

**Exhibit D-2
of
PZC Case 2011-104 Issue Response**

Comments Received for PZC Case 2011-104

Note: These are comments received outside of the public hearing comment period.

Davis, Tom G.

From: evan [<mailto:evanrowland@gci.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2012 9:10 AM
To: Davis, Tom G.
Cc: srhickel@gci.net; Daniel Bolles
Subject: Evan Rowland's Title 21 comments
Attachments: Doc1.pdf

Just my thoughts on things in general. I really think that Dan Coffey's comments on Chapter 8 could easily be expanded.

Evan Rowland
227-0741

Comments from Evan Rowland, Anchorage home builder, regarding Title 21 rewrite.

Comments on Dan Coffey's suggested revisions. **Page numbers are from Mr. Coffey's booklet.**

1. Chapter 3 page 7 off-site infrastructure improvements requirements and Exhibit G.
 - a. I fully support these suggestions in its entirety. It appears that staff does support some change here and I hope they do a complete job of it. The "Condo ordinance" basically says that if you do anything to your property, we can make you do anything we want to any public infrastructure, which is insane. The ordinance kicks in when you dump 5 truckloads of top soil on your lawn or whenever you build any 3-plex or greater anywhere. Stop the madness. We tried to direct this ordinance to projects of certain sizes of acreage or units built but we were ignored during the process.
2. Chapter 4 page 11 # 2 paragraph, Mixed use Developments. No way should mixed use development be required of a property owner. In my opinion a lot of these new fangled buzz words for development pertain to large cities where you have a long commute to go from home to business. In Anchorage you can probably go one mile from a decent neighborhood to a business area. Why do they need to be 50 feet away from each other when almost any existing neighborhood will fight any new commercial development in their back yard? I do not see that staff addressed this in their comments.
3. Chapter 6 pages 19 & 20 Dimensional Standards and Measurements. I support the idea that the restrictions on building height and separation are overdone. Staff seems to be open to some change here and hopefully they will make it a little more appropriate.
4. Chapter 7 Exhibit R Design standards for residential. I fully support this exhibit and staff appears to be making some changes in this direction.
5. Chapter 7 page 319 line 32 of **the Title 21 booklet, On-site pedestrian Connections.** This section scares the hell out of me and staff seems unconcerned about Mr. Coffey's recommendations. According to the definitions of walkways on page 627, it says that a walkway is for non-motorized vehicles which mean driveways and on site drives and streets cannot be counted in this connectivity. And where a walkway crosses any driveway it has to be delineated with special paving. These requirements kicks in any time you build anything, I think. In a small 20 unit townhome development it would be a killer. In the townhome section on page 396 line 18 -39 it says driveways can be used, but can the 300 foot long on Site Street be used? Hopefully it can. This section is way over done in it entirely. Presently, isn't all primary entry doors connected to the

driveway and to the street without any major concerns for except dumb kids that would not use the sidewalk anyway?

6. Chapter 8 Subdivision Standards page 30 of **Mr. Coffey's booklet**. I support these recommendation and Exhibit S. Staff does not support Exhibit S. The PM&E department of Development Services was going rogue for years as to getting on warrantee and getting off warrantee of newly constructed public streets by private developers. I have not been involved with them for several years and do not know if things have improved or not. During the writing of this chapter several years ago we had this language in the re-write and agreed to by all, but it was left out of the final draft somehow. I think the MOA should be held accountable to do a good inspection the first time and get the job done, and not get to do as many as they want year after year. For years Building Safety has lived by the rule of "no new items added to the original inspection on reinspections" What's wrong with PM&E? Why can't they get it done?

Summary of what I see. If I have this right;

- a. My backyard now has to be 15 feet deep to count as private open space and cannot be used as a drainage swale to count as open space. This backyard has to have a 1% slope per moa drainage requirements, but can't be more than 5% to count as open space. We are required to provide drainage swales between every building and at all property lines. How is this going to work? **Good luck with all this.**
- b. I now need to have 5 foot wide sidewalks on both sides of the Onsite Street that need to be delineated from driveways. I also think I need bollards every 6 feet between the street and the Onsite Street. **Do I have this right?**

Slopes
Page 299
TOP paragraph

Page
320
Line 15-35

Page
298
Line
31
298

There is a huge concern of future affordable housing in Anchorage. The builders have probably 6 years of inflation and code changes that they have not been charging for due to market conditions. When the market does pick up there will not be a ready available work force to do the work due to people leaving the trades field over the years due to lack of work. Us builders try to keep in mind young families, like 30 years who are starting families and do want a single family home or a town home. How many of this age group will be able to afford that five years from now?

Davis, Tom G.

From: evan [<mailto:evanrowland@gci.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2012 3:37 PM
To: Davis, Tom G.
Cc: Connie Yoshimura
Subject: on site sidewalks

Tom,

the real nuts and bolts for me opposing this requirement of 5 foot side walks on both sides of the driveway is that they won't fit on most of the small parcels that are left to build on. If you can find one that is 165 feet wide you are lucky. I am positive that if given the choice of 5 feet in the back yard or a sidewalk across their driveway, people will take the back yard every time. Back yards are not real important to these people, but I am sure they are higher on the list than a sidewalk.

Last night Connie did say that back yards need to be 10 feet, but on page 299 line 6, it says they need to be 15 feet deep to count as open space. It is 10 feet now but is going to 15 feet.

Also to add to what Connie was trying to do by adding "townhouse style" to one section, I think where she met to add "Townhouse style" was to page 394 line 36, "Standards for Townhouse Residential". It should read "Standards for townhouse residential and townhouse style residential" I think everybody agrees with this.

Thanks for your work on all of this.

Evan Rowland
227-0741



**Anchorage Chamber of Commerce
Board of Directors
Resolution 2011/12-01
In Support of Title 21 Rewrite Expedited Approval**

WHEREAS, the Title 21 Rewrite project was started in 2002 to implement the citizens' vision for Anchorage's future as presented in the adopted Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, to date, a total of five drafts have been produced. Countless staff and volunteer hours have gone into reviewing and changing the various drafts. The extensive public process has been open to everyone; and

WHEREAS, there have been multiple public hearings at the Planning & Zoning Commission and the Anchorage Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the Assembly's Title 21 Committee thoroughly reviewed, analyzed, and frequently changed drafts of the code; and

WHEREAS, by the summer of 2010, all but one of the fourteen chapters had been "provisionally adopted" by the Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor initiated a review of the Provisionally Adopted Title 21 and the consultant turned in his report in June of 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor proposed amendments to the Provisionally Adopted Title 21 based on the consultant's findings in October 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission closed their public hearings on March 12, 2012; and

WHEREAS, this lengthy process has resulted in a negative impact to business in the following ways:

- 1) The uncertainty of the rules for developers, and
- 2) The requirement that developers, plan reviewers and the planning commission must refer to the current Title 21, the Provisionally Adopted Title 21 and the guidance of the Comprehensive Plan all of which conflict in many cases; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce requests that the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Assembly do all they can to expedite the process to bring the code to adoption as soon as possible.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this resolution be sent to Mayor Dan Sullivan, the Anchorage Assembly, and Anchorage Chamber members.

Approved the 18th day of May, 2012.

Bruce Bustamante
2011-12 Anchorage Chamber Chair

Sami Glascott, MPA
Anchorage Chamber President

Zoning and Platting Cases On-line

View Case Comments

[Submit a Comment](#)

** These comments were submitted by citizens and are part of the public record for the cases **

Questions? If you have questions regarding a case, please contact Zoning at **907-343-7943** or Platting & Variances at **907-343-7942**.

1. **Select a Case:**

2. View Comments:

Case Num: 2011-104

An ordinance amending Title 21 for Title 21 rewrite

Site Address: N/A

Location: Provisionally adopted Title 21 Rewrite Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, and draft Chapter 14, in addition to the Proposed Amendments. *THIS IS NOT A PUBLIC HEARING*

[Details](#) | [Staff Report](#) | [submit a comment](#)

Public Comments

5/21/12

Gary Hickling

15241 Snowflake Dr

Anchorage AK 99516

Little Rabbit Creek is in my back yard. I do not support increasing the creek set back to 50'. That is a lot of land that will become non-usable. Anchorage has a very limited amount of land and this will only make the problem worse.