m.

Public testimony – None provided

Commission discussion - None

Staff recommendation: That the PC provide direction on the question of whether Transit Oriented Corridors (TOC), Transit Oriented Nodes (TON), or a combination thereof are more appropriate development models for Juneau.

Furthermore, staff requests that the PC provide direction on how potential nodes should be selected, if the TON model is recommended; that is, does the Commission favor utilizing a node choice model that is based on existing transit service or one that is based on planned or potential

transit service? Staff recommends a hybridized approach that connects select TON sites with ¼ mile radius TOC, as well as placing a ¼ mile radius TON at the Douglas Community Building.

Commission action - Noted throughout the discussion

**AME20120002**

An Ordinance to increase residential density limits and amend the Table of Dimensional Standards (TDS).

Applicant: CBJ Community Development

Location: Boroughwide

Staff report

Mr. Lyman referred to the Descriptions of Land Use Categories document. He explained that during the recent Atlin Drive rezone case, there was confusion about what zones were allowed to be in a certain land use designations within the Comp Plan. When people apply for permits, staff refers to zoning districts to regulate various land uses within certain zones. They also have the Comp Plan land use designations that are slightly ephemeral, so they found that when that case was reviewed they were required to be more absolute. He requested the Commissioners to review this document and think about the zoning designations staff added to the end of certain land use designations to determine whether they are appropriate.

When a land use designation in the Comp Plan Maps has the same name as a zoning designation on the Zoning Maps it leads to quite a bit of confusion. He would like authorization by the PC to change the labels on the existing Comp Plan Maps so the cartographer is able to start working on them, but no changes will be made to the boundaries. He is proposing to change Mixed Use (MU) in the Comp Plan to Urban (U) to remove confusion, to which the PC agreed. Mr. Bishop asked if there are any MU areas in the borough not within a U area. Mr. Lyman explained that in the Comp Plan the Mendenhall Mall area is under the MU designation, which is a document that looks to the future, and the vision for the Mendenhall Mall area is that it will be a U center of the valley.

He provided a couple TOD aspects in relation to land use designations, which he'll speak to later on, depending upon whether there is time to do so tonight or he would wait to present those options at a subsequent meeting.

He provided information on possibly omitting (T) areas, e.g., in certain zoning districts they currently have D-1(T)D-10 so when sewer services are installed in such areas the PC is able to rezone those parcels to D-10, but rezoning to D-5 or D-15, etc. requires Assembly action. However, (T) areas do not make much sense in the Comp Plan, which are more aspirational in nature. Staff recommends, e.g., in the Comp Plan where it states Urban Low-Density Residential (ULDR) (T) Medium-Density Residential (MDR), staff is requesting that those be changed to MDR because they are not rezoning such parcels until sewer is installed where it tells them to do so in the future per the Zoning Maps. Mr. Watson said standard complaints are often presented, e.g., that parcels zoned D-1(T)D-10 are assessed under D-10 zoning, so people have stated that they do not want their property rezoned to D-10 because they have no intentions of developing it, but he realizes that the CDD or the PC are unable to solve this problem. This also has come into play when builders subdivide parcels then they immediately have to pay higher taxes on them. He realizes pending legislation is taking place in regards to this, but it is still unclear as to whether it's truly going to solve these problems. Mr. Lyman said assessment has some relation

to rezoning of the districts. From his discussions with the Assessor's office, he was told that they do not look at the lot size, and instead they, e.g., look at the lot, which has a residence on it so they can reasonably expect that this is what they will have in the future. He can see the concern if it is a small property that couldn't be subdivided, i.e., a D-3 parcel that is unable to have additional development but it gets rezoned to D-15, and then maybe their single-family home does not fit well in that zoning district, which is a type of aspect they would have to deal with through the public process. On the other hand, if they are talking about large chunks of D-1 properties where the City installs sewer would speak to why the borough has undeveloped properties. He explained that if someone is perfectly happy sitting on 50 acres of property adjacent to urban services, and it takes rezoning such property from D-1 to D-15 in order to change the economic picture to get them to develop it or sell it to someone who will, maybe that's the answer they are looking for. He asked if the PC has any comments or concern about the idea of eliminating (T) areas from the Comp Plan Maps, and leaving them in the Zoning Maps. Chair Satre said the PC agrees to do so as long as it is extremely clear to property owners when they view the Comp Plan Maps, as there have been ongoing complaints the PC has heard in the past that they were confused in regards to (T) areas because it was their understanding that those properties would always have the initial zoning; Mr. Lyman offered to do so.

Mr. Lyman explained that with the Atlin Drive case he mentioned earlier it has a GC land use designation in the Comp Plan Maps, which was intended to also include Light Commercial (LC), but the GC name is confusing to many. Therefore, staff recommends deleting GC and renaming it so it simply has a Commercial (C) designation. In addition, the Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial (HC/LI) is fairly cumbersome, and they already have LI area in the Costco and Home Depot area, and so on, and therefore they probably do not need to call out HC. Similarly, staff suggests they also change HI/Industrial (IND) to HI. Staff is not proposing to change any text at this point, just the labels on the maps for these areas, to which the PC agreed. He explained that there are both Marine Waterfront Commercial (MWC) and Waterfront Commercial (WC) land use designations so staff intends to change both of them to Marine Commercial (MC), to which the PC agreed.

He explained that the reason staff is requesting to increase densities is because Juneau lacks flat and dry developable land within easy reach of urban services. This includes infill development to get more residential units on the market by providing urban services more efficiently to denser development if residential areas are closer to other destinations, which will open up new modes of transportation. There are efficiencies due to denser construction that would provide that mobilization, site preparation, exterior wall, and roof costs are going to be the same for given buildings so the more units within buildings where they are able to spread those costs out, which is extensively supported in the Comp Plan.

Some of the opportunities include the existing linear MU development along the backbones of Glacier and Douglas Highways, including that there is already transit service along those areas, which have a very high demand for housing. The obstacles include low height limitations in most zones, parking requirements that developers continually complain about, and few developers undertake MU development opportunities. Financing of MU development is incredibly complicated, as commercial lending tends to be a completely separate process than residential. Therefore, if it is possible for developers to show the bankers that they have permits, it might be easier for them to obtain financing. There are relatively low residential limits in most local zones. He found that Portland and Seattle refer to 20 dwelling units per acre as the lowest multi-family zoning district they have so all other zoning is denser, but Juneau mainly has D-18

being 18 units per acre. Therefore, it is interesting that the highest density limit in Juneau for most zones is below the lowest multifamily zoning designation for those communities.

Zoning strategies include TOC and TON, which they will come back to later during the Comp Plan discussion. They can increase building height and density, and reduce parking requirements within a .25 and .5 mile of transit in appropriate zones. They can offer bonuses for height density increases and parking reductions where they are not currently offered outright. In terms of the increased height and density limits in appropriate zones, that is where LC and GC happen to generally be located within a mile of Juneau's transit corridors. Therefore, without having to adopt a TOC overlay, bonus system, or special regulations, they can reach increased height and density limits in such zones simply by changing some of the other regulations for them. He referred to an existing frequent transit service slide with a .25 mile buffer around it that provides ½-hour or more frequent service, which also shows a couple of breaks in service (attachment G). There are GC designated parcels in downtown, areas around the Mike Hatch Jeep Eagle dealership in North Douglas, more by the hospital, quite a bit in Lemon Creek, Fred Meyer, and Mendenhall Valley, including a bit more in Auke Bay. There are LC designated parcels in the Mendenhall Mall area, Lemon Creek, downtown, including a bit more in downtown Douglas. All of those parcels are within a .25-mile radius of transit service, except for the Mike Hatch Jeep Eagle parcel and some neighboring property.

He referred to the chart on page 4, stating that gradually increasing maximum allowable residential density provides for a smoother transition from less-dense to more-dense neighborhoods, as well as improving conformance to existing zoning districts. By increasing the maximum allowable density of LC from 18 to 30 dwelling units per acre, GC from 18 to 50, and MU2 from 60 to 80 they all fit much better in relation to the curve shown on the chart by reaching  $R^2 = 0.9305$ . He said the question is, "should the LC or GC zoning district be home to more residents?" Currently, LC has 277 and GC has 284 lots with roughly the same amount of area between them of 291 and 281 acres, respectively. They also have 478 and 194 dwelling units, respectively. They are clearly seeing much more development in LC than GC, with an average development density of 1.6 in LC and .67 dwelling units in GC per acre, with height limits of 45' in GC and 35' in LC, so they could essentially have the same numbers in terms of dwelling units between these two zones. He noted that WC is not listed on this chart, which is discussed elsewhere in the code, so when he re-presents this draft ordinance before the PC he will add this as a line item to eliminate confusion, which they have been treating as 18 dwelling units per acre. He explained that they have ended up with much more development in LC than in GC, and in either case they have not approached the current 18 dwelling units per acre density limit throughout the borough. The LC zone is intended to provide a buffer between, e.g., D-5 and other more intense uses. A recent LC development off of Jordan Avenue and Trout Street abuts a D-5 residential neighborhood with GC and Industrial across the street, but those neighbors in D-5 zoning were not happy with the type of uses that are permitted in LC because they counted on the initial zoning remaining as a buffer between them and more intense development. GC provides buffering between Industrial and LC zones, and less frequently abuts single-family residential neighborhoods. He provided slides of existing dense development in the downtown area (attachment A) of the Mt. Roberts Apartments on Gastineau Avenue designed for mud to flow underneath, which was developed at 38 dwelling units per acre. On Channel View, there is a St. Vincent de Paul development project at 49 dwelling units per acre, even with a large parking area, that has about a 27% occupancy, which they will review further this evening. The MacKinnon Apartments are developed at 108 dwelling units per acre, and they own a parking lot on adjacent property they lease to REACH that is not provided for tenants of

the apartment building. Therefore, even if the CBJ requires parking for certain development projects, the property owner is not required to provide that parking to their tenants, which he requested the Commissioners to keep in mind during this discussion. The six-unit Jensen Apartment building on the corner of 6<sup>th</sup> and Franklin has 107 dwelling units per acre constructed on the property lines with only on-street parking. The Marine View Center has 142 dwelling units per acre with a two-level parking garage, and houses retail, offices, and apartments. The Mendenhall Tower Apartment building has 371 dwelling units per acre with apartments, a barber shop, offices, and a two-story parking garage behind it so that has fairly dense development.

Mr. Watson asked why the CBJ occupies apartment space in the Marine View Center. Mr. Pernula said it was available space when the CBJ needed it that the Municipal Building could not provide, so the City leased two floors in the Marine View Center. These floors are obviously configured for apartments although they altered the plans by moving walls, but initially there were 12 apartments on each floor.

Mr. Lyman referred to the memorandum, dated March 12, 2012, on draft parking requirements for multifamily residences with Universal design in the Blue Folder. During his discussions with Craig Moore, Vice President of Planning and Development at Tlingit-Haida Regional Housing Authority (T-HRHA), who referred staff to the Federal Fair Housing Act Design and Construction Requirements at 24 CFR 100.205; Charlie Ford, Building Official, proposed using the definition of Type A units in ICC A117.1, a standard that the CBJ Building Inspectors and Plan Reviewers are already familiar with, including that it is identical to the Fair Housing Act requirements. The standards for Type A Accessible units are already adopted into CBJ Title 19, so the Building Code is where they apply no less than 2% of units in multifamily dwellings with more than 20 units. Therefore, cross-referencing to this standard in CBJ Title 49 would be a fairly simple means of incorporating a level of accessibility by design into projects. He explained that Type A units are fully accessible that do not have roll-in showers. He also spoke to Dan Austin, General Manager of the St. Vincent de Paul about this, including that he recently received an email from Southeast Alaskans for Independent Living (SAIL) regarding this as well. SAIL is concerned that doing so would result in degradation of accessibility for people who are mobility impaired. Many people who experience disabilities drive vehicles or have caretakers or family members who do, and therefore that was not the appropriate medium to look at. They understood his general reasoning, but he agrees that in doing so he did not provide a strong correlation between persons with disabilities or mobility impairments and vehicle ownership. Instead, the correlation is about income, so he attempted to provide for more accessible units that could be constructed more affordably at market rate. He spoke to Mr. Austin further about what might work, so he provided a new recommendation per this memorandum on page 2. In order for particular units to have tax credits applied to qualify for financing through the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation or the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the property owners are required to sign a legal document stating they would monitor the income eligibility of their tenants between 30 and 60 years. He explained that typically a 30-year agreement is required for offsite parking by CDD. Mr. Austin indicated that if a property manager failed to maintain income eligibility requirement records, he faced what he called a ‘draconian bureaucracy,’ i.e., if a property owner were to miss income eligibility requirements and four annual audits of rent and income receipts for tenants, they would have much more to worry about than the local parking requirement. He cited the 3-13-12 Recommendation listed on attachment B, which he handed out to the PC, stating that it is not a per unit parking requirement as he originally proposed because multifamily parking requirements vary depending upon the number of dwelling units. Therefore, he states that “1/2 the parking



requirement for multifamily units as required by geographic area and number of bedrooms” in the revised recommendation. This provides a mechanism for the City not to have to monitor deed restrictions or compliance with the City by having to add another layer of oversight, which is what they have struggled with for a long time in terms of affordable housing.

[9:11 p.m.: Ms. Bennett disconnected via teleconference.]

Mr. Bishop asked if parking requirements in areas not located in downtown correlate to the numbers in the table for those structures as well. In addition, whether the proposal staff is presenting was based on national standards. Mr. Lyman referred to page 7 of the March 8, 2012 memorandum in relation to AME20120002, stating that three parking requirement factors are for Development Density and Design, Demographics, and Abolish Requirements, which were provided via a national publication titled *Parking Spaces, Community Places* published by the Environmental Protection Agency. Under the section titled Development Density and Design, it states, “Research shows that each time residential density doubles, auto ownership falls by 32 to 40 percent.” This is not in relation to an apartment building in the middle of suburbs, but when future density is placed near existing density than they have a more walkable-, pedestrian-, bicycle-, and transit-friendly neighborhood where people do not need to use vehicles so much. Therefore, the reduction in parking staff is proposing would only be for units locked in as being affordable housing.

[9:19 p.m.: Ms. Bennett reconnected via teleconference.]

Mr. Pernula asked Mr. Lyman if the proposed parking reductions would be further cumulative, e.g., they already provided a reduction for single-room occupancy (SRO), including in the PD-1 zone for a 60% reduction as well. Mr. Lyman said his intention is to not allow for such “double-dipping,” which relates to TOD and TON per the Comp Plan. He explained that if they eventually adopt a Transit-Oriented overlay zoning district where developers are able to obtain certain bonuses, they are not going to want those bonuses to further increase residential densities in the LC and GC zones where they are going to presumably increase in the near future anyway. Therefore, perhaps when they come across those density bonuses, they would exclude LC and GC projects or reduce the amount they could receive, e.g., they might allow for one reduction or the other, but not both.

Chair Satre stated that the PC believes staff is on the right track, but they still have to review what all the potential complexities are moving forward.

Mr. Lyman referred to attachment C of the draft TDS, stating that it contains typos due to an Excel glitch not working with superscript, which he’ll correct before it’s incorporated into the ordinance, i.e., the minimum lot width in the D-10 SF zoning district is not over 300,000 square feet. His focus was mainly on MU2 based on the draft WDLUP, and then LC and GC. He noticed within the MU2 that they have a 5,000 square foot minimum lot size but only 2,000 square feet are required in commercial and industrial zones, and he was unable to figure out why they thought they needed such large lots. However, when he calculated the minimum lot width of 50’ and a depth of 80’, he thought the lot size should be changed to 4,000 square feet, and then he rationalized the numbers a bit. If they are looking at re-development in the MU2 area, it seems as though they should provide the right lot size in the TDS before that happens. This is so they do not have to deal with variances or changing the code in mid-process. Furthermore, other planning staff pointed out that the MU zone also has a 5,000 square foot minimum lot size,

which does not agree with its minimum dimensions of 50' by 80' either, so it's another aspect staff would change in the TDS. He asked if the Commissioners had any strong feelings in regards to this; Mr. Bishop said he prefers that they match. Mr. Lyman said in reference to that, in the MU2 zone is where they currently allow 60 dwelling units per acre, and the minimum lot size is 5,000 square feet, which is nearly 1/10<sup>th</sup> of an acre so they could potentially provide for six dwelling units on that minimum lot size, but the TDS requires 7,500 for a duplex, which is enough area for about eight or 10 dwelling units in the MU2 zone. This doesn't make sense either so he recommends they delete that cell, and he also does not want to include a minimum lot size for duplexes in the MU2 zone.

In terms of height limitations listed in the TDS for MU2, LC, and GC zones, he is proposing to increase the height limit of each of them by 10'. The MU2 zone has the ability to go from 35' to 45' with a height bonus, as the recent State, Library, Archives and Museum (SLAM) project did in addition to going through the variance process. In the draft WDLUP, there are a couple of small areas, i.e., the back side of the village where they are contemplating a 25' height limitation, but if those lands are Native Deed restricted than the City doesn't have any say over how tall those buildings are. He noted that many of those are being purchased by the T-HRHA or Brad Cure who redevelops them, which is when they lose that protected status and are subject to CBJ regulations. This was discussed at previous meetings, and it is his understandings that there is a concern about maintaining a lower height limit for the backside of the village in order to not provide undue pressure towards gentrification. Therefore, if other buildings could be taller, more people might want to buy those properties to redevelop them so he does not see what they would be gaining by providing that area with a 25' height limitation, including limiting one strip of housing to two stories when everyone else is allowed to go higher. He recommends that they just go to a 45' height limit in MU2 zones, and then restrict where bonuses could be applied beyond that, which the PC would be able to review on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Pernula commented that he intends to discuss these aspects with people in the area. Chair Satre asked if the Commissioners are in general agreement with this recommendation, the Commissioners nodded in the affirmative.

Mr. Chaney commented that he has been involved in the staff recommendation for building height and density increases, which is sort of like "stealth rezoning" because they would be changing the nature and character about what could later be done in these zones. However, he feels somewhat uneasy because property owners tend to be concerned about rezones, especially in zones adjacent to them, and the audience is nearly empty at this meeting tonight. He believes that if they sent out individual meeting notices to adjacent property owners stating that zones next to them are going to double or triple in density and possibly allow for the addition of one or more stories, they probably would have received more reaction. Therefore, he does not know how to get those individuals to attend outside of conducting a major rezone, but it would be best if the PC encourages people to get the word out that they are considering these aspects.

Chair Satre said the PC is still seeking a bit of direction, and he is looking forward to viewing the map of the GC overlay, including determining what 55' buildings might look like in other areas where there are none, which the PC will take into consideration as they move forward with this review. Some of the basic goals the PC has been talking about for quite a while were to find methods in which to increase density, and allowing for taller buildings assist in doing so, including that the PC was provided letters in the meeting packets regarding this. In terms of how they might get the public to attend and provide comments prior to changes being made to the

TDS and before permits are being reviewed in regards to properties adjacent to them, the Commissioners will have to see what they can do.

Ms. Grewe referred to the Existing Residential Development LC and GC Zoning Districts slide, noting that at the bottom it states that even if they made changes there might not be any development forthcoming. She requested to read that specific verbiage again because she agrees with Mr. Chaney that in some ways what is being proposed is “stealth rezoning.” At the same time, she believes the PC needs to increase density and a method to do so is by increasing building height in certain zones, although she does not know how many applications might be forthcoming, which is when members of the public are going to show up.

Mr. Lyman stated that if they have current limits of 18 dwellings units per acre, and the current residential development in LC is 1.6 dwelling units per acre with the current residential development on GC at .67 dwelling units per acre, they are not close to approaching what they are currently calling for in the Comp Plan. Therefore a question he has been posing to architects, developers, property owners and managers, including anyone else who might be able to objectively inform him, is whether this is going to make any difference at all. The responses he has received is that unless they go to a limit of at least 30 dwelling units per acre they will not foresee multifamily development in the commercial zones because “it won’t pencil out.” He noted that an individual is in attendance at this PC meeting who has been working on such a project for St. Vincent de Paul, so if the PC were to incorporate the recommended changes that would entirely change Mr. Austin’s proposed project. He does not want to make it sound as though staff is recommending these changes boroughwide for one project, but that specific project is indicative of what developers are facing. When he spoke to for-profit developers, they stated that they have to think about this further, although should they make those recommended modifications it would change everything. However, people do not build to every bottleneck; rather they tend to build to the first bottleneck, and if that’s to parking, density, or height then that limits everything else. Therefore, if they are able to expand those bottlenecks to allow what the Comp Plan states that they should be having built, the borough will obtain some development, which is more than none that they are seeing right now.

Ms. Bennett recalls the large crowd in attendance at previous PC meetings in regards to the new floodplain maps, so she wonders if a little ingenuity in advertising might assist in increasing attendance by property owners if they were better informed about what’s at stake; Chair Satre said they would have to be creative in order to do so. Mr. Lyman said this item was listed on the Agenda and posted in *The Juneau Empire* in the middle of February 2012, and that took place once again for this PC meeting. He noted that a reporter for *The Juneau Empire* is present tonight, was and that he hoped that there would be an article in the local newspaper about this because it is a really important project. He explained that the notices were also sent to all the neighborhood associations in Juneau, and not a single one contacted staff. They could put a 500’ radius around every LC or GC zoned property for notices, but that would take a while and be a fairly onerous undertaking for staff. Even so, there is not much they can do if people do not read notices or the packet material. Chair Satre added that through the public process is when the PC will make a recommendation to the Assembly who will enact an ordinance, so there are multiple levels that take place in the processes beforehand. Ms. Lawfer said the average person should be informed of what these differences would mean by staff providing comparisons of what they have now versus what a development might look like in the future.

Mr. Medina asked where GC zoning is located in the Auke Bay area. Mr. Lyman said the four properties immediately after the Mendenhall Back Loop Road on the uphill side heading out the road, which consists of the power company, the UAS Bookstore, and Squire's Rest.

Ms. Grewe stated that Mr. Lyman started his presentation by noting that no matter what they do for affordable housing they are still really conservative in their methods and tools compared to other places. At the same time, although this is true those other places are metropolitan, and she would say that Juneau is barely urban in character comparison. However, they are nonetheless conservative, but at the same time making decisions about these types of activities is difficult for a small town where they know people. She knows that people would eventually state that they did not understand or read the notices or the packet material, although it seems that they have spent hours discussing what they should do and how they should present it to the public, and yet they are still likely way more conservative than any other urban community on the west coast. She thinks Mr. Lyman has done a great job rationalizing the decision that the PC needs to make, and he provided an analytical type of approach to making decisions so doing so could be fair and equitable.

Chair Satre commented that the PC has to move forward, but there is general agreement among the Commissioners who have been involved with these issues for a quite some time that density, height, and parking recommendations they are working on are in line with the intentions of the PC.

Mr. Watson said the PC is tasked with looking to the future to ensure Juneau remains a viable community. Once the draft WDLUP moves further along there will be more interest, but the PC has to lay the groundwork beforehand in order to receive feedback from the public.

Mr. Haight referred to the draft TOC Map (attachment G) of the March 8, 2012 memorandum, and requested that when the Commissioners review that in the future staff should make an attempt to provide some type of visualization as to what the impact might be on the LC and GC zones to adjacent residential areas.

#### Public testimony

Wayne Jensen, 1210 Second Street, Douglas, said Mr. Lyman did an excellent job explaining the situation. He is testifying in support of increasing the density and building height requirements in the commercial zones, which is very appropriate and consistent with the current Comp Plan and hopefully after it undergoes the present review process. He is the Chair of the Alaska Committee, which is one of the other City-sponsored organizations, and although his primary interest is in support of allowing for more affordable housing these changes could potentially also increase housing opportunities for the USCG, as Mr. Watson mentioned, and for other seasonal housing needs such as for the legislature and the UAS student housing, including elderly and low- or lower-income types of housing. This is a great opportunity to make efficient use of the land in the LC and GC zones, which he supports. He has been working with St. Vincent de Paul on a specific project, and with these changes he believes that project would become viable. Right now that project has reached maximum density, so if these changes were passed it would allow for a considerable amount of additional development for that area. He explained that Mr. Austin has stated that with financial support to construct low- or lower-income, senior, or special-needs housing that there are still some subsidies for those types of rent, but if those start to go away the next solution is to try to develop housing that people can afford without a subsidy. Therefore, in order to do so they would have to construct more

efficient and smaller housing using less land, which he also supports. Some of the constraints he views in developing affordable housing are too low density and building height and higher parking requirements that the PC is contemplating changing. He believes there is a relationship between parking, senior housing and SRO, and he would like the PC to potentially consider “double-dipping” as explained earlier. If they were to do so, he does not think that will place a burden on the rest of that particular neighborhood because those projects were developed in commercial zones next to transit corridors and other services so those people don’t need as much access to parking.

Public testimony was closed.

#### Commission discussion

Mr. Bishop stated that it is economically in the developer’s best interest to provide for adequate parking for their structures, so the PC should be aggressive in their reduction to parking. Chair Satre added that he believes the PC has been appropriately cautious so far in relaxing parking restrictions in certain cases, which has appeared to work.

Staff recommendation: That the PC provide staff direction on the proposed changes to the TDS, CBJ 49.25.400 so as to raise base height limits in the LC, GC, and MU2 zoning districts by ten feet. Staff also recommends that the PC provide staff direction on the proposed changes to the Density Table at CBJ 49.25.500, which would increase residential density limits from 18 dwelling units per acre in both the LC and GC zones to 30 and 50 dwelling units per acre, respectively, and in the MU2 zone from 60 dwelling units per acre to 80 dwelling units per acre.

Staff further requests that the PC provide guidance on how to address parking requirements for particular types of multi-family housing, particularly the elderly and low-income elderly.

Commission action - Noted throughout the discussion

#### Transit Oriented Development

Chair Satre requested that this item be continued to the next meeting, to which the PC agreed.

**VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - None

**IX. REGULAR AGENDA** - None

**X. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT** - None

**XI. OTHER BUSINESS** - None

**XII. DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

#### Upcoming meetings

Mr. Pernula stated that the packet contains material for the upcoming COW meeting for further review of the Comp Plan, which will be held on March 20, 2012 at 5:00 p.m. in the Assembly Chambers. The provided chapters have very few changes, but the PC did not complete their review of the policies in Chapter 4 (pages 35-40) that they were going over tonight. Therefore, the upcoming COW next week is when he would like the PC to finish that policy review of Chapter 4, and then review the remaining chapters. The COW might also wish to later follow up

on what was discussed tonight in terms of increased density and building height, and parking reduction requirements.

#### Draft Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for FYs '13 - '18

He provided the PC a draft CIP list of projects for FYs '13 - '18 in the packet, which will be presented to the Assembly for approval on April 11, 2012. He intends to provide this to the PC at the March 27, 2012 meeting, and if they are unable to fully review the draft CIP then they also have the April 10, 2012 meeting, which is just the day before it's due. Chair Satre stressed that he wants to ensure that the draft CIP is reviewed prior to the end of the March 27, 2012 PC meeting, as he does not prefer to wait until April 10, 2012. Mr. Pernula commented that another option is to hold a special meeting on April 3, 2012, but the PC could make such a determination after the March 27, 2012 meeting.

#### Status update of the CDD participation in the Home Show

Chair Satre requested an update of CDD's activities at the recent Home Show. Mr. Pernula said many people visited the CDD booth that asked questions about various permits and rezonings. Staff made a presentation on accessory apartments from a Building Inspector's perspective, including from a zoning standpoint. Chair Satre said he heard that the CDD booth was well attended, and there was a request for the accessory apartment presentation to be provided once again. He said the presence of the CDD at the Home Show over the years has been very important for staff, the PC, and local folks, which he appreciates.

### **XIII. REPORT OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

Mr. Watson said the PWFC met yesterday and Mr. Pernula already covered the most important topic. There was also a discussion on bus shelters in relation to the City gaining access to the State Department of Transportation rights-of-way.

[The February 6, 2012 PWFC meeting minutes were provided by staff to the PC for their perusal.]

### **XIV. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

Mr. Watson requested staff to provide an update to the PC at a subsequent meeting on any forthcoming projects they foresee. He explained that he keeps hearing that no development is taking place, but at the Home Show he spoke to several developers who stated that they are very busy, which might consist of projects that staff are potentially approving at the CDD level, rather than bringing them forward for PC approval.

### **XV. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Watson, to adjourn the PC meeting.*

There being no objection, it was so ordered and the PC meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.