

Assembly Title 21 Meeting Notes – May 17, 2006

Chapter 7

Pg. 345 Standard

Committee: Does the 30-degree daylight plane include higher density housing?

Planning: It's calculated with a different method. For RM 2 and 3 zones it is shown on page 299. We missed RM4. We might put it in the same chapter. We're trying to make it more thorough and consistent.

Committee: How and when is the 30-degree plane measured? Is it above the horizon in January or June?

Planning: It's the equinox at noon. We attempted to define it on page 513 but it needs illustration.

Public: Why not just say "when standing at a certain point at a certain time the degree of the structure shall not cast a shadow of a certain number of degrees on a neighboring building"?

Committee: That makes sense.

Public: How does this affect a church in a residential neighborhood?

Planning: The steeple is exempted from the height restrictions, but the building would have to meet the code.

Committee: I hadn't realized that this related to transitions between uses as in line 22. I thought the city was more concerned with transitions between districts or zones.

Planning: No, it is zones but it's also neighboring uses. It's not very clear.

Committee: You might check Alaska Law to see if this is legal.

Planning: We're design testing this.

Committee: This isn't very clear for mixed use districts.

Public: Is this part of a concept of Northern City Design?

Planning: This is pretty common.

Pg. 346 Non-Residential Devel. Adj. to Existing Residential Use L 18-31

Committee: It should be "or" instead of "and" at the end of the line 30

Planning: Thank you.

Committee: Are we looking at aesthetics or health safety issues here?

Planning: There is some concern for both.

Committee: Numbers 1-6 and 10-11 are current but 7-9 are new. If this section and the height restrictions are adopted it will create huge non-conformities.

Pg. 347 Landscaping, Screening and Fences

Committee: There are three types of landscaping, correct?

Planning: There is site perimeter, site enhancement, and parking lot landscaping. There is also a tree requirement.

Committee: You're trying to cover it all at once. I appreciate the changes you have made and the meetings with the landscape architects who were part of the real estate task force. You've taken many of their suggestions.

Pg. 347 2. L 39

Committee: You've gone from 5 lots with 5 dwellings to 2 lots with 2 dwellings

Planning: This will make it more comprehensive.

Public: Tri-Plexes and above are pretty common.

Pg. 350 Table 21.07-1

Committee: You haven't included landscaping block planters or retaining walls. Can you have boulders that are 3' wide instead of 3' high?

Pg. 351 Table 21.07-2

Committee: I'm assuming that you will include RC at some point. There are also a lot of small lots in the Government Hill area where the buffering will be very hard.

Planning: This would not necessarily be used there.

Public: It says between two parcels in intensely developed areas.

Planning: It's not very clear but it's trying to explain how to separate potentially incompatible zones.

Committee: You should make the cell that says "District of Proposed Development" white so that it shows the proposed development.

Planning: That might make it clearer. We are still looking through all this.

Pg. 352 Table 21.07-2

Public: From RM-3, RM-4 to RS-2, RL-1 L4 landscaping requires 30 feet for commercial it is only 15 feet.

Committee: That's a legitimate concern.

Planning: We will look at that.

Committee: We have 4 landscaping zones and 32 uses. You might want to expand this table.

Planning: Good point.

Pg. 353 Table 21.07-3

Committee: I have a request for the L2 buffer to be reduced to 6 ft. instead of 8 ft. Would that be a problem?

Planning: We are trying to provide more site flexibility. We proposed that the minimum width be closer to average in part because of the landscape buffer in the perimeter. Too much flexibility could reduce the buffer.

Committee: The buffer between what? Doesn't it depend on the uses you are trying to separate?

Planning: We are trying to provide buffers for street frontage and zoning districts.

Committee: I'd hate to see you get too inflexible for the aesthetics of a view that you will see only when driving by it.

Public: If you allow a reduction in L4, you should do the same in other areas.

Pg. 355 iii. Minimum Stocking Requirements L40-44

Committee: The landscaping has increased from the last draft.

Planning: We talked to some professionals and .03 units are not enough for where we want to go.

Committee: When you add these new requirements you are reducing parking and adding a burden for snow removal.

Planning: .03 wasn't enough.

Committee: Most of what I've heard about this section has been positive. The new standards seem practical.

Committee: Because of snow removal requirements, landscaping should be linear rather than circular. I want that option available.

Public: I'd prefer that interior parking area be for pedestrian walkways rather than landscaping. It would increase the perimeter of lots and make snow removal easier.

Public: Because of the points assigned to landscaping, we are likely to see every parking lot with evergreen trees, but spruce trees will die with no shade ---- especially when they are young.

Pg. 358 L 43

Committee: Some of this seems too specific to be in code; couldn't you place mulch requirements in regulations?

Pg. 361 b. Surety L 15-25

Committee: Is this a change from current code?

Planning: I believe it is. It looks like it's been shortened.

Committee: It looks OK. The deed of trust was eliminated.

Pg. 361 6. a. Maintenance L 35-45

Committee: How do we enforce landscape maintenance requirements?

Public: It's not happening.

Planning: We tried to write this to address that problem.

Committee: It's great that you have the waiver for irrigation. That should help plants survive.

Pg. 362 2. Refuse Collection L 16-21

Committee: Have you talked to Waste Management to make sure that what we are requiring is appropriate?

Planning: We are talking to them. There may be places that we need to use smaller waste vehicles for maintenance.

Public: Waste Management told me they would not pick up dumpsters located in the alley behind my property. They told me the dumpsters had to be in the front.

Pg. 362 a. Residential Dwellings L 22-24

Public: Why are we not allowing dumpsters at these sites?

Pg. 363 iii. Screening Enclosure L 5-16

Committee: Why do you have to have a solid fence if the dumpster is completely obscured by landscaping?

Public: Change line 20 on page 362 so the line reads receptacles should be adequately screened OR located in unobtrusive yet convenient locations.

Public: Why a 6 or 8 foot fence when dumpsters are only about 4 feet tall?

Public: This doesn't work in alleys. Sometimes the dumpsters are shared between buildings. It would be hard to know who would do the screening.

Pg. 363 b. Standard L33-37

Committee: This requires loading areas to be screened by a 6-8 foot fence, unless they are located in an alley. What about situations like the Fred Meyer in Eagle River where the loading area is at the base of a natural bluff? This doesn't seem realistic.

Pg. 363 b. Standard L 42-47

Committee: I've heard that there can be problems with snow removal when you have to screen HVAC equipment.

Public: If it's done correctly then it is fine.

Pg. 364 B. Standard L 11-23

Committee: Why do you have to have a 6" extrusion screened?

Planning: We have to set the standard somewhere.

Committee: It's seems a pretty little extrusion to require screening.

Pg. 364 1. Applicability L 42-45

Committee: I don't see how people will figure out if their fence will fall into this category. Maybe a table would help.

Pg. 365 3. Maximum Height L 9-25

Committee: There is no mention of RC here. The Government Hill CC doesn't want any fences in the side and rear yards to be higher than 6 ft. (L21-22) Why are rock walls prohibited?

Planning: This is referring to a wall made of material like glass bottles. A rock wall is fine.

Public: In regards to non-sight obscuring fences, chain link fences will frost in the winter and then you can't see through them. (L 18-19)

**Next meeting: May 25, 2006 9:30 – 11:30 AM Planning Dept.
First floor Conference Room
We'll start on Chapter 7 Page 366 21.07.090 Off-Street Parking and Loading**

Our meeting dates will change to Thursdays with the meeting on May 25th.