

WEST ANCHORAGE DISTRICT PLAN -- PRE-RELEASE DRAFT

PLANNING GROUP COMMENTS – As summarized and consolidated by Staff

WORKSESSION #2 – September 22, 2010

Proposed Categories for Comments on Land Use:

- A TSAIA related issues
 - PE Parks & Environment
 - LU Land Uses
 - GEN General Land Use Map/Text Comments
-

<u>Category</u>		<u>Comment Summary</u>
1	LU	Map 4-1c, Land use details along Spenard Rd should include areas to the east; the dashed line for east border should be firmed up and specific. The Spenard CC has advocated for the West District boundary to include areas east of Spenard Rd.
2	LU	Plan needs synopsis of and coordination section with Midtown Plan recommendations.
3	GEN	The maps should include at least the major road names for reference specifically, collectors and arterials.
4	LU	Small-scale Commercial areas on W Northern Lights—concerns about safety, traffic, and impacts to adjacent properties. Text should include reference to traffic/safety and master plan requirement. It was not clear from the Land Use map that only 1 of these sites is intended to be developed. Include other measures to avoid strip development.
5	LU/PE	Should the ROW areas along W Northern Lights be shown as residential or Open Space since they are used as parks? Mapping issue.
6	LU	Small-scale neighborhood commercial in Sand Lake at W. Dimond may not be at best location. Consider adding another, or moving it to the north at Raspberry to accommodate more residential areas. Concerns that strip commercial on arterials are traffic generators and not walkable.
7	GEN	Concerns about breakup of Spenard area and how the east side may be lost to commercial (rezones from residential). Need to add text language about preserving residential areas in the Spenard-Midtown Plan interface and clearly describe how the two district plans are to interact and coordinate. [Combine with #2]
8	GEN	The text and maps need to clarify what the exact boundaries are for the Spenard Planning area (future Spenard Corridor) and the actual WADP east boundary in Spenard. [Combine with #1]

9	GEN	Exhibit 4-1c needs to be 11X17” (and include <u>all</u> of West Anchorage)
10	LU/GEN	Major mapping issues with AWWU/Parcel #6 vicinity—maps (2-1, 4-1a) not consistent (trails vs. land use). Why is parcel #6 shown as transportation use? [Duplicates #16?]
11	LU	Areas around TSAIA that serve as buffers but do not have formal agreements should be shown on the land use map as “other areas that serve as parks”. Maybe definition needs to be expanded. Ownership of these parcels does not change how these buffers are used and what the public wants them to be used for (e.g. 1982 Land Use map shows east Turnagain Bog as green).
12	GEN	Once adopted, how will the land use maps, and especially those areas identified as parks on airport land, apply to TSAIA? They are a temporary use and the MOA has no jurisdiction. Showing these as recreation will only confuse matters when TSAIA does need to develop one for aviation use in the future. Revise third bullet on page 74 to clarify last sentence.
13		Need to define “community” more broadly to recognize that there is a constituency within the community that supports and advocates for airport and aviation uses. TSAIA is part of the “community”.
14	LU/A	Do maps address land use conflict areas where TSAIA noise contours overlap residential areas? Perhaps consider adding a map that highlights residential areas that conflict with noise contours. Perhaps improve redevelopment discussion in the land use text to address down-zoning relative to noise contours and density changes. Explain all the tools that prevent future land use conflicts. Recognize that down zoning/loss of property value may require compensation to property owners.
15	LU/GEN	Parts of Spenard are increasingly threatened by expanding industrial and airport land uses, especially in Northwood area. Perhaps land use section can address how the land use maps work in conjunction with Title 21.
16	LU/A	Parcels #1, 18, 19 should be shown in different color (parks or open space) since they may end up as non-aeronautical uses, although this may be premature since there is a lengthy FAA process to determine whether it would be allowed. There may be feasible aeronautical uses that do not require aircraft access.
17	LU/A	HLB parcels on west side of TSAIA have incorrect boundaries. All parcels along the west side of TSAIA should be confirmed and corrected. West side Land Use map should be 11X17” to show detail in this area.
18	LU/A	HLB parcel #4 boundaries need to be shown and the area’s land use needs clarity. Transportation land use overlaps HLB lands and possible issues with coastal trail.
19	LU/A	Land use maps should not necessarily show or assume land uses that are to be predicated on future trades. Perhaps land use maps need a note and/or asterisks on those parcels whose land use would change as a result of land trades. [Combine with #15?]
20	LU/A	Wendy’s Way has 6 lots that are to be taken out as residential uses (RPZone). Portray RPZ on either Land Use or other maps.

21		Define the meaning, significance and location of the “fence” surrounding TSAIA. Restricted access is key aspect. Location can change over time. Not the same as the boundary.
22		Consider showing Runway Protection Zones on LU Map.