

ASSEMBLY TITLE 21 COMMITTEE

Summary of Discussion on Meeting September 16, 2005

Public Review Draft #1 Discussion Chapter 5 continues

p. 219, line 42-45.....Does definition include or exclude small nursery?

p.220, line 3-6..... Committee believes we should make memorials permissible in this definition.

line 7.....Why differentiate urban vs. rural jails? Are there state standards for correctional institutions?

p.221, line 16.....Maximum lot coverage, committee member believes 25% is too much open space.

p.222, line 15.....adequate needs to be defined

line 27-30 and line 36-40..... look at the definitions of RR freight terminal and rail yard....Do SBS and Anchorage Sand & Gravel fit here?

p. 223-229..... Telecommunication Facilities....Committee requests that planning staff meet with representatives of the industry to review this entire section.

p. 224, line 1-6..... Is this specificity necessary and could it limit us in the future? Also have we distinguished between commercial and residential? Planning noted this section came from the industry. Public questioned whether the new radio system to be used by MOA, ASD, APD, AFD and state would be able to work with so many restrictions.  
Line 40.....Committee asked if these height and distance requirements were problematic, 50 feet may not clear trees.

p. 225, line 28....committee recommends change to “unobtrusive color”. Public question about line 37, planning response was that this is current language.

p. 226, line 28-29.....Committee suggested adding concealing fence requirements

p. 227, line 35.....Note was made that this section much more flexible towards non-conformities than recent ordinances. Committee asked if the department intended no amortization of towers.

p. 227, line 36....Public noted confusion regarding the word “destroyed”. Do we want to distinguish between a tower that falls down and one taken down to replace?

p. 229, line 10.....Committee noted “area” a better word than “site”

p. 230, line 8....Committee member requested that commercial agriculture be defined by having items for sale. Planning indicated that commercial is hard to define and used example of boarding horses for barter.

Line 17-24....Committee concerned this language too broad. A suggestion was made that we get specific where we have problems. Large Animal Ordinance discussion 9/23/05 will cover most of this material. It was noted that commercial kennels are covered in Title 17.

p. 231, line 13-26.....Committee asked why we need specific regulation to cover animal grooming and vet clinics? Planning response was that sometimes there are complaints of noise and odor.

Line 13....What does “to maximum extent feasible” mean?

p. 232, line 4-9....committee member believes definition of “commercial paddock/stable” and “minimum lot size” will cause problems.

Line 14-19...Some thought this too restrictive. Public noted exotic animals not defined.

Line 23.... Definition of veterinary should include large animals

Public noted standards precluded a pet shop from moving into an existing building.

p.233, line 36...Can a fitness center be an accessory use? Also noted these are sometimes found in small locations in strip malls.

p. 234, line 10-15....one committee member found these regulations objectionable and stated the focus should be on impact, not on tax status line 17-19....Is this meant to prohibit decks?

p. 234-235.....Committee noted the differences in set back standards...100 feet for horses, 50 feet for nightclubs and 300 feet for unlicensed night clubs. What is the rationale for the differences? Committee asked that unlicensed nightclub be better defined. Would this include a coffee house with live music or a restaurant playing recorded music? Committee requested the standards should focus on addressing problems such as: 1. conversion of a

restaurant to a bar, 2. unlicensed/underage nightclub impact on neighborhoods, or 3. environmental impact on neighbors. Planning agreed this section needed work.

p.236, line 1-6...Public asked if Tozer Track fits here?  
line 24-43...committee member felt this too specific and needed to be condensed.

p. 238, line 28...Does this include cross country skiing and sled dog rides/trails? Planning replied this section developed with Larry Daniels from Alyeska Resort. Alpine skiing draws more people than X country. Committee member wondered why define this whole thing.

p. 239, line 28...Members present felt 3,000 sq ft may be too small to do business. Planning will check with existing banks to see if this or the 5,000 ft figure is appropriate.

p. 239, line 35...Committee member believe taverns not currently permitted under state law.

p. 241, line 6-9....Can we have a daycare in an office? Committee member wants to be sure it is allowed.

p. 243, line 24....Committee member doesn't think any exist that are less than 5,000 sq. ft.  
line 33-34....This is unclear. Are they permitted elsewhere?

Begin next meeting at top of page 244. Next meeting September 23 at City Hall.

Debbie Ossiander, Co-Chair Assembly Title 21 Committee