

Title 21 Meeting Notes – Wednesday, November 16, 2005

Pg. 400

Committee: How much are we reducing parking? What are the cumulative effects?

Planning: We are trying to have less parking spaces and more reasonable lot sizes.

Public: The square footage would be 20 – 25% more. The AGC paid \$15,000 to have a study done by DOW to determine the impact of this language.

Parking lot sizes will increase about 15% because of the landscaping. We may do another study.

Committee: Is this the same compact car space as current code?

Planning: Traffic wanted compact car spaces, planning does not. The table reflects Traffic's plans.

Pg. 402 L1

Committee: The 70% doesn't seem right for an auto area zone or rural zones. Couldn't the lot's drainage, the traffic pattern and economics dictate this? Why not have a site plan for each property rather than have the regulations written out?

Planning: Maybe a site plan would kick in with the size of the building or lot. Traffic is already reviewing this for larger properties. We will probably propose 50% in mixed-use areas.

Public: Why not have 50% in all areas, because otherwise it would make too many properties non-compliant. **Committee:** Why 70% in industrial areas?

Pg. 402 L33

Public: I question the 30%. It should be the same as the table.

Pg. 403 L1

Committee: How many units is multi family? **Planning:** Three or more

Committee: It seems like you have moved in this draft to a more incentive based program. Maybe there would be more flexibility given if you added car/van pool space.

Planning: We're not sure what other flexibility should be given. For example, we are not sure who has the authority to reduce fees.

Committee: How about reducing the 70% at this point. Why not have incentives for underground parking? **Public:** That it way too expensive.

Committee: They are talking about parking under the building not underground parking.

Pg. 403 L 5

Public: Table 21.06.3 says there will be a minimum of 35%. We need continuity.

Pg. 403 L 7

Public: When you have parking under a building and parking in front of the building why require screening? You'll have a security problem.

Committee: Why require screening when you have landscaping. What do we gain besides the cost? Just a comment.

Pg. 403 L15

Committee: Is this current law? Planning: No.

Committee: It is expensive to build parking. If we want to build these to get cars off the street then we shouldn't have a lot of other requirements. When you are adding housing and parking why do you shove retail requirements into it? I hope we would look into that before mandating it.

Pg. 403 L 26

Committee: Here is the word perpetuity again.

Planning: It will be changed to "for the life of the use".

Pg. 403 L36

Public: Does this require private parking enforcement?

Committee: It's incentive for car/van pool spaces. It's better to have incentives rather than punishments. If you put in two car/van pool spots, the incentive should be to reduce other spaces.

Pg. 404 L 26

Committee: How does this work with winter driving?

Planning: We are trying to encourage something other than striping, such as light poles to designate areas.

Public: What happens when circulation and pedestrian ways collide?

Public: Raised objects in the concrete can cause problems for handicapped. The slashes are a different tactile so the blind can feel the egress. Committee: What do we gain with these requirements?

Public: Safer pedestrian areas.

Planning: We are trying to provide a specific place for pedestrians so they aren't just walking everywhere.

Pg. 405 L 21-23

Committee: Is this in all districts? Planning: Yes.

Committee: Does this include residential?

Planning: Yes, for new developments.

Committee: Does adjacent mean contiguous? This shouldn't be required across the board. It's too costly.

Planning: Maybe a map would help here, to illustrate what is being asked.

Committee: Shouldn't this be at the discretion of the Director?

Pg. 405 L 33

Public: Can these drop-off areas be in the ROW?

Planning: We have no immediate response.

Public: Sometimes parking would work in these areas.

Pg. 406 L 10-14

Public: Class 1 or greater street – You can't back out into a collector street. You must nose out. This language creates a conflict.

Pg. 406 L32-36 Snow Storage

Committee: If you have a grassy area, can that be landscaping and snow storage? **Planning:** Yes.

Committee: There is no snow disposal site in Eagle River and we only plow one sidewalk. This will create problems in service areas.

Pg. 406 L 36

Public: The 15 feet snow piles should be 25 feet here. It would allow you to store 65% more snow.

Pg. 407 L 1-15

Committee: Does this require paving a certain area to provide for snow storage?

Planning: If you wanted to pave and stripe you could, but you can also have grass to push the snow onto.

Committee: I wonder if five units are the right size to require this? The costs are prohibitive. Shouldn't we exempt developments with parking garages?

Pg. 407 L 21

Public: I would like to propose that any space needed for a trash dumpster and screening should be considered parking space.

Planning: We may want to exempt residential.

Committee: This is not acceptable for existing developments.

Pg. 407 L 32

Committee: There are many existing places that will need grandfathering, particularly for parking spaces in front of garages.

Planning: Traffic wanted to research this a little more. They see the problem and are figuring out how to change it. There will be more work on slopes.

Pg. 408

Committee: This table is too prescriptive.

Planning: We suspect that these are national numbers.

Pg. 409 L11-14

Committee: The raised medians will increase costs for snow removal.

Pg. 410 L 2 Dimensions

Committee: It would be helpful to have a drawing here.

Public: The 1st space has to be van accessible. Not sure if this is clear enough – I wrote a comment on this for planning.

Pg. 412 L 17-20

Committee: You will hear discussion from the assembly as to the purpose of this.

Public: The Homebuilders Association says that this will result in a 15% increase in cost.

Pg. 413 L18-21

Planning: We will delete “on the elevation of the dwelling facing the front lot line of the property”.

Committee: This language on garages creates much non-conformity. Why bother?

Planning: We have heard many complaints about this.

Pg. 413 L 33

Planning: We will change “ranch style” to single story.

Pg. 414 L 9-18

Committee: I like the choices and options available.

Pg. 414 L37

Public: Why do the driveways have to be paved when the street isn't?

Planning: We have noted that.

Pg. 415

Committee: You might want to think about a way to make things consistent for multifamily housing. Where are the break points meaningful? I compliment your menu of choices.

Next meeting will start on page 416.

December 2nd at City Hall in the Assembly Conference Room from 8 – 10 AM