

tax, and whether the homeowners had land costs; Hughey clarified that there was a small land cost to the buyer as they were responsible for paying property tax.

Public Comment: None

Commissioner Deliberation: None.

M-Alderson/S-Mudry moved to approve the final plat for a planned unit subdivision at 1410 and 1414 Halibut Point Road in the R-2 multifamily district subject to the attached conditions of approval. The properties were also known as Tracts 1 and 2, portion of U.S. Survey 500. The request was filed by the Sitka Community Land Trust. The owner of record was the Sitka Community Land Trust. Motion passed 3-0 by voice vote.

M-Alderson/S-Mudry moved to adopt the findings as listed in the staff report. Motion passed 3-0 by voice vote.

E [CUP 22-14](#)

Attachments: [CUP 22-14 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road STR Staff Report](#)
[A CUP 22-14 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road STR Aerial](#)
[B CUP 22-14 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road STR Floor Plan](#)
[C CUP 22-14 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road STR Parking Plan](#)
[D CUP 22-14 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road STR Plat](#)
[E CUP 22-14 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road STR Photos](#)
[F CUP 22-14 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road STR STR Density](#)
[G CUP 22-14 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road STR Renter Handout](#)
[H CUP 22-14 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road STR Applicant Materials](#)
[I CUP 22-14 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road STR Public Comment](#)

Staff Report: Ainslie introduced the proposal for a conditional use permit for five short-term rental (STR) units at 505 Sawmill Creek Road. The applicants had purchased the property and wanted to redevelop it as a multi-family structure with a community center. The community center would be considered under the next item on the agenda, CUP 22-22. While still in the planning and financial phase, the applicants wanted approval for 5 of 16 planned dwelling units to be used as STRs. Request for approval was before Commission now, as the STR income was a part of the financing strategy for the overall project. They were also requesting a 2-year initiation period instead of 1 year. Of the 16 planned units there would be: two studio units, ten 2-bedroom units, three 3-bedroom units, one 4-bedroom unit, a gym, property manager office, mail room, and library as common elements in the building. For the STRs, three were 2-bedroom units and two were 3-bedroom units with an onsite manager working on site and a chauffer to be provided. Unlike bed and breakfasts, the zoning code did not specify that STRs could only occur in single-family homes or in a duplex. Further, the code had no provisions or limitations for the density of STRs within multi-family, but general consideration of density generally is a criteria which Commissioners could apply in their consideration of the request.

In terms of impact analysis there were a total of 30 parking spaces, the multi-family use would require 24 parking spaces. Access to the lot was planned from Baranof Street via Sawmill Creek Road (SMC). Traffic on Baranof Street would increase, as it

was primarily a residential street. In terms of noise and odor potential, staff concluded that the onsite manager and long-term tenants would help prevent/mitigate negative effects. There was public comment submitted about the density, both of overall development but also the STRs. Ainslie clarified that the proposed multi-family density was not the subject of tonight's approval, as it was allowable under the districts development standards. However, Ainslie noted that the density of the STRs was absolutely relevant and should be a part of the Commissioners' consideration. The proposal met the zoning code minimum requirements for STR's and staff recommended approval from that standpoint. The comprehensive plan also encouraged housing development, and high density development. However, there were neighborhood concerns about traffic and density that needed to be weighed by the Commission.

The applicant, Rachel Jones, was present. She stated that the short-term rentals would provide 50% of the project's income and fund the development project. Two of the units are a co-living units which she felt would be suitable for young adults or multi-generational living. The goal was to bring long-term rentals to Sitka and the short-term rentals would fund the development. The project had been designed to fit the zoning code, but the applicants were open to restrictions on number of parking spaces for the STRs. She suggested that the 5 STR units could use one parking spot with supplied car. The applicant responded to the letters read into public comment, stating the slab was in good shape and pilings would be repaired. They were working closely with contractors and the building department on structural concerns for the building. If the project went forward, the applicant would build a fence to border the property and the garbage could be moved to a different location.

Public Comment: Marcia Strand wanted the Commission to look at the whole picture, including parking and traffic flows. Baranof Street had become very busy with traffic turning onto Sawmill Creek Road and would like the Commission to work with the applicant on parking issues. She had concerns with the number of toilets and demand on the utilities. Keith Nyitray with the Sitka Co-op was in favor of this request. Staff read a written comment from John Gleason/Shana Colburn & Family stating their opposition to the request based on the amount of increased traffic on Baranof Street, and a preference to have all access to the property from SMC rather than Baranof Street. Further, there was concern regarding the integrity of the foundation. A letter from Sarah Longenbaugh and Edward Schoenfeld was read by staff, which requested the construction of a privacy fence between the property and its immediate neighbors. Staff also read a written comment from Adam Chinalski who also had concerns about the structural integrity of the building's foundation.

Commissioner Deliberation: Windsor asked if the applicant had reached out to surrounding property owners, Jones had reached out to some of them and tried to address their parking and traffic concerns. Alderson voiced concerns about parking and the busy side street, noting that when there isn't sufficient parking people will find their own not necessarily where it is wanted. Jones stated they could redesign the parking plan to have access via Sawmill Creek Road and to reduce parking in the back. Ainslie agreed a new parking plan could possibly reduce the traffic on Baranof Street and the front parking lot could additional parking spaces if configured differently. Windsor agreed Sawmill Creek Road should be an access point in the development of a new parking plan. Applicant stated the parking was designed this way to stop cut through traffic but they could work on a redesign. Ainslie clarified that Commissioners could alter condition 11 to require the applicant to come back with a new parking plan.

M-Alderson/S-Mudry moved to extend the initiation period for the conditional use permit to two-years rather than one-year to accommodate the timeline for the overall site development. Motion passed 3-0 by voice vote.

M-Mudry/S-Alderson moved to add a condition of approval requiring a privacy fence along the property lines that border abutting properties prior to construction and alter condition 11 to have review and approval of the parking plan at a later date. Motion passed 3-0 by voice vote.

M-Alderson/S-Mudry moved to approve the conditional use permit for five short-term rental units at 505 Sawmill Creek Road in the R-2 multifamily residential district subject to the attached conditions of approval as amended. The property was also known as Lots 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14, Block 20, Sitka Townsite, US Survey 1474 Tract A. The request was filed by Rachel Jones. The owners of record were Brendan & Rachel Jones and Tripp & Sherry LaRose. Motion passed 3-0 by voice vote.

M-Alderson/S-Mudry moved to adopt and approve the required findings for conditional use permits as listed in the staff report. Motion passed 3-0 by voice vote.

F [CUP 22-22](#)

Public hearing and consideration of a conditional use permit for a community center (food co-op operations) at 505 Sawmill Creek Road in the R-2 multifamily residential district. The property is also known as Lots 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14, Block 20, Sitka Townsite, U.S. Survey 1474, Tract A. The request is filed by Rachel Jones. The owners of record are Brendan Jones, Rachel Jones, Tripp LaRose, and Sherry LaRose.

Attachments: [CUP 22-22 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road Community Center Staff Report](#)
[A CUP 22-22 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road Community Center Aerial](#)
[B CUP 22-22 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road Community Center Floor Plan & Parking Plan](#)
[C CUP 22-22 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road Community Center Plat](#)
[D CUP 22-22 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road Community Center Photos](#)
[E CUP 22-22 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road Community Center Applicant Materials](#)
[F CUP 22-22 Jones 505 Sawmill Creek Road Community Center Public Comment](#)

Staff Report: Ainslie introduced the conditional use permit for a community center (food co-op operations). The food co-op used to operate at this location when the Presbyterian Church was active and wanted to again use the property as a permanent location. Food co-op activities would include receipt of freight, sorting/packing, co-op member pick-up, and incidental sales of extra items. During construction, pick ups would be four times per month and after construction could increase to 2-3 times per week. The zoning code did not define what a community center was, but the American Planning Association Glossary of Zoning, Development, and Planning terms offered this definition; "a building to be used as a place of meeting, recreation, or social activity and not operated for profit and in which neither alcoholic beverages or meals are normally dispensed or consumed." Ainslie stated that the Commission needed to determine whether the food co-op at this location was of an appropriate use and scale, that it was characterized as a social or community use, and did not rise to the level of commercial activity that would not be appropriate under a community center or under the intent of R-2 zoning district. The parking calculation for this use was difficult to