

WEST ANCHORAGE DISTRICT PLAN -- PRE-RELEASE DRAFT

PLANNING GROUP COMMENTS – As summarized and consolidated by Staff

WORKSESSION #3 – September 30, 2010

Proposed Categories for Comments on Chapter 5-Implementation:

LU Land Uses
A TSAIA related issues
T Transportation
GEN General Land Use Map/Text Comments

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Comment Summary</u>
1	LU Obj #2	Does the Parks Plan address acquisition and need for natural open space for West Anchorage?
2	Gen-Intro	There was quite a bit of confusion and discussion about how this plan's implementation items relate to other functional plans. The Introduction section of Chapter 5 needs more description of the relationship between this plan's actions and other functional plans. Make it clear that what is described and listed as an implementation action or priority in Chapter 5 represents <u>new</u> additions and changes to what is listed (or not) in other MOA functional plans.
3	LU-2	The Spenard Comm Council remains concerned that the east boundary of this district plan in the vicinity of Spenard Rd does not extend to the east enough. The district boundary splits the community council and its land uses and the plan is not clear how this interface zone will be coordinated or managed. Plan needs to specify that coordination with Mid Town Plan and boundary decisions need to be in <i>Near Term</i> . Community Council does not feel it was heard on this plan area split.
4	Gen-Intro	Introduction language needs explanation about relationship between Chapter 4 Objectives and Chapter 5—since some of the Ch 4 Objectives do not show up in Chapter 5.
5	T-3 #4	This site includes an informal parking area for trail users. It should be identified as a new, small-scale trail head/parking lot here and possibly on Chapter 4 maps.
6	T-4	The last two sections are duplicative and should be merged.
7	T-4 #4	The phrase “when possible” should not be part of the action for identifying coastal trail routes near the Coastal Wildlife Refuge. Reconsider language for coastal trail references and specific references to ROWs especially since the estuary parcel is about to become public.

8	T-10 / N-3	Include language to insure that <u>maintenance</u> of roads and landscaping is included in the action.
9	Gen	Implementation language should be clear about the main focus action of each: is the action to amend a plan, or is it to construct a trail, or both?
10	T-3 & 4	These should be Near Term actions. Seems like the language could be clearer and simple.
11	T-2	There was confusion about the reference to bus stop amenities but not to general service upgrades. Does the plan advocate for upgrades to transit service, per land use recommendations? Need language to describe how service upgrades are determined—maybe here or in Chapter 4. Make sure timeframe is accurate & realistic.
12	T-4	Add ... <i>to provide connections</i> in the opening sentences.
13	T-3 #1	Is Jade St still a specific priority now that the estuary parcel is public. Maybe the item needs reference to other access points in that parcel.
14	T-3 #2	Snead St is actually Westpark Drive and it has a bike trail now. Clarify that the trail connection needed is actually along Kincaid Rd from Westpark to Kincaid Park.
15	T-3	Add a trail connector (preferred as a separated trail) on the North Frontage Rd from Northwood west to Spenard Rd. Add to appropriate plan (Ped or Bike). And check to see if there should be an additional link from Northwood to Spenard west of 45 th .
16	T-7	Reword to add school zones to places where no-right on red can occur, and change from <i>and/or</i> to simply <i>and</i> .
17	T-8	Should read that the ARRC to institute changes that <i>address</i> safety concerns, instead of <i>minimize</i> .
18	T-3 #3	Clarify what this connection really means—is it a trail along the Aero Dr ROW and/or e-w connections to the school from the ROW? Turnagain CC opposed to a trail in Aero ROW. Recommend that any trail in wetlands in the area be constructed as a boardwalk.
19	T-3 #7	Clarify the description of this new connection, ie that it is to provide a n-s connection across the West Romig Campus between Hillcrest and W Northern Lights. Location is conceptual.
20	T Obj #3	Clarify that the objective should plan for and develop a road network that <i>appropriately</i> accommodates traffic...
21	T Obj #4	Add that <i>Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS)</i> should be used to make roads support and enhance surrounding land uses.
22	Gen	Resolve the final name—is it Town Center or what? Prefer Town Center
23	T-9	Concerning the ARRC doubletrack: T-9 may not be necessary if the doubletrack EA contained appropriate items/conditions to address these impacts.
24	Gen & IA-5	Buffer areas and concepts should include the fact that costs and ownership need to be determined and formalized in their planning and implementation.
25	IA-23	Confusing as written—clarify.
26	IA-1	Does not seem to be an appropriate or effective implementation item for its objective. Clarify, move, or delete. Non-aeronautical use designation

		may not provide any mitigating effect on airport activities.
27	IA-4	Middle bullet of second grouping is not written clearly nor does it provide for an effective buffer area, since it could be leased or cleared later on.
28	IA-5	Should read that the buffer concept should be prepared and built, and there was concern that it may be too detailed with design specifics. These may not be necessary.
29	IA Obj #4	Implementation actions under this objective may not be viable—needs more discussion and feedback from affected parties.
30	IA-12	Identify the proper name of group referenced.
31	IA Obj #1	The use of the word “encourage” is not appropriate and is duplicative of other wording in the objective. May not be
32	IA-4	Clarify that the buffer area for the N side of Raspberry Rd should extend across the entire road frontage of the Kulis parcel.
33	IA Obj #1	Comm councils are concerned that the objective is one-sided towards supporting TSAIA--use of the term “vitality” applies to TSAIA but not for the neighborhoods. Neighborhoods need stronger acknowledgement in this objective.
34	IA-6 & 18	Why is the 60 DNL used instead of the 65 DNL, which is the regulatory reference? Most of the items in these actions may be a takings and/or private property devaluation. Concerns that the Real Estate disclosures for airport environs and noise overlay may not be covered in state statutes. Seems too complicated with little positive return. Who should be responsible for noise issues on older homes? The noise overlay and related items may take rights away for residents towards TSAIA over time—may reduce liabilities and private citizens recourse.
35	Gen IA	What happens when the DNL contours changes? Plan or Chapter 5 needs to identify actions to take relative to DNL changes and their relationship with certain Implementation items. Plan does not account for how to address contour changes with new runway scenarios or airpark additions.
36	Gen IA	Is the demographics data presented for TSAIA (jobs) still viable, or up to date? May be relevant to policies.
37	IA 6 & 18	The Plan may not accurately account for balancing TSAIA’s growth and work force capabilities vs. long range community/neighborhood quality of life and property values. What is the result to the tax base/property assessments in areas of noise contours and the new noise policies in the overlay. How do these actions impact the tax base—needs to be addressed.
38	Gen IA	The Plan should require that TSAIA and FAA address and pursue resolutions to ground and aircraft noise sources. The Plan may not reflect the reality that TSAIA is a major source of impacts out toward the community and that there is little to no impacts from the community towards the airport. The burden of addressing impacts focuses too much on private landowners.

