

MINUTES

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

October 30, 2012
Assembly Chambers
5:18 PM

I. ROLL CALL

Chairman, Michael Satre, called the Committee of the Whole meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held in the Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building, to order at 5:18 p.m.

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

Commissioners absent: Nicole Grewe

A quorum was present.

Staff present: Hal Hart, Director; Greg Chaney, Planning Manager; Ben Lyman, Planner, Heather Marlow, Land and Resources Manager; Rorie Watt, Engineering Director

Chair Satre addressed the Commission mentioning a prior meeting earlier that day at the City Manager's Office where they had discussed the possibility of a combined Assembly and Planning Commission Committee of the Whole meeting and suggested a possible date of Monday, December 10, 2012, but cautioned that there might also be a Planning Commission meeting the next night and if they would let him know they would get an e-mail circulated the next day, and if that date would not work, they would have to meet in January some time. He said he actually wanted to get a couple of meetings in as the year went on.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- October 16, 2012 – Committee of the Whole Planning Commission.

Chair Satre informed the members that the minutes will not be approved this evening and will be approved at a later date.

III. NON AGENDA ITEMS - None.

IV. REGULAR AGENDA

CSP2012 0015: Selection of municipal property to improve for subdivision and sale of residential property. CIP funding is proposed to be utilized for these projects.

Applicant: CBJ Lands and Resources

Location: Pederson Hill and Switzer Creek Area

Staff Recommendations:

1. Continue to develop the organizational capacity for affordable housing and continue to monitor local housing data.
2. Encourage the creation for more one and two-bedroom apartments and single-family homes to manage the unmet need.
 - a. 205 single family homes.
 - b. 138 multifamily rental units (duplex to apartments).
 - c. Additional senior housing - an increasing segment of population.
3. Establish an Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
4. Address the buildable land issue - establishment of a housing planning process would allow for the collaboration of resources and help determine where needed housing units will fit within the CBJ.
5. Strengthen the Continuum of Care Network (CoC) - success of the CoC is partially dependent on the availability of housing outside of their network, typically 1 and 2 bedroom apartments or single-room occupancy apartments, that clients can be moved to and include the appropriate level of services, to free up space with the CoC system.

Staff Report

Chair Satre recognized Ms. Marlow, Land Resources Manager and said that it was his understanding that this was new information to be presented that night, so they could have a good working discussion and then they would come back to the Planning Commission on their regular meeting for final approval.

Ms. Marlow thanked Chair Satre and said that they were trying to get to a recommendation from the Planning Commission to the Assembly on Municipal Property, to move into for development, subdivision and approval for Affordable Housing. She mentioned that the topic had been a main agenda item for the Affordable Housing Commission, they have passed it out of the Affordable Housing Commission and on to the Assembly. They have met with the Assembly Joint Committees of Lands and Public Works and Facilities twice, who asked them to go back and do a little bit more discussion with the Affordable Housing Commission which has occurred and their original recommendations still remain. She stated that the Affordable Housing Commission had been looking at this quite a bit and brought it to the Planning Commission before they went to the Full Assembly to request the transfer of funds, so the Planning Commission could have a chance to be brought up to speed on the work products and the

reviews. She referenced a memo that the members had been given a copy of and directed them to the decision matrix and their recommendations.

Ms. Marlow continued saying that they have been looking at development plans for Pederson Hill and the Switzer area, looking at road and utility connections, wetlands, habitat constraints, and cost estimates. Two years ago, she said that they had done the Housing Needs Assessment Report that came out of JEDC, the 2012 version should come out before the end of the calendar year. She stated that they have not made significant gains on the Statement of Need, so the 2012 study would look very similar to the Statement of Need from June 2010.

There were five recommendations that include developing organizational capacity for Affordable Housing and continuing to monitor local housing data. She pointed to the summary of the Statement of Unmet Need for Affordable Housing, 205 single-family units, 138 multifamily units (plus a discussion on the need for additional senior housing). They have established an Affordable Housing Trust Fund which both the Assembly and the State Legislature has put money into, for low-interest loans to Affordable Housing proposals. Address the buildable land issue by developing a housing planning process that would allow for collaboration of resources and determine where needed housing units will fit within the city. To strengthen the Continuum of Care Network which is all the different non-profits and agencies in the community that deal with special populations and the different needs for housing, emergency shelter that we see in the community, the options are limited to single-room occupancy type of situations, group home quarters etc.; the measures taken to increase affordable housing will aid in strengthening the continuum of Care Network's activities as well.

In January 2007, Susana Montana prepared a buildable land study that was integrated into the current version of the Comprehensive Plan, she went through and looked at the various city parcels that were identified for future development, did some analysis of wetlands and opportunities and constraints on those municipal properties. Ms. Marlow said they had followed up on Ms. Montana's work and chosen several properties to review for additional detail, opportunities, and constraints.

The study showed 12 parcels that the municipality owns and holds for various purposes. They had focused on four parcels; Parcel 1, which is a very large parcel called Switzer Creek/DZ area; Pederson Hill (adjacent to Auke Lake), S'It'Tuwan subdivision Parcel 5 (Under Thunder); Parcel 7 is Goat Hill on Back Loop Road; those four parcels seemed most suitable for Affordable Housing Development in particular for apartments, single-family, and additional senior housing.

There were other parcels that they did not get to because of them being outside the service boundary, or if utilities were not available, or if it was cost prohibitive (e.g. Parcel 3, because of the sewer project that has gone in at North Douglas, private lands that have been up-zoned).

Ms. Marlow said that they have yet to see development proposals on those properties. The city wanted to stay clear of private properties, so that didn't have any competition in the housing market in Douglas and also stay away from road capacity issues at the Tenth and Egan bridge.

Ms. Bennett asked what number Pederson Hill was, Ms. Marlow replied Parcel 4.

Mr. Watson asked if it was similar to what the Public Works Committee had looked at. Ms. Marlow said it was exactly the same.

Mr. Hart mentioned that one of the things he and Ms. Marlow had talked about extensively was the proximity of the parcels to various modes of transportation.

Ms. Marlow continued saying that they had chosen three properties for additional study. They dropped Goat Hill due to D5 zoning and a number of topographic and natural features constraint to it. They focused in on Switzer, Pederson, and S'it'Tuwan subdivisions.

Switzer: They looked at all the standard considerations like intersection capacity, utility capacity, wetlands, streams, eagle nests, and deer overwintering habitat. They also looked at soils and topography and we came up with three development areas [pointed to map] Development Area 1, overlying the DZ School Area, Development Area 2 immediately across from DZ School on Renninger Drive, and Development Area 3, Mountain Avenue Development Area. Mountain Avenue has an unbuilt right-of-way that dead-ends into municipal property, so there wouldn't be any land acquisition.

She then talked about their findings. (Switzer Plan Study - Figure 11, Page 22) Opportunities and Challenges for Development Area 1; trails and streams, buffers and eagle nests, and different considerations called out. The remaining areas are developments areas 1A and 1B. They spent some time with the school district talking about their plans for locating new schools. The school district has a long-term goal of locating another elementary school in the DZ area. They reserved a site for a future school for planning purposes only, but the district is willing to consider other areas in Lemon Creek for a school site.

For Development Area 1A, above DZ School and Development Area 1B to the west of DZ School and then Development Areas 2A and 2B, 2A would be immediately across from DZ School, and 2B would be another couple of blocks down that proposed road. These areas are relatively small for Development Area 2 and then we have Development Area 3, which is at the end of the Mountainside Drive. Development Area 3 is a much larger development area than 1 or 2 and they have the ability to put several 100 homes there. She mentioned that the fire code specifies having more than one access point when there are over 100 dwelling units, was one of the trigger points that they used in their cost estimates and analysis. They also plan to improve Mountain Avenue (widened with sidewalks). There will be a road connecting the development areas 2 and 3, giving them an opportunity for more than a 100 dwelling units in the Switzer area.

Mr. Watson asked why the School District had priority over land use.

Ms. Marlow replied that the school district had gone through a process in the past where they felt that a school site was endorsed by the City Assembly and that the school site was this Development Area 1. Staff did not find proof of this though the Comprehensive Plan identified retaining a school site in this area for a future need.

Mr. Bishop asked if the school district were not to place a school in Development Area 1 and it is a viable alternative for residential, would there be an equal number of units as in Area 3 and whether the same number of road systems would have to be built in Area 1.

Ms. Marlow answered that they would have to build as much for both and that if the school was put up in Development Area 3, you could build more homes in Area 1, but that would mean displacing homes that would have gone in Area 3. She mentioned that the engineers estimated 200 homes.

Mr. Bishop asked in terms of exposure to light and view sheds, which area was better.

Ms. Marlow said they were about equal.

Ms. Bennett asked if Development Area 3 would be close to the Lemon Creek Correctional Center. Ms. Marlow responded yes, it would be. Ms. Bennett queried if that would pose any problems. Ms. Marlow said no because the heavily forested topography provides sufficient separation.

Pederson Hill - She stated that they did the very same exercise that they did for Switzer and mentioned that they had assumed the D10 density estimates for both development areas.

She pointed to a slide that represented the topography in the wetlands and the eagles' nests that they found in the field and described the study area. She said that the City owns a much larger area, which they are integrating into their planning considerations, but that the focus of this study was on the lower elevations.

Ms. Marlow referred to the study area and broke it down into several different potential development areas - Development Areas 1 through 8. The City owns the land under 1 through 6, 7 is not owned completely by the City and 8 is owned by the University. Referring to Figure 4, Development Areas 1 through 8 were considered, five different access corridors were identified (A through E). She said they could do 100 dwelling units and then they would need a second access point. DOT has reviewed their access points and intersections and they have a strong preference for Wild Meadow Lane. She said that they do have some constraints in that they will need to do some sort of a land acquisition or land purchase with the University to do the connection from Wild Meadow Lane to the back parallel road and there is an eagle's nest in the middle of the Wild Meadow Lane right-of-way, if it were to be developed and extended.

They developed some cost estimates based on the above considerations as well. She mentioned that they liked the combination of access corridors A and C. Access Corridor C is the Lutheran Church (across Sherwood Lane) and they could use the church driveway to expand into a right-of-way, that the right-of-way would go through the Lutheran Church parking lot and they could accommodate their parking lot on city property next to the church. There would be some impact to the Lutheran Church Campus but they could mitigate and replace any sort infrastructure or site

characteristics that they have there. They think that development Areas 3 and 4 are the most cost effective and the easiest to permit and build.

Development areas 3 and 4 lend themselves additional phasing both to the west and to the east. The study also shows concepts that were called out for real long-term development of Pederson Hill, which are the access corridors from the ABCor study in that if they ever got the road to Juneau, DOT would likely align the highway in back of Auke Bay School coming out through Pederson Hill and through their subdivision. They don't want a DOT corridor running through the middle of the plated subdivision, so they are staying in conversation with them and anticipate having some sort of a road corridor separation to the development areas.

Mr. Medina asked if Development area 1 with 8 units would be feasible for development.

Ms. Marlow replied that it is not because of the cost (referred to the SAS matrix).

Under Thunder, S'it'Tuwan, Phase 2: There is an opportunity to go in and do a relatively straightforward next phase of S'it'Tuwan Subdivision.

She explained S'it'Tuwan Subdivision using the map. The S'it'Tuwan Subdivision was developed on city property and the city owns the remainder of the property at the back of it and a good portion of the base of Thunder Mountain as well. They partnered with Tlingit-Haida Regional Housing Authority to come through and do the subdivision. The City was compensated with improved subdivision lots at the end of the development, so it was revenue neutral for the City. The emergency coordinator did a study looking at the hazard potential for avalanche and mass wasting on Thunder Mountain. His memo summarized that there is a good opportunity to do housing development below avalanche track 4.1 and with a little bit of study, maybe 4.2 as well; but avalanche tracks 4.3 and 4.4 will need some concerted study and investigation. Ms. Marlow felt that the area was probably best suited for a PUD type of development or they could also do another S'it'Tuwan subdivision (standard subdivision layout in linear street), but these tend to be more expensive than the PUD concept.

They did do some cost estimates for S'it'Tuwan Subdivision. Tlingit-Haida encountered some ground conditions there with massive boulders and other challenges to laying out straight roads and utility lines that increased the cost and the unknowns in that area. It is an opportunity looking at the number of potential housing units but certainly wouldn't be any more than what S'it'Tuwan already has, it would be about half the size, 50 dwelling units or so.

Mr. Watson asked if the land was initially given to the City by BLM. Ms. Marlow replied that this is part of their municipal selection.

Mr. Watt then spoke about the projects that have been completed already and some that are sinking, particularly in the Mendenhall Peninsula.

He noted that they have spent a lot of time over the last few years extending sewer to both North Douglas and West Valley neighborhoods and have done probably 6 or 7 construction projects, a

couple of large Local Improvement Districts whereby the property owners have contributed to the projects, thus all properties in North Douglas from the bridge to Bonnie Brae are served with a sewer. The larger tracks that exist above the road have the fundamental access to it, but would take more infrastructure to develop them. In the West Valley, they have served all of the properties in the industrial district, along Glacier Highway, up to the crest of Pederson Hill.

They have one small sewer extension project left to serve the small number of homes on the downhill side of Pederson Hill going down into Auke Lake, but the infrastructure is both in North Douglas and in the West Valley. There was a lot of local money that was put in as well as property owner contributions, and a few grants from the State that went in, which were all leveraged to pretty good benefit.

When the project went on the ballots the second time, the scope was expanded from sewer extension along with other projects required for denser development, anticipating that there would be a follow-up effort, but not really knowing what the priority of the municipality would be.

They had investigations about whether we should be looking at a second connection in West Juneau, North Douglas, across Kowee Creek to take high pressure water. It was a high cost idea and there was relatively low utility per dollar spent with lukewarm support from the property owners that controlled the key pieces of land; therefore the idea was dropped.

There was also a public process to talk about whether sewer should be extended down Mendenhall Peninsula on the existing roadway down Fritz Cove Road and down Engineers Cutoff and the other lesser roads. It was their recommendation not to pursue that sewer extension, essentially because those neighborhoods are mostly built out; there was not much opportunity for additional development. The infrastructure would have been very expensive to maintain for the municipality and expensive to build, there would have been a lot of rock blasting on Fritz Cove Road, there would have been a lot of municipal pump stations, and there would have been a lot of home owners that would have had to pump up the road.

He stated that slightly more than half of the neighborhood was opposed to the concept of sewer extension in general because they recognized that many of them would pump and there was limited support for additional development in those neighborhoods. Thus, they ended their planning efforts for sewer extension in those neighborhoods, and basically thought it better to program the money into the Switzer area and to Pederson Hill. There is some remaining monies that are still available for these development projects.

Mr. Medina asked to describe the area that West Valley encompasses.

Mr. Watt explained that lower West Valley would be west of Brotherhood Bridge, all the properties down Industrial Boulevard and on the side streets down in there, Wild Meadow Lane on the other side of the highway, along Glacier Highway the properties up to the hill, but not going down Engineers Cutoff. Some of the smaller side streets have been included as well.

Mr. Watson questioned if the existing sewer lines are sufficient as they are now to support a total build-out on Pederson Hill.

Mr. Watt answered yes, they are sized to accommodate quite a bit of a development and that they would be good enough over the 30 to 50 year horizon.

Mr. Watson asked if the University was on the sewer system.

Mr. Watt responded that they are and that there is a small wastewater plant in Auke Bay.

Mr. Bishop thanked Mr. Watt, Ms. Marlow for the excellent presentation and appreciated Rod and their liaison for being a part of their working discussion.

Ms. Bennett asked, "I would like to hear your opinion on building a 100-unit tract of land versus a 50-unit tract of land, and presumably the bigger one would be more efficient, but would it be more livable?"

Mr. Watt replied that it depends on the topography, the length of access road, the wetlands and the permitting hurdles, the proximity to existing neighborhoods, and the different concessions that need to be made to get a project moving forward. He said that it was a good question to lead into the matrix, which tries to take all of those different things together and evaluates them against each other.

Mr. Haight queried regarding the infrastructure for utilities at the Switzer Creek area particularly with regards to the water pressure at higher elevations.

Mr. Watt stated that they are looking into having more efficient options without putting in new reservoirs and new pumping stations.

Ms. Marlow added [pointing to the red highlights in Development Area 3] that those areas would need some assistance with a boost station and those have been added in the cost estimates.

Ms. Marlow noted that it is a unique time in that many resources are available for municipal land development though she noted that there are more development projects than funding would allow. So, it is a decision point where to invest those resources.

She stated that in reviewing this with the Affordable Housing Commission, there was common agreement that Development Area 2A in the Switzer plan [the area immediately across from Renninger School] is the short-term development area that should be pursued as soon as possible. She noted that it is possible to get around 30 dwelling units in that area without much difficulty in terms of ease of permitting and impact to private land etc.

Development Area 3 in Switzer was recommended for long-term development by the Commission because there is the potential to reduce site prep and hauling costs due to the proximity of material sources. The city has sand, gravel, and rock sources proximate to this

development area as well as some waste disposal across the street. The area is appropriate for residential infill, thus would be similar to surrounding density, so the neighborhoods would be similar to one another, and there is potential for infrastructure cost sharing with the future school site (the State would be able to reimburse the city for a portion of the cost of development for the school site and for any access roads built).

Ms. Marlow said that for long-term development, staff is recommending Pederson Hill Development Area 3 and 4, totaling 100 units; mainly focusing on the ease of permitting, the desire to spread development impacts throughout the community, favorable development costs, and the very strong potential for long-term phasing (e.g. Housing on the top of Pederson Hill).

Mr. Medina asked if areas 2 or 3 would be preferential from a potential homebuyer aspect.

Ms. Marlow replied that it would be more of a personal decision.

Mr. Bishop felt that it was an opportunity that they could not afford to miss though he felt that it was important to hit the right opportunity. He was concerned about the City becoming too involved as well. He saw an opportunity of broadening their network of centralizing the community around the Lemon Creek Area, expanding it and developing a denser area. Though he understands that there is tremendous opportunity at Pederson Hill, he did not feel that they were ready for it yet. They have to come in agreement with the State on where the corridors are going to be and making sure that they are not putting development in the wrong place.

Mr. Watson commented that because of the indebtedness that the school district now has for school bonds, it is not a cent percent reimbursement program, at best it will be 60. He said when talking about affordable housing, there is a vision of something horrendous and asked Ms. Marlow if they got any feedback from the neighborhoods.

Ms. Marlow replied that is it definitely considered in the matrix, the ease and ability to permit and the impact to private lands. She acknowledged that it is going to be challenging and recalled the S'it'Tuwan Subdivision experience. Her thought was to spend quite a bit of time with the Assembly, so that they understand what community goals are being achieved and the reason for embarking down that road.

Mr. Watson agreed that consensus from the Planning Commission, Lands and Assembly would go a long ways to further resolve those issues out.

Mr. Miller stated that he was very impressed with the report, he felt it was very thorough and very interesting.

He commented that in his experience with Planned Unit Developments, developers would be able to develop lands much cheaper than standard development and noted that there are only two PUDs in Juneau. He described, "The first thing you do is you chop off 40% of your land and give it away and the next thing, if you pack all that development on to the remaining 60% of the land, but it still has the exact same number of lateral, sewer lateral, water laterals, but now

because it is all packed together tighter, you cannot use natural topography for drainage grading and so now you end up with much more expensive systems to install and operate." He asked, "Do you see this where the City is going to develop it and turn over lots to be sold to individuals or do you see this as the City is going to put in the main arterials and then there will be little development areas of several acres that could be sold to different-sized developers by bid or auction. How do you see this getting developed? Is CBJ going to go into the lot building business, like they did at Lena, and if so, how well did you guys do it or how do you see it go on?"

Ms. Marlow said that the term PUD may not be the most appropriate. She stated that a master plan would be developed for whichever area is chosen for long-term development. The master plan would include phases - they would be basically in the subdivision building business, putting in roads, utilities, a park; then they would identify parcels in the subdivision to solicit bids for Affordable Housing Projects. The Affordable Housing Commission would rate those responses and make a recommendation to the Assembly on which responses to respond to, along with terms and considerations to negotiate on for the disposal of the property. She thinks that the initial disposals are going to be tied directly to the perpetuity of affordable housing commitments. She explained that if there is a project that shows long-term perpetuity, the City is going to look favorably to doing a partnership or a disposal for that. If they were to propose market rate homes, or do a discount on a smaller portion of the homes to get them affordable status, it would be weighted or reviewed differently than a long-term perpetual affordable housing proposal.

Mr. Miller asked for clarification if they were going to build the lots.

Ms. Marlow replied that they would not build the lots but they would build the road and the utilities, it would be vacant unimproved land that would be subdivided into parcels that people could bid on for projects, so they would have the full site prep cost.

Mr. Miller inquired about how they were going to make it perpetually affordable (subsidy or a nonprofit sector that could supply the subsidy).

Ms. Marlow said that research done by the Affordable Housing Commission showed that there are anywhere from 4 to 8 funding sources that come together to fund a project, and one or more of those sources would be from the State or the Federal level, they come with requirements that the project be designated as affordable for 30, 55, or 99 years. She explained that that is just the nature of financing used sometimes.

There are other models such as the Juneau Housing Trust Model where they buy the land, build the homes and sell just the homes, not the land, so, land stays in property tax status. When it is time for that owner to move, there is a deed restriction on the house that the house had to be sold back to the Juneau Housing Trust, so that they could collect another income qualified buyer to sell the house to, and that's how their projects stay in perpetual affordable status; through administration and oversight.

Mr. Miller asked if many of these could be done in a year and if the primary focus was to try to do 32 units.

Ms. Marlow answered that it would be dependent on the developer, but in building common wall type developments such as townhomes, 6 or 8 units could come up at a time, making 30 units very possible in a year. She also noted the pent-up demand for housing referring to the Housing Needs Statement and that a lot of agencies on the Affordable Housing Commission had wait-lists for 200 to 300 people to get into housing.

Mr. Medina asked Mr. Watt if the city plowed Lee Court. Mr. Watt said he believed it was a publicly maintained road.

Mr. Medina asked if \$250,000 would be considered Affordable Housing.

Ms. Marlow answered that the definition they use for affordable homes is a price point of \$250,000 or less, or 30% of average median income, which was about \$1200 a month, or \$400 a month in rent.

Mr. Watson referred back to page 2, "...even where these 130 units might be provided, it might also be necessary to consolidate ownership and management of these housing organizations to provide better economies of scale.." and asked if that was like the Housing Authority.

Ms. Marlow answered yes and mentioned a group called the Juneau Homeless Coalition with a membership of over 30 agencies, they are seeing quite a bit of overlap between purpose, mission, staff, expenditures, and so are considering consolidating among themselves.

Ms. Lawfer supported whatever has been done so far but questioned if a home of \$250,000 was affordable for most people in this town.

Mr. Miller sought clarification that staff wanted to go up to Pederson Hill, but the Affordable Housing Commission wanted Switzer. Ms. Marlow responded whichever one they could get done first is the way it is right now.

Mr. Miller added that he agreed that Pederson Hill will fulfill both needs, but if there was pent-up need and there was an ability to provide 30 units of subsidized housing, he asked if it would be better to do that first and take some need off the table.

Chair Satre said that it may be good to have this come back around for public hearing, so that potentially some of the entities could come and give their side on what they might envision should certain opportunities come into play.

Ms. Marlow mentioned that the nature of the discussion was to decide which areas made most sense for development.

Ms. Lawfer asked Chair Satre where they would go from here with regards to this report and the recommendations.

Chair Satre said that they as a commission do have some concerns and this is a time to discuss them. They will bring this back as an official public comment item and make recommendations exactly as is, or make amends to them. He felt it was extremely helpful that Ms. Marlow and Mr. Watt were present to give a detailed explanation. The Commission could revisit this with a good prepared discussion next time.

Ms. Lawfer questioned if it could be brought back sooner than later. Chair Satre said that it would be relatively soon.

Ms. Marlow said that they were shooting to get this on their first agenda in November and that she had been told by the manager's office that it is a hot topic for the Assembly Retreat. She is supposed to bring this back to the Assembly within the next month or two.

Mr. Hart asked if the Commission needed any additional information to understand things more fully.

Mr. Watson mentioned that the price point of \$250,000 or less can be considered affordable especially when financing for 30 years, oftentimes, the payment will be less than what one would pay for a 2-bed apartment in Juneau.

Mr. Bishop asked Ms. Marlow if there was any research done on what happens to the resale and the rental rates of existing housing when a large block of affordable housing is brought in.

Ms. Marlow said that she was not sure of the numbers but the Juneau Market is not a standard market in the US economy and they would need to bring hundreds and hundreds of homes online in order to start to change price points.

Ms. Bennett commented that she was amazed at how many homes had been rehabilitated on 6th Street (mentioning that was a lot of conflict when trying to resolve that issue and the positive outcome).

Chair Satre said it was an excellent presentation. He agreed with some of Mr. Bishop's comments as an individual. He also mentioned that previous discussions with the Planning Commission have really looked at the Switzer Area first and foremost, and they knew there were longer range planning issues with Pederson Hill and Auke Bay areas, so they might want to think about that a little bit and have that in further discussions going forward.

Mr. Bishop said he would like to see more visuals showing how the proposed Auke Bay Corridor works with their subdivision. He asked if Figure 9 and 10 could be merged together.

Ms. Marlow said that DOT refuses to say anything definite until a development proposal is submitted for them to respond to.

Mr. Bishop stated that he would really like to see something happen on Pederson Hill. He said it would help to have some coordination between the Planning Commission, Assembly, and the State and Ms. Marlow's office as well; he suggested inviting someone from the State to a Committee of the Whole meeting.

Ms. Marlow replied that she doubted that they would respond with anything more concrete than “they would respond to an application”.

Chair Satre thanked Ms. Marlow and Mr. Watt for being here.

BREAK 18:48 – 18:56

AME2012 0006: Chapters 10 and 11 Comprehensive Plan – A text amendment of Title 49 and of the Comprehensive Plan for the 2012 Update.

Applicant: City and Borough of Juneau

Location: Boroughwide

Chair Satre referred them to the amendment of the Comprehensive Plan and the revised Chapter 11 as well as the revised maps from the last discussion.

Mr. Lyman, Senior Planner, stated that he anticipated a quick discussion of the last two chapters that they had not reviewed of the Comprehensive Plan and within a month or so the changes would be completed and it would be ready for public review.

One thing that they had discussed that hadn't been resolved was the Mixed Use Designation in the Land Use Maps. They discussed that it could cause confusion having a zoning district called Mixed Use and another called Mixed Use 2, and also having another land use designation of both the Mixed Use that are all really equivalent.

A Mixed Use Development is generally defined as a single development that has a mixture of uses typically, generally residential as well as nonresidential uses. He said that a two-story building with a general store on the first story and a single residence above would be a Mixed Use development. A Mixed Use area where you have an apartment building next to an office building, in separate developments would also fit within the broad Mixed Use grouping.

Currently, they have a Light Commercial zone where they allow 30 dwelling units an acre as well as commercial use; General Commercial zone where they allow 50 dwelling units per acre plus commercial uses; plus two Mixed Use zones and the Waterfront Commercial zone where 18 units an acre and commercial are allowed. He mentioned that they actually have a lot of mixed use zoning districts. The question was what would they call what they had been calling the Mixed Use Land Use Designation in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Lyman suggested a number of possible names, including MU3, but he was looking for direction from the Commission. He said that they were also known as Live-Work Neighborhoods or Developments, Compact Development, or a Walkable Center as they talk a lot about Mixed Use Development being in a Walkable Transit-Oriented Design.

Some of the big things in Transit Oriented Development and Mixed Use Development are density, diversity, design, and distance, but the D designation is used in the Residential Zoning District, so calling it D3 would not help. Mr. Lyman suggested that they could call it an Infill Priority, Development Priority or Central.

Mr. Bishop said TND, Traditional Neighborhood Design.

Ms. Bennett mentioned Central Business District or Downtown Core. Mr. Lyman said downtown already has a Central Business District and that label might be confusing.

Ms. Lawfer queried if they were keeping Marine and Mixed Use Marine. Mr. Lyman responded that was a separate Land Use Designation, the MMU.

Mr. Lyman mentioned that the draft map is still labeled as "Urban" but he did not want to take that to the public with that designation. He wanted it to focus more on the design and functionality of the area.

Next, he stated that one of the major changes that had been discussed by the Committee of the Whole was a new map for Bonus Overlay Districts. They had previously discussed having a Transit Oriented Development Overlay as well as an Affordable Housing Overlay, and they realized that what they were trying to accomplish in both areas was essentially the same (focusing on development around transit lines, near urban services, looking at density bonuses, parking reduction and design amenities that make for a quality environment for people to be able to walk, bike, catch transit and be comfortable doing it).

He had been directed by the Commission to work with the cartographer to come up with a single Bonus Eligible Area Map. He pointed to page 3 of 4 in the staff report where they amended the parameters for the bonus eligible area per the last Planning Commission meeting.

They had actually talked about using the Hazard Maps that were adopted into the Land Use Code, but the problem with those is that they can be amended by staff after application by a property owner/developer, do an engineering report and then amend the map boundaries, it does not come back to the Planning Commission or to the Assembly. So, he didn't want to use those maps, even though they are a bit more detailed than the Comprehensive Plan Hazard Maps. Unfortunately, the Comprehensive Plan Hazard Maps are not as accurate and do not have a lot of detail. He asked that it may be beneficial to remove that restriction on these maps and adopt them into the Land Use Code and decide that they won't issue development bonuses on properties for development within hazard areas.

Not within the Mendenhall Wetlands State Game Refuge or Juneau International Airport - The Commission had asked that they include institutional and public use designated lands in the Comprehensive Plan, but he felt that would create confusion if they gave development bonuses in the airport.

Not within a Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial or Waterfront Commercial/Industrial Land Use designated area on the Land Use Maps.

On Page 4 - Not including the bus route for properties within one-half mile of the bus route along the Mendenhall Loop Road between the entrance to UAS in the west and the Mendenhall River in the east and so the Back Loop Road is excluded between the Mendenhall River and essentially Auke Bay or halfway down Auke Lake.

Mr. Bishop asked why they had to have #5 if it had to be with regular services half an hour or less.

Mr. Lyman replied that Routes 3 and 4, which serve the whole Mendenhall Loop Road and Glacier Highway, run on opposite circuits and so on average, it is a 30-minute service.

There were some other changes to the text that the Commission requested in Chapter 10, primarily removing all of the references as to which zoning districts are appropriate. He said he left some of the discussion about things like parks and how they should be in the same zoning district as the land that surrounds them because they are going to be smaller generally speaking, than the minimum area for a particular zoning district, as well as discussing how stream corridors, watersheds and scenic view corridors are all overlay districts not to be confused with actual Land Use Designations.

Mr. Bishop felt like they were picking on the area between the Back Loop and the University when it was put in writing and specifically spelled out. He thought that they should leave it the way it is because they do say that it has to be within an appropriately zoned area anyway.

Mr. Lyman agreed that was a possibility and he would not have any issues with that. He said that that area primarily is a single family/duplex zoning district and there has been opposition from a lot of those neighborhoods to higher zoning changes in the past.

He said that staff has been working on how to organize the bonuses and how different types of bonuses are appropriate for different zoning districts. He cited an example that they didn't necessarily want to allow a huge amount of extra development in the D1 zoning district because by its very nature, D1 zones don't have public sewer or else they would have been up zoned and so they wouldn't want to be extending large density bonuses to those properties, but maybe could give a height bonus and other bonuses for protecting sensitive habitat might be appropriate.

Mr. Bishop mentioned a large acreage for sale next to Montana Creek, that really could use density bonuses to preserve habitat. He is more inclined to want to have density bonuses in areas like that and use it for cluster type development projects. He would just skip clause 5.

Mr. Watson said he was not sure he agreed with Commissioner Bishop on that. He preferred to leave #5 the way it is right now.

Ms. Bennett said that part of the rationale for excluding that had to do with the road coming along Goat Hill and down into Auke Bay.

Mr. Bishop said that his recollection was that we were deciding it was all residential property and it was not zoned appropriately for what we are allowing density bonuses for.

Chair Satre said that was his recollection as well.

Ms. Lawfer mentioned she would be okay to leave that part out.

Chair Satre stated that he could be comfortable if they were sure that they were going to protect that area through the actual bonus provision.

Mr. Bishop felt that they need to be able to cluster their subdivision and get some benefits out of this, to make it such that they actually have the ability to do the D5 density in a tighter compact development and right now, their code doesn't allow for that. It doesn't have any bonuses that allow clustering development in a D3 zone for providing the amenities or for doing set-asides. He thought that they need to be moving towards that direction of using density bonuses to reward good development in D3 and D5 zones as well as within commercial zones and higher density D10 and D15 zones as well. He mentioned that mixing up development types is an appropriate thing to do today and moving more towards Traditional Neighborhood Designs is a good thing.

Mr. Watson said he might have misunderstood Mr. Bishop, but what he thought he had said was that he wanted to remove this, so that he could preserve more natural land.

Mr. Bishop responded yes and no. In the case of the property he was speaking of, they have a lot of flood plains and they can't reach their densities because of that flood plain, but if there were a provision that allowed them to do set-asides, i.e. natural areas, flood areas etc. and to be able to cluster their development, then that would provide a relief to them.

Chair Satre said that basically if they took out 5, then the area from the river over to the University housing facilities would have a half-mile buffer overlay. He asked if they wanted to include the area in the bonus eligible area.

Mr. Miller felt it would be a good idea to go ahead and include it to give some potential to protect some areas, otherwise someone was going to get a Corps of Engineers permit and fill it all in.

Chair Satre queried if they were in general agreement that they would add a half-mile buffer to the area, but that they would have allowed the ability to provide bonus provisions along a major road and bus corridor.

Ms. Lawfer asked if there was water and sewer in the area. Chair Satre responded that there was.

#5 was eliminated.

Mr. Lyman mentioned that although there are a lot of people who depend on transit along there, it is a relatively low number of boardings and alightings, or relatively low ridership, and adds a lot of time to the service route and is an area that is constantly threatened with losing some level of transit service. He felt the commission was going in the right direction taking off #5.

Mr. Miller questioned Resource Development on Page 214 and questioned the last sentence, "...after available resources have been extracted from these lands, they should be re-designated or rezoned..." it occurred to him that maybe they needed to change a couple of sentences. He also asked about the second sentence where it says "...such specific uses may include where appropriate resource extraction, development of recreational visitor-oriented facilities or residential uses....", but depending on where it is that, might be general commercial, light commercial, or industrial. He stated that if they were going to include some things the areas could become, then maybe they should include all of them or get rid of that description because the Land Use Designation would usually cover a bigger area. He did agree with keeping "re-designated or rezoned".

Mr. Watson said he agreed with Mr. Miller and he was also troubled with "after available resources", asking who determines what the available resources are.

Mr. Lyman said he thought the whole paragraph was actually really confusing and he would take a crack at rewriting the whole thing and keeping this intact.

Mr. Bishop said that he thought this was totally different from what was written in the 2008 update, because he didn't think it had included specific uses before. His recollection was that it was set aside for future uses that were entirely nonspecific and that when they say resource, they mean any resource. He said that it was not supposed to be specifically for timber resources, mineral resources, it could be human resources, economic resources, whatever resources that existed on the land and he thought that it had been misinterpreted and written to mean something more specific than was originally intended.

Mr. Lyman stated that it was definitely word for word the same in the 2008 Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Satre interjected saying perhaps this could be simplified, even down into a single statement.

Mr. Lyman suggested that they would go with essentially the first sentence and then modify the last sentence as discussed earlier. "Land to be managed primarily to identify and conserve natural resources until specific land uses are identified and developed, as resources are extracted or identified, these lands should be re-designated and rezoned appropriately".

Ms. Lawfer and Mr. Watson agreed.

Mr. Lyman added that he would keep the area outside of the study area designated as Resource Development. Mr. Lyman remembered that there had been a substantial rewrite in 2008.

Mr. Watson recalled that at the last PC meeting, there wasn't an accurate way to define "scenic" when discussing the issue of Scenic Corridors and View Corridors.

Mr. Chaney stated that the term Viewshed is difficult but that the term Scenic Corridor is easier to deal with, referring to Map 1 on Page 189, Hazard Map 2 of 2 also has Scenic Corridors and the shaded areas are listed as Scenic Corridor/Viewshed. The Scenic Corridor Area is easy to map and is a designated area, but they would need some help in defining what a Viewshed was.

Chair Satre noted that one person's Viewshed was not the same as another person's Viewshed, but at least this piece says that can be something that they review as part of it.

Mr. Lyman stated that the language was in there, "...the Land Use Code should include provision that allows staff and/or the Planning Commission to deny or conditionally approve projects that might negatively impact Scenic Corridor Viewshed designated lands or the viewscape there from..."

Mr. Miller felt it was impossibly subjective to define.

Mr. Lyman commented that without identifying what they wanted to protect, they would not know what they are willing to give up. They need to have some mechanism in the Land Use Code that identifies the important View Corridors and put something in the Land Use Code that would be supported by the Comprehensive Plan where they could regulate it because right now they didn't have anything useful.

Mr. Bishop suggested just accepting the language as guidance for doing something in the future.

Mr. Watson stated that he didn't agree with that.

Mr. Medina said he agreed with Commissioner Miller in that it was way too subjective.

Ms. Lawfer joked about Trash Mountain being in the scenic corridor and it was important to identify these appropriately.

Chair Satre asked if they wanted to strike the amended language and asked the Commission what they would like to do moving forward because they had the designation Scenic Corridor/Viewshed, and they had additional language that was going to drive them to amending the Land Use Code and getting into that subjective and objective conversation or do they leave it as it for future work.

Mr. Bishop said if they were going to have a Scenic Corridor/Viewshed Map, then they need to have it do something, and they need Title 49 for that. They need an implementing action to follow it up. He continued that just having a statement in the Comprehensive Plan won't do anything except for decisions on public lands, but if they only wanted it to be on public lands

they could leave in but if they wanted to include private lands, they would need to add something in Title 49.

Chair Satre agreed that the safe thing to do was to stay with Public Land designation for now.

Mr. Lyman said he was going to offer a text change to the last sentence, "The Land Use Code should be revised to include provisions that regulate projects that negatively impact Scenic Corridor/ Viewshed designated lands or the viewscape there from".

Mr. Bishop moved that they strike the second paragraph.

Chair Satre asked if Commission was in general agreement.

Mr. Chaney suggested identifying where the Viewsheds are before adding a code section in the Land Use Code.

Chair Satre mentioned that he thought their decisions on public lands were going to be very different than private lands and he guessed they could come back to Title 49 later when the Planning Commission could talk about it going forward.

Chair Satre suggested they leave it as written but from a staff perspective, put it on the list of things to be addressed as the Planning Commission.

Mr. Watson asked for confirmation that Chair Satre was suggesting they leave it in for the present time, but it would be discussed again.

Chair Satre responded that they leave the existing text and the underlined part would come out.

Chair Satre stated that they would keep the language from the 2008 revision.

Ms. Bennett mentioned that on page 216, under Commercial, if they should add in professional offices.

Mr. Lyman answered that it says "mixed retail, residential, and office uses were allowed" which include office complexes.

Ms. Bennett asked if office implied professional as well as retail.

Mr. Lyman responded that offices definitely meant professional offices, not retail.

Mr. Lyman mentioned that he had noted there were large black hazard blobs and avalanche mass wasting blobs shown on the Hazard Maps, however felt that they need to be called out in the description as not being as exact as the Land Use Code Maps. He thought it was might be useful as an informational item in the Comprehensive Plan, but they may want to be more specific.

Ms. Lawfer asked if this was the only place where there were black blobs.

Mr. Lyman stated it was only on Maps 1 and 2 of the Scenic View Corridor, Watershed, and Hazard maps and they are not shown on the other maps.

The maps have been essentially unchanged except for Map S in the Hilda Creek area.

Subarea Guidelines and Considerations – Mr. Lyman noted that there was discussion in the 2008 Update process of whether to present historical and cultural resources like petroglyphs and archeological sites.

The rest of the projects that were listed had been updated at the staff level.

He said that the one caveat he had on all of the subareas had to do with reference to the Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 8. They had asked Parks and Recreation to comment on which projects have been accomplished and when they update their Comprehensive Plan, staff could update their lists.

Mr. Watson said that regarding Chapter 8, Parks and Recreation, he had a discussion with Brent Fischer asking him what they had actually updated, and he said, "Well it is the bolded part" and he had gone back and looked at it, and it was hard to find any bolding in that document and he didn't see a lot of updates.

Mr. Lyman stated that Chapter 8 was updated in 2007 or 2008 and the entire chapter was readopted and it was the one that listed out the priority improvements by subarea, but their subarea boundaries were different than ours.

Mr. Watson referred to Subarea 1, Eagle River to Berners Bay, Point #9, the last few words "...that any extension of the Glacier Highway to the ferry terminal located at or near the mouth of the Katzehin River or beyond for access to the Kensington Mine or points north, is designed to provide a year-round energy-efficient passage..." and he asked what energy-efficient safe passage meant.

Mr. Miller said that in doing the math on how much fuel a ferry takes to go to Haines and how many cars it could take versus driving a modern vehicle - the fuel savings is astronomical in a year by driving cars as opposed to taking the ferry.

Mr. Lyman added that out of discussions with the Marine Transportation Advisory Board and their recommendations for the Southeast Alaska Area Wide Transportation Plan, their caveat for DOT looking at extending the road north and building a new ferry terminal, the Marine Transportation Advisory Board is only willing to endorse that if there was also provision of public transportation between the Capital Transit route and that new ferry terminal.

Mr. Lyman noted a few grammatical and cross referencing changes.

On page 281, talking about the safest Pedestrian and Pedestrian Circulation System in the Lemon Creek and Switzer Creek areas, he added the 2009 Non-motorized Transportation Plan and the Safe Routes to Schools Plan.

A comment from Commissioner Bennett on Page 286 about the CBJ continuing its efforts to develop a convenient transportation terminal near downtown which would provide a transfer station for mass and rapid public transit where commuter buses, possibly a light rail system would connect to shuttle buses and commuters could park their automobiles at the terminal, and then asked if that was the downtown transportation center. The answer was unfortunately no, the center called for in the Plan is more of a transit facility that's over by the bridge, it stops people before they came into town.

There is a new discussion starting on Page 288/289, updating Point 2 for Subarea 7 Thane, recognizing that there had been some reconstruction of that road but that the safety issues have not yet been addressed.

Subarea 8, Page 292 regarding the North Douglas Crossing and the failure to get funding for that crossing; basically just saying that if this is going to continue to be a planning priority, the City will have to do a lot of education to get the community on board.

Staff is recommending removing the transitional designation in the Comprehensive Plan Maps that required a change in Text, Page 293.

Number 16 on Page 294, is a Downtown Douglas guideline that is in the North Douglas Section, so it was completely moved over to Number 11 on Page 298.

Mr. Bishop referred to Page 209, regarding the new review for the Comprehensive Plan Maps, he would personally prefer to strike the whole fourth paragraph as the language was limiting and directive rather than open and general.

Mr. Miller said he liked the paragraph. He thought that staff did a nice job of explaining the difference between the two, the Zoning versus Comprehensive Plan Maps and due to the fact that some of the flexibility in the ordinance was taken away, it was important to save this paragraph.

Mr. Bishop responded saying he liked the analogy, but saw it differently, and if he had a parcel that was residential and zoned adjacent to Rural Reserve, which was designated in the Comprehensive Plan Maps and then they wanted to take that Rural Reserve and turn it into some higher density zoning, the part that was established next to him would be gone and wouldn't be able to rely on the initial designations or have that security anymore.

Chair Satre questioned if they needed the addition. He mentioned that there are other pieces in the chapter that address both of those. He suggested keeping the existing language.

Mr. Watson opined to strike that particular paragraph.

Chair Satre asked what the department would be doing next.

Mr. Lyman said that staff is going to go through all his notes, check the chapters and the minutes and make sure he didn't miss anything, make all the changes that the commission requested, and at some point hopefully within about a month, they will publish an entire draft plan, and take it out to the public.

Previously, public opinion was sought first but this time, staff went through the 2008 Plan, did a full review, then brought it before the Planning Commission and some major changes were made. Now, they need to take this back to the community, to neighborhood meetings and talk to them about the changes that are proposed, and get some public feedback. Their plan is to do that after the holidays, so they will be doing public notice in December and having the draft publication out early December - late November. That will give a month for everyone to be looking at it and then after the New Year, they will start with public meetings, neighborhood outreach, bring those comments back and bring them to the Planning Commission again for review and passage on to the Assembly of the entire draft plan. They plan to have it in the Assembly's hands in March.

Mr. Lyman said that nevertheless, the 2012 update is going to be a 2013 update because there is too much change to take to the Assembly at this point.

Mr. Miller asked about the avalanche areas at Thunder Mountain, he asked if a study could be done to find out if a 100-unit project could be done instead of the proposed 30 units if it was deemed safe.

Mr. Lyman responded that Ms. Marlow had given a similar presentation to the staff last week and explained the topography of the area using the map. He stated that they would be better suited in terms of infrastructure, costs, and development costs to cluster the development in the northern half near to the end of the road to avoid bridging over braided streams, or do it directly off of Threadneedle St., but that would be a separate project.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Hart mentioned that Mr. Smith would like to update everyone about the Assembly Retreat that happened the previous Saturday.

Mr. Smith stated that he was pleased that every assembly person had an opportunity to identify their list and he thought that probably five issues that were identified last year were brought back to the table in that session. He noted the importance of doing some financial planning in view of the fact that both State and Federal Revenues were projected to go down, coupled with the fact that they haven't had the time because the Public Works Department hasn't had an opportunity to identify deferred maintenance, time to quantify where they were in comparison to other municipalities with regard to their benefit structure and 65% of their budget is related to employee salaries. He was pleased to see that the Assembly had identified the need to develop closer relationships with the Committee of the Whole, Planning Department, Community

Development Group, and the Engineering Department. At the retreat, all the managers had an opportunity to present to the Assembly, which was a new thing.

Chair Satre said he appreciated Mr. Smith bringing forth the Planning Commission's list to the Assembly. Mr. Smith said that he stressed with the Law Department that there was a lot of ordinance backlog. Chair Satre mentioned that they have been working with the City Manager and the Deputy City Manager as well, going through their concerns. He emphasized the need to get the Planning Commission and Assembly Committee of the Whole Meeting scheduled soon and that continuing to schedule them would be very important.

Mr. Smith asked the Planning Staff if they could share with him how the Comprehensive Plan Update has been presented to the Assembly in the past and whether it could be made easier to understand.

Chair Satre said that they would give some thought on how to simplify the presentation to the Assembly and the Public.

Mr. Smith shared some comments on the retreat. The action list was discussed first which he felt was done backwards. There would be another session where the facilitator said they would start with a broad vision, identify the steps to get there, and then identify the specific things they wanted to accomplish. Mr. Smith stated that he would report back on the outcome of that session.

Chair Satre appreciated Mr. Smith for keeping the line of the communication going back and forth.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.