

City and Borough of Sitka
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
October 16, 2007

Present: Don Alexander, Larry Crews, Brian McNitt, Richard Parmelee, Jeremy Twaddle, Planning Director Wells Williams, Planner Sara Russell, and Secretary Maria Finkenbinder

City Staff: Fire Chief Scott Elmer, City Engineer Dan Jones, City Attorney Theresa Hillhouse

Members of the Public: Ken Kimball, Craig Shoemaker, Pete Jones, Ken Bellows, William Patrick, Harold Kalve, Thor Christianson, Steve Clayton, Duane and Tracie Lambeth, Dan Coffey, Alice Machesney, Tim Hoyt, Annette Blankenship, Lureen Stedman, Craig Giammona (Sitka Sentinel)

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Consideration of Minutes from the October 2nd, 2007 meeting:

MOTION: M/S Twaddle/Crews moved to approve the minutes from the October 2nd, 2007 meeting.

ACTION: Motion **PASSED unanimously** on a voice vote.

The evening's business:

VARIANCE REQUEST
REDUCTION OF FRONT SETBACK TO 4 FEET
CONSTRUCTION OF A FREEZER
507 KATLIAN ST.
SEAFOOD PRODUCERS COOPERATIVE (SPC)

Public hearing and consideration of a variance request filed by Seafood Producers Cooperative for 507 Katlian Street. This request is for a reduction of the front setback to 4 feet for construction of a freezer. The property is also known as Lot 1 of the SPC Subdivision.

Ms. Russell briefly described the location of the project relative to Katlian St. and adjacent properties. She discussed the main concerns raised by City Staff, namely: line of sight, location of water lines, proximity to the existing fire hydrant, and electrical line locations, and explained how the applicant will address these concerns.

She said SPC submitted a photo demonstrating that the project will not create a line-of-sight traffic problem. The image taken from the perspective of a northbound vehicle shows orange flagging where the new freezer will be constructed. On the freezer's proximity to the fire hydrant, SPC has moved the proposed location of the building to provide at least eight feet clearance from the fire hydrant on the north side of the building as suggested by environmental superintendent Mark Buggins. To address City Engineer Dan Jones' concern on the location of the storm drain, SPC offered to relocate the storm drain so that it does not pass under the proposed building.

Ms. Russell pointed out that Electric Department System Engineer Bob Dryden has stated that under normal circumstances the proposed building would not be acceptable as permanent structures are not typically allowed within the power line right of way. But Mr. Dryden understood from an operations standpoint why the location best suits the facility. He did an onsite visit and has indicated that all the primary lines have more

than ample legal clearance. However, he made the following observations: (1) the large telephone line needs to be moved up the pole about four feet, and (2) the Electric Dept. needs to replace the street light circuits and clean up a small guy wire which has something to do with the telephone system.

SPC Chief Engineer Ken Kimball told the Board that there is no obstacle that SPC can't accommodate. He explained how SPC would address the concerns raised by City Staff, stressing that the project will not hinder traffic on Katlian St. and that there is enough distance between the building and the pavement to provide a clear line of sight for vehicular traffic.

Asked by Mr. Twaddle on how the freezer will be accessed, Mr. Kimball explained that it will be accessed from the lower level of the main building. The product will enter into the freezer and exit at the second level going towards the back of the main building. There will be no container vans extending in front of the structure.

Mr. McNitt noted that that Board is widely supportive of SPC but he felt that the project will further squeeze down Katlian St. and limit future options for roadway expansion. He wanted to know if there are other options to locate the freezer. In response, Mr. Kimball said that SPC has no other option. Otherwise, SPC will have to subtract what they are already doing or move to another location but the latter won't enable them to accommodate the product in an efficient manner. They currently don't have enough freezer capacity which is limiting their production and how much they can process. Further, he pointed out that their project is the least restricted area on Katlian St. and it doesn't take away a portion of the roadway at all.

On Mr. Crews' concern about losing five parking spaces in an area where parking spaces are limited, Mr. Kimball insisted that there is always a place to park on Katlian St.

SPC Manager Craig Shoemaker stepped forward and spoke about the scope of the project and its benefits to the Sitka community. He responded to additional questions from the Board and addressed the issue of parking. He said that that they won't have a problem that a condition on fleet vehicle parking be included in the variance.

Mr. Bellows, owner of Air Sitka an adjacent property, stated that he has no objection to the project and thought that SPC is an asset to Sitka.

MOTION: M/S **Crews/Twaddle** moved to approve the variance request filed by Seafood Producers Cooperative for 507 Katlian Street. This request is for a reduction of the front setback to 4 feet for construction of a freezer. The property is also known as Lot 1 of the SPC Subdivision.

AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION: Mr. Twaddle offered to amend the motion by adding the condition that SPC be required to post "No parking in front of the structure." Mr. Crews accepted the amended.

ACTION: Motion, as amended **PASSED unanimously** on a voice vote.

MOTION: M/S **McNitt/Crews** moved to approve the following findings in support of the approval of the request:

1. That there are special circumstances to the intended use that do not generally apply to the other properties such as higher than normal sight distance than what is available on this portion of Katlian St. and the ability to maintain that sight distance as the condition for approval;
2. The variance is necessary is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right or use possessed by other properties but are denied to this parcel;
3. That the granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property, nearby parcels or public infrastructure with no-parking requirement as a condition for approval;

4. That the granting of the variance will not adversely affect the comprehensive plan. It will, in fact, further enhance with respect to the economic goals in the comprehensive plan.

ACTION: Motion **PASSED** unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Williams mentioned that the variance approval may be appealed. There is an outstanding objection from the City Administration as stated in an email included in the packet.

**PRELIMINARY PLAT
14-LOT PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT
140 GRANITE CREEK ROAD
PETE JONES**

Public hearing and consideration of a preliminary plat for a 14-lot planned unit development at 140 Granite Creek Road. The request is filed by Pete Jones. The property is also known as Lot 2 of the Lower Granite Creek Subdivision.

Mr. Williams told the Board that there have been some changes to the plat since the September 4th meeting. The “hammerhead” design previously proposed at the back portion of the subdivision has been replaced with a cul-de-sac design with a radius of 35 feet, 10 feet less than subdivision code requirement. He said that City Engineer Dan Jones has noted that the proposed platted radius of the cul-de-sac is acceptable but it should be approved by the Fire Chief for emergency vehicle use and explicitly recognized and approved by the Commission. He mentioned that the Planning Office received a comment from Fire Chief Elmer who stated that as long as it can be assured that there is no on-street parking in the cul-de-sac, the Fire Department will be able to access and egress the area with a fire truck.

Mr. Pete Jones spoke about existing cul-de-sacs which he said are smaller than what he is proposing for his subdivision. He will develop the cul-de-sac with a full 35-foot radius which he said is larger than the dimension typically constructed in existing subdivisions. He said what matters is how the cul-de-sac is built and how it is used and not how it is written on the plat. He also stressed that the lot sizes, ranging from 4,000 square feet to 9,000 square feet, are not in any way restrictive. The houses he envisioned to construct will fit in those lots and are doable without a variance, given the 15-foot front setback designated for the development. He has been designing and building for the past 30 years and never sought a variance.

Responding to Mr. Crews’ query about drainage, he explained that the curb gutter goes in two directions – towards Granite Creek Road and towards Granite Creek. He expressed uncertainty on where the snow will be piled up with the new configuration. The hammerhead configuration provided for snow deposit.

Mr. Jones further said that the City main water line runs to the golf course and he will be able to connect it. The sewer line, however, ends at lot 117-123 on Granite Creek Road. He will have to pay for the expense of digging up Granite Creek Road and bringing up the line up to the development.

Asked by Mr. McNitt if the cul-de-sac ends up being an issue, would he be amenable to shave off some of the lots, Mr. Jones said that it is already “overkill” as it is. He may have to go back to the hammerhead idea. He felt that the cul-de-sac will work since it will not be a heavy traffic road and there is a fire hydrant at the beginning of the road.

City Engineer Dan Jones said that the proposed 30 foot right of way is 20 feet less than the subdivision requirement but he noted that there are mitigating factors that the Board can include its findings: (1) Due to the location of Granite Creek at the rear of the subdivision, it is clear that the road will never become a through street serving more property, and (2) A narrow road, in this particular terrain and subdivision configuration, might actually have some positive “traffic-calming” attributes.

The City Engineer also spoke about the problems that have started to emerge with the smaller cul-de-sacs in town. He said that the Police Department deals with parking on cul-de-sacs on a neighborhood-to-neighborhood basis particularly with respect to emergency vehicle access.

Fire Chief Scott Elmer told the Board that the Fire Department is comfortable with a cul-de-sac with a 50-foot radius and they expect it not be plugged with cars. He said that if on-street parking on the proposed cul-de-sac is limited to guest-parking only, they will be able to turn around a fire truck.

Mr. Williams mentioned that he received a call from Roger Sudnikovich who expressed concern about a residential subdivision in an industrial area and from Dan Cox who was also concerned about a residential development near a seafood processing facility. He pointed out drainage and storm drain permitting can be handled outside the platting process while Kristin Griffin's questions are addressed in the subdivision design. He suggested that the applicant be invited back to the next meeting during which time the Board will finalize the plat notes and types of restrictions.

**VARIANCE REQUEST
REDUCTION OF FRONT SETBACK TO 12 FEET
CONSTRUCTION OF A GARAGE
WILLIAM PATRICK
2003 ANNA CIRCLE**

Public hearing and consideration of a variance request filed by William Patrick for 2003 Anna Circle to reduce the front setback to 12 feet for construction of a garage. The property is also known as Lot 5 of the Verstovia Park Subdivision #2.

Ms. Russell walked the Board through the location and terrain of the property which she described as unusually shaped with topography restraints such as a steep bank and bedrock at the back portion of the lot. She noted that many of the structures on Anna Circle don't meet the 20 foot front setback requirement. In an email, Environmental Superintendent Mark Buggins wanted to make sure that the applicant knows where the utility lines are and should not build on it.

Mr. Patrick assured the Board that he has located that utility lines and does not have problems with it. Responding to Mr. McNitt's question about the distance of the front corner of the house from the property line, he estimated it to be 22 feet. On Mr. Twaddle's concern about the garage covering the side egress to the back bedroom, the applicant said that the garage will not affect the bedroom window and that there is also another egress in the back.

MOTION: **M/S McNitt/Crews** moved to approve the variance request filed by William Patrick for 2003 Anna Circle to reduce the front setback to 12 feet for construction of a garage. The property is also known as Lot 5 of the Verstovia Park Subdivision #2.

ACTION: Motion **PASSED unanimously** on a voice vote.

MOTION: **M/S McNitt/Crews** moved to approve the following findings in support of the approval of the request:

1. That there are special circumstances to the intended use that do not generally apply to the other properties such as the irregular shape of the property and presence of steep bank in the rear portion of the property which forces the proposed structure towards the front setback;
2. The variance is necessary is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right or use possessed by other properties but are denied to this parcel such as the expansion of a small structure;
3. That the granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property, nearby parcels or public infrastructure with no-parking requirement as a condition for approval;
4. That the granting of the variance will not adversely affect the comprehensive plan. It will, in fact, further enhance with respect to the economic goals in the comprehensive plan.

ACTION: Motion **PASSED** unanimously on a voice vote.

**VARIANCE REQUEST
REDUCTION OF THE NW SIDE SETBACK TO 3 FEET
CONSTRUCTION OF A GARAGE
HAROLD KALVE**

Public hearing and consideration of a variance request to reduce the northwest side setback at 102 Clothilde Bahovec Way to 3 feet for a construction of a garage. The request is filed by Harold Kalve. The property is also known as Lot 2C of the HPR Lot Line Adjustment.

Ms. Russell briefly described the applicant's property and how the subject structure is situated within the lot. She said that the eaves on the right side of the new structure will encroach into the northwest side setback by 2 feet. The adjoining property owner is SEREMS who indicated that they are aware of the setback encroachment and have no objections to the construction and location of the applicant's garage and carport.

Mr. Williams explained that the ramp at the back portion of the SEREMS structure is an ADA ramp and as such, is exempt from setback requirements.

Mr. Kalve told the Board that the developable portion on his property is towards the SEREMS building. He said that the new construction will be 26 feet deep by 28 feet wide plus a 12 foot carport. His alternative will have to go 2 feet more in depth. Asked by Mr. McNitt on the size of his property, Mr. Kalve said that it is around 19,000 feet with a 20 ft. roadway. Only half of it is usable space.

Mr. Christianson of SEREMS stepped forward said that SEREMS does not have any problem with the request. There isn't any part of the SEREMS building that is actually three feet away from the proposed structure.

MOTION: M/S McNitt/Twaddle moved to approve the variance request to reduce the northwest side setback at 102 Clothilde Bahovec Way to 3 feet for a construction of a garage. The request is filed by Harold Kalve. The property is also known as Lot 2C of the HPR Lot Line Adjustment.

ACTION: Motion **FAILED 1-4** on a voice vote with Alexander voting in the affirmative.

MOTION: M/S McNitt/Parmelee moved to approve the following finding in support of the denial of the request: that there are other feasible alternatives that won't require a variance.

ACTION: Motion **PASSED** unanimously on a voice vote.

**VARIANCE REQUEST
REDUCTION OF THE MINIMUM DISTANCE
FREESTANDING SIGN FROM 5 FEET TO 1 FOOT
CHANNEL CLUB
STEVE CLAYTON FOR CHUCK OLSON
2906 HALIBUT POINT ROAD**

Public hearing and consideration of a freestanding sign variance request filed by Steve Clayton on behalf of Chuck Olson at 2906 Halibut Point Road. The request is to reduce the minimum distance of a freestanding sign from the front property line from 5 feet to 1 foot. The property is also known as Lot 1B of the Channel Club Subdivision.

Ms. Russell presented the details of the request which basically involves the reduction in the front setback from 5 feet to 1 foot for the installation of a freestanding sign for the new Channel Club. She showed an image of the sign which is being built from metal by Lee Craft, and another image showing the proposed location of the sign. She pointed out that the ROW distance in this area of Halibut Point Road is over 80 feet,

much greater than the road width. With the large ROW distance, the distance although one foot from the actual property line, is far enough off the road that it won't present a line of sight problem to drivers.

On Mr. McNitt's question if the State DOT has any problems with the request, Mr. Williams remarked that DOT was notified and in the past, they would call the Planning Office if they have concerns. Staff did not hear from DOT regarding this request.

Mr. Clayton, representing the owners of Channel Club, told the Board that the sign will be two feet off the ground. They will be utilizing flood lights which will be focused directly on the sign.

Mr. Williams informed the members that the Code was revised in 2004 when the threshold for smaller structures and signs were lowered.

MOTION: **M/S Twaddle/Crews** moved to approve the freestanding sign variance request filed by Steve Clayton on behalf of Chuck Olson at 2906 Halibut Point Road. The request is to reduce the minimum distance of a freestanding sign from the front property line from 5 feet to 1 foot. The property is also known as Lot 1B of the Channel Club Subdivision.

ACTION: Motion **PASSED unanimously** on a voice vote.

MOTION: M/S **McNitt/Crews** moved to approve the following findings in support of the approval of the request:

1. The municipality finds that the necessary threshold for granting this variance should be lower than thresholds for variances involving major structures or major expansions;
2. The granting of the variance is not injurious to nearby properties or improvements;
3. The granting of the variance furthers an appropriate use of the property.

ACTION: Motion **PASSED** unanimously on a voice vote.

Secretary's Note: The following two agenda items were taken up simultaneously –

**CONDITIONAL USE (CU) PERMIT
OPERATION OF AN EXISTING LODGE
TO ACCOMMODATE UP TO 24 GUESTS
DOVE ISLAND LODGE
DUANE AND TRACIE LAMBETH**

Public hearing and consideration of a conditional use permit for operation of an existing lodge on Dove Island to accommodate up to 24 guests. The request is filed by Duane and Tracie Lambeth. The property is also known as Lot 1 of the Dove Island Subdivision.

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
COMMERCIAL DOCK WITH A SEAFOOD PROCESSING FACILITY
DOVE ISLAND LODGE
DUANE AND TRACIE LAMBETH**

Public hearing and consideration of a conditional use permit for a commercial dock with a seafood processing facility on Dove Island. The request is filed by Duane and Tracie Lambeth. The request is for an existing dock. The dock is seaward of Lot 2 of the Dove Island Subdivision.

Mr. Williams walked the members through the chronology of events that led Dove Island Lodge to file the current conditional use permit requests. He presented onscreen how the lodge is situated on Dove Island in relation to the Machesney property; the neighboring islands such as Guertin Island and Ring Island; Knutson Drive, and Jamestown Bay. He also outlined the issues surrounding the Dove Island Lodge operations which includes conditional uses for the lodge, seafood processing, and commercial dock; exact details of the lodge operation including building layout, number of guests, number of employees, and months of operations;

approval for the size and scope of seafood processing; dock issues including size, presence of the seafood processing facility, use and impacts of float plane operations, and fuel storage; identification of the nature and use of the access easement that bisects the Machesney property.

Applicants

Dan Coffey, representing the Lambeths, initially outlined the reasons behind the complexity of the problem saying that part of the problem stemmed from the uses that arose before the Lambeths acquired the property, and also from the fact that the Code was changed in 2002 and then in 2007 but the operations existed before then. He gave a summary of events that delayed the Lambeths' application for conditional use permit which had something to do with the change in the Machesney Revocable Trust. He asked the Board to recognize the fact that these things have occurred for a period of time from 1995 to 2007 and not to ignore it. He said that the appropriate way to handle the matter is to look at it as a conditional use application and work in the context of the conditional use application. He explained that it is a simpler way than trying to sort through what is grandfathered in and what is permitted, and secondly, it allows the Board to mitigate through conditions any impacts they might find that could exist relative to neighboring properties.

Mr. Coffey also asked the Board to take into consideration the existence of building permits which he said allowed for the construction of additional bed and breakfast rooms and commercial-type kitchen. He stressed that the applicants made a substantial investment and went through the building permit process. Mr. Coffey's oral narrative also addressed the dock issues and seafood processing issues. He assured the Board that the applicants are willing to work with the City on every aspect of the application and to address every issue.

Responding to Mr. McNitt's question regarding the current permits they have, Mr. Lambeth said that they have the Yerkes original conditional use permit for a lodge for 2 cabins (8 adults + 4 children); building permit for the construction of additional five bedrooms attached to the house and a commercial kitchen; and a DEC permit for food service.

Mr. Coffey explained that in 1995, Mr. Yerkes got a CU permit to operate a lodge for one cabin then in 1998, Mr. Yerkes notified the City that he's building an additional cabin, presumably accommodating the same number of guests as the first cabin. There was no response to the letter and Mr. Yerkes took it as an approval. The Lambeths continued the operations the way Mr. Yerkes had.

Mr. Williams pointed out that there are substantial difference to the facts presented with respect to this issue.

On Mr. Parmelee's question on the number of employees the lodge has, Mr. Coffey said that Dove Island Lodge has 18 employees plus 2 chefs. The lodge manager, lodge maintenance person, 2 servers, a housekeeper and the 2 chefs live on the island while the boat captains, deckhands and fish processors live in town.

Public Comments

Mr. Christianson, resident of Guertin Island, told the Board that he does not have a problem with what's going on in Dove Island, adding that he's amazed what little impact it has on Guertin Island. The floatplane leaves outside the Bay and he doesn't see the charter people come and go. He also mentioned that he likes the idea of having full time people working on Dove Island so they can keep an eye on his property. He said Dove Island Lodge has been good neighbors and he doesn't have any objection to their operations.

Ms. Machesney, resident of Dove Island, stated that she does not have a problem with the lodge saying that the Lambeths are nice neighbors. She likes development in Sitka and liked what the Lambeths have done on their side of the island.

Mr. Hoyt of 123 Knutson Drive expressed objections to the heavy use of float plane and helicopter by Dove Island Lodge. He said that his family is deprived of the full enjoyment of their property with the noise generated by the float plane and helicopter. He thought that a helicopter is not a good mix in the

neighborhood and contrary to Mr. Coffey's statement, he said the float plane do take off from the Jamestown Bay side. He urged the Board to severely curtail Dove Island's operations.

Mr. Bellows, property owner of Ring Island, wanted to see the CU application denied due to the noise generated by the Dove Island guests partying at night. He said he lived on Ring Island for 30 years but decided to give it to his sister for that reason.

Ms. Blankenship urged the Board to deny the permit application for the following reasons: (1) the impact of 24 guests on a small island; (2) Dove Island Lodge is in violation of the code; (3) they failed in every condition e.g. no vegetative buffers, noise, use of the boardwalk and dock; and (4) the operation of a lodge runs contrary to the residential character of a GI district. She asked the Board to consider the impact of Dove Island Lodge on the entire surrounding area, and not let the Code be optional for people to follow or not.

Ms. Stedman, property owner on Jamestown Bay, stated that her main concern was how the negotiations for the operations of the lodge would impact existing property rights, that it shouldn't be removed or diminished. She also raised the question that if the lodge and dock have been in operation since the 1990s, why can't it be grandfathered. She also spoke about the historic use of Jamestown Bay for float plane moorage and commercial flight services. She didn't want to see the opportunity to fly float planes off Jamestown Bay be unnecessarily taken away.

In response to Ms. Stedman's query about the dock operations being grandfathered, Mr. Williams said that a portion of the dock is but the present configuration is not, from the perspective of the Zoning Code. The dock has been expanded since Yerkes operated the dock. He also mentioned that Jamestown Bay is considered state waters.

Responding to Mr. Parmelee's question regarding the adequacy of waste treatment system on the island, Mr. Lambeth said that they have put in a septic system for 40 guests.

Staff Comments

Mr. Williams suggested that the Board request the applicants to submit a 3-part addenda to the application, consisting of the following:

- Annotated map showing the components of the lodge
- 2-page outline that further describes the components of the lodge
- 1-page listing of all permits received and applied for by Dove Island Lodge e.g. FAA permit for flying, DEC permit for water, sewer, Corps permit for the dock

Further, he requested that the annotated map list the following for every component:

- Minimum/maximum client load to be accommodated
- How clients are accommodated, room configuration
- Employee count
- Characteristics of each one of the cabins, description, no. of guests, etc.
- Vessel count

Mr. Coffey said that they don't have any problem with the request and they will do everything they can to comply.

Mr. Williams likewise mentioned an email from Gary and Nancy Short who expressed concern about the float plane operations on Jamestown Bay.

Mr. McNitt requested the Planning Staff to provide the rest of the Commissioners copies of the previous correspondence submitted by Annette Blankenship which he said clarified the issues associated with Dove Island Lodge.

**ZONING MAP AMENDMENT
TO REZONE LOTS 1 TO 14
ASHAAK SUBDIVISION
LOTS 1 TO 10
PROPOSED INDIAN RIVER LAND SUBDIVISION
FROM P (PUBLIC) TO R-2 MHP (MULTIFAMILY/MOBILE HOME)
CITY AND BOROUGH OF SITKA**

Public hearing and consideration of a zoning map amendment request filed by the City and Borough of Sitka to rezone Lots 1 through 14 of the Ashaak Subdivision and Lots 1 through 10 of the proposed Indian River Land Subdivision from P (Public) to R-2 MHP (Multifamily/Mobile Home)

Mr. Williams told the Board that this request is simply a housekeeping amendment which does not only clean up the zoning of the Ashaak Subdivision, currently zoned Public, but also rezones the property set aside for the City's 11-lot Indian River Land Subdivisions.

Addressing Mr. McNitt's concern regarding Indian River, Mr. Williams said that there is a clearly defined buffer zone between the perimeter of the subdivision and the river which is set aside for mitigation. It has an average distance of 150 feet with the closest property line to the river at 75 feet. He added that they have done 2 series of wetlands delineation for the area.

MOTION: M/S **Crews/McNitt** moved to approve zoning map amendment request filed by the City and Borough of Sitka to rezone Lots 1 through 14 of the Ashaak Subdivision and Lots 1 through 10 of the proposed Indian River Land Subdivision from P (Public) to R-2 MHP (Multifamily/Mobile Home).

ACTION: Motion **PASSED unanimously** on a voice vote.

**PRELIMINARY PLAT
11-LOT MAJOR SUBDIVISION
END OF INDIAN RIVER ROAD
ACROSS FROM SCAPS
CITY AND BOROUGH OF SITKA**

Public hearing and consideration of a preliminary plat for an 11-lot major subdivision filed by the City and Borough of Sitka at the end of Indian River Road on the right side opposite Sitka Counseling Center and Yaw Drive. The subdivision includes land owned by the City and Borough of Sitka and the Alaska Mental Health Authority. The property is also known as a Portion of Lots 2 and 3, US Survey 3695.

Mr. Williams stated that this subdivision has gone through excessive public hearing and regulatory review. It took two years to get the Corp of Engineers wetlands permit for the lots and now it is ready to go through the subdivision process. Staff has received Assembly authorization to acquire approximately 13,000 square feet of land from Alaska Mental Health Trust which allows an additional lot to be created, yielding 11 lots total. He added that the utilities will be installed before Indian River Road is paved especially since the water, sewer and electrical utilities will all be underground.

MOTION: M/S **Crews/McNitt** moved to approve a preliminary plat for an 11-lot major subdivision filed by the City and Borough of Sitka at the end of Indian River Road on the right side opposite Sitka Counseling Center and Yaw Drive. The subdivision includes land owned by the City and Borough of Sitka and the Alaska Mental Health Authority. The property is also known as a Portion of Lots 2 and 3, US Survey 3695.

ACTION: Motion **PASSED unanimously** on a voice vote.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT - None

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 pm.

Chair, Don Alexander

Secretary, Maria Finkenbinder