

**From:** Linda Kovac [mailto:lkovac@chugiakcouncil.org]

**Sent:** Friday, March 17, 2006 11:12 AM

**To:** 'tkinney@mtaonline.net'; 'Bill & Dixie Waddell'; 'tlooney@arcticsunengineering.com'; 'barbara wells'; 'King, Steven B.'; 'Bill Schnabel'; 'Tofteberg, Christopher J.'; 'David Beveridge'; 'Keefer, Don'; 'J. Wesley Turner, MD'; 'Jay Marvin'; 'Joel Neimeyer'; 'Mark Musial'; 'Morris, Steve S.'

**Cc:** 'Maricle, Kathleen R.'; 'mertenbj@chugiakcouncil.org'; 'David J. Baldwin'; 'Bill Starr'; 'Robert R Reagan'; 'Brewer, Andrew W POA'

**Subject:** Title 21 Draft #2: R-8 and R-9 Becoming RL-3

In Title 21 Draft #2, existing R-8 and R-9 rural residential zoning districts are both mapped to become the proposed RL-3 zoning district. Please read the two public comments attached.

Do you think that there will be a problem for on-site well and septic systems in the proposed RL-3 zoning district given RL-3's area requirements are proposed to be reduced from both R-8 and R-9?

Thank you for your consideration,  
Linda Kovac, Chugiak, 688-5356

---

---

Existing R-8 Rural Residential Zoning District - Dimensions and Intent:

Minimum area required for 1 dwelling = 217,800 sq ft

Minimum area required for 2 dwellings = 326,700 sq ft

The R-8 district is primarily designed to satisfy the needs of low-density residential development in areas where topographic or other natural conditions are such that higher-density development and the provision of public sewers and water would be unfeasible at any time. In addition to topography, some of the natural conditions which could exist to render land desirable for the densities proposed in this zone are wind hazards, marginal soils, landslide susceptibility, groundwater pollution and groundwater availability. A secondary use of the R-8 district is to allow for low-density residential development in areas where public sewers and water are unlikely to be provided in the foreseeable future and where higher-density development would exceed geological and hydrological capacities for safe and healthful human habitation unless these facilities are provided. An example of such a condition would be where higher-density development in certain water recharge areas, utilizing on-site sewage disposal systems, could pollute the groundwater supply in the immediate areas as well as in areas of lower elevation.

Although the intent of this zone is to establish an average density throughout its area of geographical application which conforms to the lot area requirements above, it is not the intent to establish that density uniformly throughout such areas of application. It is contemplated that there will be parcels in areas zoned R-8 which will have natural characteristics that would allow higher residential densities on those particular parcels with no adverse effect on the surrounding land. In these cases, the use of development techniques, such as clustering of lots of dwelling units, is accepted as being a permitted form of development. Where proposed development differs from the norm established in the specific requirements of this zone the planned unit development procedure will be the tool to be utilized in petitioning for the development pattern desired.

---

---

Existing R-9 Rural Residential Zoning District - Dimensions and Intent:

Minimum area required for 1 dwelling = 108,900 sq ft

Minimum area required for 2 dwellings = 163,350 sq ft

The R-9 district is designed to satisfy the needs for low-density residential development in areas where public sewers and water are unlikely to be provided for a considerable period of time or

where topographic or other natural conditions are such that higher-density development and the provision of public sewers and water would be unfeasible at any time. In the first instance, where public facilities may be provided in the distant future, the regulations are written to ensure that development during the interim period does not exceed geological and hydrological capacities for safe and healthful maintenance of human habitation, while still allowing for the maintenance of a rural lifestyle. In the second instance, where natural conditions would make higher densities and the provision of public facilities unfeasible, the regulations would fill a need on those lands where the application of R-6 zoning would be inadequate for the characteristics of the land, while R-8 zoning would be too restrictive. Application of the R-9 zoning district most probably in these instances would include lands which have hazards from the standpoint of water recharge areas, steep slopes, wind hazard and marginal soil conditions. In many cases, this zone would be applied to lands which have, without zoning, been developed at these standards.

Although the intent of this zone is to establish an average density throughout its area of application which conforms to the lot area requirements above, it is not necessarily the intent to establish that density uniformly throughout such areas of application. Where proposed development differs from the norm established in the specific requirements of this zone, the planned unit development procedure will be the tool utilized in petitioning for the development pattern desired.

---

---

Proposed RL-3 Rural Residential Zoning District - Dimensions and Intent:

Minimum area required for 1 dwelling = 87,120 sq ft

Minimum area required for 2 dwellings = 130,680 sq ft

The RL-3 district is intended primarily for low-density residential development in areas where public sewer and water are unlikely to be provided for a considerable period of time or where topographic or other natural conditions are such that higher-density development and the provision of public sewers and water would be unfeasible at any time. Where public facilities may be provided in the distant future, the regulations are intended to ensure that development during the interim period does not exceed geological and hydrological capacities for safe and healthful maintenance of human habitation. Certain types of non-residential uses, such as governmental, educational, religious, or recreational uses, may be allowed subject to restrictions intended to preserve and protect the residential character of the district.

---

---

Public Comment 1:

March 8, 2004

Attn: Mr. Dave Tremont

Subject: Title 21 Update, Module Two, Districts and Uses, Public Draft: January 2004

Dear Mr. Tremont;

In reviewing the subject material, we noticed that it is proposed to consolidate the existing R-8 district into R-9. This would have the effect of decreasing the minimum required lot size for developments high on the hillside (in areas presently zoned R-8) from 5 acres to 2-1/2 acres.

We live just below Glen Alps on a five-acre lot, in an area zoned R-8. We also own about 22-acres adjacent to and east of us in Section 30 (Glen Alps). When we bought this property, we understood that the reason for R-8 zoning and the five-acre lot requirement was to keep the density of septic tanks to an acceptable level consistent with thinner soils and percolation problems frequently encountered high on the hillside. We see nothing that has really changed in the last twenty years to alleviate these concerns.

There is still a substantial amount of acreage in the Glen Alps area that probably will be developed over the next twenty years. This includes the 160-acre Tabbytite native allotment. Allowing these parcels to be developed on 2-1/2 acre lots as opposed to 5-acre lots will just about double the number of septic tanks and water wells on this high plateau. There are many springs on the slopes below Glen Alps, along the north side of Rabbit Creek Canyon, not to mention all of the water wells that supply the residents of the canyon area. Our concern is for the quality of water coming from our wells and from the springs.

We feel that there is good justification for retaining the 5-acre lot requirement for development on the higher slopes and plateaus of the hillside. It appears to us that there are several ways in which this might be addressed with minor additions to the Title 21 Update. We do feel very strongly about this and are in the process of reviewing this issue with our neighbors. We appreciate your consideration of our views.

M.L. (Pete) Woodson  
Georgia B. Woodson

Cc: Glen Alps Community Council  
councils@alaska.net

---

---

Public Comment 2:

---

---

I would like to let you know that I and many other members of the Glen Alps Community Council oppose the elimination of R-8 zoning in the Title 21 Rewrite Module 2 draft. We believe that the increased density allowance from a minimum lot size of 5 acres to 2.5 acres would degrade the rural character of the areas currently zoned as R-8. These areas have very little tree coverage which would have a high visual impact with the higher density housing. Some members are also concerned with the water quality and wastewater impacts that the higher density housing would impose. The current R-8 zoned areas are located in an alpine environment that has thin soil coverage, seepage issues, and all the wells intercept bedrock fractures. There must have been good reasoning to originally zone those areas as 5 acre minimum lot size; what is the reasoning to reduce the lot size now? Did the consultants from Clarion even visit those areas to determine the impacts of higher density housing? Has an engineer been consulted to determine what impacts the higher density septic systems will have on water quality and surface runoff of the surrounding residences? I have neither seen nor heard of any justification for the elimination of R-8 zoning as it now stands from the Anchorage Citizens Coalition workshops.

Mike Hendee  
Glen Alps Community Council  
mhendee@lcmf.com

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.  
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.