

SOUTH DOUGLAS / WEST JUNEAU AREA PLAN
Steering Committee Meeting
Zoom Webinar Format
Wednesday November 10, 2021

Steering Committee Members Present:

- | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Carole Bookless | <input type="checkbox"/> Rebecca Emblar | <input type="checkbox"/> Liz Smith |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Matt Catterson | <input type="checkbox"/> Arnold Liebelt | <input type="checkbox"/> Linda Snow |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Frank Delaney | <input type="checkbox"/> Robert Sewell | <input type="checkbox"/> Joyce Vick |
| <input type="checkbox"/> H. Erik Pederson, Planning Commission Liaison | | |

Staff Members Present:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Allison Eddins, CDD Planner | <input type="checkbox"/> Alexandra Pierce, CDD Planning Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jill Maclean, CDD Director | |

Agenda Items

- I. Call to order
- II. Approval of June 29th and October 26th Minutes
- III. Public Testimony on Agenda Items – 10 minutes
- IV. Public Testimony on Non-Agenda Items – 10 minutes
- V. Review of CBJ Lands Management Strategies
- VI. Exploring various housing models - Cottage Housing (see attachment) and Co-op Housing (<https://www.abbottcoho.org/> - Anchorage's cohousing development)
- VII. Committee Comment
- VIII. Adjournment

CBJ Lands Management Plan

https://chstm2y9cx63tv84u2p8shc3-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/FINAL_Posted-to-Web_Nov-21-2016.pdf

Next Meeting:

- Tuesday, November 16th (tentative)
Tuesday, December 7th (tentative)
Tuesday, December 21st (tentative)

SOUTH DOUGLAS / WEST JUNEAU AREA PLAN
Steering Committee Meeting
Zoom Webinar Format
Tuesday, June 29, 2021
DRAFT MINUTES

Steering Committee Members Present:

- | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Carole Bookless | <input type="checkbox"/> Rebecca Emblar | <input type="checkbox"/> Liz Smith |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Matt Catterson | <input type="checkbox"/> Arnold Liebelt | <input type="checkbox"/> Linda Snow |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Frank Delaney | <input type="checkbox"/> Robert Sewell | <input type="checkbox"/> Joyce Vick |
| <input type="checkbox"/> H. Erik Pederson, Planning Commission Liaison | | |

Staff Members Present:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Allison Eddins, CDD Planner | <input type="checkbox"/> Alexandra Pierce, CDD Planning Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jill Maclean, CDD Director | |

Agenda Items

- I. Call to order – Meeting called to order at 5:05pm
- II. Approval of Minutes – June 15th meeting minutes approved
- III. Public Testimony on Agenda Items – No members of the public present to testify
- IV. Public Testimony on Non-Agenda Items – No public testimony
- V. Land Use and Zoning Discussion in relation to Cordova Street and West Juneau Sub-Areas
 - a. Identify Opportunities and Constraints for both Sub-Areas (reminder to keep the Plan Elements in mind – Connected, Distinctive, Sustainable and Future Focused, Prosperous, Healthy and Active, Culturally and Artistically Rich)
 - The Committee evaluated the focus area maps for Cordova and West Juneau.
 - CORDOVA
 - Ms. Bookless stated that she supported the rezone recommendation in the Cordova area along the highway.
 - Mr. Liebelt reminded the Committee that the group had mentioned previously the desire to see art integrated into infrastructure projects and wanted the Committee to not lose sight of that when we discuss. Need a "Welcome to Douglas" sign near the round-about.
 - Ms. Eddins suggested approaching DOT with the idea of allowing community groups to add art to their Douglas infrastructure. See where that gets us. Community led art projects.
 - Ms. Snow suggested art on the side of new and existing bus shelters and artistic historic signage. Example is the old Douglas ferry terminal location outside her condo on Dock Street.

- The ideas of a low tide trail was floated around and formalizing the beach access near the Breeze Inn in the DOT right-of-way.
- Ms. Snow suggested installing a flashing crosswalk at the Cordova intersection.
- Ms. Bookless would like for the Committee to hear from DOT if this is possible. Have been told in the past that Douglas Highway cannot have flashing lights.
- Mr. Liebelt asked if the highway right-of-way is wide enough for complete sidewalks along both sides. Ms. Snow mentioned Safe Routes to School money could be used.
- Mr. Pederson stated that most DOT projects are funded by federal funds. Having these ideas in the area plan can help DOT when applying for future funds.
- Ms. Bookless mentioned, in terms of Distinctive and Connected, Douglas could use more signage. For example, when she first moved here she didn't know where Blueberry Hills was.
- Mr. Liebelt asked about CBJ land in the Cordova area that might be suitable for a recreation or park area. Ms. Pierce stated that CBJ would like to see the mountain bike trail from Treadwell to Nowell formalized.
- Ms. Embler added to the Opportunities list a need for a social gathering space in the Cordova area.
- Mr. Sewell would like to see a community focus in this area but it's hard to know exactly what can be done. That focus is missing in this area.
- Ms. Pierce reminded the Committee that residents choose to live there for the convenient location and views. They would not be opposed to a public area but there is not a big push for one. This is due to the close proximity to trails, downtown Juneau parks and the playground in Cedar Park. A lot of kids play in the street in this area.
- Mr. Sewell stated that he senses fragmentation in the area. The food pantry in the synagogue is not well-known to the residents in the area, for example.
- Ms. Pierce recommended that having a process with the Cordova area residents similar to the Chicken Yard Park outreach with the Starr Hill neighborhood would be useful, if the opportunity presents itself.
- Ms. Bookless has students who live in the D18 zone of the Cordova area who ride their bikes to Sandy Beach because they lack recreation opportunities in their neighborhoods. Many of these kids don't have daily access to cars or their parents are working and cannot drive them.
- Mr. Sewell recommends having a focus group with the Cordova residents.
- WEST JUNEAU
- Mr. Liebelt mentioned that integrated housing types should be increased in this area. What have other communities done? A healthy community needs to have all types of housing to feed a strong economy.
- Ms. Eddins stated that other communities have shifted to form-based zoning with greater focus on design standards and public amenities. Juneau just adopted two new zoning districts that better integrate housing types and small-scale commercial uses into residential neighborhoods.
- Ms. Bookless stated that Douglas doesn't have much housing for seniors and the new zoning districts that integrate commercial may be good for seniors. Is there the ability to have co-op type housing? Ms. Eddins stated yes, co-op housing would be allowed in the new zoning districts.
- Mr. Sewell asked about parking in the new zoning districts?
- Mr. Pederson explained the parking is based on use and not district but CDD is working on the parking requirements to decrease the minimum requirements in Downtown

Juneau. The same could be done for Douglas. There is currently the option for a business or housing development to apply for a Parking Waiver to reduce their parking requirement.

- Ms. Bookless would like to see the proposed multi-modal pathway realigned a little further down away from 6th Street and connect to 2nd Street. The plan should show various routes the pathway may take.
- The vision for the multi-modal pathway needs to be flushed out more and explained in detail in the plan. Using examples from other communities would be helpful.

VI. Committee Comment – The Committee agreed to take some time off this summer to allow for travel. Mr. Liebelt reminded the Committee to upload photos to the Dropbox and to take a tour of the study area making mental notes about what you like, what you don't like, etc.

VII. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 6:35pm

Next Meeting: July 6, 2021

SOUTH DOUGLAS / WEST JUNEAU AREA PLAN
Steering Committee Meeting
Zoom Webinar Format
Tuesday, October 26, 2021
DRAFT MINUTES

Steering Committee Members Present:

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| P Carole Bookless | P Rebecca Embler | P Liz Smith |
| P Matt Catterson | P Arnold Liebelt | P Linda Snow |
| P Frank Delaney | P Robert Sewell | P Joyce Vick |
- P** H. Erik Pederson, Planning Commission Liaison

Staff Members Present:

- P** Allison Eddins, CDD Planner **P** Alexandra Pierce, CDD Planning Manager
- Jill Maclean, CDD Director
- P** Scott Ciambor, Chief Housing Officer

Agenda Items

- I. Call to order – Meeting called to order at 5:05pm
- II. Approval of Minutes (Postponed until November)
- III. Public Testimony on Agenda Items – Darren Snyder attended the meeting. It has been difficult to follow along with this process and understand the big picture. Ms. Eddins said that staff will do a better job communicating with the public and will reach out to Mr. Snyder.
- IV. Public Testimony on Non-Agenda Items – No Comments
- V. Overview of CBJ Housing Goals and Priorities – Scott Ciambor, Chief Housing Officer
 - Mr. Ciambor reviewed the CBJ Assembly goals for housing. These goals mostly came out of The Housing Action Plan that was adopted in 2015. Mr. Ciambor then took questions from the committee.
 - Ms. Snow asked about the senior housing project in Vintage Park. Are they private projects that CBJ loans money to? Mr. Ciambor stated yes, this was a public/private partnership. CBJ purchased the land, provided the tax abatement and a \$2million grant. The project went through a competitive bid process. Ms. Snow asked if there is interest in doing a project like this in Douglas. Mr. Ciambor stated that no, this was a big project and it is hoped that this project will meet the needs of the community for some time.
 - Mr. Sewell asked Mr. Ciambor to talk more about the subdivision tax abatement program. Mr. Ciambor explained that the program allows for developers to avoid paying the increased taxes for 5 years while they develop the land that they subdivided.

- Mr. Sewell also asked about the Point Lena lots – were they sold to developers who then flipped them for profit. Mr. Ciambor stated that those were over the counter sales that were open to anyone.
- Mr. Sewell asked Mr. Ciambor to elaborate on the "mistakes of the past" in terms of density. Mr. Ciambor explained that in the past CBJ didn't plan for increased density along public transit routes and missing middle housing, for example.
- Mr. Ciambor also talked about the Downtown Tax Abatement that was recently approved for Downtown Juneau. This could be applied to Douglas too if there is enough interest.
- Ms. Bookless asked about encouraging housing development on the land owned by Catholic Church and Tlingit and Haida. Mr. Ciambor explained the he is in touch with Tlingit and Haida and would like to create more opportunities for groups to use the Affordable Housing funds. CBJ is not aware of any particular plans they have for this lot or the lot they own above the JD Bridge.
- Mr. Liebelt asked how much influence CBJ has in how development takes place. Mr. Ciambor stated that he and other employees are educating the Assembly about the tools at their disposal that can influence what gets developed. However, where the city doesn't own the land and doesn't have site control. The only tool they have in that case is an incentive, like a tax abatement. The Housing Fund is another tool.
- Mr. Sewell mentioned the sense of community in Douglas and asked for tips on the concept of "Community by Design" ideas. Mr. Ciambor said he would enjoy bringing ideas back to the committee and mentioned that the biggest impact the committee could have in terms of "community by design" is influencing the future development of 6th Street.
- Mr. Bookless asked about CBJ's ability to promote housing co-ops. Mr. Ciambor mentioned one example he is aware of is in Anchorage. It is resident driven and used the city as a resource for funding and designed with the planning department. Parking waivers and other regulatory exceptions would be available to this type of development.
- Ms. Snow mentioned that CBJ approved a cottage housing ordinance. Mr. Ciambor said yes, that is still in the books but land use and financing have been hurdles that developers have not been able to overcome with this type of development.

VI. Douglas Housing Data – Ms. Eddins reviewed the Douglas data that was presented at the public meeting in 2020 and then took committee questions.

- Ms. Snow asked if Census data is out yet for Douglas and would like to see this data updated. Ms. Eddins stated that detailed housing data is not out at the block level. That data will hopefully be available by the time the draft plan is ready to go out to the public for review.
- Ms. Embler asked if Airbnb units are counted as housing units in the Census. Ms. Eddins said that yes, those units are counted as housing units.
- Ms. Eddins asked the committee to start to think about housing needs borough-wide and what role Douglas can play in meeting those needs. The development of more market-rate housing including smaller bungalow type houses would help meet those needs and would be in line with the existing character of the neighborhoods.
- Mr. Sewell stated that Douglas does not owe the city a big housing development. The Committee needs to think carefully about how new housing would impact what the community currently has. A new development would create a decade of noise and development traffic and for what? Housing is tight in the city but is the development worth it?
- Ms. Eddins stated that it is unlikely that the Assembly would support the idea of not trying to get CBJ owned land that is suitable for development into the hands of private developers

to help alleviate the housing shortage. Multiple adopted plans state that CBJ lands need to be sold and that Juneau needs more housing.

- Mr. Liebelt reminded the committee that private development cannot be stopped but we do have the ability to shape the type of development and the character. Housing is evolving. We need to keep an open mind. We can preserve the character while creating new housing. New housing will help support the existing and new businesses.
- Ms. Vick stated that she would like to see a variety of housing types and does appreciate the flavor of the residential neighborhood in downtown Douglas.
- Ms. Bookless stated that the way we view housing has changed a lot. People like the small miner's houses and we can't think that people still want a large house with a large yard. We need more than just standard single-family and multi-family.
- Mr. Sewell stated that it seems that the development of 6th Street is a foregone conclusion and that the Committee will have no influence on what kind of development will happen there.
- Ms. Eddins stated that the Assembly would support Committee recommendations that place parameters or design requirements on new development, deed restrictions for affordable housing, etc.
- Mr. Sewell stated that new housing on 6th Street (with over 50 developable lots) would permanently change the character of the Townsite.
- Ms. Eddins stated that based on previously adopted plans, the Assembly would like to see some of those lots to get into the hands of private developers within the next 20 years. New development may change the neighborhood but that change does not have to be negative. The Committee has the opportunity with this plan to help decide what type of development happens and what types of infrastructure upgrades are required.
- Ms. Bookless stated that she did not realize that 6th Street was a foregone conclusion and that makes her question her involvement in this process.
- Ms. Vick stated that committee members who have strong opinions should remain on the committee and give their opinions.
- Ms. Eddins stated that she will reach out to the CBJ Lands Manager about attending the next meeting.

VII. Committee Comment – Mr. Liebelt stated that he appreciates the diversity of comments.

VIII. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 6:30pm

Cottage Housing Developments

March 7, 2017

by Justin Shiu, Associate Planner at M-Group

<https://www.m-group.us/m-lab/blog/2017/3/7/cottage-housing-developments>

Cottage housing developments, as a form of smaller single family residential units, diversifies housing choice and provides housing that is more attractive to some households than that of traditional single-family homes.

The type of cottage housing development discussed here refers to projects that feature a cluster of units – often between four and twelve – built around a common open space. Typically, each cottage is around 1,000 square feet. This type of development is not new; the historical pattern of small housing units clustered around small parks and open spaces can be found in some parts of older cities. Recent cottage housing developments have been established as infill projects, offering a middle ground between single-family residences and multifamily development. Cottage housing can offer a smaller scale housing choice, which are suitable for meeting a variety of needs, compared to traditional detached single-family homes.



Cottage housing developments can be found around the county. They present a variety of opportunities in creating housing and meeting housing needs where other prevalent housing types are not great fits. There may be challenges implementing cottage housing developments where development constraints or local opposition limit available options. To create opportunities that allow for cottage housing development and set standards for development, a variety of considerations should be taken into account in the planning process. The following presents a brief overview of cottage housing development and provides considerations for their integration into cities.

COTTAGE HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS AROUND THE COUNTRY

Cottage housing developments can be found around the country. In Shoreline, Washington, Greenwood Avenue Cottages features eight units of less than 1,000 square feet around a large open space and served by a 300 square foot community building. Beyond offering attractive, smaller housing options for those drawn to their style, cottage housing developments have served needs for different segments of the population.



Union Studio. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

Accessed October 24, 2016.

https://www.huduser.gov/portal/casestudies/study_07022012_1.html

Cottages have been suitable for providing workforce housing. In Suffolk County, New York, Cottages at Mattituck is a 22-unit income-restricted workforce housing project. The price for the 1,100 square foot units was determined by median income earnings. The cottages will remain permanently affordable through deed-restrictions.

Cottages can be affordable options integrated into an urban context. In East Greenwich, Rhode Island, Cottages on Greene is a privately-financed, mixed-income infill development located in the historic downtown area. The cottage housing style emphasized a walkable and smaller-scale, urban living environment. This denser residential development type serves as a transition between the downtown and single-family residences and allows for locating 15 homes within

walking distance to a variety of shops, services, and restaurants in the downtown. The project also allocated five deed-restricted affordable housing units.

Cottages can be important residences for groups with special circumstances. In Sacramento, Quinn Cottages is an affordable development comprising 60 one-bedroom cottages serving single residents and parents with one child. Mercy Housing manages the cottages and provides support programs that allow the development to serve as transitional housing.

OPPORTUNITIES AND ADVANTAGES

The appropriateness of cottage housing developments may vary depending on the location, however the developments can have advantages over other types of development. They can make more efficient use of land than single-family residential development. Although they are denser than traditional single-family homes, cottage housing could be implemented in single family residential areas where the cluster of housing would not appear to be a significant departure from an already dense concentration of single-family homes, or a medium-density single-family residential district as applied in some jurisdictions. They can fill properties that are large and underdeveloped. While developments may have densities somewhat higher than neighboring single-family homes, design of the buildings and the common open space can minimize the perception of mass. They may also serve as a transition between single-family homes and condominiums / townhomes.

As an intermediate between lower and higher density development types, a cottage housing development may help diversify housing choices and capture needs from different segments of the population. Cottage housing offers living arrangements that are attractive to households seeking modestly-sized homes and those who desire a close neighborhood environment. This housing type is an option that can accommodate smaller households, including single residents, households with few children, and older residents seeking to downsize. The close proximity of units can lend itself to fostering a neighborhood within a neighborhood feeling, which can create a greater sense of familiarity and safety.

An advantage of cottage housing developments is their flexibility, from making more effective or desirable use of underutilized spaces to serving the needs of different populations. As an infill type development, they can maintain a spacious feeling with open courts. As higher density development, they offer privacy by having detached units. Their sizes allow them to be potentially more energy-efficient compared to larger residences. They can serve as housing for families seeking to downsize, young households, and the workforce.



Keller Court Commons. Petaluma Argus Courier, Petaluma, CA. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://www.petaluma360.com/news/2524154-181/pocket-neighborhood-passes-planning-commission>

CHALLENGES

Although cottage housing developments can present a number of opportunities, they may be accompanied by specific issues due to characteristics of the development.

Construction is not necessarily much less expensive than traditional single family homes. The baseline standards of the cottages are the same for new residences, including compliance with building standards and installation of utility connections. Furthermore, costs for cottages may be more on a per-square-foot basis because unit prices cannot be increased based on square footage with as much bedroom and living room floor area that can be relatively inexpensive to build.

Locational suitability is a limiting factor. Availability of lots with sizes capable of accommodating development may be low. Allowable density on a lot generally needs to be higher to allow for economically feasible projects. However, neighborhoods may be sensitive to denser development. Taking lot size, density, neighborhood sensitivity into account, cottage housing developments may be limited to certain residential areas.

Parking can also present challenges. The site may have limited space available for parking. Despite smaller households that are drawn to cottage housing, sufficient parking is required to mitigate excessive spillover to on-street parking.

CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

If it has been determined that a cottage housing development would not be impractical as a result of various challenges, a set of guidelines may serve to help shape how a development might fit within the site context. Cottage housing ordinances have been established in several jurisdictions. Ordinances that were reviewed include Kirkland, Spokane, Port Townsend, Redmond, Lakewood, and Marysville in Washington, and Lehigh Valley in Pennsylvania.

Although a cottage housing ordinance may not necessarily be a tool that every jurisdiction would want to consider integrating into their municipal codes, the examples of existing cottage housing development regulations provide a basis to review and evaluate cottage housing projects proposed within a community. The guidelines presented here do not represent a comprehensive collection of standards that have been used nor do they suggest that cottage housing design must fit within these parameters, but they present a starting point to consider what aspects of development have been applied and provide an initial point of reference for further discussion.

Units and Lot Sizes

- **Number of Units:** A minimum and maximum number of units may be defined. Minimums of 4 units and maximums of 12 units have been used in some ordinances.
- **Lot Sizes:** Consider not setting a minimum lot size.

Floor Area and Coverage

- **Density – Floor Area Ratio:** The use of floor area ratio for a site may be an appropriate standard to allow a practical design of cottage housing development. If density is used, the standard may limit density to two or three times the density of base zoning, which also may vary based on the zoning district.
- **Floor Area:** A maximum floor area may be set for each cottage housing unit. Example maximum floor areas have been found to be between 800 and 1,500 square feet.
- **Coverage:** Coverage is applied on a per unit basis. Building coverage has been found to be between 40 and 60 percent.
- **Density:** Increasing density may be accomplished through the following
 - Increasing density based on underlying zoning (e.g., base zoning multiplied by two)
 - Reducing minimum lot requirements (e.g., base zoning divided by two)
 - Multiple cottages on a lot (e.g., up to two cottages on a single family lot, with certain conditions)
- **Density Bonus:** Consider the appropriateness of density bonus incentives.
- **Expansion Restricted:** Covenants may be used to restrict the expansion of cottages.

Setbacks and Height

- Setbacks: Consideration should first be given to the appropriateness of existing setback regulations. For setbacks different from standard residential zoning, the following have been used:
 - Front setback examples. 10-20 feet.
 - Side setback examples. 5-10 feet.
 - Rear setback examples. 10 feet.
- Average Setbacks: Consider using average side and rear setbacks to provide design flexibility
- Building Separation: Use a minimum building separation to allow for space between buildings. A typical standard is 10 feet between buildings. Building code standards may be used to guide the minimum separation standard.
- Stories: Consider whether a one story limit or a two-story limit is appropriate.
 - Some architectural styles of cottages featuring lower plate height accommodate second floor area within the roof. To limit mass, a cap on second floor area may be based on a percentage of the first floor.
- Height: Consider whether development would create tall and overly narrow homes.
 - Pitch limitations on cottage roof.
 - Maximum ratio of height to width.

Parking

- Parking Spaces: Off-street parking may be between 1.0 and 2.0 spaces per unit.
- Parking Arrangement: Parking can be designed such that access is away from primary streets. Parking spaces design could be through side access by alley, side access by private street, and a non-primary street. Adequate screening should be provided for any option. Parking lots may be more feasible than individual garages.
- Parking Clusters: Consider whether parking should be distributed among small clusters on the site to minimize visual impact. Consider maximum contiguous spaces in each cluster and minimum separation between clusters.
- Parking Reduction: Parking reduction may be considered if the site is close to transit.

Design

- Design: Consider whether requirements should be placed on a color scheme and variety in design.
- Orientation: Orient the primary entry towards the common open space area.
- Porches: Consider covered front porches. The minimum area may be 60-80 square feet.
- Sidewalk: Sidewalk connections and sidewalks along public streets.
- Parking Lot: Parking may be consolidated into one or a few small lots to allow for closer spacing between buildings.

Common Space and Amenities

- Common Open Space Area: Each dwelling unit should provide an allotment of space for a common open space area. In several ordinances, 400 square feet per unit has been used but areas as small as 150 square feet per unit have been applied as well. Common open space may also be low in instances where there is a requirement for private open space.
 - Consider specifying that required setbacks, private open space, stormwater management facilities, parking areas, and driveways do not qualify as common open space area.
- Community Building: A community building may be permitted.

Integration into the Community

- Outreach: Provide outreach and education
- Trial Period: Consider a trial period to ensure regulations are working as intended
- Conditional Use Permit: An administrative conditional use permit may be a good approach to consider developer and community input so that the project works within the context of certain areas.

CONCLUSION

Cottage housing developments offer opportunities to fill in housing needs, but they may be limited in locations that could accommodate such developments. Density and neighborhood sensitivity may make it difficult to find suitable sites for cottage housing developments, in addition to needed interest from the developers.

However, it is also the compact character of these developments that makes them attractive to those with specific housing needs that can be served by small but detached housing units. In planning for cottage housing developments, establishing guidelines may help address some concerns related to the form the developments may take. A consideration of policies and guidelines can show if cottage housing developments would fit within the local context and how development may take shape.