

## Minutes

### **Auke Bay Steering Committee Meeting**

Community Development Department, City and Borough of Juneau

**Joann Lott, Chair**

September 3, 2015

#### **I. Welcome and Introductions**

##### **Roll Call**

Eric Feldt called the Auke Bay Steering Committee Meeting, held at the University of Alaska Southeast, to order at 6:02pm.

##### **Steering Committee Members Present:**

Joann Lott, Karla Hart , Caroline Hassler, Ric Iannolino, David Klein, Nathan Leigh, Lawrence Lee Oldaker, and Linda Snow (Douglas Indian Association Representative).

##### **Steering Committee Members Absent:**

Sharyn Augustine, Michele Grant, Eric Lindegaard, Mike Noel, Philip Rolfe, Alice Taff, and Tlingit Haida Central Council Representative.

##### **Staff Present:**

Hal Hart, CDD; Eric Feldt, CDD; Brenwynne Grigg, CDD; James Bibb, Northwind Architect; and Gerald Gotschall, Northwind Architect; Matt Bell, Planning Commissioner.

#### **II. Public Testimony on Non-Agenda Items**

Ms. Snow, Douglas Indian Association, commented on an ordinance in 1969 where the City rezoned Auke Cape from Residential Status to Public Use to protect area because of hundreds of years of historic use. In 1984, with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Plan revisions, the land was rezoned back into residential. Ms. Snow doesn't believe negative development on this land was intended, but the designation happened. In the Cultural Chapter, an Auke Bay Plan Goal 2 (page 26) calls to preserve and limit activity at Indian Point. Ms. Snow requests that the Steering Committee recommend to the Assembly this area is rezoned to a designation that prohibits development and preserves the area.

Ms. Lott motioned for the meeting to be extended to 8:30pm if needed. The motion carried.

Mr. Klein recommended public comment be kept to 3 minutes per topic. The motion carried.

### III. Unfinished Business

#### A. Develop Customized Regulations and Incentives for Plan Implementation

##### **Topic 1: Complete Streets**

Staff gave short presentation on what a complete street might look like for a collector or local access street. An example would be a sidewalk on one side or both. What might Minor Arterial or Arterial streets look like? Would you like flexibility depending on the topography and feasibility of the street? Would you like bicycle accommodation?

*Public Comment:*

No public comment.

*Motion:*

Motion by Ms. Hart, seconded by Mr. Iannolino, that Collector and Local Access streets are zoned for maximum speeds of 20mph to provide for safer bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Motion carried 7/1.

Motion by Ms. Lott, seconded by Ms. Snow, require sidewalks on both sides of the street, but to provide flexibility to gauge number of sidewalks needed depending on site topography. Motion carried 8/0.

##### **Topic 2: Narrow Streets and On-Street Parking**

Staff presented questions such as, should collector and local access streets consist of smaller travel lanes? Should at least one lane of on-street parking be provided? Are one-way streets ever acceptable?

*Public Comment:*

Question from a Member of the Public: Mr. Conan asked how streets will be planned for bicycle traffic and asked whether the local bicyclists club has been contacted for input. Mr. Hart replied that generally, most "complete street" plans are agreed upon by bicyclist clubs. Also, procedurally, how does the Assembly run a meeting? Mr. Feldt replied that Steering Committee meetings are meant to be run differently than Assembly and Planning Commission meetings and gave a brief overview of those differences.

Question from a Member of the Public: Ms. Michelle Ridgway asked whether landscaping was viewed as a good thing or a bad thing by the bicyclist communities. Mr. Feldt replied that at the last Steering Committee meeting, they voted to pursue complete streets and amenities.

Comment by Member of the Public, Ms. Ke Mell commented as to the topography of the area and whether certain types of streets will be feasible. She went on to say this has not yet been brought up in presentations. Narrower travel lanes are going to be easier to build, less costly with the existing topography, and will use less property. Streets that are sloping are more

problematic for on-street parking. She suggested it might be helpful to look at topography first when talking about a limited area so as to have the specifics.

Comment by Member of the Public: Mr. Conan stated that it seems we're getting into too many details without being experts on topography. In doing so, the committee will get beyond their expertise if they get it too specific.

*Motion:*

Motion by Ms. Hart, second by Ms. Lott, that collector and local access streets consist of smaller 10' travel lanes. Motion carried, 7/1.

Motion by Ms. Lott, second by Mr. Iannolino, to have at least one lane of on-street parking to be provided along Local Access Street with signage that states no boat trailers. Motion carried 7/1.

Motion by Ms. Hart, second by Mr. Klein, in areas with adequate traffic circulation, one-way streets would be acceptable if an opposing direction bike lane is included. Motion failed, 4/4.

Motion by Mr. Leigh, second by Ms. Snow, in areas with adequate traffic circulation, one-way streets would be acceptable. Motion carried 6/2.

**Topic 3: Streetscape Amenities**

Staff presentation that asked if street amenities should be installed where appropriate. Should residential streets be lined with landscaping? Should arterials and collectors contain pedestrian lighting and landscaping?

*Public Comment:*

Comment by Member of the Public: Ms. Ke Mell cautioned that before we start requiring street amenities, we should decide or think about who will pay for them? Will it be the responsibility of the CBJ, property owners, a neighborhood association, etc.? If these amenities are not looked after, they aren't an asset.

Comment by Member of the Public: Ms. Joanne Schmidt from DOT gave a brief presentation on what is and isn't allowed in State owned right-of-way.

Comment by Member of the Public: Mr. Conan stated that he had a hard time envisioning the committee telling property owners what should go on private property and thought it might be difficult getting that through the Planning Commission and Assembly.

*Motion:*

Motion by Ms. Hart, second by Mr. Iannolino, that street amenities such as trash receptacles, landscaping, benches, lighting, and bike racks, shall be installed on public streets where appropriate and as resources are available. Motion carried 6/2.

Motion by Mr. Leigh, second by Mr. Iannolino to not accept the provision that residential street must be lined with landscaping. Motion carried, 6/2.

Motion by Ms. Hassler, second by Ms. Lott that Arterial and Collector streets shall contain pedestrian scale lighting in the right of way where allowed. Motion carried 8/0. *(The intent of pedestrian scale lighting is to provide a smaller scale of lighting with a rural feel rather than tall overhead lights.)*

#### **Topic 4: Hide Trash, Loading Docks, Equipment**

Staff gave short presentation that expressed the intent to increase the aesthetics and feel of the area.

##### *Public Comment:*

Comment by Member of the Public: Ms. Ke Mell expressed a caution to consider a height limit on landscaping, for example, you might not want to plant a spruce that will grow 100 feet tall.

Comment by Member of the Public: Mr. Bruce Conant commented that he preferred offering carrots than sticks when looking at requirements.

Mr. Feldt clarified that this requirement relates only to commercial mixed use areas. Mr. Hart noted that as density of an area increases, there will be more noise and potential issues that having vegetative buffers could help to mitigate.

Mr. Pat Carroll asked if they were speaking to things in the Right-of-Way such as utility boxes, transformers, traffic signaling, etc.)

##### *Motion:*

Ms. Hart moved, Mr. Klein seconded, that in the Auke Bay center area, all trash dumpsters, loading docks, and fixed equipment should be screened from adjacent ROW's, pedestrian pathways, and mapped view shed of the Auke Bay Area Plan by using landscaping, fencing, or buildings. Motion carried, 7/1.

#### **Topic 5: Pedestrian Connections**

##### *Public Comment:*

Comment from Member of the Public: Ms. Ke Mell suggested striking the language of existing sidewalks and look to future sidewalk. She also suggested the Committee make it clear who would maintain the pathways and the City should decide in advance where they go instead of leaving it up to the property owners.

Comment from Member of the Public: Mr. Gerald Gotschall spoke about the grid planning we all envisioned, mid-block cross-connections are a must for pedestrian connections.

*Motion:*

Motion by Mr. Iannolino, second by Ms. Snow, that development shall provide pedestrian connections that connect parking areas and building entrances to sidewalks and pathways. Motion carried 8/0

Motion by Ms. Snow, second by Ms. Lott, property owners shall receive a density bonus or other incentive for creating pedestrian connections across private property. Motion carried 8/0.

**IV. New Business**

B. Discuss Zoning District Changes for a New Town Center

No discussion

**V. Public Comment**

No further comments

**VI. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35pm by Committee Chair, Ms. Joann Lott.