




(907) 586-0715
CDD_Admin@juneau.org
www.juneau.org/CDD
155 S. Seward Street • Juneau, AK 99801

DATE: September 14, 2017

TO: Planning Commission – Committee of the Whole

FROM: Jill Maclean, AICP, Senior Planner
Community Development Department 

FILE NO.: AME2016 0016

PROPOSAL: A Text Amendment to adopt the Lemon Creek Area Plan as part of the CBJ Comprehensive Plan

The City and Borough of Juneau Code states in CBJ 49.10.170(d) that the Commission shall make recommendations to the Assembly on all proposed amendments to this title, zonings and re-zonings, indicating compliance with the provisions of this title and the Comprehensive Plan.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A – Draft Minutes, Lemon Creek Steering Committee, August 7, 2017
- Attachment B – Draft Lemon Creek Area Plan September 2017
- Attachment C – Comprehensive Plan Chapter 11 Land Use Maps Guidelines and Consideration for Subarea 4 and Subarea 5
- Attachment D – Guidelines for the Development or Update of Community-Based Area or Neighborhood Plans

INTRODUCTION

The City and Borough of Juneau Title 49 Land Use Code states in CBJ 49.10.170(a) that one of the duties of the Planning Commission is Comprehensive Plan review. Furthermore, CBJ 49.10.170(d) requires the Commission to “make recommendations to the Assembly on all proposed amendments to this title, zonings and re-zonings, indicating compliance with the provisions of this title and the Comprehensive Plan”. The Comprehensive Plan and its additions are incorporated into Title 49 at CBJ 49.05.200.

BACKGROUND

The Comprehensive Plan identifies the need for area plans for Lemon Creek, Switzer Creek and Salmon Creek (see *Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan* section below and Attachment C). The Plan is a step in the borough’s strategy for influencing change in this area. The *Lemon Creek Area Plan* will form the basis for defining the vision and projects for the Lemon Creek area. It is

a consensus based plan, built through input from residents, local business and property owners, local non-profit groups, and other interested parties.

In 2015, the Assembly tasked the Community Development Department (CDD) with undertaking the *Lemon Creek Area Plan*. In accordance with the *Guidelines for the Development or Update of Community-Based Area or Neighborhood Plans* (see Attachment D), CDD conducted an open house on March 10, 2016 to solicit interest from the community, provide information on the planning process, and request applications for interested people to serve on the Steering Committee. On April 12, 2016 the Planning Commission appointed the Steering Committee, which included residents, property owners, and business owners.

Throughout the month of June 2016, CDD conducted six focus group meetings including: infrastructure and transportation, natural resources and recreation, business and economic development, human services, history and cultural resources, and city departments.

In September 2016, the Steering Committee began holding regularly-scheduled public meetings. The Steering Committee was presented with background information on the Comprehensive Plan and other relevant CBJ plans, zoning and land use, housing needs, and feedback received from the open house and focus groups. This information, combined with the chapters drafted by CDD planners and other relevant CBJ staff, allowed the Steering Committee to formulate informed goals and actions for each chapter of the plan. Public testimony was also taken at each Steering Committee meeting and considered as decisions were voted upon. The Steering Committee approved each goal and action through a consensus building process resulting in a majority vote of the committee.

As neighborhoods and areas of the borough differ from each other, the following chapters were seen as relevant to Lemon Creek: History and Community Character, Land Use, Neighborhoods and Housing, Transportation and Infrastructure, Economic Development, and Natural Resources and Recreation.

On February 4, 2017, a public design workshop was held to seek input from community members primarily on recreation and bike/ped connectivity throughout Lemon Creek. MRV Architects worked with CDD to conduct the workshop and led the public through this design process, which ultimately resulted in an overarching design concept – *Area Plan Design Goals* (see Attachment B - Appendix A: Public Participation).

The Area Plan Design Goals illustrates the community's vision of how the area should develop over the next twenty years. Features include preservation of the Switzer Creek area, multi-modal paths connecting Lemon Creek to Downtown and the Mendenhall Valley, trails connecting to the Mendenhall State Game Refuge, and potential new streets in the commercial and industrial areas.

The culmination of this community planning process is the draft *Lemon Creek Area Plan*, which was distributed for a two-week public comment period from July 17 through July 30, 2017. CDD staff compiled the comments received and made recommendations to the Steering Committee. At their August 7, 2017 public meeting, the Steering Committee voted on whether or not to amend the Plan in response to the public comments (see Attachment B – draft Lemon Creek Plan, Appendix B: Public Comments). The Steering Committee also voted to recommend the final draft *Lemon Creek Area Plan* to the Planning Commission for consideration and favorable recommendation to the Assembly.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Comprehensive Plan (Chapter 11) identifies the need to produce a neighborhood plan for the Lemon Creek and Switzer Creek areas. The draft *Lemon Creek Area Plan* complies with the Comprehensive Plan and specifically with Chapter 11, Land Use Maps G and H.

Map G – Subarea 4: East Mendenhall Valley and Airport includes a portion of the Lemon Creek Study Area along 7 and 8 Mile Glacier Highway. The draft Lemon Creek Area Plan does not make any rezoning recommendations in this area, and the draft plan is compliant with the Land Use Designations of Map G.

Map H – Subarea 5: Switzer Creek, Lemon Creek, and Salmon Creek includes the majority of the Lemon Creek Study Area, in addition to the Salmon Creek area which is not part of this planning process. Subarea 5 Guidelines and Considerations includes 15 guidelines (see Attachment C) of which Guideline 1 is to:

Conduct a neighborhood plan for the Lemon Creek and Switzer Creek areas to (1) address livability concerns for residential areas, (2) accommodate the land use and transportation needs of commercial and industrial uses, (3) address recreational and natural/conservation area needs, (4) identify transportation improvements, especially pedestrian- and bicyclist- related safety improvements, and (5) reduce incompatible uses and minimize or mitigate adverse impacts of such incompatible uses related to air quality (noise, dust, fumes, odors), public safety and natural resource protection.

The draft *Lemon Creek Area Plan* makes several rezoning recommendations in Subarea 5, and these recommendations are compliant with the Land Use Designations of Map G.

If adopted, the *Lemon Creek Area Plan* would be an addendum to the Comprehensive Plan. The *Lemon Creek Area Plan* provides a 20-year vision to guide growth, protect natural resources, and enhance and maintain amenities for livability. Where the *Lemon Creek Area Plan* and the Comprehensive Plan conflict, or where the *Lemon Creek Area Plan* is more specific, the *Lemon Creek Area Plan* supersedes the Comprehensive Plan.

Findings

Based upon the information presented, the draft *Lemon Creek Area Plan* complies with the Comprehensive Plan.

COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER RELEVANT CBJ PLANS AND STUDIES

The Lemon Creek Area planning process included a review of other relevant CBJ plans and studies, as well as plans and projects by other agencies. The draft *Lemon Creek Area Plan* complies with these plans and studies and, in some instances, makes more specific recommendations. For example, Chapter 5: Transportation and Infrastructure notes that a recurring theme of transportation plans in the Lemon Creek area is better connections for bicyclists and pedestrians and mitigating conflict between the residential and commercial/industrial vehicles. *Area Plan Design Goals* depicts additional multimodal paths and trails throughout the area while enhancing the existing bike/ped trails (see Attachment B - Appendix A: Public Participation). For a complete list of plans and studies, see Appendix C: Referenced Plans and Studies of the draft *Lemon Creek Area Plan*.

Findings

Based upon the information presented, the draft *Lemon Creek Area Plan* complies with other relevant CBJ Plans and Studies.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Committee of the Whole review and consider the draft *Lemon Creek Area Plan* and schedule it for a public hearing before the Planning Commission on October 10, 2017.

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

August 7, 2017 at 6pm

I. Roll Call, 6:00 pm

Steering Committee Members Present: Stephen Johnson, Chair; Susan Erben; Sandra Coon; Dave Hanna; Mark Pusich; Wayne Coogan; Daniel Collison

Steering Committee Members Absent: Paul Voelckers, Planning Commission Liaison; Michael Lukshin, Vice-Chair; Patrick Quigley; Michael Short; Tom Chard

Community Development & CBJ Staff Present: Jill Maclean, AICP Senior Planner; Allison Eddins, Planner II; Bhagavati Braun, Administrative Assistant

II. Review Comments Received from Public Comment Period

Mr. Johnson stated his intentions on how to go through the process. Mr. Pusich asked for a point of order about how to incorporate public participation. Mr. Collison clarified by saying the committee ought to let the public discuss before a vote was held on each item.

Ms. Maclean explained the public comments document in front of the committee, and outlined the first comment from Mr. Heumann.

Ms. Coon asked about Comprehensive Plan maps not agreeing/overlapping. Ms. Maclean clarified that this refers to a later comment.

Mr. Collison asked about the Riveredge Park condos land donation for a park – were there other contributions above and beyond the land? Ms. Maclean said they were to provide easements for open space and put in the trail. They did this and maintained it for some time and maintenance was supposed to be taken over by CBJ, she said. Language that speaks to “playground or trail” and “funds or in-kind services” makes it appear that the developer met what they were supposed to do.

Mr. Collison asked that staff verify that the developer met their contributions, and that the city does not consider that the developer needs to contribute more. Ms. Erben suggested that whatever can be cleared up ought to be put in writing. Instead of stating that we are 90% sure, we should be totally sure and state that they have met their obligation, she said. There will be less gray area, and she advocates that the committee find this for sure. Mr. Coogan said he felt the committee was getting in the weeds and if the committee were to do this for them why not do it for others? Mr. Pusich said that if they have their Certificate of Occupancy, they should have satisfied the conditions. They have maintained it for many years, he said, and suggested the committee move on.

Mr. Coogan said he thought blight shouldn't be taken lightly because property values are affected. He said he didn't know if there is anything more to be done at this stage, but it should be acted upon and not just talked about.

Ms. Maclean said she believed this was addressed in the document. Ms. Erben and Ms. Coon both said that if the committee wants to change something there needs to be specific suggestions for language changes at this meeting. Mr. Coogan stated that if Ms. Maclean thinks it has been addressed then he is satisfied.

MOTION: by Mr. Collison to amend Chapter 4 Neighborhoods and Housing Goal 1 and Chapter 6 Natural Resources and Recreation Goal 3 by adding an action: "Retain easement at Riveredge Park condos for public trail and park associated with the rezone of this area. Develop trail and park area." - Timeframe is short-term; Lead Responsible Party is CBJ P&R. Mr. Hanna Seconds.

Mr. Johnson opened the motion for discussion. He stated that the blight issue is already covered.

Ms. Maclean clarified that any comments that the public provided to us – we stated where they were already addressed in the plan. Only addressed things not in the plan.

Ms. Erben said that she feels strongly that we give this public input the seriousness that it deserves. Maybe we could make it stronger.

Ms. Maclean took offence at the suggestion that the committee and staff need to give more time and energy into this. She stated that everyone has worked very hard on these topics and have compiled this document with a lot of care. If there are specific suggestions please share them, but we have put a lot of work into these already.

Mr. Coogan: here is the quote: reads from the Lemon Creek Area Plan.

Ms. Erben said she thinks we could do more.

Mr. Coogan: I don't think it really could – this covers the general problem and doing more is inappropriate.

Mr. Collison: as I understand it there's one motion on the floor and that has to do with the park and the trail. He stated that if Ms. Erben has language that she would like to add to motions she should do so, but her concern seems to be different than the motion on the floor.

Discussion about how the chart is formatted and how to go through the public comments.

Mr. Hanna friendly **this would be the only part of Mr. Heuman's comments we take and move on after this motion passes.**

Mr. Collison did not accept.

Mr. Collison let's talk about this motion and move on – if it's more about this item that's fine.

Mr. Johnson invites public to participate – no public comment.

Mr. Johnson calls for vote

Carries – unanimous

Ms. Erben asked for more time.

Mr. Hanna: respectfully no, we have had time before now – if you are not prepared we should move on.

Mr. Johnson moves onto the next line, comments made by Margaret O'Neal

Ms. Maclean outlines staff work on sheet, all issues are covered in the Plan. No staff recommendation to change.

MOTION: by Mr. Hanna to adopt findings of staff and move on. Mr. Johnson seconds.

Ms. Coon: I think it was addressed.

Mr. Collison **friendly amendment** after seeing a lot of comments relating to D10 SF I came up with new language. In Ch4, Goal 2, Actions 4 and 5 add "which would be more compatible with existing D5 zoning in adjacent Pinewood Park subdivision".

Mr. Hanna **accepts**.

Mr. Johnson invites public to participate – no public comment.

Mr. Johnson calls question

Passes – unanimously

Ms. Maclean outlined the next comment, from Richard Harris, and staff findings. She clarified that the boundaries were chosen through the public process, that's why the Ridgeview Subdivision is included in the study area. Staff has made sure these recommendations all comply with the Comprehensive Plan.

MOTION: by Mr. Hanna to adopt staff's findings and move on. Mr. Pusich seconded.

Mr. Johnson invites public to participate – no public comment.

Mr. Johnson calls question – Motion carried with Mr. Coogan opposed

Ms. Maclean outlined the comment from Daniel Nore and staff findings, additionally she Outlined CBJ comments about the area, these are noted in the CBJ Comments section of the document.

Ms. Coon stated that on the corner of Pine and Central off of Glacier Highway it is extremely dark at night. Mr. Johnson said this may be covered on the new DOT road plan.

Ms. Coon said that since these people made comments – it should be addressed.

Mr. Pusich asked Ms. Maclean, didn't we talk about this in the document?

Ms. Maclean – not sure immediately, did talk to public works about this.

Mr. Collison requested that if someone had a specific motion, they please bring it forward.

MOTION: by Mr. Pusich to adopt comments and staff's findings. Mr. Collison seconded.

Mr. Johnson invites public to participate:

 Marcy Larson – increased light and safety is something that the Alaska Brewing Company has talked about. Streetlights are important especially when you have children.

Ms. Erben said this was true, especially when there are needles and drug users that can take our neighborhood down in a second. Unfortunately I didn't prepare that much, she said, but I think that it's a shame if we don't address because people have made the comment that we ought to address it.

Mr. Coogan **friendly** we ask staff to find the appropriate place to put the recommendation that the city explore neighborhood residents concerns regarding street lighting. (Ms. Maclean suggested it could go into Chapter 4, Goal 1)

Mr. Pusich **accepted**

Mr. Collison asked Mr. Coogan if his suggestion is for the narrative or a goal

Mr. Coogan left it up to staff

Mr. Hanna: Ms. Maclean has already identified a good spot – might also include in Ch 5, Goal 3 – but we should leave it up to them.

Mr. Johnson called the question

Motion carries - unanimous

Ms. Maclean outlined comment from Anonymous and staff findings. Outlines CBJ comments about the area.

Ms. Erben wants to clarify who is CBJ employees etc from emails.

Ms. Coon clarified that this question about environmental issues was brought up by an anonymous commenter.

Ms. Erben: they need to complain to another place – city should pass comment on to DEC.

Mr. Johnson asked Ms. Maclean if she would pass the comments on to DEC.

Ms. Maclean said she would.

MOTION: Mr. Hanna moves to adopt comments and staff findings. Mr. Pusich seconds.

Mr. Johnson invites public to participate – no public comment.

Mr. Johnson called the question

Motion carries - unanimous

Ms. Maclean outlined comments from John Blasco, representing Alaskan Brewing Co. and outlined staff comments.

Ms. Erben: what is the DBA

Downtown Business Association

MOTION: Mr. Hanna moves to adopt staff findings and recommendations. Mr. Collison second.

Mr. Coogan “encourage common walls” have we talked about that?

Ms. Maclean – yes, outlines a bit of what was talked about – more wrapped into density question regarding topography of the land

Mr. Collison: Mr. Hanna is your motion about the whole line or just the recommendation?

Mr. Hanna: all of it

Mr. Johnson asks AK Brewing about common walls

John Blasco – workforce housing, enjoyable and attractive, is what we would like to see. Could be affordable and good for people who could be our employees. Encouraging workforce housing style.

Ms. Erben I like to keep it to two homes (e.g.: duplexes), without bringing our property downhill

Ms. Coon stated that common walls won’t necessarily bring property values down

Mr. Pusich disagreed with Ms. Erben: I don’t think we’re taxed with limiting development – I think the brewery is asking for us to be open to workforce housing, we shouldn’t be getting that restrictive.

Ms. Erben I think it’s important that we protect our neighborhoods and not make them very dense, and we’ve let the city do all these high zonings, and our value is going to go down like crazy. I feel like we’re held up against the wall and the city is saying “you have to do this” and I think this is just going to go downhill. We didn’t get any D5. I feel like we’re in a corner.

Mr. Hanna amend – the comments are valuable, and the recommendation for common wall dwellings are good, on Ch 4, Goal 1 add “this may include allowing common-wall development in some zonings”

Mr. Collison ask the chair if we could ask the Brewing Co. if our motion address their concerns.

Mr. Blasco – yes

Ms. Larson – yes, we mostly had questions, we think they have been well addressed. We would add the word “economic” before “incentives” in the staff recommendation. She also asked a question about LCBA and a difference with DBA

Loren Jones clarified that the DBA sets their own rules, not a City entity.

Mr. Johnson clarified that the LCBA doesn’t exist

Ms. Larson: but it’s referred to in the plan

Ms. Maclean – the Plan recommends the creation of the Lemon Creek Business Association (LCBA) it is understood that it doesn’t currently exist. Outlines where it falls into the plan. Hopes for how they might influence the city and the Lemon Creek area.

Mr. Coogan **friendly** add “optional” after “potential”

Mr. Hanna did not accept

Mr. Collison friendly add “economic” to motion in chart (as suggested by Ms. Larson above).

Mr. Hanna accepted

Mr. Hanna clarified: it’s just suggesting that this could be done. If may never happen, if it does it could have these people, but it doesn’t have to.

Mr. Coogan **friendly** strike responsible party JEDC or Chamber from what is in the table.

Mr. Hanna did not accept

Marcy – was there a place for community center?

All – no

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carries - unanimous

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Llewellyn Lutchansky and Staff recommendation.s

MOTION: Mr. Hanna *move to find staffs findings thorough and accurate and adopt findings as they are.* Mr. Collison *seconded.*

Mr. Hanna believe these comments may be due to a breakdown in communication because we were talking about more than low income housing – I think our work was misinterpreted and we did address all housing.

Mr. Coogan: no staff recommendation so there will be no action here.

General agreement

Ms. Erben would like to see the addition of senior upper and medium income housing.

Mr. Hanna doesn't see the need.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carries – Ms. Erben against

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Leo Lutchansky and Staff recommendations.

Mr. Collison stated that there was no specific language suggested, and no place to put this.

Ms. Maclean: this is more support and identifying that we reviewed and looked at it, no actual proposal.

Mr. Collison: is there actually language in the Goals and Actions specific to advocating for the output of the public workshop?

Ms. Maclean: the actions hit on everything, but there is no action actually advocating support for the Vision Plan.

Mr. Collison I could support an action item about supporting the Vision Plan, something like “Support (the development and maintenance of) open space and trails as depicted in the Lemon Creek Area Vision Plan”

Mr. Johnson: if all of the issues it addresses are in the Plan separately we don't have to do this. I don't want to adopt the vision plan solidly because it's fluid.

Mr. Coogan Chapter 6, Goal 3, Actions 1 and 4, don't these cover the issues?

Mr. Collison agreed, it looks like the actions already speak to this.

Ms. Maclean these actions were ones that directly came from the chart from the public design workshop. It is the plan combined.

Ms. Erben suggested adding “**including input from the Lemon Creek Area Vision Plan**” at end of Goal 3, Action 1 think it makes it stronger if it's named.

Mr. Hanna we had this discussion earlier and there was a lot of agreement that the vision isn't very clear and not a universal agreement, let it be a guide, not a dictate. I would not vote for that motion. It's critical that we include the vision, and the basic ideas of what are desired, which the plan does.

Shouldn't muddy the waters.

Ms. Erben “continued input” is listed, it makes is stronger if we name it.

MOTION: Ms. Erben moved to add “including input from the Lemon Creek Area Vision Plan” at the end of Goal 3, Action 1. Ms. Coon seconded.

Mr. Johnson called the question

Motion carries – Mr. Johnson and Mr. Coogan opposed

Ms. Erben suggested that staff add ideas about density/street construction be integrated into the Plan where appropriate.

Mr. Pusich: the city has laws and regulations about these – these things to make the neighborhood “more attractive” these are already in play. There may be exceptions, and the laws here may be changed, it might not be feasible.

Ms. Erben expressed concerns about sidewalks and underground utilities, buried storm drainage.

Mr. Pusich clarified these issues for Ms. Erben.

Ms. Erben asked staff to find a place in a goal to say that we would like to strive that all utilities are going to be underground.

Mr. Collison: Ms. Erben is identifying a motion to act on. If no one is willing to second let’s move on.

MOTION: Ms. Erben moves to direct staff to find a place in a goal or someplace that would add a little part about “to direct the city to do what it can for buried utilities” “to achieve buried utilities wherever possible”

Ms. Maclean asks to interject.

Ms. Erben OK

Ms. Maclean this type of requirement would be difficult legally to implement these only in the LC area Additionally if we look under land use goal Mr. Johnson, action Mr. Coogan, action Ms. Erben, these get at the issues. What you’re saying plus more.

Mr. Johnson do we have a second?

Mr. Coogan seconded

Mr. Coogan friendly should be at least 48 inches deep

Ms. Erben not accepted

Mr. Johnson called the question

Motion fails – Ms. Erben in favor

Ms. Erben would like to change “Lemon Flats” to “Lemon Valley”. It may have been used, but it’s not a common term.

MOTION: Ms. Erben moves to change “Lemon Flats” to “Lemon Valley”. Mr. Coogan seconded

Mr. Johnson called the question

Motion fails – Ms. Erben in favor

MOTION: Mr. Collison moves to adopt staff’s review and strike the recommendation. Mr. Hanna seconded.

Ms. Erben doesn’t want more waste in the Lemon Creek area. Is it going to be a second dump?

Mr. Hanna: Mr. Lechansky could be misinformed. It’s not another garbage dump. Mr. Hanna gives some more detail, it’s not toxic, it’s not a garbage dump, regulated by DEC, relatively benign materials.

Mr. Coogan ready to vote – concerns of public member are unfounded.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carries – Ms. Erben opposed

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Brady Fink, and Staff recommendations.

MOTION: Mr. Collison moves to adopt staff’s review. Mr. Pusich seconded.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carries – unanimous

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Steve Haaviq and Staff recommendation – needs to be a borough wide issue – it’s at a higher level, and is being addressed.

MOTION: Mr. Coogan motion to adopt Staff review. Mr. Pusich seconded.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carries – unanimous

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Irene Gallion and Staff recommendations.

MOTION: Mr. Collison moves to adopt staff review. Ms. Coon seconded.

Ms. Erben worried that she is the first person to say the dump is a benefit. Everybody hates it.

Ms. Maclean – outlines CBJ Engineering and Public Works (E&PW) comment which addresses the dump.

Mr. Pusich should we take action on that as well now?

Mr. Collison: I'm saying let's accept this one and move on.

Mr. Coogan motion is to accept Irene's comment line, the E&PW line really isn't telling us anything that's new under the sun. We covered the dump thoroughly in the Plan. Sounds like E&PW is saying to leave well enough alone, it looks like this comment is tempering the need to change landfill.

Ms. Maclean clarified that the E&PW recommendation would make no change to actions – it would be integrated in the chapter for context.

Mr. Pusich: respect your point – under Goal 2 there are still strong points about landfill. This language doesn't change our actions won't lessen our impact

Mr. Collison amended his motion – strike recommendation – include “see CBJ engineering comments for related information”

Mr. Coogan we don't need to add anything here. This is probably the most sensitive subject and why are we letting bureaucrats tamper with it?

Ms. Erben: the narrative was so long ago that I would have to review it.

Mr. Hanna: there is a motion on the floor which has been seconded, and it takes out the suggestion that we put that language in.

Mr. Johnson calls the question.

Motion carries – unanimous

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Alex Ditcharo and Staff recommendations.

Ms. Erben wanted to know if he was public or city. (public)

MOTION: Mr. Collison moves to accept Staff's review. Mr. Pusich seconded.

Mr. Johnson asks public for input.

Ms. Larson expressed concern that a second access was not listed in the Plan.

Ms. Maclean clarified that the Plan does address second access a number of times.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carries – Mr. Coogan opposed

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Amy Sumner, and Staff recommendations.

Question about if it was as a public person or in her capacity in a field – unsure staff will review. (Staff found that she was acting on behalf of Juneau Watershed Partnership and her comments are reflected as thus in the final Plan.)

MOTION: Mr. Collison moves to adopt Staff review of Ms. Sumner's comments and associated recommendations, and that staff follows up and asks if she was commenting as an individual or in professional capacity. Mr. Hanna second.

Mr. Johnson: are we harming gravel extraction with these recommendations?

General agreement: no.

Ms. Erben wants to make creeks not impaired.

Ms. Maclean: committee did agree to what is currently in the plan – after extensive discussion.

Ms. Erben would like to see more about repairing watersheds.

Mr. Coogan **friendly** – remove asking Ms. Sumner if she was commenting as an individual or as a professional. **Not seconded.**

Ms. Maclean suggestion – will call and clarify, this will change location in chart.

Mr. Coogan was pleased with this change.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carried – Ms. Erban opposed

Ms. Erben: is there a place where we could add a couple words that we still want to work to not throw the towel in on Lemon Creek (water body).

Mr. Hanna clarified that this was in the motion that just passed.

Mr. Pusich: in addition, lists other action Ch 6, Goal 2. Covers this issue.

Ms. Maclean outline comments from CBJ Parks & Recreation (P&R) and Staff recommendations – recommendation to add item to both chapters because the issues is covered in the narrative of both chapters.

MOTION: Mr. Pusich moves to adopt Staff findings and recommendations. Mr. Hanna seconds.

Mr. Hanna expressed a little “heart burn” on their comments on non-motorized recreation. In public comment on P&R the highest scoring item on improvements was off-road motorized recreation.

Ms. Erben: there is the whole Borough to do that, it doesn’t have to happen in the Lemon Creek area.

Mr. Hanna expressed a general comment about P&R not listening to public on motorized recreation.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carries – unanimously

Ms. Maclean reviewed comments from CBJ Engineering (E&PW) and Staff recommendations

Mr. Collison: this language has not been added yet.

Ms. Erben: where would it go so we can read that real fast?

Additional language would be located on p. 20 above relevant plans and studies.

MOTION: Mr. Coogan moves to delete the recommendation and move that we will not regard this recommendation. Mr. Johnson seconded.

Ms. Erben **friendly to remove the last part – leave the recommendation blank.**

Ms. Erben uncomfortable with unfamiliarity with the document

Mr. Coogan: they’re talking about the landfill in glowing terms, it’s manipulative, I have throttled back my ire.

Mr. Johnson calls the question.

Motion carries – Ms. Erben opposed

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from CBJ Engineering – Quarry, and Staff recommendations.

MOTION: Mr. Hanna moves to remove recommendations from this comment, and accept the rest of the row. Mr. Coogan second.

Mr. Hanna: when we first did this [made a recommendation to consider selling CBJ gravel to the public sector] we knew that staff would have heartburn on this and they did. I see no need to water it down.

Ms. Erben: I think we should adopt this recommendation, but I think that we should have it open enough that we aren’t tying things down.

Mr. Coogan: addressing this we have already vetted this issue thoroughly. The action says “pursue” it isn’t pinning anything down.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carries – Ms. Erben and Mr. Collison opposed

MOTION: Ms. Erben moves to add “after gathering public input” at the end of current action (Ch 7 Goal2, Action 10). No second.

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from CBJ Lands & Resources (L&R), and Staff recommendations. She added that Mr. Voelckers can add extraction area to the Lemon Creek Area Vision Plan.

MOTION: Mr. Hanna moves to adopt staff findings and recommendation not accept recommendation on conducting a community dialogue. Mr. Johnson second.

Mr. Collison: I appreciate that they want to appreciate that they want this on the plan, but should also be on the map in the housing section.

Ms. Maclean clarified that there is an updated map which clearly defines area 3 (per L&R concerns).

Mr. Collison where would it be in the Vision Plan?

Ms. Maclean clarified that the Vision Plan is conceptual, gives general vicinity, there are no property lines so it can't get very specific.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carries – Mr. Collison and Ms. Erben opposed

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) and Staff recommendations.

MOTION: Ms. Erben moves to accept Staff findings and recommendations. Mr. Hanna seconded.

Mr. Collison: there are lots of issues regarding landfill – concerned that we're adding language that puts a spotlight on bear problems, we have other concerns about the landfill.

Ms. Erben withdraws motion

MOTION: Mr. Collison moves to accept Staff findings, striking recommendation. Mr. Coogan second.

Mr. Collison clarified that the existing goal remains.

Ms. Erben further voice to bears not being the main problem about the dump.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carries – unanimous

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from the Alaska Department of Transportation, Southcoast Region (AKDOT&PF) and Staff recommendations.

MOTION: Mr. Pusich moves to approve recommendation and analysis. Mr. Hanna second.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carries – Unanimous

III. Public Participation

Ms. Larson – proposed Vision Plan map appears several times, and it seems like that is “the plan” just an observation. Perhaps rename for clarity.

Well done. Thank you, really good finished project, impressive work.

Ms. Erben would like to add narrative comments from table 4 to the public participation chapter.

Mr. Collison: given the public comments should we change the name? Maybe “Lemon Creek Plan as envisioned by community members of the date public design workshop”

MOTION: Mr. Hanna moves to rename vision plan “visioning done at public design workshop”

Mr. Collison could we say “suggested recreational activities”

Mr. Coogan second

Some discussion about different ideas for the new name ensued.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

Motion carries – Ms. Erben opposed

It was recommended that Chapter numbers be added to footers.

IV. Recommend DRAFT Lemon Creek Area Plan to the Planning Commission

MOTION: *Mr. Pusich moves to approve plan as modified tonight, and send to the Planning Commission. Mr. Coogan second.*

Mr. Johnson calls the question.

Motion carries – unanimous

V. Review Next Steps

Ms. Maclean outlined next steps:

The Plan will likely be heard first at a Committee of the Whole (COW) meeting at 7:00 on 9/12, this would be a work session. The public hearing will probably happen at the following Planning Commission meeting on 9/26. [These dates changed after this meeting.]

Mr. Coogan comment – as they're wrapping it up Staff have freedom to do clerical and design improvements without changing content.

Mr. Collison making neighborhood association great again. How they can the group further the action items?

Ms. Maclean: there will be public notification once adopted. Neighborhood Association was listed on last notice with a call to respond if residents were interested in joining, only one response. CBJ may work with the association to get the word out, but the association should take the lead.

Mr. Collison: envisioned identifying a date and location, and the city could help advertise.

Announcement could add action items that we want to highlight. Asks about timeline for adoption.

Ms. Maclean outlined the timeline: the Planning Commission will hear it in late September, could send back to committee or recommend to the Assembly, it will then go to the Assembly for two more hearings before it could be adopted.

Mr. Collison when's the soonest it could be heard by the Assembly?

Ms. Maclean probably late November or December.

Mr. Collison would like to start revitalizing the association earlier.

Ms. Maclean clarified that the actions cannot be advertised as official city stance until adopted by the assembly – the neighborhood association could jump in and do anything at any time.

Mr. Coogan suggested using the app Next Door.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 pm.

TO: Planning Commission – Committee of the Whole

FROM: Jill Maclean, AICP, Senior Planner
Community Development Department

FILE NO.: AME2016 0016

PROPOSAL: A Text Amendment to adopt the Lemon Creek Area Plan as part of the CBJ Comprehensive Plan

Attachment B – Draft Lemon Creek Area Plan, September 2017 can be found on-line at <http://www.juneau.org/lemoncreekplan/>, or in hard copy at any Juneau Public Library, the City Clerk’s office in City Hall (155 S. Seward Street), or at the Community Development Department, 4th floor of the Marine View Building, 230 S. Franklin Street.

Guidelines and Considerations for Subarea 5:

1. Conduct a neighborhood plan for the Lemon Creek and Switzer Creek areas to (1) address livability concerns for residential areas, (2) accommodate the land use and transportation needs of commercial and industrial uses, (3) address recreational and natural/conservation area needs, (4) identify transportation improvements, especially pedestrian- and bicyclist-related safety improvements, and (5) reduce incompatible uses and minimize or mitigate adverse impacts of such incompatible uses related to air quality (noise, dust, fumes, odors), public safety and natural resource protection. (***The Draft Plan addresses these issues.***)
2. Provide for additional medium- to high density residential development in areas with access to arterial roadways from collector streets. Encourage the efficient use of land by allowing non-family housing, such as for students, single-adults or seniors, in mixed use districts within shopping centers or malls. Increase building height limits and decrease or eliminate parking requirements for such residential developments where adequately served by public transit. (***See Chapter 3 Land Use and Chapter 4 Neighborhoods & Housing.***)
3. Restrict residential development in areas where off-site impacts of sand and gravel extraction operations, such as noise, dust, heavy truck traffic, would adversely affect residents unless it were assured that residents of the proposed housing would not be so adversely affected, such as for transition or temporary housing. (***See Chapter 5 Transportation & Infrastructure and Chapter 6 Natural Resources & Recreation.***)
4. Provide a safe pedestrian and bicycle circulation system in the Lemon Creek and Switzer Creek areas, per the Area Wide Transportation Plan, the 2009 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, the Safe Routes to Schools plan, and Chapter 8, Transportation, of this Plan. (***See Chapter 5 Transportation & Infrastructure.***)
5. Protect access to Lemon Creek Trail, Salmon Creek Historic Trail and Heintzleman Ridge Trail. (***See Chapter 2 History & Community Character and Chapter 6 Natural Resources & Recreation.***)
6. Encourage the construction and/or retention of a buffer and initiation of a beautification effort along all major roads. (***See Chapter 2 History & Community Character, Chapter 5 Transportation & Infrastructure and Chapter 6 Natural Resources & Recreation.***)
7. Reserve wetlands and tidelands in public ownership for fish and wildlife habitat and open space/natural areas. (***See Chapter 4 Neighborhoods & Housing and Chapter 6 Natural Resources & Recreation.***)
8. Designate CBJ-owned areas outside the Salmon Creek Dam inundation hazard area for Bartlett Regional Hospital expansion hospital and related medical facilities. (***Not addressed in the Draft Plan – the Bartlett Regional Hospital campus was not considered part of the Lemon Creek area.***)
9. Allow for expansion of state office complex facilities adjacent to existing offices within public/institutional land use designation areas west of Switzer Creek but not along shoreline areas. (***See Chapter 3 Land Use and Chapter 4 Neighborhoods & Housing.***)
10. Identify sufficient land to accommodate commercial and industrial uses. Adjust the boundary between commercial and industrial lands in the Vanderbilt-to-Lemon Creek area to account for current conditions and market demands. Provide additional buildable land for heavy industry and prohibit higher intensity uses, such as retail, office and residential

uses, within the heavy industrial areas. (**See Chapter 3 Land Use, Chapter 4 Neighborhoods & Housing and Chapter 7 Economic Development**).

11. Renninger Road serves a CBJ school and water reservoir and an affordable rental housing development and could further be used to access other CBJ lands suitable for development of affordable housing. (**See Chapter 4 Neighborhoods & Housing**).
12. Jordan Creek, Lemon Creek and Vanderbilt Creek are listed as impaired water bodies by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) and, therefore, careful review of all future development proposals that could affect the volume, velocity, cleanliness, and overall water quality of these creeks and their watersheds and tributaries is warranted. Coordinate all development within the sphere of influence of Jordan, Lemon and Vanderbilt Creeks with DEC to ensure that development meets the guidelines of the creeks' restoration plans, called the TMDL Document. (**See Chapter 6 Natural Resources & Recreation**).
13. The Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 8, recommends a number of parks, trail, community garden and stream corridor improvements. Those recommendations include: (a) construction of a coastal trail along Egan Drive or along the "inside" or north side of Egan Drive, connecting Sunny Point to neighborhoods to the east and west; (b) Upgrade the Dzantik'i Heeni Middle School and the Switzer Creek/Richard Marriott trail; (c) construct a covered basketball court/play area at Dzantik'i Heeni Middle School; (d) reserve a stream corridor on Switzer Creek; (e) resolve Lemon Creek Trail issues; (f) develop an All-Terrain-Vehicle (ATV) or Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) course in the Upper Lemon Creek area; (g) develop a trail from the Sunny Point intersection to the Pioneer's Home intersection and along the Pioneer's Home marsh with an accessible viewing platform for bird watchers; (h) protect access to the Heintzleman Ridge trail; (i) review the area for suitability for mini-parks; (k) establish a community garden area; (l) study the Lemon Creek area for suitable park sites; and, (m) continue ADA improvements at Twin Lakes. (**See Chapter 2 History & Community Character, Chapter 6 Natural Resources & Recreation and Appendix A Public Participation Lemon Creek Vision Plan**).
14. Identify historic and cultural resources within the subarea. Projects that may impact historic resources identified within this subarea are to be reviewed by the Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC) prior to issuance of a permit. Where new historic or cultural resources are discovered or identified, the Juneau-Douglas City Museum should be contacted immediately for documentation and technical assistance toward preservation and/or curating of the resource. The demolition or removal of historic resources should be avoided and should only occur when no other option for its preservation or relocation to a suitable site exists. (**See Chapter 2 History & Community Character**).
15. Since views of the water are a highly-rated value by residents, buildings in the (WCI)-designated areas should be situated or oriented to retain views of the water between buildings. (**See Chapter 4 Neighborhoods & Housing, Chapter 6 Natural Resources & Recreation and Appendix A Public Participation Lemon Creek Vision Plan**).

GUIDELINES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OR UPDATE OF COMMUNITY-BASED AREA OR NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS

Request for Area or Neighborhood Plan:

The development or update of community-based area or neighborhood plans should be initiated by direction of the Assembly, the City Manager, and/or the Director of the Community Development Department (CDD). The Planning Commission (PC), neighborhood associations, and other interested groups may make recommendations to the Assembly.

Scheduling:

Community-based planning initiatives may be scheduled on an individual, case by case basis, and may be undertaken with consideration of staff availability and workload. Efforts should be made to complete the planning initiatives within 18-to-24-months of commencement, and may vary upon complexity of the issues and the plan.

Staff assistance for the planning effort and boundaries of the affected area should be approved by the Director. The boundaries of the affected area should be drafted by the Planning staff with direction from the Steering Committee and input from the public.

Notification & Planning Team Appointment:

Upon PC approval of the planning initiative, a Steering Committee should be established. The CDD should notify the public via a newspaper of general circulation, the City and Borough's website, social media, and other means appropriate (i.e. external business or agency newsletters) that a steering committee is being formed and that any member of the public fitting the criteria of the affected planning area initiative is encouraged to apply. The Director, with input from Planning staff, should recommend a slate of stakeholders from the affected area representing residents, property owners, business owners, education, youth, and other relevant groups to the PC. The steering committee should be comprised of no more than eleven members depending on the planning initiative. A PC member as well as the Assembly member from the affected district, may act as liaisons to the steering committee, and should not be considered voting members.

The steering committee members should reside in or own property within the affected area, or own a business or other community agency within the affected area; and commit to the following:

- Volunteer their time and commit to attending meetings for the planning initiative;
- Commit to consider compromises that may assist in managing conflict and building consensus;
- Listen to and consider testimony from the public and government agencies;
- Commit to develop a plan that represents the affected study area;
- Commit to distributing accurate information to other community members and clarifying misunderstandings or misperceptions.

Should any steering committee member fail to meet the commitments outlined above, miss 50% of the steering committee meetings, or miss three meetings in a row, the member may be removed by the Director.

Steering Committee & Public Outreach Methods:

Upon approval of a planning initiative, Planning staff may conduct research, inventory resources, and prepare background text, base maps, and other related items that may be useful for the needs of the steering committee. The information may be prepared in draft format and provided to steering committee members in advance of the first steering committee meeting. Planning staff should determine which public engagement methods may be utilized throughout the planning initiative in order to identify issues and concerns within the affected area.

Steering committee meetings and public engagement sessions should be advertised at a minimum with the newspaper of general circulation, and on the City and Borough's website. Property owners, registered voters, registered neighborhood associations, and current residents located within the affected area should be notified by mailing that a planning initiative is being undertaken and public sessions are scheduled. Additional public outreach is strongly recommended, such as notification provided to business owners operating within the affected area, public notification posted on public information boards when available, notification sent home with schoolchildren, notification included in utility bills, PSAs on local radio, and other appropriate methods that may be identified. If specific dates are not known, a general description of the project, a phone number, and email contact should be provided for more information.

Planning staff should hold public sessions within the affected area at locations that are ADA accessible. Planning staff should facilitate all public sessions, including steering committee meetings, and public input should be taken at a designated time during each session. Recommendations may be made by the steering committee, and votes should require a simple majority. This allows the steering committee to hear from the public, discuss issues and concerns, and make recommendations based upon a full and complete understanding of the context.

Public sessions should be held at times and locations determined by Planning staff throughout the public participation process. Public session format and timing may vary depending on the planning initiative, the agenda, and the attempt to engage as many participants as possible. The public sessions allow the community to actively participate in the planning initiative, ensure that their voice is heard, and allows Planning staff and steering committee members to fully understand the needs of the affected area.

Draft Plan Document:

Upon completion of the public engagement process, Planning staff should develop a draft plan that may be available in the Community Development Department office, in the City and Borough public libraries, and on the City and Borough website. A comment period timeframe should be set, and property owners and registered voters located within the affected area should be notified by mailing that the draft plan is complete and that they may submit comment either at the public session or via email or letter. Each planning initiative should have a dedicated webpage and email address.

The draft plan should also be provided to the steering committee no less than two weeks in advance of a publicly advertised session. The steering committee should review and provide comment on the draft

Attachment D

plan at a public session, at which time the public should also be given the opportunity to provide feedback and comments. A two-week public comment period should be established after the draft plan is presented to the steering committee. Upon closing of the comment period, Planning staff should make recommendations to the steering committee, which should address the comments received and whether or not the comment was incorporated.

Steering Committee Review & Recommendation:

The steering committee should review Planning staff's revisions, and should hold a public session (publicly noticed as detailed above) to recommend the plan to the Planning Commission. Planning staff should present and facilitate discussion on the sections of the draft plan, the public comments received, whether or not the comments were incorporated into the draft plan, and the reasoning for incorporating comments or not. Public comments should be included as an appendix to the plan.

The steering committee should vote by simple majority to recommend each section of the draft plan to the PC. Steering committee votes will either recommend each section to the PC or send the section back to Planning staff for further revision. The steering committee should work towards consensus and attempt to minimize voting. If voting occurs, it should be by roll call vote. No proxy voting is allowed; voting via conference call is permitted. If the steering committee determines that further revisions are necessary, the steering committee should review Planning staff's revisions and should hold a public session (public notice as detailed above).

The draft plan should not be forwarded to the PC until the steering committee has made recommendations on all sections of the plan.

Public Hearings:

The PC should hold a public hearing prior to voting on the adoption of an area or neighborhood plan to provide the public with an opportunity to present their support or objections to the draft plan. The PC should hold a second public hearing to make their final recommendation on the draft plan. The PC may recommend revisions to the draft plan prior to submittal to the Assembly. The PC should submit their recommendation to the Assembly.

The Assembly should hold, at a minimum, one public hearing to vote on the adoption of the Planning Commission's recommended draft plan. The plan should be adopted by ordinance as an element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Implementation and Monitoring:

The outcome of the plan should not be the plan, but actions implementing the plan. The actions of the plan should be considered in the budgetary process, Capital Improvement Program, and integrated into the Comprehensive Plan. People who participated in the development of the plan should be encouraged to transform the steering committee and other involved parties into a neighborhood association or other such organization recognized by the CBJ with specific responsibilities for implementation. Further,

Attachment D

monitoring of plans and related activities should be undertaken on a two-year basis, or as otherwise specified.