

Assembly Title 21 Meeting Notes – Wednesday, January 25, 2006

Pg. 421 L 31

Certificate of Zoning Compliance same as current Certificate of Occupancy, but also applies with Land Use Permit

Pg. 422 L 1-3

Public: There is more than 1 Comprehensive Plan and they are not always consistent within themselves. Standards should be law, not a Comprehensive Plan.

Committee: I'm concerned how this will apply to Eagle River.

Planning: You take the more specific plan as the guiding document. If a Comprehensive Plan conflicts with Title 21 then Title 21 overrides.

Public: On L 3 the word "relevant" should go between the words "the" and "comprehensive".

Committee: Maybe more comprehensive language could be put back in to clarify this.

Pg. 422 L 17-21

Planning: This language was added based on Engineers recommendations, because the current language doesn't adequately address the issue.

Committee: How can you develop property and not change existing drainage?

Public: We have a problem with the words "every effort" in the second sentence. Maybe removing the word "every" would make it OK.

Pg. 423 L 16-17

Public: Is the icing potential evaluated strictly for roadways or does it include the whole subdivision?

Planning: We will clarify.

Pg. 424 L 12-13

Committee: What does this mean?

Public: There could be a conflict of design between wind mitigation and drainage requirements.

Committee: Maybe it could be clarified.

Pg. 424 L19-33

Committee: I've been hearing concerns with this. People like cul-de-sacs. Is the radius and length listed here the current standard?

Planning: I think so.

Committee: I understand that connectivity is paramount but I'd hate to be forced in areas like Peters Creek to build multiple bridges over waterways. They would be hard to maintain and expensive. We need to use discretion. Why be so strict when we know that there will be exceptions?

Planning: Some flexibility is part of the platting process. It's current practice. There's a standard but you can ask for a variance.

Public: Going to the Municipal Engineer might be a better way to go. The variance experience is time consuming. Cul-de-sacs are popular. This document doesn't take into account topographical features or lot size. It is way too proscriptive. All subdivisions will end up looking the same. I foresee firm standards and enactment by the various boards when this document gets put into place. There is real concern that there will no diverting from the document and no variances allowed for at least awhile.

Committee: Maybe if we had someone else to go to listed in the document it might make it easier.

Pg. 425 L 9-10

Committee: What about BLM lots here. Some of them aren't platted. The ROW may not be dedicated. They still need addresses.

Planning: No, ROW is reserved then. We should deal with that.

Public: You could delete the word "permanent" in L9, addresses change. On L10 you could delete the word "only".

Planning: We will work on that.

Pg. 425 Slope Table

Committee: Are the slopes existing language?

Planning: It's current practice. We have been trying to make it clearer.

Committee: It would be helpful to have the table clearer, where's R11?

Planning: R11 is steep slope, so is governed differently.

Public: Why not do the slope restrictions by individual lot. Some large lots are steep but have a nice flat building pad on them.

Committee: Why not take into account topography, lot size and slopes for large lots and not make it so strict? This averaging, is this an issue you've heard about from the public?

Public: It makes a lot of land undevelopable. What about zone maps?

When the land changes by 5% you move to a new slope assessment map.

Planning: Topographic maps are too difficult to use.

Public: It would help if you had a ground (instead of an arial) survey done.

Committee: If this was a tool to use instead of such strict guidelines, it would be better.

Pg. 426 L2-5

Committee: Is this new language?

Planning: Avalanche zones have not been in code before, but avalanche restrictions have been department policy. In some cases we require mitigation, like a ditch or berm to hold the snow. We brought the 1982 Avalanche Maps for the committee to see.

Public: It says the "red zone" but doesn't specifically reference these maps.

Committee: We are required to put long standing policy into code.

Pg. 426 L26-28

Public: We've asked repeatedly to increase 200 to 300 feet and 100 to 150 feet for flag lots. [Discussion followed about appropriate length]

Committee: There are some length concerns here, especially for fire access.

Pg. 427 L13

Committee: In #4 why is the driveway restricted to 40%?

Planning: That's to allow for snow storage. [There was general discussion about 40% vs. 15-20 feet.]

Pg. 427 L26

Public: #6 You could need multiple flag lots on a rural sloped area.

Planning: We'll talk to Platting about that.

Pg. 427 L 38

Committee: What's the impact of this?

Public: It shows a total disregard of cost. There should be an alternative when you have multiple utility easements. [General discussion about allowing planting in utility easements.]

Pg. 428 L5

Public: The Utility Corridor Plan takes into account utility easement widths and alignment, but under L6 pg. 431 it says the easements shall be adopted to utility company standards. That's a conflict.

Committee: I'd rather see utility easement size regulated by the Muni, instead of by the utilities.

Pg. 428 [M] L3-7

Public: This should be combined with Pg. 431 L1-10.

Pg. 428 L 29-38

Committee: Should vacating and dedicating half streets and alleys standardized?

Pg. 429

Committee: What is the difference between a walkway and a sidewalk?

Planning: A sidewalk is on a road. A walkway is a pedestrian access from a cul-de-sac, typically to a school. This language should be standardized.

Pg. 429 L3-6

Public: "Provide" should be added after "necessary to". The minimum should be 5 not 4 feet, 6 feet is better.

**Committee: School District has a trigger for hazardous walkways.
Planning: This is current language on width. We need to do some homework to make the language consistent and less confusing.**

Pg. 429 L 9-10

Committee: State DOT has standard definitions for trails, etc. Does requiring dedication of walkways prohibit a Homeowners Assoc. from creating and maintaining a walkway?

Public: It would be the property of the Homeowners Assoc.

**Next meeting: Wednesday, February 1st at the Planning Dept. conference room from 9:30 am – 11:30 am
We will start on page 429 L 13**