

ASSEMBLY TITLE 21 COMMITTEE

Summary of Discussion on Meeting October 7, 2005

Public Review Draft #1 Discussion Chapter 5 -- Tables, Chapter 6

Pg.190....Committee: Tavern in the top column should be eliminated, since this is not a definition used in Alaska. Why are no taverns, bars, etc. allowed in Turnagain Arm district?

Planning: It is not in their land use plan. Committee: Why have bar and brew pub as separate classifications? Planning: We could make them the same. Brew Pub has the implication of industrial use, more parking and increased use.

Committee: Under Office, business or professional in TA, conditional use is listed for offices, you may want P/C. Planning: Yes

Committee: Why is a site plan review needed in mixed use districts? Planning: Not sure Committee: Broadcasting and recording are different uses. Planning: Understands difference.

Committee: Funeral services are a necessary service in a community. Maybe you could define it more openly and with more flexibility. Planning: A funeral home is not necessarily

wanted in a residential area. It's better in a higher density area.

Committee: Why is small equipment rental not allowed in mixed use? That will be a problem for rural areas. Planning: This is more appropriate for auto corridor districts. We'll look at it for rural.

Pg. 191.....Committee: Why are repair shops and building material stores not allowed in mixed use districts? This will be a problem for Chugiak/Eagle River. That is where the stores are.

Planning: You are making a good point for Eagle River being separate. Committee: Thank you. Planning: Areas of different use and density need to complement each other. It would be helpful to have a land use plan map. Committee: We want you to hear that there is a problem with meat/seafood processing in the table. These businesses are often very appropriate for mixed use, pedestrian friendly neighborhoods.

Pg.192.....Committee: Why no pawn shops, plumbing/electrical in mixed use? These tables seem too detailed to cover the needs and desires of different parts of town. In some areas they are

broad, but in many more areas they seem extremely specific. Planning: We are going to make revisions. Maybe we should combine some of these and make them broader. (The same point was made for page 193.)

Pg. 194..... Committee: Why no catering in mixed use areas? Planning: This was meant for the airport area. Committee: But not all catering is large volume. Maybe you could delete the word catering. We have to keep turning back to the definitions, maybe we could put the page number next to the category in the table. Why is resource extraction allowed in mixed use districts? Planning: It's been done that way for a long time, typically to allow for preparation in construction. Committee: There are very few places where a boat storage facility is permitted. Does this mean one couldn't be built on a lake? Planning: Good point.

Pg. 195.....Committee: Why is marine wholesale not allowed in marine commercial? Planning: We consider this industrial activity. Committee: The self-storage ordinance passed earlier this year allowed storage in commercial areas, why is it not allowed in mixed use? Planning: We believe it is more appropriate in commercial or industrial.

Pg. 196.....Committee: Why are there so many land reclamation areas allowed? Planning: It is intended for a short period of time and to bring properties back to a potential higher use.

Chapter 6

Pg. 307..... Committee: In R-1, is the 30 ft. height for a 2 story house? Isn't 3 stories permitted? Are site condos allowed in R-1? Planning: We haven't figured out the site condos yet. Committee: Is a 3 story house allowed in R-2? Planning: No. Public: In R-3, on lots greater than one acre, you are forcing contractors to build multi family units instead of single-family detached. Is that intentional?

Pg. 308,309,310..... Planning: These are basically the same as existing standards.

Pg. 311.....Public: In auto commercial district and office district, max. height limits, shouldn't this say 45 feet or four stories? Planning: It should say whichever of these is greater. Side setback standards are set to encourage intensive use. Committee: What is mean sea level? Shouldn't it say mean high water or mean low water? Planning: point taken

Pg. 312.....Committee: Why do we have a height limitation for industrial zones? Planning: Few uses here are over 50 feet.

Pg. 313..... There was a general discussion about how we will implement existing neighborhoods into mixed use areas, particularly with these district size limitations. Committee felt they could be seen as arbitrary and too limiting. Public: Can these limitations be adjusted at a public hearing? Committee: Some of these size limits won't work in rural low density areas. Planning: Everything here is new because we haven't yet seen true mixed use districts in Anchorage. These size limits came from the Urban Land Institute.

Pg. 314....Planning is still working on the airport development standards, so this table is not complete.

Pg. 316, L14-16..... Committee: What does this mean? It needs to be rephrased. Planning: It means that two separate buildings may not use the same setback area.

Pg.317, L9....Public: Are these the only requirements for handicap access ramps? Planning: No, ADA standards and building codes apply.

Pg. 317, L28-29....Public: These setbacks seem to have changed, why mess with something that has worked fine? Planning: Recommendations from the consultant

Pg. 317, L30.....Committee: Why are double frontage lot setbacks so restrictive on both sides? Public: Could the administrative official give exceptions? Planning: We will look at this.

Pg. 317, L39-41 through Pg 318, L1-20.....Committee: Why all these requirements for written permission from utilities before using their setback? Please look at these, especially those for open space, yards, surface parking, landscaping...

Pg.319, Table... covering setbacks from projected ROW centerline, this is not changed from current standards

Pg. 320, L16-33.....Committee: Sight distance triangles need to be defined consistently throughout document. This is not currently the case. Planning: We have started that process. Public: We need to clearly identify pedestrian crossings.

Pg. 320, L31.....Public: Please define major street more clearly.

Pg. 322, L1-14.....Usable yard, Public: Why can't setbacks be considered usable yard? Planning: If we don't clearly define and require usable yards, they would not exist—especially in multi-family housing areas. Committee: The slope restrictions would virtually prohibit development in many areas of Eagle River and the Hillside.

Pg.322, L25.....Committee: What is a belt course? Planning: It is something that sticks out of a building, (like a shelf on the building's side).

Pg. 323, L2-3.....Gross parcel size includes all setbacks, easements and ROW on property

Pg. 324.....Public: In flag lot F#17, why is the flag portion considered a front setback when it is not at the front of the property? Committee agreed this didn't seem to make sense. Planning: This is current practice

Pg. 325.....Public: lot #9 and lot #10 both reference note three, this should be eliminated on lot #10 because the reference belongs to the other lot

Next meeting will occur on October 14 at City Hall from 10-noon. We will begin Chapter 7, design standards, the first thirty pages.

