

**Lemon Creek Area Plan
Steering Committee
Meeting Minutes
Gruening Park Rec Room**

March 16, 2017 at 6pm

Steering Committee Members:

Stephen Johnson, Chair
Michael Lukshin, Vice-Chair
Paul Voelckers, Planning Commission Liaison
Tom Chard
Daniel Collison
Wayne Coogan

Sandra Coon
Susan Erben
Dave Hanna
Mark Pusich
Patrick Quigley
Michael Short

Staff:

Jill Maclean, Senior Planner, Community Development
Allison Eddins, Planner I, Community Development
Tim Felstead, Planner, Community Development

Scott Ciambor, Chief Housing Officer, Managers Office
Bhagavati Braun, Administrative Assistant, Community Development

Agenda:

- I. Roll Call (6:00pm)
Completed at 6:08 PM
- II. Approval of Minutes February 23, 2017 (5 minutes)
Mr. Lukshin moves to adopt minutes
Mr. Coogan seconded
Motion carried
- III. Approval of Transportation & Infrastructure Chapter, Goals and Actions (10 minutes)
Ms. Maclean gave an overview of the work that happened since the last meeting, and reviewed changes that were made.
Mr. Lukshin asked if it is possible to add CIP important portions as an appendix for reference.
Ms. Maclean – yes
Mr. Coogan – moves to approve the chapter as amended
Mr. Hanna – seconded
Call for discussion
Mr. Lukshin – question on Goal 1 regarding second access. Mr. Lukshin stated that there was informal consensus that any new roads should be paved, specifically the second access route.
Ms. Maclean – Goal 1 was made broader regarding second access to neighborhoods within Lemon Creek. Thinks updated action item covers the question of that – lets study it versus mandating it.
There was a discussion about whether or not the city would put in an unpaved road and whether the Committee should put in specific language recommending or requiring paved roads, potential dust and wetland issues were also discussed.

Mr. Voelckers – add the following to the first action under goal 1: “, with a recommendation for a minimum two lane paved surface.”

General agreement.

Mr. Coogan – calls for the question

Motion passed, unanimous with Mr. Lukshin abstaining.

Confusion over what was voted on. Was the vote on Mr. Voelckers’ suggestion to add language to Goal 1 or was the vote on Mr. Coogan’s motion to approve the chapter?

Ms. Erben – motion to pause the meeting for 10 minutes to allow others to read the other goals as a courtesy.

Mr. Lukshin seconded.

Ms. Maclean clarified that the whole committee receives all information before the meeting for their review.

Motion was not voted on – no one opposed the overview.

Ms. Maclean gave a brief overview of the Goals and Actions.

Approval of Neighborhoods & Housing Chapter, Goals and Actions

a. Discuss the chapter (45 minutes)

Ms. Maclean gave an overview of the changes that had been made to the chapter between meetings and clarified the difference between modular versus manufactured homes.

Mr. Ciambor addressed some of the larger changes to the chapter – toward the back on p 12 we wanted to include a lot of the details of the recently adopted Housing Action Plan and how it would apply to Lemon Creek specifically – description of what the resolution does and listed the applicable action items.

Two programs that exist in CBJ now that are applicable to Lemon Creek – Mobile Home Down Payment Program & Accessory Apartment Grant programs.

Mr. Felstead – there have been discussions about the Urban Service Area Boundary (USB) – we have added some background about that which spells out why we have a USB – it’s there to make the most use of existing infrastructure (roads and sewer service) – that’s how it will be cheapest to add housing to Juneau. Also refers to the suggestion in the comp plan where D10 will be the density that will pay off for creating more urban service areas – make infrastructure improvements really pay off.

Mr. Chard – concerned that Lemon Creek has fairly high density with multifamily units and mobile homes etc. – concerned that CBJ’s goal of increasing housing stock is showing up as our goal for Lemon Creek, looks like we are looking for high density in Lemon Creek – not sure that’s the will of the Committee.

Mr. Ciambor – tried to address that in the conclusion, talking about diverse housing stock, soft increases to enhance the character and community feel in Lemon Creek – every area of the city needs to increase housing stock, not just Lemon Creek. The focus in Lemon Creek is to create more of a neighborhood feel; the area already has diverse housing stock.

Mr. Collison – Housing Action Plan’s proposed housing development is going to be more dense than we have previously seen. Would like to make sure that we have systems in place that ensure that Lemon Creek can evaluate how our housing development will proceed in relation to the rest of the borough – reasonable in relation to other neighborhoods. 10 houses/acre is a big change. One question about the Urban Service Boundary, in light of the Housing Action Plan is a 30 year plan, and we will be in line with that 30 year plan, how do you take into account the other areas that could be potentially be added to that Urban Service Boundary, specifically North Douglas road; how does that relate to the Lemon Creek plan in the next 10, 20 etc. years

Mr. Felstead – The Comprehensive Plan talks about expanding Urban Service Boundary as conditions require. Once we start reaching a level of density at which the community is not comfortable we can look into expanding the Urban Service Boundary – West Douglas is identified as new area that

- could be developed, but that doesn't point to it happening soon. There is a hotspot map which is a good representation of where developments are happening throughout the borough right now. It's not just Lemon Creek that is being focused on to solve the borough's housing demand
- Mr. Chard – p 13 states that the target goal for housing – understand lifted out of Housing Action Plan and could be used in Lemon Creek – looks like it's our recommendation – I'm not comfortable with that – can we soften it and have it as the Housing Action Plan recommendation, not ours
- Mr. Coogan – proposed the following addition on page 13, 3rd paragraph, "The above intentions will be embraced to the same degree they are in every other neighborhood in Juneau"
- Mr. Collison – Two critical concerns:
1. Housing Action Plan wants to build 2000 units over 30 years – does not talk about developing housing on public land – of those 2000 units what's a reasonable unit on public versus private lands?
 2. Housing Action Plan refers to housing development opportunities by neighborhood – look at all public lands in CBJ and identify those for development – parse those out by neighborhood and identify housing targets by neighborhoods. Only then can we go through and say what would be potential – we need to see this info from CBJ before assessing this.
- Mr. Voelckers – my recommendation is to not get too wrapped up in numbers – almost impossible to predict, Housing Action Plan is advisory, tied up in economic drivers, our main focus should not be to wait for numbers, but more on what we would like to see if development happens.
- Mr. Ciambor – The HAP plan is not just about CBJ property, there is a huge reliance on the private sector to meet those goals as well. It is tricky to gauge private industry and incentivize it. The Housing Action Plan gives us a way to look ahead, but is not super particular, because it's not happening through the City & Borough of Juneau.
- Ms. Erben – talking about the whole of Lemon Creek – not just city lands
- Mr. Collison – in HAP housing goals are organized by neighborhood – 2000 units in 30 years – not all will be built on public land – how many on public land? What are our targets within this for our neighborhood?
I feel that Lemon Creek gets an undue burden of undesirable projects – I want to feel that whatever development happens in the future is in line with what's happening with the rest of the borough.
- Mr. Coogan – Page 16 talks about incompatible uses. I would hope to advocate that we set a goal of trying to relocate the landfill somewhere.
- Ms. Maclean – Discussion of the landfill can be restated and referenced to land use chapter where we talk about it in more depth.
- Ms. Erben – handed out population projections from the state – gave an overview of info on sheet. Maybe Housing Action Plan is off track in comparison to the state forecasts. Not a lot of growth is indicated, including looking at the economic indicators etc. I'm here because I want my beautiful neighborhood to be the same or better – We want more high-end housing. Our demographics already include a lot of the lower income housing, we should reflect borough wide changes – not be burdened.
Pinewood Park – a number of lots are undeveloped in wetlands (p1) I want to see that these will remain park land.
Lemon Flats – would like to call it a "new neighborhood area" p2 – not talked about as a neighborhood prior to now.
- Ms. Maclean – Lemon Flats was an historical name for the area – the thought was to bring back an historical name that will help bring up the image of neighborhoods in Lemon Creek.
- Ms. Erben – p3 – offended that the document didn't list current neighborhoods as strength; they're why we are here. "quality established neighborhoods with long term residents."
Add weaknesses – aging problem is mobile homes not affordable housing.
- Mr. Coogan – subjective language – let's just delete this pullout quote

Ms. Erben – wants to keep pull-outs

Ms. Erben – p 6 concerned about quality of homes if this integration happens. Make sure that its borough wide.

Ms. Maclean – the studies cited are national studies, will add citations in footnotes.

Mr. Chard – I like the objective data, facts, characteristics of neighborhoods; don't like subjective statements and goals pulled from other studies. Leave objective stuff and leave subjective stuff for the goals. As a group we are trying to find where the balance and values in our neighborhoods is.

Discussion about Development Areas shown on page 14.

Mr. Hanna – area 1 – entirely appropriate to put a proviso in there about steep slopes (like is in area 2). Would be an extremely difficult site to develop.

Mr. Pusich – echo that – Switzer creek dam sits above that as well – it's gone but there is a lot of debris etc. it is a challenging site.

Mr. Coogan – there are underlying reasons why these sites haven't been developed

IV. Public Participation (15 minutes)

Marcy Larson – from Alaskan Brewing, been there 30 years. Someone mentioned a Department of Transportation traffic study. Do we have access to this report?

Mr. Felstead has copy that he will make available.

Ms. Larson – what neighborhood is Quigleyville in?

Quigleyville falls under "Other Places" – not in a particular outlined neighborhood.

Ms. Larson – Interested in Lemon Flats – we haven't had any problems with Gastineau Human Services nearby; that was a concern that never materialized, neighborhood is growing, not sure what is going to happen soon. The neighborhood is going to change a lot – urge you to pay attention to this neighborhood which is mixing vulnerable people with mixed use and industrial things on a heavy traffic area – how are we going to keep everyone safe? Suggests addressing adding infrastructure – lighting, sidewalks etc. to keep everybody safe.

Llewellen Lechancy – would like to see an emphasis on middle to higher income housing for seniors in Lemon Creek.

Mr. Coogan – generally speaking preexisting people are usually not asked to be more accommodating than new comers. As things develop the Planning Commission should ask that the new developments should not put a burden on established businesses.

Mr. Pusich – regarding lighting etc.; it is valuable to have more lighting etc., but there is a cost to adding infrastructure. Can't see how that would come about unless there is a consensus within the neighborhood to provide those benefits.

Mr. Chard – can we pull sums from CBJ rather than shouldering the burden for basic safety provisions like lighting? If it's a priority for us let's request this from the city.

Mr. Ciambor – to Mr. Chard and Mr. Pusich's point about funding – there is an opportunity to advocate for that from the City in this plan.

Clarify about Housing First – permanent supportive housing and healthcare clinic. There will be a single entry and staff always on site including case management and an executive director. The goal is community integration, very supported project. The Housing First staff are responsible and on call to address problems for the neighborhood and borough. Studies show that alcohol intake diminishes quickly Supported housing means there will be support for the neighborhood.

Mr. Voelckers – can't promise that money is going to come (for lighting etc.) but there is a sense that Lemon Creek has been shouldering a bit of a burden – The Assembly wanted to focus here because it may have been overlooked previously – some of the actions are less specific currently – maybe we should advocate for more specific things.

Ms. Coon – really do need lighting set up at Avis and Central, there is no direct light on that corner; would like to advocate for that. Have been in communities where they have a clean-up day – can we have that? If it means money – we should ask for some since we pay our property taxes.

Mr. Johnson – suggest we move goals and actions to another night and end tonight.

Ms. Maclean – will take current suggestions and integrate them for the next meeting – suggests that everyone look at goals and actions and email specific suggestions etc. so that we can incorporate and reflect them for the next meeting (please do not reply all to emails).

Ms. Erben – are you (Ms. Maclean) going to be the gatekeeper?

Ms. Maclean – I will put all suggestions in – but we cannot violate open meetings act.

V. Review Order of Upcoming Chapters (3 minutes)

Meeting March 30th focus on Neighborhoods and Housing chapter.

April 6 – Economic Development chapter.

Three meetings are planned for April.

Mr. Chard – requests transportation plan emailed

VI. Adjournment

8:05

Next Meeting Date: March 30, 2016