

Review of Chapter 4
(pages 131 – 178 of T21 Draft 2)

Note: This review is in response to Linda’s email concerning what we want in our Separate Chapter. I believe we will want to do chapters 4-9. I intend to review and comment on each of the five chapters, hopefully one a week. I also believe we need a T21 committee to go over things and come up with our recommendations.

p133. Q: Are these the Zoning Districts we want ? I would include an RL-1 (as mentioned elsewhere) and a new District RL-5, Low-Density Recreational Residential, 5 acres and greater. Also I would combine the Business District and Mixed Use Districts, since the CBD’s allow residential already. This would allow simplification and more diversity within a District (also 3 or 4 fewer zones) and only one Business category. More on this later.

p134. Keep the RL-1 (similar to the old R-5) and possibly the RC as long as we can modify it. Both RL-1 and RC need to be modified to be useful and relevant.

p135. no. 3, I disagree with the statement “... by encouraging residential development to occur at or near zoned densities.” This will force higher density development onto areas that have not developed at “zoned densities.” I would encourage residential development to fit into communities that are already developed. I particularly like items no. 6, 9, and 10. To the description of each zoning district it states “Certain types of non-residential uses, such as ...” we need to add that “home occupations” may be allowed...

p136. The new RM-1 Low-Density Mixed Residential District sounds like trouble because of the mix of housing types from single family to four-plex. Adequate lot size will be necessary to make it work. The RM-2 with 8-plex maximum should be the maximum for all dwellings in CER. And it should be restricted to city or town type development. I would add language from RM-4 (p137) “New development should facilitate strong pedestrian and bicycle connections to nearby city centers and non-residential uses.) Also include part H.2.c. Maintaining Residential Character and Part H.3. District Location Requirement (p137). Districts RM-3 and RM-4 should not be included in the CER Zoning Districts.

p137. Under J.1. for RL-3 (formerly R-9) omit the language “where public sewer and water are unlikely to be provided for a considerable period of time” and futher down omit “at any time.”

p138. Add new RL-5 District. The RL-5 district is intended to provided low density development of residential property located within park lands (in-holdings), to maintain the viability of existing 5 acre or greater residential developments, and to protect critical wildlife habitats. Lettered items from RL-4 (formerly R-10) “a” thru “h” all apply to this district. Also add Item “i” Impacts to existing wildlife corridors and traditional wildlife use areas shall be minimized at all times.

p139. A.3. omit “discourage new strip commercial development.” Especially like A.4. “Minimize traffic congestion and avoid the overloading of public infrastructure and services;”

p140. Neighborhood Commercial District. This is a mixed use district (residential-commercial) It does not allow drive thrus thus making it more exclusive. This is one that I would combine with other business types. Good requirement for arterial or collector road size.

p141. Under the AC District it states “Planning and design shall accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists.” I would make this statement hold for every District. It should be one of the 10 general statements at the beginning of this chapter! Under CBD-1 it states that “the district permits and encourages residential uses.” This is the core downtown district for Anchorage and appears to be mixed use. This is one that could be combined with a mixed use district.

p142. Concerns building tower design...we do not want any towers.

p143. Maximum Height of Structures in CBD Districts. CER needs to establish this height in our document. We do not want bonus points to allow an increase in height. The Table of Design Amenities and Bonus Points for CBD Districts begins at the bottom. I would rather see minimum requirements established for public amenities rather than a complicated system of points.

p144. Bonus point table cont’d.

p145. Bonus point table cont’d.

p146. CBD-2 and CBD-3 are presented. The size of Eagle River’s downtown would probably lend itself to one CBD district which could have mixed use features.

p147. Presents the OC, Office Commercial District. I object to statement G.2.c. Minimum Residential Density “any multiple-family residential uses in the OC district shall have a minimum density of at least 18 units/acre.” I don’t know if we’ll have any OC district in ER but we don’t want any minimum densities.

p148. Under Mixed Use Districts, General. Item Nos. 6 and 8 are critical and probably impossible to achieve considering the nature of mixed use districts. The NMU district (in contrast to the NC district) probably does not apply to CER and should be eliminated.

p149. The CMU (Community Mixed Use) District sound similar to the NC (neighborhood commercial) district and should probably be dropped. My note at the top of the page says “incorporate mixed use into the allowable uses in the CBD’s.”

p150. More on the Mixed Use Districts. Development Standards are referenced to sections in chapter 7. Mixed use districts could disappear into the neighborhood commercial and business district zones.

p151. Section F.2.b. Public Focus Areas. Good section, keep. Section F.2.c.ii. Make the open space incentive a requirement, and not subject to the “private” restriction. F.3. Reduced Parking Ratios just sounds problematic.

p152. ii. Building Placement and Street Setbacks for MU. Sounds like they are established for downtown Anchorage with no allowance for northern city design. Not good for Eagle River. Part F.5. Pedestrian Amenities Required. This concept must be applied to all developments. Part F.5.b.iv. Calls for 1 per cent of the building cost for Art. Any comments ?

p153. F.5.c.ii and iii. Guidelines for the Citing, Construction, and Character of Pedestrian Amenities. KEEP, especially ii and iii. Industrial Districts. OK.

p154. Chugiak-Eagle River Districts. Good purpose/intent statement. Keep RL-1 District (similar to old R-5). Change statement in B.1. to read “This district permits a mobile home dwelling on an individual lot.” Not the plural of dwellings and lots.

p155. B.2.b.i.(A) and (B). Garage and carport sizes are arbitrarily set at 9 percent of the lot size for lot acreage less than 2 acres and not to exceed 8,000 SF for lots of 2 acres or more. Need a better way to address this topic. B.2.b.ii.(C) is a dubious statement about the volume of traffic “than would normally be expected in a residential neighborhood” and could be used against any home business or home occupation. It gives arbitrary power to enforcement.

p156. B.2.b.ii.(D)v. We should have a limit on the number of inoperable vehicles, regardless of screening requirements. Don’t want any junk yards. Part C. Rural Commercial, 2.a. The Open Space requirement should not be waived.

pp157-159. Other Districts. No problems.

pp159-177. Overlay Zoning Districts. At the very bottom of the page in Part A. “The following overlay districts are established”, [add] but are not intended to be an exclusive list. Or words to that effect.

And that’s it for my review of and comments on Chapter 4.

ab

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.