

Assembly Title 21 Meeting Notes – May 3, 2006

Chapter 6

Pg. 297 Table 21.06-1

Planning: Last time at this point you asked for a comparison of dimensional standards between what's current and what's in draft #2. We have done that and have copies available.

Committee: Under RS-1 what is "all other uses"?

Planning: That would be churches, schools, anything else that might be in a residential neighborhood.

Committee: This table would be easier to read if the headings were on each page.

Planning: That was a mistake and will be corrected.

Pg. 299 Table 21.06-1

Committee: under RM4 it says, "10, except that the fourth story, and an" is this sentence finished?

Planning: It should say any and then continues to next page.

Committee: Why can "no portion of a structure within 50 feet of any other residential zoning district exceed the height limitations of that district?"

Planning: The height limitations for different districts are different. We wanted a height gradation between them.

Committee: I always think of zoning districts as being separated by streets. Are you saying that abutting lots can be in different zoning districts?

Planning: Yes

Public: AHBA noted that there is no maximum density for multi family.

Planning: That district, RM4, has the largest density.

Pg. 303 Table 21.06-3

Committee: What's the rationale for the front setbacks in NMU?

Planning: We want the street scape to be pedestrian friendly.

Committee: Why limit it to 30% of the front building façade?

Planning: We want to prevent the space between the street and the building from being all parking lots. It creates a strong street environment.

Committee: I'm trying to understand what or where the CCMU is.

Planning: We don't want to put zoning labels on the land use map. People will get confused. We did put in language that says if buildings don't meet the maximum setback then they will not be considered non-conforming.

Committee: It seems like we are trying to impose standards on areas that can't or won't be able to change.

Public: The Dimond -Old Seward area could be very walkable but there is only one sidewalk.

Planning: We are trying to craft a code that allows expansion or remodel to come towards conformity.

Committee: How are you going to handle frag lots? Most buildings have parking lots in the front now.

Planning: We are trying to recognize that.

Committee: How do people get to the RCMU's? They usually drive. Some new construction is creating a pedestrian friendly area inside the parameters of the building.

Planning: We're not trying to change what is already there. Other cities are making great strides in creating streetscapes that are user friendly with flexible setbacks.

Committee: How do you handle an area the size and scope of the Dimond Center. I don't see that something like this could ever happen there. You have to be flexible and minimize the impact on current business.

Planning: Someday that area will want to change. A street presence could be provided with liner buildings. These would be right on the street with the parking inside and on the back.

Committee: How does landscaping play into this plan?

Planning: It would be less than the 8 feet required for a parking lot.

Committee: It seems like in RCMU there's an interior flow which is different from the neighborhoods.

Planning: That is actually a good arrangement for Regional Mixed Use. We are not requiring mandatory change; we are just working towards the goal.

Committee: I think it's great to encourage people oriented places rather than car oriented places.

Public: You still have 15% requirement for open space. Allow the developer to use this at his discretion. That's the function of landscaping.

Public: I'm thinking long term and how Seattle has been able to get people walking. It's important to move our city in that direction.

Committee: I'm worried about how the community is going to look at this. The emphasis will be on businesses that don't meet the standards even though you say they won't be non-conforming. It's threatening with no language for a different approach. I urge you to think about that.

Committee: If people want to walk it still seems like you would want deeper setbacks.

Planning: It makes a longer walk to the stores.

Committee: It's the demand for walkability I'm taking about. When the opportunity to make it work exists, then great, but where it doesn't work -- why impose it on business?

Committee: We are trying to put sidewalks on Spenard right now and the neighborhoods are worried that it is cutting into their right of way.

Planning: We looked at what exists and it's surprising how many places already meet these standards.

Committee: Can we talk about FARS?

Planning: 1 to 1 gross floor area means that if you have a 10,000 sq. ft. lot then you can have a 10,000 sq. ft. building.

Committee: Does footnote 3 allow café tables?

Planning: It doesn't prohibit them.

Pg. 304 Table 21.06-4

Committee: Why is the airport in our code when it's federally controlled?

Planning: There are some things in the airport district that we can control.

Public: For continuity in the Antenna Farm District the 87,120 area should read 2 acres

Planning: Thanks

Committee: Is the Turnagain Arm District information current?

Planning: Yes

Committee: Since we determined that the only watershed is in Chugach State Park, why is there a maximum height limit of 50 ft?

Planning: I'll check.

Pg. 305 Unroofed Landings, Decks, and Stairs L 27-31

Committee: Is this only when you put a deck in a setback?

Planning: Yes

Public: You can't build a roof over it though.

Pg. 306 ii. L 21

Committee: Please check the 48 inches for ramp width.

Pg. 306 Construction on Adjoining Lots L 28-29

Committee: It is unnecessary to add "provided further that the building complies with building code requirements".

Pg. 307 b. L4

Committee: Do people call and ask the utilities if they want to put in a flowerbed?

Public: They should request a locate and that would let the utilities know their plans.

Planning: It's current code.

Pg. 307 Minimum Setback L 30-37

Committee: I'm leery of having OSHP and the neighborhood plans listed. We should delete line 36-37.

Planning: The setback is from the projected centerline rather than the actual.

Committee: We have areas that are old BLM lots. There have been roads built outside of ROWs and it will be a huge mess.

Planning: We are proposing taking out where it says "existing".

Public: If you have a road with 40 ft. of right of way on one side and 30 feet on the other, then 35 feet will be the projected center line.

Planning: The roads can exist but we are measuring from where the road should be.

Public: It's impossible to take out the word existing. I'm thinking about the DeArmond Stage 2 project. There needs to be a mechanism to make things equal. They could be grandfathered until it's ready to do correctly.

Committee: There are so many roads that were built for topographical reasons. Maybe we could leave them both in so there won't be so many fireworks.

Planning: We could also use the word or.

Pg. 308 iii. L 7

Committee: Please check to see what kiosks means here. Are these coffee carts?

Pg. 308 v. L 9-11

Committee: When would you need a temporary retaining wall?

Public: For construction areas temporary would already be 6 months with a 6 month extension

Planning: We'll check on this.

Pg. 309 ii. L 21

Public: Trees are required to be trimmed in the right of way.

Committee: I think this is common.

Planning: The way the new system works, very few home owners will have to trim trees.

Committee: Our road service areas are concerned with this cost.

Planning: It has to be done in the sight triangle.

Pg. 310

Committee: Does a crawl space apply to FARS?

Planning: Yes

Committee: Why include basements – in the grand scheme of things that has little or no impact on the building size?

Pg. 311 b. L 31-34

Committee: Can you have an antenna in a neighborhood as high as you want?

Planning: Yes

Public: The problem is with microwave dishes. They are going in on top of cell towers and to my knowledge they are not being regulated.

Committee: This is news to me.

Pg. 313 Setbacks

Public: #6 footnote is the wrong citation.

Committee: #11 footnote doesn't end.

Planning: We will check on that.

**Next meeting: May 10, 2006 9:30 – 11:30 AM Planning Dept.
First floor Conference Room
We'll start on Chapter 7**

After the May 17th meeting, meeting dates will change to Thursdays.