

community interest, stating that several factors were worth consideration, to include whether the proposed changes allow for harmonious coexistence in the neighborhood, the perception of the cruise ship dock and area being a sort of gateway to the community, and the scarce supply of industrial land.

Ainslie stated that from a code administration perspective, the zoning amendment was recommended, however from a policy/community standpoint, the staff recommendation was neutral, based on a desire to hear from the community to determine the most mutually beneficial agreement.

The co-applicant, Chris McGraw, came forward and stated his intentions for the development. He stated that he did not plan to expand retail operations, but was focused on the restaurant and visitor attractions. He stated that due to the costs of development, the highest and best use of the land is by far the cruise ship dock, and, due to these costs, the property will not be reverting to industrial use.

Members of the public gave their opinions, beginning with Ben Hilberk, who worked at the restaurant on site. He stated that they currently operated out of a tent, but had steadily increased business since starting in 2013. He stated he was hopeful for a more permanent operation/facility. Hugh Bevan stated that he saw benefits to the entire community with these changes, and that this was an opportunity to support local business. Richard Wein stated that he had concerns about this development drawing business away from downtown, and could result in additional businesses closing as visitors would remain at the dock site, or visit the Fortress of the Bear sites, instead of going downtown. Wein referenced the Icy Strait tour operation outside of Hoonah as an example. Chuck Trierschield stated that as a downtown business owner, he supported this development.

M-Weaver/S-Windsor moved to approve a zoning map amendment at 4513, 4521, and 4533 Halibut Point Road to be rezoned from the Industrial zoning district to the C-2 general commercial and mobile home district. The properties were also known as Lot A, HPM Subdivision, Lot 55, U.S. Survey 3475, and a portion of Lot Fifty-one (51), U.S. Survey 3475. The request was filed by Chris McGraw and Charles McGraw. The owners of record are Halibut Point Marine Services, LLC and Charles McGraw. Motion passed 5-0 by voice vote.

M-Weaver/S-Windsor moved to adopt the findings as listed in the staff report. Motion passed 5-0 by voice vote.

H [ZA 19-06](#)

Public hearing and consideration of a zoning text change to amend Titles 6, 19, and 22 of the Sitka General Code to define Tiny Houses and Tiny Houses on Chassis and allow them in Mobile/Manufactured Home Parks. The request is filed by the Planning and Community Development Department.

Attachments: [memo- update to commission 8Jan20](#)
 [StaffReport ZA 19-06- 11Dec19](#)
 [Action Plan -Tiny Homes, sm dwellings - Draft](#)
 [IRC Appendix Q-Tiny Houses](#)
 [amending Title 6 ver2 11Dec19](#)
 [amending title 19 adopting appendix Q 11Dec19](#)
 [amending title 22 - ver2 11Dec19](#)
 [Application](#)

Ainslie stated that this initiative for tiny houses was a special project for Scott Brylinsky, who then gave a presentation. Brylinsky explained that there exists a demand for tiny houses as an affordable housing option in Sitka, and that the high cost of housing has been consistently cited as a main challenge for doing business. Brylinsky noted that there is a population in Sitka who would benefit from housing of this type, and is in line with the Sitka 2030 Comprehensive Plan. Brylinsky explained that the tiny houses were required to meet life, health and safety standards, and would require approval from the building department, and that homes mounted on chassis would be subject to the same safety and stability standards as a modular or manufactured home when on site. He also explained that there were four aspects to this decision:

- 1) Adopt Appendix Q, which made allowances for sleeping lofts, ladder access to lofts, and egress/rescue requirements.
- 2) Create a legal status for tiny houses on chassis, and allow them in mobile/manufactured home parks
- 3) Allow tiny houses on permanent foundations in mobile/manufactured home parks
- 4) Allow single tiny homes on chassis to be placed in zones that allow a single manufactured home on lot.

Brylinsky noted that the recommendations are sourced from the IRC (International Residential Code), and are largely supported by the community, based on input received by the planning office. Following Brylinsky's presentation, the floor was opened to public comments.

Chandler O'Connell stated she supported the amendments, and noted that there was great community interest, tiny homes were a benefit for the housing market, and a good middle ground to home ownership. Pete Jones stated that, as a mobile home park owner, he supported this resolution. Matthew Jackson supported the amendment, and stated that it legitimized some activity that was already ongoing. Jeremy Twaddle stated concerns regarding the building standards, the size and quality of the homes, and court owner's control over the process. Mim McConnell thanked the commission for their work, stated she liked all four points offered by the planning department, and noted that tiny homes would be safer than boats, which serve as primary residences for many Sitkans. Rich Riggs stated that as a mobile home park owner, he supported this proposal, and would like conversation about the size limit of the tiny homes. Riggs stated that as an employer, he observes housing as a barrier to growth. Kevin Mosher stated that he's received support from the community, and stated that while tiny houses are not for everyone, they are a tool in the shed to address affordable housing, and a good start towards addressing this problem in Sitka. Richard Wein stated that he had been following this process for a while, and that it could have been done sooner, given the simplicity of it. Connor Nelson spoke, stating that the idea of having homes on wheels on residential zoned lots did not make sense, the roofing and design standards were too exclusive, the loft/ladder access design was discriminatory, and

that he did not want to see substandard housing. Nelson also stated that he did not believe the affordability issue came from housing, but from the price of utilities. Clyde Bright stated in his testimony that as a mobile home park owner, he had attended comprehensive plan meetings and assisted with wording. Bright thought that opening additional land was a better solution, particularly No Name Mountain, but that he also supported these code amendments. Adam Chinalski stated that he supported most of the amendments, but had concerns about the quality of the homes on chassis, and their effect on neighborhoods. Chinalski expressed concerns that people would bring in low quality homes on trailers, and these could be a hazard. Robert Woolsey stated that he supported this proposal, and had increased confidence due in part to the attention to detail. Woolsey stated that Sitka had a housing dilemma, and cited the example of young adults being unable to move back home due to the market, and that Sitka needs many options for housing. Andrew Jones spoke in support for the amendments, and stated his appreciation for work done to update the code. Jones stated that there is a history of local success with tiny homes. Maureena O'Hanlon spoke out in support of the amendments, and thanked the committee for its work.

Following public testimony, staff read comments submitted to the planning department by email.

Karen Hegyi wrote that she supported the amendments, but did have concerns about tiny homes on individual lots, and the accumulation of property that may accompany them. Kathy Kyle wrote that Sitka is in desperate need of affordable housing, and that tiny houses may be an upgrade to trailers currently in place. Cheryl Call wrote in support stating that tiny houses are attractive, innovative and affordable, and that she would love to see clusters of them on city lots. Justin Olbrych wrote that tiny houses make sense, and as a home builder he notes the lower cost to construct and smaller footprint. Olbrych wrote that the City promotes accessory dwelling units, and tiny houses are an extension of this concept. Olbrych suggested making lots subdividable for the addition of tiny homes to residential lots as a benefit to land owners and tiny house owners. Tory Curran wrote that she supports these amendments. Marian Allen wrote in support of these changes, noting the affordable housing issue in Sitka.

Commissioners discussed the amendments. Weaver stated his support for placement of tiny houses in mobile home parks. Spivey noted the risk to the builder and park owner caused by permanent foundations in mobile home parks. Mudry voiced concerns over the height of the structures with regard to transportation through town. Windsor stated his support for the amendments. Hughey stated his concerns on permanent foundations placed on rented land, and stated that without price controls, owners may be vulnerable. The commissioners expressed reservations regarding the placement of tiny houses on chassis in residential zones designated for single family manufactured homes, as well as concerns over the impact on neighboring property values resulting from this placement. Ainslie suggested this type of placement be conditional, in order to provide better oversight, and allow approval on a case by case basis.

M-Windsor/M-Weaver moved to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance changes with the exception that tiny houses on chassis to be placed in zones that allow a single manufactured home on a lot be a conditional rather than allowed use, recognizing that final housekeeping edits and formatting changes may be made during formal ordinance preparation. Motion passed 3-2 by voice vote.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Seeing no objection, Chair Spivey adjourned the meeting at 9:45 PM.