

Margaret Hart

From: peter thielke <peter.thielke@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 2:11 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Variance application for 200 Park Street

Dear Planning Dept. Personnel,

I am writing to support the variance application by Zachary and Jacquie Foss to construct a garage at 200 Park Street.

First, I own the property at 722 Biorka, where I grew up many moons ago. I know the neighborhood well, and actually spent a lot of time in the house at 200 Park Street, where a boyhood friend, Benny Schultz, lived in the 1950s.

One of the reasons for this letter of support is that I have such high esteem for Zach and Jacquie. I met them about fifteen years ago in Sitka. They have lived in my house and Zach has done a lot of carpentry projects for me. Zach is an excellent carpenter and does things the right way, which, by the way, never used to be the "Sitka way." They are honest, hardworking, responsible and friendly Sitkans.

My brother, John Thielke, owner of 720 Sawmill Creek Blvd. and 206 Baranof Street, feels the same as I do about Zach and Jacquie, and I will suggest to Johnny that he write a similar letter of support. Former pillar of the community Florence Donnelly, now deceased but not forgotten, also had Zach work for her and held a similar regard for him.

Now, we all know that in the 1930s or 1940s there were no codes or planning departments in Sitka, so many things were done that today couldn't pass code. If, in 1950, the owner of 200 Park Street wanted to build a garage, he or she just would. Simple as that. No problem. But today the codes are in place and the City has to do its best to juggle the old way and the new way vis-a-vis buildings in the city. If I were on the Planning Commission, here are a few of the questions I would consider:

1. Will the new garage be safely constructed? (My answer: Yes)
2. Will it negatively impact the neighbors, such as by causing excessive noise or increased traffic? (My answer: No)
3. Will it add to the aesthetics of the neighborhood, much of which has already been improved? (My answer: absolutely!)
4. Will it increase the tax base? (My answer: Yes)
5. Will it enhance the housing market, either by resale or rental? This house is rather small and would be seemingly more affordable than other larger more expensive Sitka homes or view lots. (My answer: Yes)
6. Would an improved home with a garage enhance the quality of the neighborhood by eliminating a car on two that would otherwise have to be parked on the street? (My answer: yes)

I strongly support the granting of a variance to construct a garage to Zachary and Jacquie Foss. Please call me or email should you have any questions.

Thanks and all best,

Peter Thielke
Ojai, CA

805-798-2971

Margaret Hart

From: Justin Olbrych <justin.olbrych@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2019 10:06 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Etolin/park street variance request

That little arctic entry on the south side, bringing the setback to two feet, seems a bit tight. One, there is no concrete foundation under that. It was an add on. The details in the packet are wrong. Two, when the street is upgraded with sidewalks, seems like a two foot variance would disrupt that possibility. I'd like to be in the loop on the information. Justin Olbrych. 702 etolin st. I didn't receive a packet in the mail. Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

Margaret Hart

From: Amy Danielson <amyrowed@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2019 8:27 AM
To: spi3050@yahoo.com; d Windsor@gci.net; randywhughey@gmail.com;
taycolvin@gmail.com; alaskanengineer@gmail.com; Amy Ainslie; Aaron Bean
(Assembly); Kevin Knox (Assembly)
Subject: New setback Guidelines.

Dear Planning and Zoning,

I have some concerns about granting variances within the new setback guidelines. As stated in the new codes being made for smaller lots, this change was to reduced the amount of variances being requested. I see already a request for reduction to the already new set back guidelines has been asked. The new guidelines are more than generous and anything more than the 5/9/14 ft set back is not a good idea. Below is a letter I wrote the assembly when adopting these new guidelines. Please consider dense housing impacts everyone around.

Thank you for all the work you do,

Amy Rowe Danielson
amyrowed@gmail.com

Between every two pines is a doorway to a new world. John Muir

May 2019

Dear Assembly of Sitka,

I am writing in regards to the amendments to the Zoning Codes. While I support the need for options to build on smaller lots to aid in affordable housing, I do not agree with easing the rear and side setbacks 5/9ft-8ft and increasing the lot coverage to 50%. I live in one of the neighborhoods (Biorka Street) designated as higher density. It is very close to have a neighbor 5 feet from your property line. Also, in neighborhoods like this one, when new houses are built to the 35 ft. guideline, it blocks the light, and sun to the homes. Many houses here are less then 35 feet, a story and 1/2. If a house is allowed to be built 5 feet from the property line, and 35 feet high, the neighbor would have minimal light and sun. And adding he option for more lot coverage from 35% to 50% would only add to the impact to surrounding neighbors.

Lot setbacks are in place to ensure everyone has equal space, air and light in a neighborhood. They are for safety and and quality of life. Please re-evaluated these new setback standards to be sure you are making the best decision for Sitka long term.

F ORD 19-16A Amending Title 22 "Zoning" of the Sitka General Code by modifying Chapter 22.20 "Supplemental District Regulations and Development Standards" (1st reading as amended)

Thank you for your time,

Amy Rowe Danielson
amyrowed@gmail.com

Between every two pines is a doorway to a new world. John Muir

Margaret Hart

From: wendyalderson@gci.net
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 2:29 PM
To: spi3050@yahoo.com; dwindsor@gci.net; randywhughey@gmail.com; taycolvin@gmail.com; alaskanengineer@gmail.com; Amy Ainslie; Aaron Bean (Assembly); Kevin Knox (Assembly); Kevin Knox (Assembly)
Subject: Var 19-02 Foss 200 Park St request

Hello,

My name is Wendy Alderson and I live at 714 Etolin St. I am writing in regards to the variance requests submitted by Jaque Foss for 200 Park St. I did not receive a letter from the city referencing any of these requests so I was not aware that this item was on the July 2nd agenda. I have reviewed the requests online and I would like you all to know that I am absolutely against the granting of any of these variances.

I really struggled to support the new setbacks that were recently adopted, as I believe it punishes those of us who can't afford to purchase larger lots out of the downtown area, however I was won over by your reasoning that it would prevent people from asking for (and being granted) further variances. I was actually happy for the new owners of 200 Park St because I thought "Wow, good timing, these new setback codes will benefit you." So I am really disappointed that someone would come in, buy a property knowing exactly what they were getting and what the code is, and then immediately disregard the (more than generous, in my opinion) new setback codes.

Furthermore, I disagree with the key point on the agenda page online "Potential negative impacts to public health and safety, neighborhood harmony, and property values are minimal, as the house is currently in "tear down" condition – renovation plans should improve neighborhood aesthetic. Parking plan in place to minimize disturbances to neighbors and traffic." Considering our current lack of infrastructure on Etolin St I think it's presumptive to assume that a project of this caliber will have no negative impact on the neighborhood.

The Park St Etolin St corner is already a dangerous bottleneck and having the stairs to the arctic entry two feet from Etolin St. will only add to the problem. At this point, if two cars approach the stop sign at the same time, one of them has to back up to let the other proceed. Either that, or pull in to someone else's private driveway. There is already limited visibility and a large number of small children play on that corner constantly. Having a two story duplex 7' from Park St and 2' (for all practical purposes) will further impede visibility and create a real hazard. Frankly, I don't mind creeping along Etolin St, I wish everyone would, and those of us who live in the neighborhood have learned to work together to make our compromised traffic patterns work, but unfortunately, we are not the only ones who use Park and Etolin St, they are, after all, public roads, and many drivers seem to feel that those stop signs are optional.

The existing concrete foundation is large enough to build a substantial two story house without further variances, if that is what the owners choose to do. Case in point; two years ago I built a 1,200 sq ft two story two bed two bath house on a 3,600 (+/-) lot at 409 DeGroff St. without requesting any variances, and that was with the 8' side and 20' front setbacks.

Once again, since I did not receive any notice of this agenda item in the mail, I did not attend the hearing. It looks like the department's recommendation was to move this forward? Does this mean the next hearing will be in front of the assembly or will you be revisiting it? I would like to know what my next step is as far as contesting this variance.

Thank you for taking the time to read my email,
Wendy Alderson

Margaret Hart

From: Brandon Marx <marxlaw@gci.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2019 8:26 AM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Variance Request 200 Park Street

To Whom it May Concern:

I will be in Phoenix at the time of the hearing on July 2. I write
To point out a concern with respect to the front set back request
And the safety/parking complications posed by allowing
a duplex on such an undersized, unusually shaped lot.

While I have not had the privilege of seeing the plans that are on file, I
Understand that the applicants intend to build a duplex on the property.

This means more than one, and possibly up to 4 vehicles needing to
Find space for safe access and egress.
Given this prospect, shrinking the front set back clearly presents
issues with respect to safe parking in an
Area that is already congested due to unenforced zoning and set back rules
On neighboring properties.

The home at 700 Etolin Street, directly across from
The property in question, has very limited parking for a residence that now
Houses multiple renters who have more than one vehicle. Those vehicles sometimes
End up parking in front of this applicant's property at 200 Park Street,
along the shoulder of the street. Because Etolin street is so narrow there is
no ability for those residents to park on the street. So there is overflow
that ends up in front of this applicant's property. This overflow problem
was created, in part, by a prior variance shrinking the front set back to allow
an addition / storage room.

700 Etolin also constructed an
opaque fence which does not comport with existing front
fence ordinances; these ordinances were written for safety reasons;
so, there are several factors in this unusual intersection at Park / Etolin
that have made it less safe for small children and I worry
that this application will worsen the situation.

Our neighborhood has so many small kids that we constantly worry
About. We specifically worry about vehicles
backing out from parking spaces that have limited
Or restricted viewing.

We live directly across the street from 200 Park Street at 615 Etolin, and we
worry that with a duplex being placed 5 feet from the front set back, on such an
Undersized lot, it will further frustrate the parking in this area, making it less safe
For small kids.

That said, we are happy that the home is being renovated; we just wish that
Whatever structure that is built keeps the existing set back distance, or
Otherwise appropriately addresses these concerns by allowing for
Appropriate, off street parking. The lot really is too small for a duplex in my opinion,
But if that is allowed, as it seems to be under R-1 these days,
the parking issue really should be addressed.

Brandon C. Marx, Esq.
Law Office of Brandon C. Marx
408 Oja Way, Suite B
PO Box 6171
Sitka, Alaska 99835
(t) 907-747-7100
(f) 907-966-3100
sitkalawyer.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for the use of the individual or entity named above and may contain information that is confidential, privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in this transmission are strictly PROHIBITED. If you have received this document in error, please immediately notify the sender by calling (907) 747-7100 or notifying the sender at marxlaw@gci.net and then delete this email from your computer. Thank you.

Margaret Hart

From: Bridget Kauffman <ak.bridget@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 01, 2019 8:06 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: VAR 19-02

My name is Bridget Kauffman. I live at 712 Etolin Street. I am opposed to the setbacks requested for 200 Park Street. The corner of Park Street and Etolin Street is already pinched making vehicle passing very difficult. Etolin Street is really a lane and accommodates only one car at a time. Vehicles attempting to pass or turn on this particular street corner must maneuver carefully around each other in order to pass. The setbacks requested will further reduce visibility on the corner. There seems to be a trend in the neighborhood to allow much reduced setbacks. I am very much opposed to these setbacks.

Thank you for your time.
Bridget Kauffman

VAR19-02

7/2/19

To whom it may concern:

I have discussed Jacqui
2) Zach Foss's planned changes
to 200 Park Street and as
a member of the neighborhood,
I feel it/they will be a positive
addition and tasteful expansion
of our small community of
families. I support the
variances they request.

Shelley Adams

210 Park St.

907-738-6020