



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

**December 12, 2019**

**MEMO**

**From:** Irene Gallion, Senior Planner 

**To:** Nathaniel Dye, Chair, Title 49 Committee

**Through:** Jill Maclean, Director  
Alexandra Pierce, Planning Manager

**Case Number:** AME2018 0004

**RE: Initial summary of public meetings on proposed ADOD standards**

Staff requests that the Title 49 Committee provide:

- Feedback on the DRAFT comment analysis, including any questions you have for clarification, or suggestions on responses.
- An initial review of the DRAFT ordinance, including any modifications that may be considered based on initial public input. Note that the public has until January 24<sup>th</sup> to provide feedback.

Further actions may be requested after public comment closes on January 24, 2020.

**Background**

Public meetings were held on Thursday, December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2019 at 6:00 pm, and Saturday, December 7<sup>th</sup>, at 3:00 pm. Both meetings were held in Assembly Chambers. The first meeting had 26 people in attendance, with no dignitaries. The second one had 18 in attendance and included Assemblyman Loren Jones, Assemblyman Carol Treim, and Planning Commissioner Ken Alpers.

Irene Gallion made the presentation, with Laurel Christian and Amy Liu providing support. On Thursday the Planning Manager attended and provided support. On Saturday the Director attended and provided support.

The powerpoint presented is attached, as are the handouts provided:

- A handout that followed along with the presentation. Dimensional standards were broken out in order they were addressed, and tables summarized the differences between existing and proposed dimensions. The handout also included some basic information on zoning, and explanations of dimensional standards that required a little extra context (such as setback exclusions). Feedback from the first meeting resulted in the following modifications to the presentation for the second meeting:
  - Slides showing the variances in the ADOD area since 1966. After 1987 we were also able to show what sorts of variances they were.
  - We expanded the information on what lot areas generate what level of conformance to minimum lot size. In the first presentation, we provided the conformance information for 3,500, 3,000, and 2,500 square feet.
  - We re-evaluated our vegetative cover slide and modified it.
  - We included a picture to show what 7' separation between buildings looks like.
- A color map of the proposed ADOD boundary and the underlying zoning.
- A handout that explains the different dimensional standards.
- An on-the-spot comment card designed to quickly collect general feelings about proposed standards.

During the meeting, Ms. Christian noted questions and concerns raised by attendees. Attendees could also provide written feedback on the on-the-spot comment card. There were 89 comments, a **DRAFT analysis is attached to this memo**. Your questions about the comments or your suggested responses are welcomed by staff.

Seven individuals submitted on-the-spot comment cards. These cards listed different elements of the proposed ADOD standards, and asked participants how they felt about them, with a range from “dislike strongly” to “like strongly.” Results are summarized below:

Feature:	Dislike Strongly	Dislike	Neutral	Like	Like Strongly	TOTAL	Notes
Lot size?	1	0	2	3	0	6	One left blank
Lot width and depth?	0	1	2	2	1	6	One left blank
Lot building coverage?	0	1	1	2	3	7	
Lot vegetative cover?	1	2	2	1	1	7	
Structure height?	0	0	2	3	2	7	
Setbacks?	1	1	0	4	1	7	
Reduced setbacks for smaller lots?	0	2	1	3	2	8	One answered twice, N and LS
Setback exceptions?	0	2	1	3	2	8	One answered twice, N and LS
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>56</b>	

Note that, for “Reduced setbacks for smaller lots?” and “Setback exceptions?” one respondent provided two answers – one “neutral” and one “strongly like.” Both were recorded.

## Next steps

The revised powerpoint was sent to all attendees on 12/10/2019, along with a reminder on the comment deadline. I will send an e mail reminder a week before comments are due.

I will e mail attendees with the following dates when they are established:

- Planning Commission Committee of the Whole review of the DRAFT ordinance.
- Planning Committee action on the DRAFT ordinance.
- Assembly Committee of the Whole review of the DRAFT ordinance.
- Assembly Committee action on the DRAFT ordinance.

A **DRAFT ordinance** is attached for consideration. This is an opening position based on our discussions before the public outreach. Things still worth considering:

- We need to be more explicit about how this interacts with the non-conforming ordinance. Should we do that now or wait to see how it fares in the Assembly?
- How does this work with variances? If a property has a topographical hardship, could they get the 3' setback reduced?
- Would we prefer that the dimensional standards be put into a table rather than written out?

Attachments:

Comment analysis  
Draft ordinance  
Presentation powerpoint  
Handout – presentation  
Handout – map  
Handout – dimensional standards  
Handout – comment card