

Title 21 Meeting Notes – March 29, 2006

Pg. 149

Public: You make two references to the Anchorage Bowl 20/20 Plan, and not the other area plans. Is that intended to stay?

Planning: Yes, but we're not trying to say it can only be in this area.

Public: I just thought it was better as a note.

Pg. 151 Public Focus Areas L 11-19

Committee: Are we going to require a public square or plaza for every acre that is developed for mixed use? That seems excessive. Could a bench be enough to make a public focus area?

Planning: Line 18 shows that 1% of the development is enough.

Pg. 151 Incentive for Additional Residential Development L 25-34

Committee: Why is there a difference in the FAR (floor area ratio) numbers?

Planning: The .07 should be .05.

Committee: That means you can build a bigger building. Why do we care?

Planning: On line 30 the .02 should be 1. We are trying to control the scale in mixed use. We want things smaller in residential mixed use neighborhoods and larger in commercial ones.

Pg. 151 Building Placement and Orientation L 38

Committee: This could be a problem for rural placement. It seems like you could only walk in certain areas. Parking will not be convenient.

Planning: That's why we added rural commercial areas.

Pg. 152 Building Placement & Street Setbacks & Building Entrances L 1-11

Committee: I'm concern for the rural commercial owners. The costs of adding an entrance could be huge.

Planning: It only requires one on a street and it would be easier to do when the building is constructed.

Public: It could be hard to get someone new at the counter to understand this.

Planning: If you have suggestions on how to rewrite this, we would appreciate the help. There has to be an entrance that pedestrians can get to without crossing a parking lot.

Committee: I'm not sure why you are making the requirement for all mixed use. Are you trying to make buildings more accessible by pedestrians?

This could add to the cost of running a business.

Public: It's for public safety also.

Public: I can see a problem with class 3 streets where there is no vehicle access.

Committee: People walk and we are encouraging that. It requires a shift in thinking.

Pg. 152 L 23-34

Committee: This seems excessive in some cases. This section calling for public art costing at least 1% of the construction value could cost a lot of money. Can you have an awning over the sidewalk? Why not add covered sidewalks?

Planning: You'd have to get an encroachment permit from the state.

Public: It happens in the CBD.

Pg. 155 Accessory Uses L 5-20

Committee: I can think of two places where people store a couple of airplanes. Is this allowable?

Planning: That's a subordinate thing to an aircraft subdivision.

Committee: The way I read this, you are trying to limit accessory uses to 9%

Planning: Yes, for carports and garages

Committee: In cases where workshops are attached to the garage it could be larger than 9%, why is that a problem?

Planning: This concept comes from the approach we took in Girdwood.

Committee: The bigger problem here is creating pockets of non-conformity if you make it retroactive.

Committee: Why can't I have a bigger building than 5800 square feet on six acres?

Planning: In residential neighborhoods some people have built accessory buildings right up to the neighbor's property lines.

Committee: I would prefer setbacks.

Planning: You could have several buildings but not one that's bigger than 9%.

Committee: This is a policy question. How do you create an area of residential development when there is already other development there? You're trying to create all these areas but we don't know what's there now.

Pg. 155 Home Occupation L 21

Committee: Just to let you know, we have a group of people looking at Home Occupation standards.

Pg. 155 L 35-37

Committee: How do we define traffic and deliveries in greater than normal volume? How does it work for assisted living situations?

Planning: We handle that, Bed & Breakfasts and daycare each separately.

Committee: We are finding more and more of these and not just in residential areas anymore. We need to recognize that gradients are necessary.

Pg. 156 Use of an Intermodal Shipping Container L 9-11

Committee: I don't mind the Connex so much but I want to see it screened. Maybe we could limit the number and create setbacks.

Public: Could you side and roof it to look like a shed?

Planning: We need to be careful. What's acceptable siding?

Committee: You might want to look at this.

Public: You could say that accessory buildings need to look like the residence.

Committee: How can you allow Connexs and not Quonset huts?

Planning: Quonset huts were disallowed in the 60's and nobody has asked for them to come back.

Pg. 157 District-Specific Standards L 17-18

Committee: I have received but not read Senator Ted Stevens comments on this.

Planning: We have a long standing disagreement between the city and the state. They don't want us to zone them.

Committee: We don't have the right to govern the state. It would be nice to have the airport buffered from the city. You could say that the airport is governed by the Airport Master Plan.

Pg. 157 DR: Development Reserve District L 24

Committee: Is the DR a substitute for T?

Planning: It's a transition.

Committee: I was just curious if we needed it and I see we do.

Pg. 158 Purpose L 8-13

Committee: Shouldn't this say public "open" lands?

Planning: An area that is dedicated as a park can be taken over by the Park Dept. Areas not dedicated could be transferred to another entity.

Committee: What do you lose by leaving it as it is? There's a Master Plan for parks that we'll be looking at April 18th. There's no need to have it listed in the table.

Planning: There has been a misperception that undeveloped lots are parks and when they get developed people get mad.

Committee: Why don't we dedicate these areas now then and solve that problem in a clearer manner?

Planning: Originally we didn't include the Parks section. This makes it easier for people to visualize.

Committee: This is going to create problems. We have a parks plan driver for uses. I'd hate to find out that we've prohibited a use in here that's permitted in the park plan. I don't really see a need for this zone.

Pg. 158 RUC: Railroad Utility Corridor L 17

Committee: Why not leave the railroad as ROW?

Planning: There could be uses that they could establish that we'd end up being responsible for. We're proposing to establish what the use of rail

land is. We realize that their uses are out of our control but if they are leased to a 3rd party then the use comes under city control.

Pg. 158 TA: Turnagain Arm District L 32

Committee: Was this R-11?

Planning: Yes

Committee: We have a conditional use process here. It's more expensive. Why not use a major site plan review instead?

Planning: Under the current proposal there is no public sewer or water. You can apply for almost anything as a conditional use. It's sort of like a rezone.

Pg. 159 L 20-22

Committee: There isn't any institutional use reference for a conditional use permit. What if we want to put in a school?

Planning: That's different and has its own requirements. This section applies to uses over 4,000 sq. feet.

Pg. 159 Overlay Zoning Districts

Committee: Can an overlay district cover two districts?

Planning: Yes. When you do a neighborhood or town center overlay you may use less restrictive standards.

Pg. 160 AHO: Airport Height Overlay District L 9

Committee: Why do we need this? You could say follow the federal rules and save three pages.

Pg. 162 Purpose L 2-10

Committee: Why do you need to be so prescriptive with what the districts may or may not want to do? As long as a building is compatible with the existing character it should be allowed.

Planning: There are neighborhoods that share similar buildings, setbacks, etc. There may be reasons to preserve these older types of homes.

Committee: Maybe I misunderstood. What are the difference between the neighborhood Overlay and the District Plan?

Planning: The neighborhood conservation overlay is a valuable subset of a district plan. There may be a question on the details of how we create and implement this.

Pg. 163 Property Owners' Approval L 39-44

Public: There is the potential to zone out areas or specific uses if you have to keep up with the homeowner's association approach.

Committee: We might want a super majority requirement from the neighborhood for these. I have a problem with the 51% I wrote 60% to fly. We should wait to make sure butting heads doesn't happen.

Pg. 164 Development Standards L 39-44

Committee: Is enforcement of this similar to existing covenant enforcement or would it be a city responsibility?

Planning: All adopted plans are enforceable by the city.

Committee: So there are significant costs involved.

Pg. 165 RTR: Railroad Terminal Reserve Overlay District L 17-23

Committee: Why do we have this here?

Planning: We are trying to strike a middle ground with the railroad. We acknowledge their master plan and zone their land accordingly. The railroad also owns property off their track corridor.

Pg.160 AHO Airport Height Overlay district

Committee: One suggestion is to start with the organization's own master plan and then go forward. Our part of the plan should focus on what impacts neighborhoods around the airport. Can the city put a decibel level limit? In other words can we regulate noise from the airport?

Planning: If they are going to have large parking lots, they should be regulated in other areas too.

Pg. 165 FHO: Flood Hazard Overlay District L 24

Committee: This is the same as before and there are problems.

Planning: Not really.

Committee: The flood hazard maps done by ZEBA are inaccurate and there is limited enforcement. I've seen some that are more than 5 years old.

Planning: They may have been looked at and no reason was seen to update.

Committee: In Peters Creek we have problems with boulders and ice threatening houses.

Next meeting: April 5, 2006 9:30 – 11:30 AM Planning Dept.

First floor Conference Room

We'll start with Chapter 5.

