

**Exhibit D-1
of
PZC Case 2011-104 Issue Response**

Comment Received for PZC Case 2011-104

Tom Dreyer, S4 Group

Note: Due to an error, this public comment was left out of Exhibit D that was provided to PZC on April 19, 2012.



Land Surveying
Land Development Consultants
Subdivision Specialists
Construction Surveying

124 E 7th Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska 99501 www.S4AK.com 907-306-8104

May 10, 2012

To: Planning & Zoning Commission

Re: Areas of concern in the new proposed Title 21:

From: Tom Dreyer, PLS, S4 Group

STREAM PROTECTION SETBACKS

Proposed Code: Page 291: 21.07.020.4.a.i : Specifies 50' of stream protection easements either side of a stream.

Existing Code: 21.45.201, specifies 25' either side.

Issue: This would double the amount of setback area on a lot. Existing lots have been designed considering the 25' setback, not 50'.

Solution: Amend the 50' setback to 25'.

REQUIRING TYPE 1 CURB AND GUTTER

Proposed Code: Page 433: Title 21.08.050.G: The new code here appears to be requiring stand-up, (Type 1) curb and gutter, but it is unclear.

Proposed Code, 2nd example: Page 447: Title 21.08.070.D.6: “,,,,,street sections shall have vertical curb.” (Type 1)

Existing Code: Title 21.85.080: Does not refer to type 1 curb and gutter.

Issue: Type 1 curb is only appropriate in certain situations that should be left up to the professional design engineer. Type 1 curb requires builders extra expense by having to cut the curb to fit the driveway that the homebuyer requests. Developers and builders cannot guess where the future homebuyer wants his driveway.

Solution: Change proposed code to read like existing code, and delete 21.08.070.D.6.

REQUIRING ALL DEVELOPMENTS OF 16 UNITS AND OVER TO GO TO THE P & Z.

Proposed Code: Page 31 of Proposed Amendments dated May 20, 2010: Title 21.07.110.H.2.B.3: ‘,,,,,Applicable developments with 16 or more dwelling units shall be approved by the planning and zoning commission using the major site plan review process(subsection 21.03.180C).

Existing Code: Title 21.90 (In it’s entirety.) No public hearing required.

Issue: Proposed code refers to subsection that requires the siteplan to go to a UDC Public hearing. ? Then on to P & Z ? That would add another 4 to 12 months or so to the process of site plan approval. I do not see any community gain to requiring say a four unit four-plex project to go through a public hearing process. The design of these is best left to the builder and his professional design team in conjunction with the already very strict requirements of the Public Works Department.

Solution: Require no public hearing process for these multi-family site-plans.

REQUIRING 25’ SPACING BETWEEN MULTI-FAMILY BUILDINGS

Proposed Code: Page 391: Title 21.070.110.C.4.b.i.A: ‘,,,,,25 feet, (between multi-family buildings.)

Current Code: Title 21.90.003.F.3.d. : “,,,,,10’ between buildings.”

Issue: Requiring an extra 15’ between multi family buildings over current code will restrict the density on parcels of land that are zoned for high density developments. Current code allows 10’ between any two residential houses. The extra 15’ added to the spaces for multi-family will only serve to force the builders into creating longer multi family buildings instead of shorter ones.

Solution: change to 10’.

REQUIRING EXTRA DISTANCE BETWEEN MULTI-FAMILY BUILDINGS
RELATING TO HEIGHT

Proposed Code: Page 391: Title 21.07.110.C.4.b.i.B: “One foot distance for every foot of building height.”

Existing Code: Title 21.90.003.F.3.d. “,,,,,10 feet between buildings.”

Issue: Same as above, but only worse. This proposed code would increase the distance between buildings to 35’, since that is a common height of multi-family buildings that are being built. Again, single family homes are often 35’ tall also, and are allowed to be 10’ apart.

Solution: Delete the proposed code.

Note: This is only a partial list.

Thank you, Tom Dreyer, S4 Group