

In support of his motion, Mr. Voelckers said that he was very impressed by the depth and quality of the application that has been presented. Mr. Voelckers said he does think that this is fairly close to a boarding house; there are a number of people that have bedrooms but that share common space, there is also a sense of the transient occupancy that is a little different from a typical living situation, said Mr. Voelckers. He said he felt that this was an applicable Use Not Listed.

Mr. Jackson also spoke in support of the motion, and requested that a public hearing be scheduled on September 23 for a public hearing for a Conditional Use permit for Haven House. This would be a friendly amendment to the motion, said Mr. Jackson. He added that when years ago a home for juvenile delinquents was established on his street, the whole neighborhood was very upset, but that nothing negative has ever happened as a result of that home, and that now the neighborhood has incorporated that home into the neighborhood. Mr. Jackson said he felt the key to the success of these homes was being a good neighbor in the part of both sides.

Speaking in favor of the motion, Mr. Peters said that he encouraged those living in the Malissa Drive neighborhood to share their knowledge of their neighborhood, and to open their hearts and their homes.

Mr. Miller distinguished the language provided by Ms. McKeen which states that the residents of Haven House would not be serving a prison sentence such as those in a halfway house. He said for him the fact that the Commission is not viewing this as a halfway house, and the fact that this is being viewed as a Use Not Listed is appropriate since it needs its own designation. Mr. Miller said the key for him is that the Haven House residents are not serving a sentence, so that therefore they are not within a halfway house situation. Mr. Miller said he does understand the concerns of the neighborhood, as well as the goal of Haven House. This does give assurances to the neighborhood, said Mr. Miller. The process does not end here, he said. The next step would be a public hearing for a Conditional Use permit, he said, and he supports the motion.

Ms. Grewe said that she supports the motion for Haven House for a re-entry home for women coming out of prison, and as the same general character as 1.610 Miscellaneous Rooms For Rent, and approves the Conditional Use permit amendment to the motion. She said the crux of her comment is that her support is for the Use Not Listed determination, which is what the Commission is at the meeting for this evening.

Noting the characteristics of the Haven House residence, said Mr. Haight said that all but one of them fell under the boarding house or rooming house determination, which was the 1.610 category. The only element that did not fit was the transitional care element, he noted. He said that he does support the motion, and that if they want to categorize it could be categorized as a re-entry type home to differentiate it from the others.

Speaking in favor of the motion, Mr. Watson commended the neighbors who came and

professionally presented their points this evening. Mr. Watson said that he believes that Haven House presents the step the community has been missing since he moved to Juneau.

Mr. Satre said to Mr. Jackson that September 23 is one of the normal meeting nights for the Commission and expressed his concern about the workload for that evening should the Commission take on the Conditional Use permit for Haven House for that evening.

Mr. Satre said that he supports the motion, mostly because it gets the Commission to the point where it can conduct a Conditional Use permit hearing where he said he felt it should have gone in the first place. He said it does bother him to throw away original definitions, and the way that they should be applied, because they think that they are likely unenforceable. As other commissioners have said, said Mr. Satre, they are not issuing a permit, they are getting to a hearing on a permit that has very well-known side boards such as safety, neighborhood harmony, property values, traffic, lighting; very specific items on which to provide input.

Mr. Jackson withdrew the date from his amendment to the motion.

The motion was approved with no objection.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:13 p.m.