

MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Michael Satre, Chair

REGULAR MEETING
September 11, 2012

I. ROLL CALL

Chairman, Michael 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 pm.

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

Commissioners Absent: None

A quorum was present

Staff Present: Greg Chaney, Planning Manager; Beth McKibben, Senior Planner; Eric Feldt, Planner II, Crystal Hitchings, Planner I

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- August 28, 2012 – Regular Planning Commission meeting

Chair Satre informed the members that the minutes are not ready to be approved yet as corrections need to be made.

He noted a minor change to the agenda; after the Consent Agenda, Variance 2012-0015 under Board of Adjustment will be discussed, after which, they would talk about Comprehensive Plan under Consideration of Ordinances and Resolutions.

Mr. Medina asked about Variance 2012-0017, that is on the Consent Agenda, but is a Board of Adjustment item.

Chair Satre replied that typically, when a variance is on the Consent Agenda, everything is taken up as one motion without having to do the mechanics of Board of Adjustment.

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

IV. **PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON REPORT** – There was no report from Mr. Smith.

V. **RECONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS** -

VI. **CONSENT AGENDA**

Chairman Satre announced the items on the agenda and inquired if there was any public comment. The public had no comments and PC members had no questions.

MOTION: by Mr. Miller that the PC approves the Consent Agenda, as presented.

There being no objection, it was so ordered and USE2012 0007, VAR2012 0017 and USE2012 0014 were approved, as presented.

USE2012 0007

New Snow Removal Equipment Facility (SREF) for the Juneau Airport.

Applicant: City & Borough of Juneau.
Location: 1873 Shell Simmons Drive.

Staff Recommendation: that the Planning Commission adopt the Director’s analysis and findings and grant the requested Conditional Use Permit. The permit would allow the development of a Snow Removal Equipment Facility at the JIA with the following condition:

- 1) If a variance to reduce the parking requirement is denied, the applicant shall redesign the project to meet the requirement. The Director may require additional review by the Planning Commission.

VAR2012 0017

A Variance for parking reduction was proposed Airport Snow Removal Equipment Facility associated with USE2012 0007.

Applicant: City & Borough of Juneau.
Location: 1873 Shell Simmons Drive.

Staff Recommendation: that the Board of Adjustment adopt the Director’s analysis and findings and approve the requested Variance, VAR2012 0017. The Variance permit would allow for the parking requirement to be reduced from 109 to 73 for a proposed Snow Removal Equipment Facility.

USE2012 0014

A Conditional Use permit for an accessory apartment not served by city sewer.

Applicant: Constellation Development, LLC.
Location: 20015 Cohen Drive.

Staff Recommendation: that the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and grant the requested Conditional Use permit. The permit would allow the development of a 600 square foot accessory apartment on the second floor of a single family dwelling on a lot that is not served by public sewer.

Chairman Watson adjourned the Planning Commission and reconvened as the Board of Adjustment.

VII. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

VAR2012 0015

A variance to allow a new lot to be created with a driveway backing out onto a minor arterial that does not meet D1 lot size standard and allows back-out parking.

Applicant: Dale A. Whitney.
Location: Mendenhall Loop Road.

Staff Report

Crystal Hitchings, Land Use Planner with the Community Development Department, presented the staff report for the PC. She noted that this is a variance to CBJ Standard 49.40.130(b). The applicant recently submitted separately from this variance request, a minor subdivision application to create two new lots from one existing parent lot. One of the proposed lots which is the subject of this variance request will be a corner lot with frontage on both Mendenhall Loop Road and McGinnis Road and contains an existing home and driveway. She said that a grant of the variance is necessary to allow the existing driveway to remain in place to serve one of those subdivided lots. The Land Use Code Section 49.40.130(b) sets access criteria for subdivided land involving frontage directly on a minor arterial. The standard states that access onto minor arterials are allowed only when certain conditions are met. She displayed the pertinent conditions on the screen. All of the resulting lots must comply with D1 zoning district lot area standards and a parking area of sufficient size to provide minimum parking and maneuvering area to prevent back-out parking must be provided on the lot. The proposed new corner lot with frontage on Mendenhall Loop Road will be just over a quarter of the required minimum lot size and does not provide adequate maneuvering area on the site to prevent back-out parking onto the Mendenhall Loop Road. She presented a map and a photo to explain the aerial and street views from different perspectives.

Staff Recommendation: The proposal does not meet the variance criteria. Staff recommends that the Board of Adjustment adopt the Director's analysis and findings and deny the requested variance to CBJ § 49.40.130(b), and require that the existing access along Mendenhall Loop Road be closed and that access to the proposed new lot be provided from McGinnis Drive.

The approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. That the relaxation applied for or a lesser relaxation specified by the Board of Adjustment would give substantial relief to the owner of the property involved and be more consistent with justice to other property owners.

2. That relief can be granted in such a fashion that the intent of this title will be observed and the public safety and welfare be preserved.
3. That the authorization of the Variance will not injure nearby property.
4. That the Variance does not authorize uses not allowed in the district involved.
5. That compliance with the existing standards would:
 - (A) Unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permissible principal use;
 - (B) Unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property in a manner which is consistent as to scale, amenities, appearance or features, with existing development in the neighborhood of the subject property;
 - (C) Be unnecessarily burdensome because unique physical features of the property render compliance with the standards unreasonably expensive;
 - (D) Because of preexisting nonconforming conditions on the subject parcel the grant of the Variance would not result in a net decrease in overall compliance with the Land Use Code, CBJ Title 49, or the building code, CBJ Title 19, or both.
6. That a grant of the Variance would result in more benefits than detriments to the neighborhood.

Mr. Watson asked about the September 6th e-mail from Robert Murphy where he cites an improvement project for the Mendenhall Loop Road.

Ms. Hitchings replied that she did not know much about it except that she did request them to comment on the project and they have met with DOT and discussed specifically closing access points such as this where alternative access exists.

Mr. Miller queried what the street and side yard setbacks would be if access can only be had from McGinnis and a new driveway were to be put down. He also asked if the applicant could alter the structure to gain access from a different angle.

Ms. Hitchings stated that they have 20 feet on the street and 13 feet on the side.

Mr. Miller stated that was not enough to drive a car.

Mr. Haight referred to a map that Ms. Hitchings had referenced to earlier. He questioned whether Mendenhall Loop Road was the only access for those properties with driveways coming in.

Ms. Hitchings replied that there was one on the corner of El Camino as well.

Mr. Chaney commented that the as-built survey is Attachment C in the packet provided.

Chair Satre called for the applicant to come forward, sign in his name and address, and explain the project.

Public Testimony:

Dale Whitney, 3621 Mendenhall Loop Road, Juneau, AK 99801: the applicant noted the emphasis on vehicles backing out on to the bike path; he assured them that there was plenty of room to turn around on the lot once the building material and vehicles are cleared out. He clarified that he was not proposing a subdivision that runs along the arterial, but drawing a line along McGinnis which would not add traffic. He mentioned the economic non-feasibility of moving the driveway to face McGinnis or converting part of the house into a garage or a garage into a living space. He said that he was trying to clean up the neighborhood and improve it.

Chair Satre asked if he would like to speak about the alternative variance criteria findings.

Mr. Whitney replied that the driveway has been used as it is since 1958 and allowing him to continue using it is only fair.

Mr. Bishop asked about the addition to the existing house to be removed per Attachment C.

Mr. Whitney explained that there was a lean-to that had been added on to the back of the house that was collapsing and rotting, so he removed it. It was an issue because it would have encroached on the proposed lot and this had to be removed to eliminate that issue.

Mr. Bishop questioned if that is a potential access point into the garage if a driveway were to be built in that area.

Mr. Whitney detailed the lean-to measurements and mentioned that there isn't enough room to have a driveway through the back in the new house and the setback with Duck Creek.

Mr. Bishop asked if the drainage easement would be feasible.

Mr. Watson asked about the size of the structure he intended to build on Lot 2B.

Mr. Whitney replied that it would be an approximately 1500 sq. ft. single-story house.

Ms. Bennett needed clarification on where the road would go accessing McGinnis.

Ms. Hitchings answered that engineering standards require that the driveway be at least 40 feet back from the edge of the traveled way. She pointed to the map to further clarify Ms. Bennett's question.

Ms. Lawfer asked how he would access the garage if DOT were to limit access on the bike path and put metal or concrete stakes as impediments so that nobody could be driving on them or backing into them.

Mr. Whitney stated that he was not aware of them planning to start some kind of an action such as that. He stated that if the driveway is open, he could easily access the garage.

Ms. Lawfer asked where his property line ended. Mr. Whitney pointed to the map and replied to Ms. Lawfer's question.

Ms. Hitchings added that engineering has been reviewing the subdivision application simultaneously and they would certainly not be promoting two access points on McGinnis. If this subdivision goes through, they will be recommending or potentially requiring a shared access, some sort of a hammerhead configuration somewhere in the middle of the two lots.

Mr. Haight referred to the correspondences from DOT regarding the possibility that these driveways will be closed at some future time in connection with the project to upgrade the Mendenhall Loop Road. He asked what would be the next action for the driveway at that point in time.

Mr. Whitney replied that he would have to look at the law to see if DOT can actually seal off a driveway and give no access to his garage. He then said that he might just park elsewhere.

Mr. Watson referenced to DOT's website where it talks about limiting any future access to loop road.

Public testimony was closed.

Mr. Miller asked staff if there were engineering standards for back-out radiuses and how much area is deemed suitable for turning around.

Mr. Chaney replied that there are standards but that he did not have them available off hand.

Mr. Watson asked if something could be brought forth as a variance if an applicant proposes an angle that does not meet engineering's requirements.

Mr. Chaney replied that if it were a requirement of the engineering code, the Planning Commission is not empowered to override the engineering code. The PC only has power over Title 49 to vary those standards.

Mr. Watson queried if this was a requirement or just information; he read it to be more like a requirement. Ms. Hitchings wasn't sure of the exact wording but stated that they have not completed their review yet.

Mr. Watson brought up a similar scenario at Riverside where that particular property owner paved to the edge of his property line so that when they backed out of the garage, they backed to the left and then pulled out onto the street; he asked if that solution were feasible for this application.

Mr. Chaney responded that the difference is this is a minor arterial and is a different classification of roadway; the variance is to allow a driveway to directly access the Minor arterial. Back-out parking is an additional problem. Riverside Drive is considered a collector, so it is a lower class.

Ms. Hitchings reminded everyone that back-out parking is one of the requirements for meeting this particular standard that the applicant is asking for a variance for.

Mr. Miller spoke about the variance criteria. Mr. Miller felt that if they get rid of the back-out parking and kept it consistent with the other property owners, #1 would not be a problem. He thought that #3 and #4 can be met but #5(A) can't be met. 5(B) can be met if the back-out parking is taken off. He agreed that #6 had more benefits than detriments. For #2, he suggested that some help or relief can be given such that the intent of this title will be observed and the public safety & welfare will be preserved; he also would like to hear what the public had to say about that.

Chair Satre summarized that the concept is to not aggravate a nonconforming situation but to preserve the status quo of a nonconforming situation.

MOTION: by Mr. Bishop to move Variance 2012 0015 and that we adopt staff analysis and come up with new findings as Mr. Miller has put forth.

Mr. Bishop stated that they do need housing and safe access on to the Mendenhall Loop Highway but he would not want to agree with anything that would compromise safety for affordability.

Mr. Watson said that he did not have an issue with #2 because it read, "...to ensure the growth and development that is in accord with the values of its residents, secure the benefits of growth on minimizing negative impacts...", and he felt that there weren't any negative impacts on this variance. He would be more willing to vote in favor of the motion if he could be assured that there was paving coming out of the garage to back-out. He goes on to state that the owner may be in conflict with the State of Alaska and Department of Transportation and the PC approving it does not alleviate potential future problems with DOT.

Chair Satre noted that certainly conditions to eliminate any sort of back-out parking could be added to the motion as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Miller asked for the site plan. For #2, he asked if adding a T for the back-out from the garage on the owner's property could be included in the amendment. He thought that it would take care of visitor parking as well.

Chair Satre asked to add some detail to the amendment with a parking or a driveway design that would be acceptable to City Engineering and would effectively eliminate back-out parking.

Mr. Miller suggested adding a couple of off road visitor parking off of McGinnis.

Ms. Hitchings provided some potential conditions of approval on the screen and the first one addressed was back-out parking.

Mr. Miller brought up that visitor parking was an issue and wanted to add some language to that effect.

Chair Satre asked Ms. Hitchings or Mr. Chaney, what the requirement for parking in D5 was and how many spaces needed to be allowed for it.

Mr. Chaney replied that Code minimum would be two spaces for a single family residence, assuming they didn't add an accessory apartment, but that the commission could always require more.

Chair Satre said he was trying to get an idea on what the verbiage would be for Mr. Miller's suggestion in regards to visitor parking and wondered if they were all of a sudden requiring that lots have many more spaces than what is out there.

Mr. Chaney responded that since this is a variance, it is within the PC's rights to require more than the code minimum.

Mr. Miller responded that he would like to add two visitor parking areas off of McGinnis and the new driveway.

Chair Satre asked that a friendly amendment be made to the motion with the three added conditions.

Ms. Lawfer asked if the recommendation was to adopt the director's analysis and deny the request.

Chair Satre replied that they are adopting the basic description of the application, adopting the findings and then approving the variance with the three conditions.

Mr. Medina spoke against the motion saying that this is a non-conforming lot that is subdivided and it must meet the current zoning standards for all new lots. He said that granting the variance to allow the continuous driveway with back-out parking to serve one single family residence is not in keeping with the intent to preserve public safety.

Ms. Grewe spoke against the motion because of safety reasons. She stated that even if they try to prevent back-out parking, people will still back-out on the Mendenhall Loop and that is unsafe.

Chair Satre noted that the 50-foot offset from the Duck Creek does take a large portion of this lot but safety concerns are certainly very prominent.

Ms. Bennett agreed to deny the variance because of safety concerns and gave a few options of redoing the garage as an accessory apartment which would provide additional housing and improve the neighborhood at much less cost than building a new house; it would provoke a

different driveway and access. She also suggested improvements to the landscaping that would benefit the neighborhood.

Mr. Whitney asked if he could address the commission but his request was denied because the public comment period has been closed.

Ms. Lawfer asked what would happen if nothing were done. She said that the issue does not go away as there is still the safety consequence. She appreciated having the draft conditions and asked what would happen if the State were to close off that driveway. She spoke in favor of Commissioner Bishop's motion.

Mr. Haight stated that if they denied the variance, there are still other options available if the need should come about to change that driveway access. If they adopted the variance, those options are reduced to nothing. He said that he was leaning toward voting against the motion.

Mr. Bishop spoke about trying to get the applicant do the right thing, to do it properly and to move the access onto McGinnis which would allow him two lots as well as improve public safety if possible.

Mr. Watson asked if the applicant's request was turned down, if he would be able to come back for another variance for a different access or design or would the applicant have to wait a certain period of time.

Mr. Chaney responded that the applicant could apply again for a different proposal which would require new fees and the only limitation would be if it were for re-zoning.

Chair Satre recapped the motion to adopt the analysis and the Planning Commissions' findings and approve the requested variance with the three conditions as modified by Mr. Miller.

Roll call vote on Mr. Bishop's motion to continue Variance 2012 0015:

Ayes: Miller, Lawfer, Watson

Nays: Bennett, Medina, Grewe, Haight, Bishop, Satre

Motion to approve Variance 2012 0015 failed with a 3:6 vote.

Chair Satre stated that the motion to approve the variance has failed. He asked if there was a motion to deny the variance and accept staff findings now with this recommendation.

Motion made by Mr. Bishop to adopt staff findings and analysis and deny variance 2012-0015.

No opposition, vote passed unanimously.

Chair Satre summed up saying that it was a good discussion about the merits of the proposal and explained to Mr. Whitney that it was the safety issue that caused them to look at this unfavorably, but appreciated his effort in bringing up the proposal.

BREAK 20:20-20:27

Chairman Watson adjourned the Board of Adjustment and reconvened as the Planning Commission.

VIII. CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

AME2012 0006

A text amendment of Title 49 and of the Comprehensive Plan for the 2012 update.
Chapter 4 – Housing Element

Staff Recommendation: that the Planning Commission review chapter 4 and make any needed updates or revisions to the chapter. After all chapters have been reviewed on a preliminary basis, a Draft Comprehensive Plan will be published for review, after which the Planning Commission will begin a second round of review for the entire document.

Beth McKibben referred to handouts that had been distributed to the Commission Members. She stated that the comments were from Dan Austin, a representative of the Homeless Coalition. She went on to explain the graphs and the tables. The Homeless Count per 1000 residents had not been included and Dan Austin felt that it should have been included. She reviewed that the PC went through the Housing Element Chapter in March after which she went to the Affordable Housing Commission and JEDC together to review the document, and they made some suggestions. She stated that the current document is the most updated one and includes the recommended changes by the Affordable Housing Commission.

Chair Satre interjected that there might be more changes but the goal is to get to the policies and guidelines and the implementation of actions.

Ms. McKibben agreed with Chairperson Satre and went on to state that she re-organized the chapter.

Changes:

2nd page 1st paragraph: talking about housing demand and affordability. She updated the statistical information to more current data. She included new information about 2012 overall vacancy rates and their improvement over the 2007 vacancy rates.

3rd paragraph: Housing demand was updated with data from the 2010 Juneau Housing Needs Inventory.

Information was added about legislative staff, lobbyists, seasonal workers and the coast guards at the request of the Planning Commission.

Table for vacancy rate by rental type and number of bedrooms – She referred to the 5-year vacancy average provided by the Department of Labor, sent by Mr. Austin. She also mentioned Scott Ciambor, former housing coordinator for JEDC in the Affordable Housing Commission,

who confirmed that the standard practice was to show vacancy rates and 5-year averages. Ms. McKibben said she would be replacing the current table with the one that Mr. Austin had sent.

She discussed the portion on homelessness and the Point-in-Time Homeless Count which has been expanded. She suggested adding the table that Dan Austin had sent - "per capita per 1000". She goes on mention the Vulnerability Index, which is new.

The first full paragraph starting with... 'affordable housing as defined', is new as well as the one talking about Workforce Housing. She stated that one of the primary goals of the Affordable Housing Commission was to develop Workforce Housing, as it was not addressed properly in the 2008 Comprehensive Plan.

She pointed out the next paragraph where it talked about federal and state funding for affordable housing is also new to the plan.

Ms. Grewe referred to the chart, "Juneau Point-in-Time Homeless Count Rate 2011", and asked for clarification on what "other" entailed.

Ms. McKibben replied that they consist of victims of domestic violence, veterans, chronic substance abuse, severely mentally ill and chronically homeless; people who may have suddenly become homeless or have been couch surfing. They do not fit into one of the other categories, but they don't have a permanent home.

Ms. Grewe mentioned that she felt there had been better counting going on in the past couple of years and maybe the chart reflected a more accurate presentation of the homeless. Ms. McKibben agreed.

Ms. Lawfer questioned the use of the term "affordability", as housing needs already have affordability tied in with that. She also asked if the average earnings of \$48,000 need to be specifically pointed to a State Employee.

Ms. McKibben stated that she would take off the 'affordability' headings and explained that the reference to State Employee was representative of someone who had a fairly typical professional type job in Juneau. Ms. Lawfer suggested that maybe it be footnoted.

Mr. Medina questioned if they really wanted to talk about float homes in reference to Line 4 under Housing Needs where it talks about RV Parks, float homes, and boats.

Ms. McKibben responded that they were a type of housing in Juneau and people did live in them year-round.

Mr. Medina asked if there was a restriction on it to which Mr. Chaney replied that they are heavily regulated and not many new ones proposed, but that they are allowed and many people live on them within the harbor.

Ms. Bennett stated that she thought this was fabulous and didn't have a single criticism.

Ms. McKibben thanked her and continued on to state that there are two charts on the Housing Spectrum, one from Scott Ciambor and the one from Mr. Austin. The information in the tables are basically the same.

Mr. Watson expressed his concern regarding credibility when taking information from a third party. Ms. Lawfer pointed out that the chart from Mr. Austin did include references.

Ms. McKibben reiterated that the information in the two tables were the same and the spectrums were the same except that Mr. Austin's chart had some additional information.

Ms. McKibben stated that she was comfortable with the data and knew where it came from.

Ms. Grewe suggested that they stay with Scott's chart and add in the missing pieces from Mr. Austin's. Ms. Grewe mentioned that Scott's has the workforce housing there and that their housing problem was not just a homeless problem but a workforce problem which makes it a problem for their economy and every facet of the community.

Ms. McKibben went on to talk about existing housing stock and the new table showing Juneau's Occupied Housing by Age. Referring to the next paragraph, the Number of Units that were built between 2006 and 2010, she mentioned that there was some new information added.

Mr. Watson questioned if the continuing increase in value of mobile homes regardless of their age was only in Juneau and Kodiak.

Ms. McKibben stated that she would have to check. She continued to state that she had edited the portions where it talks about mobile and manufactured homes and the critical part that they play in affordable housing in Juneau. The main concern being that they are too old and don't do well in Juneau's climate. Juneau's Low Income Housing Units table has been added new.

Ms. Bennett asked whether there were any policies in place that the city would monitor for safety and health on the quality of mobile housing and manufactured homes. Ms. McKibben responded that she would keep an eye open for them when they go through policies.

Mr. Watson opined that he believed that most owners of the mobile home properties in town have an age restriction on the units and if it is not maintained, the private industry removes them. He felt that this was not an area where they should venture into.

Chair Satre mentioned having that conversation in 2008 and how involved they wanted the City to be, to which Mr. Chaney stated that they don't regulate other people's quality of housing in general, unless it is unsafe and condemn the property which is rare, though the PC does have that power.

Ms. Lawfer expressed concern that rental units are considered under Assisted-Housing Inventory which is not always necessarily the truth. Being from a Health and Social Services background,

she did not think that aging was a disability or a special need; it was more adaptive and special needs access. She did not think that the aging population should be classified under rentals.

Ms. Lawfer said she would help Ms. McKibben fix the language to read Assisted-Housing Inventory ownership and add the ownership part. Ms. McKibben asked if the agencies track it that way. Ms. Lawfer said if there weren't statistics available, to just take out that part about the aging population.

Ms. McKibben asked if she could split that into two paragraphs where there is mention of people leaving their homes and going into rentals. Ms. Lawfer agreed that would work.

Ms. Bennett added that under the Juneau low income, Northern Light Presbyterian Church has a new building opened up for teenagers who are runaways under the Glory Hole auspices.

Mr. Watson asked if the information was from the census data.

Ms. McKibben replied that it was from the Housing Needs Assessment Inventory and part of the problem is that they are dynamic numbers.

Ms. Bennett said that is not a housing unit; people are in for the night and leave the next morning.

Chair Satre suggested adding the dates for the tables to give more consistency. Ms. McKibben said she would add that.

Ms. McKibben went on to report on Loss of Housing (ways that housing is lost in Juneau) which has not changed from the 2008 plan in any substantial way; but she noted there is no statistical information.

Mr. Watson questioned what an ownership condominium when converted was.

Ms. McKibben responded that it is basically a rental unit (a building, a multi-family building, an apartment complex) that was initially used as a rental and then changed into condominium ownership where each individual owns their own unit, but the land is owned in common.

Mr. Watson pointed out that it may be old information as he has not seen that happening of late.

Ms. McKibben noted that it is going the other direction and "uncondominiumizing" it to become rental units.

Chair Satre stressed on the need to quantify the numbers as best possible for better clarity.

Chair Satre said that it was pertinent that they work at getting accurate numbers throughout the document, be it available city land, lots, housing, appropriate numbers of homeless, etc.

Ms. Bennett suggested getting some data from the Fire Department about the number of downtown dwellings that are fire hazards.

Mr. Hart mentioned that there were a number of vacancies in the historic buildings, though they did not have the exact numbers.

Chair Satre stated that the first step is to clearly define what they know and don't know. He appreciated Ms. McKibben's and other's efforts to get the tables reformatted and add fresh data; he felt that it gave a good snapshot of housing in Juneau.

Mr. Haight asked when they would be addressing Maintenance.

Chair Satre mentioned that typically only minor changes are made during comprehensive plan revision but he felt that in this case, they should delve into it more.

Ms. Grewe commented that may be a way to resolve it is to have residents and business owners keeping an eye on the problem. "With Juneau's lack of affordable housing, it is of the best interest to the community to keep an eye on losing housing."

Chair Satre agreed with Ms. Grewe's comments.

Ms. McKibben pointed to the Housing Needs Inventory table compiled by JEDC using the assessors database, which tracks changes and in a way shows what housing units are lost. She stated it doesn't really capture the whole story, but it is good information for the long term.

Regarding the numbers on the table - Apartment (in a Residence) of 8 added between 2012 and 2010 and under Single Family Homes, Single Family Residence (with apt), 8 added between 2012 and 2010; Mr. Miller queried if those were the same 8 or if it were accessory apartments added on to an existing home.

Ms. McKibben stated that she would check with JEDC before answering the question, but she suspected that the number was represented twice.

Mr. Chaney commented that the community as a whole wasn't really building very many apartment complexes, but they were adding accessory apartments at a rapid rate. He also pointed out that a 10-year average may give a better idea than the 2-year statistics presented. Ms. McKibben stated that the next time they update it; the numbers will be much bigger. Mr. Chaney mentioned the difficulty in gathering statistics prior to 2012 because of computer updates done in 2010.

Ms. McKibben introduced the pie chart that will be included in the 2012 Housing Needs Assessment. She noted changes made to the adequate supply of land for housing. She mentioned the Table – CBJ Owned Land within the Urban Service Area, which sums up the whole discussion.

Ms. McKibben noted that they continued on to Housing Policies, which the commission had not discussed in March.

Ms. Grewe commented that having more graphics of the geography of CBJ (land, ice fields and water) under the "Adequate Supply of Lands for Housing" would help to get a clearer picture of how much land is actually available (12 sites deemed suitable for affordable housing).

Mr. Watson commented that they need to take into consideration other areas of Juneau that can be developed and cited examples of housing development areas where they thought it could not be done.

Chair Satre agreed and continued on to say they are trying to get into what is truly relatively easily developable within the urban service area.

Ms. McKibben noted that they continued on to Housing Policies, which the commission had not discussed in March.

Mr. Miller asked if there was a simpler way to understand the figures on the graph as they can get confusing for a person who is new. Ms. McKibben said that the Lands Manager wanted it this way. Mr. Miller suggested having a more common denominator. Ms. McKibben thought some of it could be taken out.

Ms. Grewe asked if anyone knew about privately held vacant parcels and what the ratio of private to public was under "Adequate Supply of Land for Housing". Chair Satre responded that he thought it was part of the Lands Department's analysis, which was presented to the PC a long time ago.

Ms. McKibben responded that the paragraph right above the table says, "The query produced 147 vacant and/or underutilized parcels of a quarter acre or more within the urban service area and of these the 119 are CBJ owned." She said she imagined there was a decision made to focus on CBJ-owned property because they have control over that.

Ms. Grewe mentioned that they have the capacity to incentivize development on privately held parcels and that is the wide majority of the vacant parcels. Ms. Bennett agreed that is where policy needs to go and asked where the incentives are and why private developers are not building.

Mr. Miller mentioned having a common denominator to have a more easily understood report.

Mr. Bishop commented on looking at Housing Needs based on Housing Type.

Ms. McKibben responded that one of the policies that the affordable housing commission has been talking about is to develop a housing plan, which has finer detail, is more focused, and would include things like the housing needs based on housing type.

Ms. McKibben next referred to housing policy and implementing action.

Mr. Miller, in his experience, was not sure that developing a housing plan in order to further develop and facilitate affordable housing or different styles and densities could be listed in there. Ms. Lawfer stated, with regards to Policy 4.1 in the Standard Operating Procedure 1 (SOP-1), that she agreed about funding and securing funding for emergency shelters, transitional living etc., but queried about people who are homeless or near homeless. She requested to add that in and address it. Also under Policy 4.1-IA6, she asked to add special needs or adaptive housing.

Ms. McKibben announced that Standard Operating Procedure, 4.2-SOP4 is new as is Implementing Action 4.2-IA11, Explore and Implement Methods to Expand Housing Options for Workforce Housing.

Ms. Bennett asked if some of the Extended-Stay Hotels and other Juneau Hotels were used as Workforce Housing.

Ms. McKibben read back through their definition of Workforce Housing and explained that in reality, the Extended-Stay Hotels were functioning to some extent as housing for their workforce. It also acts as transitional housing for people transitioning out of an emergency shelter, so they get used for a lot of different purposes. She mentioned that when the plan talks about workforce housing, it's talking about permanent housing.

Chairman Satre asked if it would be helpful to add "permanent" to the definition.

Chairman Satre stated his appreciation to everyone as they had worked and reworked the document far beyond the minor changes originally envisioned.

Ms. McKibben asked for direction as to if they wanted to see the document one more time before she made the revisions.

Chairman Satre stated that he preferred to see it as a whole once all revisions are done.

Mr. Watson asked if the additions and revisions would be shown on the newly compiled master document (to keep track of what changes had been made).

Ms. McKibben said it would be a new document with all the changes.

Chairman Satre said that it had been brought up by Commissioner Smith in his Planning Commission Liaison Report and Chairman Satre stated that he thought it would be extremely helpful if the planners who were responsible for each one of the chapter changes would go through an outline, in a simple form, the changes that have happened.

Chair Satre said an outline of the changes would be helpful for the public to understand what each Chapter has gone through.

Mr. Chaney commented that they could highlight the changes from this meeting to the final one. Chair Satre agreed.

Mr. Watson noted to keep the material succinct and credible when presenting before the Assembly.

Ms. Bennett commented that she found reference regarding her concern about monitoring mobile homes in Item 4.4.4 A4-Identify and Inventory Substandard Housing including pre-1976 mobile homes that do not comply with HUD standards and pursue strategic ways to rehabilitate or replace these units.

Chair Satre thanked and adjourned Ms. McKibbens.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. REGULAR AGENDA

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

XII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Hart had a chance to meet with the Regional DOT office and they both agreed that they need to increase communication between Southeast and the City and Borough of Juneau, to try and get on the same page on land use issues in the future. They covered marine, aviation, and land use issues.

Chair Satre asked how the minutes for the meetings were being done now.

Mr. Hart replied that the minutes are being done by a new company that won the bid for minutes.

Chair Satre stressed the importance of recording the motion and the vote in the minutes which would help the reviewer.

Mr. Chaney stated that the planning staff has been going through the minutes and reconstructing those elements, and providing comments. He also asked for the members' comments if any.

XIII. REPORT OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Watson reported that Public Works met yesterday, it was a short meeting and the main topic was Gastineau School which is behind on schedule.

Ms. Bennett stated she went to the Downtown Revitalization meeting on Monday night at the Hangar Ballroom. She summarized that Beth McKibben did a presentation on transit-oriented development after which there was a long discussion about the possibility of developing a trolley system in Juneau and how housing really grows along a rail system.

Ms. Grewe asked what the status was regarding the wireless communication tower and if there has been any action related to that. She also wanted to include an article from the Anchorage

Daily News regarding what other municipalities were doing in Alaska with wireless communications. She expressed her concerns about the progress and if things were falling through the cracks.

Mr. Chaney addressed the committee stating that they were continuing to work with Cityscape who is finding Juneau's issues more challenging than maybe they originally realized. He said they were looking to add cell towers in the populated area, but Juneau does have the unique issues like topography, cell signal strength, different bandwidths, distances, and varying qualities of return signal. There is some progress but Cityscape is moving a little slower than they had hoped.

Ms. Grewe stated that from her perspective, if they were within the acceptable timeframe, to do a moratorium on any further decision making.

Chair Satre said it had to be presented to legal but from what he understood, get the report back from the consultant, work out an ordinance, and then during that time period, put something in place.

Mr. Chaney stated that he didn't sense any support for that concept in the City Manager's shop at this point. If they were to pursue a moratorium, they would need to have a pretty strong, clear statement by the Planning Commission to really dig in and decide to do it.

Ms. Grewe felt a sense of inability to make decisions regarding Cityscape between the City Manager's office and the Assembly and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Chaney recommended making a statement as a body requesting an action. He stated that Cityscape is a private contractor and the PC would not be able to control Cityscape or get deliverables in a particular timeframe from them. The moratorium needs to go on record if it needs to be looked at seriously.

Chair Satre thought that there needed to be some sort of a motion to discuss and a motion for the Planning commission to pass, something that is official if they were going to talk to the Assembly.

Mr. Bishop said it was pertinent to have a clear-cut contract with Cityscape with due dates, deliverables etc. well defined. He suggested gathering more information before proceeding.

Mr. Hart recommended starting with answering the questions of what is the status on the Cityscape contract, and what are the deliverables. He also asked about the moratorium, would there be a problem with that course of action and if there would be legal issues involved.

Mr. Bishop asked what the process is for putting the moratorium on.

Mr. Haight stated that though the moratorium may be pushing their limits a little bit, they have an obligation to ensure that communications are maintained or help develop communications throughout the Borough. He found it awkward that they are trying to define conditions to a

permit when they don't have anything to use to define conditions to. He also suggested having the last application that the PC reviewed to have as reference on hand.

Mr. Medina echoed what Mr. Miller and Mr. Haight said. He personally did not have any problem with the cell towers that have come before the Planning Commission to be approved.

Chair Satre summarized that they need the details on the contract and deliverables, the timing, and information on what the mechanism is for putting moratoriums on permits, whether there are legal implications, who initiates it, and what are the timing windows.

Mr. Watson said it was important to stay focused when reviewing applications and to be cautious when expressing opinions as they do go on record.

Mr. Satre stated that it was important to take advantage of the fact that it is going on record. He gave an example saying that if a decision were to be appealed, the record will reveal the reasoning behind the decision.

Mr. Miller appreciated the members of the PC in doing detailed discussions and stated that decisions made as a group are better than as individuals.

Chair Satre commended everyone's active participation.

XIV. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

XV. ADJOURNMENT

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

With no objection, the meeting adjourned at 10:11 pm.