

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

Multi-purpose Room
Gruening Middle School
9601 Lee Street
Eagle River, Alaska

**MINUTES OF
September 18, 2006
6:30 PM**

Due to traffic delays, the meeting began at 7:10 PM.

A. ROLL CALL

Present Toni Jones, Vice Chair
Art Isham
Lamar Cotten
Cycelia Gumennik
Nancy Pease
VACANCY
VACANCY

Excused Thomas Vincent Wang
Bill Wielechowski

Staff Cathy Hammond
Van Le
Vivian Underwood
Jon Spring

VICE CHAIR JONES explained that municipal regulations state that any action by the Commission require a favorable vote of a majority of the fully constituted Commission, except when others may be excused due to conflicts voiced during disclosure. Therefore, an affirmative vote by 5 of the 5 members present at this meeting is necessary for the approval of any action.

B. MINUTES – None

C. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Disclosures

COMMISSIONER ISHAM requested that members make disclosures regarding items on this evening's agenda.

VICE CHAIR JONES noted that she was excused from the case addressed by Resolution 2006-051, therefore there is not a quorum to act on that item this evening.

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Resolutions for Approval: 2006-051 (case 2006-074)

COMMISSIONER ISHAM asked whether action could be taken on Resolution 2006-051, given that there is not a quorum. MS. HAMMOND confirmed that the item would need to be postponed to the next meeting. COMMISSIONER ISHAM asked whether this would be provided to the Assembly without the Commission's approval. MS. HAMMOND stated that the resolution would be provided to the Assembly as a draft. COMMISSIONER ISHAM indicated this resolution would be postponed to the next regular meeting.

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ACTIONS ON PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. 2006-069** Municipality of Anchorage. Action on the *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan Update*.

NOTE: An abridged copy of the Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan Update Issue-Response Summary dated August 14, 2006 is attached to these minutes as Appendix A. The Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan Update Issue-Response Summary Addendum dated August 21, 2006 is attached to these minutes in its entirety.

VICE CHAIR JONES indicated the public hearing on this item was concluded on September 11, 2006 and action was postponed to this evening.

COMMISSIONER ISHAM moved to convene a Committee of the Whole to address the Issue-Response Summaries. COMMISSIONER COTTEN seconded.

AYE: Cotten, Gumennik, Jones, Isham, Pease

NAY: None

PASSED

COMMISSIONER ISHAM explained he had distributed a document that outlines five categories into which he has divided the Issue-Response items. The categories are: A. Accept completely; B. Accept partially; C. Consider for future Chugiak-Eagle River Title 21 Chapter; D. Consider for next rewrite or amendment of various planning documents; and E. Do not accept.

COMMISSIONER COTTEN asked if Commissioner Isham's recommendations are in response to the Department's responses.

COMMISSIONER ISHAM noted that he attempted to organize the items in the Issue-Response to which the Department responded.

August 14, 2006 Issue-Response Summary

A. Accept completely

COMMISSIONER ISHAM reviewed the Issue-Response document dated August 14, 2006 (Appendix A). Items to be accepted completely are items 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 24, 38, 39, 42, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, and 55.

4. Issue: Comprehensive Plan Authority

- There remain questions as to what sections become mandatory when the Comprehensive Plan Update is adopted by the Assembly and what sections are merely plans to be used as guides by the Planning Department. The term "shall" is used in areas of the plan when, if the section is not mandatory, it is an incorrect use of the term. There is a need for a good editing job before the plan is finalized as the terms vary from shall, require, and ensure with no clear meaning as to the intent of the terms from one statement to another.

COMMISSIONER ISHAM recommended that the Department response be ***accepted***. The Department agrees that the use of "should" and "shall" statements is inconsistent in the Plan Update as it was in the 1993 Plan, and may cause confusion as to the actual intent of statements in the Guidelines for Growth. Most statements in the Guidelines begin with action words, such as develop, preserve, require, support, protect, etc. One way to provide consistency throughout this chapter would be to begin all statements with action words. This approach would allow implementation actions to be

prioritized through the Plan's implementation schedule rather than debate about the weight of words like should, shall, ensure, etc.

The authority of the Comprehensive Plan is established by AMC 21.05.020 which states that "the purpose of the comprehensive plan is to set forth the goals, objectives and policies governing the future land use development of the Municipality that guide the Assembly in taking legislative action to implement the plan." This applies to the overall Municipal Comprehensive Plan, which includes the *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan*. The Department further recommends adding the following to the chapter introduction on page 29: "The policies and strategies in this chapter will guide municipal actions and resource commitments needed to implement the *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan Update*."

COMMISSIONER COTTEN wondered whether it would be more efficient to take action to approve those items with which Commissioner Isham agrees with the Department's recommendation. COMMISSIONER ISHAM listed the items with which he has proposed agreement to the Department's position. COMMISSIONER COTTEN noted that many of these items were the Department's responses to community council input.

There were no objections to accepting the Department's recommendations on Items 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 24, 38, 39, 42, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, and 55.

B. Accept partially

Items to be accepted partially are items 8, 12, 35, and 41.

MS. HAMMOND asked whether, if the Department's response was to concur with a comment, a partial acceptance refers to accepting the Department's response. COMMISSIONER ISHAM responded in the affirmative, giving the example of item 8 in which the Department agrees to the first bullet but not the second. MS. HAMMOND suggested that Commissioner Isham review the items in which he did not concur with the Department's recommendation.

8. Issue: Growth Objectives/Small Town Character

- Change Objective 2.f. on page 35 to “Maintain the area’s small town character and, where appropriate, rural lifestyle.” As written in the Plan Update, this sentence could be interpreted to mean that some of the area’s small town lifestyle could be inappropriate and, therefore, might not be maintained in the future. (*Chugiak Community Council, Eagle River Community Council*)
- Change Objective 2.f. on page 35 to “Maintain the area’s small town feel, and continue to provide for those desiring a rural lifestyle.” (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: Planning concurs with the first bullet.

COMMISSIONER PEASE noted she was concerned with regard to Item 8 that the revised language was open in terms of determining where rural lifestyle was appropriate; she asked if it would be better tied to a density. She proposed the language read, “Maintain the area’s small town character and, in lower density residential areas, rural lifestyle.” MS. HAMMOND explained this clarification was suggested by two community councils that also sat on the Citizens Advisory Committee. The concern was that the phrase “where appropriate” was not located properly in the sentence. She added that their concern with rural lifestyle was tied to more than residential density. COMMISSIONER PEASE agreed to not make a change to this item.

There was agreement to accept the Department’s recommendation for items 8, 12, 35 and 41 in Appendix A.

C. Consider for Future Chugiak-Eagle River Title 21 Chapter
Items to be considered for consideration in the future Chugiak-Eagle River Title 21 chapter were items 5, 11, 14, 21, 22, and 29.

5. Issue: Steep Slope Protection

- On page 31, change Objective 2.d. to “Protect areas with slopes of 20 percent or greater” instead of 25 percent. This matches the Title 21 Review Draft #2 (21.07.020C) definition of a steep slope as a slope that is 20 percent (11 degrees) or greater. (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: Planning recommends the definition of steep slope be reviewed with development of the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak–Eagle River. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **concurred** with this recommendation.

COMMISSIONER COTTEN understood that Commissioner Isham’s recommendations on items 5, 11, 14, 21, 22, and 29 concur with the Department’s recommendations. COMMISSIONER ISHAM stated this is correct.

COMMISSIONER PEASE asked, given the uncertainty regarding the timing for the Title 21 Rewrite, does this recommendation hold. MS. HAMMOND stated the Chugiak Eagle River Consortium has a State grant to hire someone to draft this chapter of Title 21 for Chugiak-Eagle River. That effort is underway.

11. Issue: Maximum Height for Downtown Commercial Structures

Response: As the Comprehensive Plan Update is intended to be a more generalized plan, the specific issue of height restriction in the downtown would be better addressed in the upcoming overlay district plan or in the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River.

COMMISSIONER ISHAM **recommended that the issue of height restriction in downtown be addressed in the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River.**

14. Issue: Removal of Snow and Ice from Sidewalks

Response: This issue can be addressed in the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **concurred** with this recommendation.

21. Issue: Responsibility for Over Sizing Drainage Facilities

Response: Planning recommends this issue be addressed in the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River or as an amendment to Title 21 Subdivision Standards: Improvements. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **recommended that this issue be addressed in the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River.**

22. Issue: Responsibility for Required Improvements

Response: New language will be proposed in the next draft of the Title 21 Rewrite to address this issue, based on comments from Citizen Advisory Committee members and from municipal staff. COMMISSIONER ISHAM ***concurred*** with this recommendation.

29. Issue: Amending the Land Use Plan Map

Response: The Department acknowledges that the Land Use Plan Map will provide direction for the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River and for implementation of other recommendations in the Plan Update. COMMISSIONER ISHAM felt the Commission should ***recommend that there be wording in the chapter that provides linkage between the Map and the actual development of the Plan.***

COMMISSIONER COTTEN asked whether Commissioner Isham has divided responses into various categories, but essentially he is largely in agreement with the Department's recommendation and perhaps it would be more efficient to discuss those items with which Commissioner Isham is not in agreement with the Department's recommendation. COMMISSIONER ISHAM wished to ensure that everyone has an opportunity to make comment. COMMISSIONER COTTEN agreed with this sentiment and did not believe his suggestion was in conflict with that. VICE CHAIR JONES felt it was beneficial to have a clear record of the Commission's actions. She noted that over time it becomes difficult to track the documents, such as the Issue-Response, and this review and action will provide a record of the Commission's decision-making.

D. Consider for next rewrite or amendment of various planning documents

Items to consider with the future rewrite of various plans were items 1, 2, 3, 18, 23, 27, and 40.

1. Issue: No Vision Statement

Response: Planning suggests a community vision can be distilled from the Plan Update and pursued as an amendment at a later date. Or a new vision could be developed during the next complete rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan. COMMISSIONER ISHAM ***concurred*** with this recommendation.

2. Issue: No Long-Range Growth Scenarios

Response: Growth alternatives can be drafted and considered when the next complete rewrite of the *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan* is scheduled. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **concurred** with this recommendation.

3. Issue: No definitions for Urban, Suburban or Rural

Response: Planning feels the definitions of the terms urban, suburban, and rural can be subjective. This Update builds on the 1993 Comprehensive Plan, which built on the 1979 Comprehensive Plan. The 1979 Plan tied these terms to density and development areas. COMMISSIONER ISHAM felt the Commission should recommend that definitions be developed for the next complete rewrite of the *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan*. He noted regarding Item 3 that the issue of defining urban, suburban and rural is not confined to Eagle River.

COMMISSIONER PEASE asked whether these definitions could be included in the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River. COMMISSIONER ISHAM questioned whether these definitions should be in regulation versus the *Comprehensive Plan*, which is more conceptual. COMMISSIONER PEASE agreed that this belongs in a conceptual document such as the *Comprehensive Plan*. VICE CHAIR JONES asked whether this issue could be addressed during development of the Land Use Plan Map. MS. HAMMOND responded that the Department tied the terms more to density ranges. She noted that the Title 21 Rewrite references to urban, suburban and rural are suggested for removal. There is no recommendation to show an urban/ suburban boundary in the *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan*; the Land Use Plan Map will show residential densities. COMMISSIONER PEASE encouraged that there be reference to these terms in Title 21. She recommended that the Commission commit to defining these terms either with the *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan* or the Title 21 chapter. COMMISSIONER ISHAM was concerned that there is not an opportunity at this point for public input into any definitions that might be proposed. He suggested that this might be handled as a future amendment to the *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan*. COMMISSIONER PEASE agreed that it would be awkward to develop definitions at this point, given that the public hearing is closed. She suggested that these terms be defined and given public review in the near-term. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **recommended that definitions of urban, suburban and rural be added as an amendment to the Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan.**

18. Issue: Planning for New Trails

Response: An update of the Areawide Trails Plan, which includes Chugiak-Eagle River, is underway, and planning for new trails in Chugiak-Eagle River will be addressed in the trails plan component. COMMISSIONER ISHAM ***concurred*** with this recommendation.

23. Issue: Traffic Congestion

Response: Congestion at the intersections of Old Glenn and Artillery Road, Old Glenn and Monte Road, and at Old Glenn Rachel/Snow Machine Drive and other intersections is being addressed in the 2006 Chugiak-Eagle River LRTP Update. COMMISSIONER ISHAM ***concurred*** with this recommendation.

27. Issue: Energy Component

Response: An energy component to address energy needs and alternative energy should be considered in the future plans on a municipal-wide basis. COMMISSIONER ISHAM ***concurred*** with this recommendation.

40. Issue: Rural / Suburban / Urban Boundary

Response: The level of specificity created by rural/suburban/urban boundary lines is not part of the scope of the Plan Update. COMMISSIONER ISHAM ***suggested that this issue be dealt with either at the next Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan Update or at the same time as definitions for rural, suburban, and urban.***

E. Do not accept

Items to not be accepted were items 19, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 43, 44, 47, 48 and 53.

19. Issue: Neighborhood Connectivity

This issue deals with Objective 2.g. on page 53 and Objective 2.h. on page 53.

Response: The recommendation of the Birchwood Community Council is to delete “provide” and insert “investigate” in Objective 2.g. Objective 2.g. states that connectivity of local roads would be provided “where appropriate.” Planning does not support this change. The request by the Birchwood Community Council was to delete Objective 2.h in its entirety, however, Objective 2.h. provides direction to transportation planning for the

community. The issue of connectivity is being addressed in the 2006 Chugiak–Eagle River Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update. Planning does not support either suggested change. COMMISSIONER ISHAM *concurred* with the Department's recommendation.

25. Issue: Residential Lighting Requirements

Response: Street lighting is required for subdivisions in urban areas, but not in suburban and rural areas. (Improvement areas are defined by zoning district in 21.85.020). If the intent of the suggested new objective and policy/strategy is to prevent street lighting from being required in rural areas, then the changes are not needed as current code provides for this already. COMMISSIONER ISHAM *concurred* with the Department's recommendation.

COMMISSIONER PEASE was not aware whether there is flexibility to opt out of street lighting. In the Anchorage Bowl, street lighting has sometimes been waived in order to retain rural character. COMMISSIONER ISHAM explained that he is familiar with a process that requires a high percentage of residents agreeing to provide street lighting. COMMISSIONER PEASE understood the concern is to not have lighting on rural roads, with which she was sympathetic. She felt that it would be desirable to allow neighborhoods to opt out of street lighting requirements. MS. LE stated that street lighting is not required in rural areas. Street lighting can be provided, if the neighborhood wants it, as Commissioner Isham noted.

26. Issue: Existing Street Light Service Area

- (1) Response to Policy/Strategy 3.c. (1) on page 55 requiring developer to petition to annex a subdivision into an existing street light service area as one option: Code does not allow this unless a developer assumes responsibility for present and future payment under the Street Light Service Area concept. This is a local utility requirement and under MOA street light service areas.

Response: The Department is not aware that this is a code requirement.

- (2) There is an existing street light service area for Eagle River to provide for maintenance and operation of street lights in the area (AMC 27.30.560). The section proposed in the Guidelines (page 55) requiring maintenance is redundant in light of the code requirement.

Response: There may be some redundancy in the language, but the Guidelines provide direction should changes to current procedures be considered in the future.

COMMISSIONER ISHAM *concurred* with the Department's recommendations.

28. Issue: Intent of Land Use Plan Map

The proposal is to finalize the Title 21 regulations before implementation of the Land Use Plan Map.

Response: Planning does not support delaying approval of the Land Use Plan Map pending development of draft land use regulations for Chugiak-Eagle River. The Land Use Plan Map is generalized and, once adopted, will provide direction for the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River and for implementation of other recommendations in the Plan Update. COMMISSIONER ISHAM *concurred* with the Department's recommendation.

30. Issue: Maximum Residential Density

The proposal is to eliminate the proposed density of 16-35 DUA and change 11-15 DUA to 11-20 DUA so the density is capped at 20 dwelling units per acre.

Response: Planning recommends the Residential 16-35 DUA classification for the areas shown on the Land Use Plan Map. The classification reflects existing zoning and development patterns, as well as goals and objectives of the Plan Update. COMMISSIONER ISHAM *concurred* with the Department's recommendation.

31. Issue: Reduce Residential Density in Eagle River Valley

- Reduce the density from the 3-6 dwellings per acre to 1 dwelling per acre along all sections of Eagle River Road and Eagle River Loop Road for all new subdivision plats.

Response: The 3-6 DUA designation on the Land Use Plan Map reflects existing development patterns and existing zoning in Eagle River Valley on the south side of Eagle River Road. COMMISSIONER ISHAM *concurred* with the Department's recommendation.

32. Issue: Avoid Downsizing Residential Density

- Some areas, especially R-7, are showing lower density because of the lot size requirement for on-site well and septic. If zoning is changed to reflect lower density, it will be uneconomic to extend public sewer for higher density if it is available in the future.

Response: There are properties on the Land Use Plan Map that are zoned R-7 that are in areas with public utilities and in areas without. The recommendations on the map are based on existing density and development patterns, and on areas that may receive public sewer within the 20-year time frame of the Plan Update. Planning does not recommend a change. COMMISSIONER ISHAM ***concurred*** with the Department's recommendation.

33. Issue: Number of Residential Classifications

- There is a concern about the increased number of residential classifications on the draft Plan Land Use Plan Map.

Response: The 1993 Comprehensive Plan had 5 residential density classifications. The 2006 Plan Update has 6 residential density categories. The highest density category in 1993 was >10. The 2006 Update proposes two categories, 11-15 DUA and 16-35 DUA, rather than >10, to reflect existing conditions. COMMISSIONER ISHAM ***concurred*** with the Department's recommendation.

36. Issue: Eklutna 770 Area Classification

- Add a note to the Land Use Plan Map for this area: "For the Eklutna 770 area, residential areas of greater density shall be clustered around the south side of the Eklutna 770 property near the commercial center."

Response: An area-specific master planning process will determine residential density, and commercial and industrial areas. Planning does not support adding the proposed note to the Land Use Plan Map. COMMISSIONER ISHAM ***concurred*** with the Department's recommendation.

37. Issue: Development Reserve Classification for Powder Reserve Tract B

- This area is unsuitable for development and especially more dense, higher dwelling ratio/acre, due to multiple and varied maneuvers typically occurring day and night on base, including excessive noise, ammunitions discharge and dust from military activities including digital multi-purpose on training range, landing and firings on ranges in area, heavy artillery and airborne drops in drop zone.

Response: There is a concern about potential incompatibilities between programmed military activities and future residential development in some areas of Tract B of the Powder Reserve. Planning recommends this area remain Development Reserve, but the definition of this classification on pages 70-71 should be expanded to include the following: “This classification includes Tract B in the western portion of the Powder Reserve, adjacent to Fort Richardson Military Reservation. Master planning in this area should provide for low-intensity development to avoid potential conflicts with programmed military activities.”

MS. LE noted that the Commission was provided this evening with a memorandum with the language proposed during the September 11, 2006 hearing regarding Tract B of the Powder Reserve. The Department wants to expand the definition to state: “This classification includes Tract B in the western portion of the Powder Reserve, adjacent to Fort Richardson Military Reservation. Master planning for development in this area should take into account programmed military activities to avoid potential conflicts.”

Additional information was received from the military in response to Eklutna Inc.'s comments referencing the map that Eklutna provided, Figure 3.16.d indicating that the map shows existing noise contours. In the military's EIS Figures 4.16. and 4.16.e show the future noise contours. Expanding military programming for the next 30 years required this EIS, which shows that the noise areas are larger than what exist today. The September 15, 2006 email from the military states that future expanded military activities will include Zone II and Zone III noise levels that may impact future development adjacent to Fort Richardson. While the map does not show the noise levels extending beyond the military boundary, the executive summary states that sound may travel beyond the boundaries of the military land. Modeling has shown that it might go between 2,500 acres and 3,500 acres beyond military activities on military land.

COMMISSIONER PEASE felt the language recommended by Staff is advisable, but does not impose conditions at this point.

There was concurrence to expanding the definition of the Development Reserve classification for Powder Reserve Tract B on

pages 70-71 to include the following: "This classification includes Tract B in the western portion of the Powder Reserve, adjacent to Fort Richardson Military Reservation. Master planning for development in this area should take into account programmed military activities to avoid potential conflicts."

43. Issue: Town Center Boundary

- Reserve the area immediately south of the Eagle River High School for additional school parking that will be needed in the future.

Response: The Eagle River Central Business District (CBD) boundary is defined in the 2003 Revitalization Plan, whereas the "Town Center" is a proposed land use classification on the Land Use Plan Map primarily intended for existing commercially-zoned areas in downtown Eagle River. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **concurred** with the Department's recommendation.

44. Issue: Town Center Classification

The request is to delete "Town Center" as a separate classification, but include as an additional description under "Commercial" and to reserve the option of mixed use where sections of the downtown may be developed or redeveloped.

Response: Planning recommends the Town Center classification as proposed in the Plan Update. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **concurred** with the Department's recommendation.

47. Issue: Map Symbols, Eklutna 770 and Powder Reserve

- (1) What is depicted for Eklutna 770 is not reflected in other documents such as the 2005 Water Master Plan by AWWU. However, Eklutna does not have an approved Master Plan for this area.

Response: An update of the 1995 AWWU Wastewater Master Plan is underway and sewer service to the 770 is proposed in the 20-year horizon of the Plan. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **concurred** with the Department's recommendation.

- (2) Eklutna has consistently asked for and received more intense development than depicted in their Master Plan for the Powder Reserve and this trend should be reflected on the Land Use Plan Map.

Response: Eklutna, Inc. has recently submitted a revised master plan for Tract A of the Powder Reserve depicting an overall residential density of 3-6 du/a which reflects the recommendation of the draft Land Use Plan Map. The Master Plan requires approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Assembly. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **concurred** with the Department's recommendation.

48. Issue: Map Symbol, Intermodal Transit Facility (page 72)

- Clarify the depiction of an intermodal transit facility in downtown Eagle River and on Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC) holdings that divide Eklutna's two residential tracts.

Response: The Plan recognizes the possible future expansion of transit services in the downtown area. The Intermodal Transit Facility depicted on Tract C owned by ARRC in the Powder Reserve identifies a potential future transit service center that could include a future commuter railway station. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **concurred** with the Department's recommendation.

53. Issue: Time Frame for Chugiak - Eagle River Title 21 Chapter

- Change the schedule to include a separate chapter in Title 21 for Chugiak-Eagle River from one to five years to one to three years.

Response: Planning does not believe the change is needed. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **concurred** with the Department's recommendation.

34. Issue: Spring Brook Drive Vacant Industrial Land

COMMISSIONER ISHAM explained that he did not make a recommendation on Item 34, which deals with the Spring Brook Drive industrial land. There is a request that some of this land be rezoned for high-end residential and other requests that it remain industrial. He asked for Staff comment. MS.

HAMMOND explained that the Department was attempting to take into account the I-1 and I-2 zoned areas. The Department suggested that the I-2 zoned area on Eagle River Loop Road could be considered appropriate as meeting the residential location criteria for residential 11-15 DUA. The Department's recommendation is that the I-1 area remain industrial and that the I-2 area be considered for change to residential 11-15 DUA. There is

not an industrial land demand analysis to provide information about what is an appropriate amount of industrial land for this area. There is a concern in the community to keep some industrially zoned land in the downtown area. Approximately 250 acres of new industrial is proposed on the Land Use Plan Map, but most of that is near the Birchwood Airport.

VICE CHAIR JONES remarked that she is ambivalent to placing a classification particularly on land that will accommodate infill development. She stated she would be more comfortable seeing a proposal for rezoning come forward and consider the request at that time. She suggested that Item 34 might be one to send forward if the Commission does not have a specific recommendation. COMMISSIONER ISHAM agreed that it would be *appropriate to leave the I-1 and I-2 zoning categories as they exist and if there is a desire to rezone to residential, that petition can be made.*

There was concurrence with the recommendations made by Commissioner Isham in relation to the August 14, 2006 Issue-Response.

August 21, 2006 Issue-Response Summary

A. Accept Completely

Items to accept completely were items 2, 8a and 10.

There were no objections to accepting the Department recommendation in items 2, 8a and 10.

B. Accept Partially

Items to accept partially were item 8b.

There was no objection to accepting the Department recommendation in item 8b.

C. Consider for Future Chugiak-Eagle River Title 21 Chapter

There were no items to consider in the Chugiak-Eagle River Title 21 Chapter.

D. Consider for next rewrite or amendment of various planning documents

Items to consider in the next complete rewrite of various plans were items 4a, 4b, 6, and 8d.

Issue 4a

- A proposed interchange midway between the South Birchwood interchange and the North Birchwood interchange should be represented on the map. This area could accommodate a “commercial” node of approximately 40 acres. Additionally, an interchange at this location will better serve development on either side of the Glenn Highway.

Response: The 2006 Draft LRTP Update identifies this corridor as a potential Study Area . The exact location and size of this area is to be determined through an area-specific master planning process for the property. Planning recommends the proposal for a 40-acre commercial node be considered during that process. COMMISSIONER ISHAM *concurred* with the Department’s recommendation.

Issue 4b

- The area along the Old Glenn Highway, approximately midway north-south, has industrial directly across the street. Due to the need to provide approximate amounts of industrial land that is well located for access, approximately 120 acres are identified for potential industrial use. This area would be developed as independent 40-acre industrial parks, buffered from the Old Glenn Highway and residential properties. The independent nodes control the size and accommodate phasing with demand, as the community continues to grow.

Response: Planning recommends the proposal for industrial use be considered during an area-specific master planning process for the 770. COMMISSIONER ISHAM *concurred* with the Department’s recommendation.

Issue 6

- The small triangle shaped parcel north of the North Birchwood access is identified as residential less than 1 DUA. This property is a great location for a recreational vehicle park, adjacent to Peters Creek. It would need to be identified as “Commercial” to accommodate this.

Response: Planning believes this would be better addressed as a future Land Use Plan Map amendment, when more information is available to review and consider. COMMISSIONER ISHAM *concurred* with the Department’s recommendation.

Issue 8d

- Identify a 40-80 (acre) industrial park site, north of Eklutna Road, east of the Glenn Highway.

Response: Planning recommends that this can be addressed as an amendment to the Land Use Plan Map when more information is available. COMMISSIONER ISHAM ***concurred*** with the Department's recommendation.

There was no objection to accepting the Department recommendation in items 4a, 4b, 6, and 8d.

E. Do Not Accept

Items to not accept were items 1, 3, 4c, 5, 7, 8c, and 9.

Issue 1

- Clarify in the Plan narrative that “natural resource extraction” and “commercial recreation” uses are permitted conditional uses within the Development Reserve land use designations.

Response: Development Reserve is not a zoning district but a land use classification that allows large-lot, single-family residential by right. Any other development requires a master planning process with proposed rezonings to active development districts. The property is zoned PC, Planned Community, and T, Transition. Without a master plan, the PC-zoned area is restricted to uses and regulations of the R-8 rural residential district. The Transition district allows natural resource extraction as a conditional use. Planning does not recommend the change. COMMISSIONER ISHAM ***concurred*** with the Department's recommendation.

Issue 3

- Identify the area southwest of the Birchwood Airport as a dual designation --industrial and transportation related.

Response: The Land Use Plan Map reflects expansion plans for the Birchwood Airport based on information from Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facility's 20-year Airport Master Plan. Planning does not recommend

the change. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **concurred** with the Department's recommendation.

Issue 4c

- The residential density of the "770" is depicted as 1-2 DUA. This area will be served by sewer and water which suggests a higher density of development is appropriate. The total number of dwelling units should be calculated on a gross basis with the clear allowance for clustered development at higher densities.

Response: The 1-2 DUA represents an overall average density for the Eklutna 770. The public master planning process will allow higher density in cluster developments. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **concurred** with the Department's recommendation.

Issue 5

- The old trailer park adjacent to the Chugiak Senior Center is currently depicted as residential, less than 1 DUA. This area should be able to be developed in a similar fashion or density as the Senior Center. The density should be modified to 16-35 DUA.

Response: The designation for this area is <1-1 DUA and provides for large-lot residences in a rural environment. The 16-35 DUA residential classification is for areas near downtown Eagle River, areas adjacent to designated intermodal transit stations, areas served by public sewer and water, and areas with an established multi-family housing development pattern and zoning. Planning does not recommend this change. COMMISSIONER ISHAM **concurred** with the Department's recommendation.

Issue 7

- Parcel "C" of the Powder Reserve is identified as Transportation-related. It may be more appropriate to identify this as "Development Reserve," requiring a Master Plan prior to any future development.

Response: The property is owned by the Alaska Railroad (ARRC). If a land transfer occurs in the future between Eklutna, Inc., and the ARRC, the Land Use Plan Map can be amended to reflect the change in ownership and land use classification. Planning does not recommend this change.

COMMISSIONER ISHAM *concurred* with the Department's recommendation.

Issue 8c

- Clarify that the area identified as commercial between the Old and New Glenn Highways can be utilized as a staging, loading and conveyor uses, as conditional uses.

Response: The Land Use Plan Map recommends generalized land use classifications. Specific permitted uses are determined by zoning districts. The ancillary uses listed above are not allowed in the B-3 zoning district, which is the current zoning for this property. If this is the intended use for this land, a rezoning would need to take place. COMMISSIONER ISHAM *concurred* with the Department's recommendation.

Issue 9

- Eklutna has land located at Hiland Road and Eagle River Loop Road that is currently designated residential, less than 1 DUA. Given its proximity, physical conditions and potential to be served by public sewer and water, it is appropriate to modify this area to residential at a density of 3-6 DUA.

Response: This land has slopes from 25 percent to 45 percent and is marginally suited for development. It is currently zoned R-1A SL but it should remain <1 DUA on the Land Use Plan Map. COMMISSIONER ISHAM *concurred* with the Department's recommendation.

There was concurrence with the recommendations made by Commissioner Isham in relation to the August 21, 2006 Issue-Response.

COMMISSIONER ISHAM moved to adjourn the Committee of the Whole.
COMMISSIONER COTTEN seconded.

AYE: Cotten, Gumennik, Jones, Isham, Pease
NAY: None

PASSED

COMMISSIONER ISHAM moved for approval of the *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan* dated April 2006 subject to the changes agreed to in the Committee of a Whole for the 8/14/06 and 8/21/06 Issue-Response Summaries. COMMISSIONER COTTEN seconded.

COMMISSIONER ISHAM supported his motion finding that the community has worked to develop the *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan Update* to reflect what exists in the community and changes needed in the future. He adopted the findings made by the Committee of the Whole.

AYE: Cotten, Gumennik, Jones, Isham, Pease

NAY: None

PASSED

F. REGULAR AGENDA

~~G. PUBLIC HEARINGS~~

~~1. 2006-092~~

~~AMATS/Traffic Department - Municipality of Anchorage. Chugiak-Eagle River Long-Range Transportation Plan 2006 Update.~~

~~Staff member VIVIAN UNDERWOOD explained that the Chugiak-Eagle River Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is a tool to plan for needed transportation improvements for roads, trails and transit over the next 20 years. It reflects community values, gained through the *Comprehensive Plan* and public comment. She commented that the LRTP must be fiscally constrained based on the amount of funding that can be realistically anticipated in the next 20 years. It also recommends updates to the Official Streets & Highways (OS&HP) Plan Map, which designates streets, highways, and functional classifications. There was significant public involvement with this Update. There were three public meetings held in the spring in conjunction with the *Comprehensive Plan*. Many of the comments from that process have been woven into the Update. A Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was formed comprised of representatives from community councils, the Road Board, Eklutna Inc., and the Parks & Recreation Department. She also attended a public hearing for People Mover. The Anchorage Pedestrian Plan also began in the spring and there have been two public meetings for that. An internal review draft of the LRTP was distributed to the CAC for comment and she prepared~~

APPENDIX A
CHUGIAK-EAGLE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
ISSUE - RESPONSE SUMMARY (ABRIDGED)
AUGUST 14, 2006

Plan Update Process

1. Issue: No Vision Statement

- A vision statement for Chugiak-Eagle River should be developed prior to adapting any Title 21 land use regulations to Chugiak-Eagle River. Once the vision statement has been developed, the Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan Update should be amended to include it. (*Chugiak Community Council, Birchwood Community Council*)
- A vision statement should be written and included in the C-ER Comprehensive Plan. (*Eagle River Community Council*)

Response: Development of a comprehensive plan often includes creating a vision that identifies what the community wants to become and how it wants to look. The 1993 *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan* (C-ER Plan) did not include a defined community vision, although guidance for one was woven throughout the Guidelines for Growth and other parts of the Plan. The 2006 Plan Update focuses on three main elements -- Guidelines for Growth, Land Use Plan, and Implementation -- and also does not include development of a formal community vision. Because the Plan Update is not recommending radical changes from the 1993 Plan, Planning suggests a community vision can be distilled from the Plan Update and pursued as an amendment at a later date. Or a new vision could be developed during the next complete rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan.

2. Issue: No Long-Range Growth Scenarios

- Alternative long-range growth scenarios for Chugiak-Eagle River should be developed to allow the community to select specific management policies for the future as was done for the Anchorage Bowl's *Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan*. Growth alternatives could include: status quo; focusing on the preservation of neighborhoods; transitioning the traditionally-commercial downtown area to commercial/residential mixed-use; slowing or limiting growth; and anticipating how development reserve areas should be developed. (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: Growth scenarios were developed for *Anchorage 2020* because it was a complete rewrite of the 1982 Bowl Comprehensive Plan. Likewise, the 1993 *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan* included growth alternatives because it was a complete rewrite of the 1979 *Eagle River-Chugiak-Eklutna Comprehensive Plan*.

Municipal code requires a complete revision of a comprehensive plan every 20 years, unless major changes occur to initiate that before then. A re-evaluation is required every 10 years. The re-evaluation of the 1993 C-ER Plan, completed in June 2005, did not find major deviations from the 1993 Plan, so a complete rewrite was not recommended. The Plan Update was prepared in response to the community's request to do this to provide direction to the Title 21 rewrite.

Growth alternatives can be drafted and considered when the next complete rewrite of the *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan* is scheduled.

3. Issue: No definitions for Urban, Suburban or Rural

- Define the words urban, suburban, and rural as they are used extensively throughout the narrative of the document. Definitions should relate to the land use classifications from the *Land Use Plan Map*. (*Chugiak Community Council, Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: In planning vocabulary, the terms urban, suburban, and rural can be related to location, zoning and associated levels of development intensity, population density, and level of services. For some, these terms also describe different lifestyles in a community. The subjectivity of that approach makes defining these terms challenging.

The 2006 Plan Update builds on the 1993 C-ER Plan which built on the 1979 *Eagle River-Chugiak-Eklutna Plan*. While both the 2006 and the 1993 versions use the terms urban, suburban, rural without specific definition, the 1979 Plan did provide explanations of these terms in the context of density and development areas.

The 1979 Plan described an Urban/Suburban Development Area which was centered on downtown Eagle River, spanning to include the highest concentration of population within areas to be served by public water and sewer. Densities ranged from 3 to 30 dwelling units in these areas. Rural Development Areas were identified for low density development at one to two dwelling units per acre (dua) with on-site septic systems and wells. (Note: the 1979 Plan was written before current requirements for a minimum 40,000 square-foot lot size for a septic system.)

If this approach were applied to the 2006 Land Use Plan Map, rural areas would generally include residential densities of <1 to 1 dua with on-site systems; and urban/suburban areas would generally include density ranges of 3 to 35 dua, with provision of public water and sewer. Areas of 1 to 2 dua might be defined as urban/suburban in areas with public water and sewer, and as rural in areas with on-site systems.

4. Issue: Comprehensive Plan Authority

- There remain questions as to what sections become mandatory when the Comprehensive Plan Update is adopted by the Assembly and what sections are merely plans to be used as guides by the Planning Department. The

term "shall" is used in areas of the plan when, if the section is not mandatory, it is an incorrect use of the term. There is a need for a good editing job before the plan is finalized as the terms vary from shall, require, and ensure with no clear meaning as to the intent of the terms from one statement to another. (*G. Dial*)

Response: Planning agrees that the use of "should" and "shall" statements is inconsistent in the Plan Update as it was in the 1993 Plan, and may cause confusion as to the actual intent of statements in the Guidelines for Growth. Most statements in the Guidelines begin with action words, such as develop, preserve, require, support, protect, etc. One way to provide consistency throughout this chapter would be to begin all statements with action words. So, statements such as Education Policy/ Strategy 3.a. on page 46, which reads "Student enrollment trends and projections shall be updated regularly" could be revised to "Update student enrollments and projections regularly." This approach would allow implementation actions to be prioritized through the Plan's implementation schedule rather than debate about the weight of words like should, shall, ensure, etc.

The authority of the Comprehensive Plan is established by AMC 21.05.020 which states that "the purpose of the comprehensive plan is to set forth the goals, objectives and policies governing the future land use development of the Municipality that guide the Assembly in taking legislative action to implement the plan." This applies to the overall Municipal Comprehensive Plan, which includes the *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan*.

To further clarify the intent of the Guidelines for Growth, Planning suggests adding the following to the chapter introduction on page 29: "The policies and strategies in this chapter will guide municipal actions and resource commitments needed to implement the Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan Update." This language reinforces the statement in the introduction to Implementation on page 73, "Until applicable strategies are implemented, the Plan's Guidelines for Growth will guide municipal decision-making."

Guidelines for Growth

Natural Environment

5. Issue: Steep Slope Protection

- On page 31, change Objective 2.d. to "Protect areas with slopes of 20 percent or greater" instead of 25 percent. This matches the Title 21 Review Draft #2 (21.07.020C) definition of a steep slope as a slope that is 20 percent (11 degrees) or greater. (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: The Citizens Advisory Committee for the Plan Update reviewed this objective and did not recommend a change from the 1993 Plan. Planning

recommends the definition of steep slope be reviewed with development of the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak–Eagle River.

6. Issue: Water Quality/On-Site Systems

- On page 33, change Policy/Strategy a. to “Measures shall be taken to ensure that on-site water wells and wastewater disposal systems are properly permitted, sited, designed, installed, inspected, operated and maintained.” (*Birchwood Community Council*)
- On page 34, add a new Policy/Strategy j. “Support the development of new state or municipal regulations that would close loopholes in regulatory oversight of on-site water and wastewater systems.” There is no current state or municipal regulatory oversight of Class C Water Systems (water systems serving less than 25 individuals or less than 15 connections), on-site water wells for two-family dwellings (duplexes), and on-site wastewater systems for two-family dwellings (duplexes). (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: Planning concurs.

7. Issue: Water Quality/Urban Run-Off

- On page 34, change Policy/Strategy h. to “The quality of urban run-off shall be maximized and the quantity shall be minimized through, but not limited to, the use of stormwater retention/detention facilities, filtration systems, and street sweeping programs.” There are other ways to achieve this but they are not named here and leaving this open-ended for other options and considerations would address that. (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: Planning concurs.

Land Use

8. Issue: Growth Objectives/Small Town Character

- Change Objective 2.f. on page 35 to “Maintain the area’s small town character and, where appropriate, rural lifestyle.” As written in the Plan Update, this sentence could be interpreted to mean that some of the area’s small town lifestyle could be inappropriate and, therefore, might not be maintained in the future. (*Chugiak Community Council, Eagle River Community Council*)
- Change Objective 2.f. on page 35 to “Maintain the area’s small town feel, and continue to provide for those desiring a rural lifestyle.” (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: Planning concurs with the first bullet.

9. Issue: Growth Objectives/New Development

- Change Objective 2.h. on page 35 to “Ensure that new development is supported by adequate infrastructure and is consistent with the carrying capacity of the land.” (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: This Objective is carried forward from the 1993 Plan. Planning concurs with the minor change.

Community Design

10. Issue: Landscaping of Roadways

- Change Policy/Strategy 3.d. on page 37 to “Develop a plan for all categories of roadways to be appropriately landscaped and maintained in the Chugiak–Eagle River area.” Without the change, this could be interpreted to mean that all roadways would require installed landscaping versus simply retaining natural vegetation. There is also no mention of who would maintain installed landscaping. (*Chugiak Community Council*)
- The landscaping of local residential roads in a large-lot rural area does not need a plan nor does it need landscaping. (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: To help address the concerns of both comments, Planning suggests the following wording: “Develop a plan for street and highway landscaping that identifies categories of roadways to be appropriately landscaped and maintained in the Chugiak-Eagle River area.”

11. Issue: Maximum Height for Downtown Commercial Structures

- Change Policy/Strategy 3.i. on page 37 to “Limit residential structure heights to thirty-five (35) feet and commercial structure heights to forty-five (45) feet , except that structures shall not interfere with Federal Aviation Administration regulations on airport approaches.”

Limiting commercial structures to 45 feet contributes to attractive buildings suited to the existing skyline, views and sunlight, is responsive to the natural setting, and supported by resident survey. Limiting the height protects existing businesses and property owners from high rise buildings impacting the value and quality of nearby properties. A 60-foot height limit allowed in the proposed Title 21 CMU district is not acceptable. Design of commercial structures should be scaled to preserve the small town integrity, ambiance and scenic vistas. Historical experience shows downtown building expansion, up or out, is not necessary. Additional height impacts

development costs and rental/lease fees. (*Chugiak Community Council, Eagle River Community Council, Birchwood Community Council, A. Voehl, S. Rasic, Public Comment at May 2006 Community Meetings*)

- Continuing to develop a strong economic base in the downtown is an essential goal and should include mixed use where lower levels are commercial and upper levels are apartments or condominiums. Parking is at a premium downtown. Mixed use with underground parking would help prevent additional congestion. Professional developers say that mixed use with underground parking requires at least four stories in order to pencil. This potentially creates a height issue in conflict with the proposed 45 feet. Flexibility should be considered where site plans could be approved for heights greater than 45 feet if urban design standards are met and buffers are created to allow for transitions between lower density and higher density. (*Chugiak-Eagle River Chamber of Commerce*)

Response: A 45-foot height maximum for commercial buildings limits a structure to three stories. While this may be appropriate in most parts of the community, it would limit the opportunity for future commercial expansion in downtown. The Plan Update calls for continued growth of employment in the central business district and for increased employment opportunities for local residents.

It would also limit the opportunity for future commercial/residential mixed-use in the downtown area. This type of use in central business districts is often designed as first-story commercial with two or three stories of residential above. This type of development is envisioned by some and provided for in the Plan Update with the designation of Town Center for downtown Eagle River.

The Chugiak-Eagle River Chamber of Commerce has contracted for preparation of an “overlay district” plan for downtown. An overlay district provides development standards that supplement the underlying zoning district in order to address certain land use factors such as building design and height. (For example, building height can be transitioned or “stepped” to protect surrounding neighborhoods.)

As the Comprehensive Plan Update is intended to be a more generalized plan, the specific issue of height restriction in the downtown would be better addressed in the upcoming overlay district plan or in the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River. If the decision is to include a height limit in the Plan Update, Planning recommends the height of commercial buildings in downtown Eagle River be tied to number of stories rather than feet. A four-story height limit would be appropriate.

12. Issue: Snow Storage/Residential Development

- Change Policy/Strategy 3.k. on page 38 to “Require new higher density residential development with privately owned accesses and parking lots to provide snow removal and/or adequate areas for snow storage on-site.” This addresses snow removal and storage on private property (site condos, for example). (*Chugiak Community Council, Eagle River Community Council*)

- Change Policy/Strategy 3.k. on page 38 to “Require new higher density residential development to provide private snow removal and/or adequate areas for snow storage on-site. (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: Planning concurs with the intent of the first bullet.

13. Issue: Snow Storage/Public Rights-of-Way

- Add a new Policy/Strategy 3.m. on page 38 to deal with snow storage on public rights-of-way - “Require all development with public rights-of-way to provide adequate snow storage area within the rights-of-way.” This addresses snow removal and storage on public rights-of-way (public streets). (*Chugiak Community Council, Eagle River Community Council*)

Response: Planning concurs.

14. Issue: Removal of Snow and Ice from Sidewalks

- A policy should be added that requires property owners to clean their own sidewalks of snow. (*Chugiak Community Council*)
- The Plan Update addresses the removal of snow and ice but does not address the fact that municipal code states that “An occupant of land adjacent to a public sidewalk shall be responsible for the removal of any accumulation of snow and the removal or treatment of any ice that may accumulate, form or be deposited thereon.” The Comprehensive Plan gives the impression that it is the responsibility of the local Road Board or Parks and Recreation Departments to clear sidewalks of snow in and around bus stops. (*G. Dial*)

Response: AMC 24.80.090 regulates the removal of snow and ice from public sidewalks, but this applies only in certain areas. A public sidewalk is defined in AMC 24.80.100 as any improved walkway intended for use by the public or adjacent to a parcel of real property located in an R-O, B-1, B-2A, B-2B, B-2C, B-3, B-4, I-1, I-2, I-3 or PLI zoning district. It is not clear if the comment is recommending the responsibility be extended to property owners adjacent to public sidewalks in all urban zoning districts, including residential. Regardless, this is an issue that can be addressed in the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River or as an amendment to Title 24.

15. Issue: Design Standards for Multi-Family Development

- Add a new Objective 2.i. on page 37: “Support the development of design standards for multi-family dwellings that address safety and aesthetics.” Design standards are needed in Chugiak-Eagle River to preserve existing

community character and natural features especially in multi-family dwellings. (*Chugiak Community Council*)

- Add a new Policy/Strategy 3.n. on page 38 for the above objective: “Implement regulations pertaining to the design of multi-family dwellings including, but not limited to, building appearance, emergency access, drainage, protection of natural resources, protection of surrounding neighborhoods, snow storage and handling, landscaping, signage, lighting, and open space.” (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: Planning concurs. (These changes could be placed here or in the Housing and Residential Development section of the Guidelines for Growth.) Specific design standards for new residential development can be addressed in the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak–Eagle River.

16. Issue: Construction of Transmission Lines and Towers

- Add a new Policy/Strategy 3.o. on page 38 to guide the construction of electrical transmission lines and towers - “Support the development of regulations that would require electrical utility companies to address aesthetics of high-voltage transmission towers, inform impacted communities about future upgrades to high-voltage electrical transmission lines and towers, and bury high-voltage electrical transmission lines in residential areas if economically feasible.” (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: Planning concurs. The Municipality is currently working with utility companies on a draft ordinance to address this concern.

Commercial and Industrial Development

17. Issue: Overlap of Commercial and Industrial Uses

- Add a new Policy/Strategy 3.f. on page 42 to allow commercial and industrial uses to overlap: “Allow industrial and commercial uses to overlap in some cases.” (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: Planning understands the intent of this language is to allow some industrial uses, such as equipment storage, on commercially-zoned property that would not otherwise be permitted. The actual provisions to accomplish this can be accomplished in the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River. Planning concurs.

Public Facilities and Services

Parks, Open Space, Greenways and Recreation Facilities/Transportation

18. Issue: Planning for New Trails

- Plans are needed for developing new trails adjacent to Eagle River High School, for trails in each neighborhood linking to them recreation sites, for a skyline trail from Arctic Valley to Eklutna above tree line, and for identifying and the old Iditarod dog sled trail down Eagle River Valley. (*Public Comment from May Community Meetings*)

Response: An update of the Areawide Trails Plan, which includes Chugiak-Eagle River, is underway, and will consist of three phases: a pedestrian plan, a bike plan, and a trails plan. Together these components will comprise the updated Areawide Trails Plan. Planning for new trails in Chugiak-Eagle River will be addressed in the trails plan component.

Transportation

19. Issue: Neighborhood Connectivity

- Change Objective 2.g. on page 53 to “Investigate connectivity to and between subdivisions where appropriate to accommodate normal as well as emergency traffic, recognizing the need to minimize cut-through traffic within residential neighborhoods.” Connectivity of existing local roads cannot legally be implemented. (*Birchwood Community Council*)
- Delete Objective 2.h. on page 53: “. ” This cannot be implemented. (*Birchwood Community Council*)
- Retrofitting roads for connectivity, in most cases, is not acceptable to the majority of the community. Cut through traffic increases on roads not built to handle the increase and there is a concern that the area will become another Mountain View before the connections were blocked off to better aid police dealing with criminal activity. (*G. Dial*)
- Retain language regarding connectivity as it is in the Plan Update; especially for secondary/emergency access. (*T. Kinney-Public Testimony*)

Response: Objective 2.g. states that connectivity of local roads would be provided “where appropriate.” Planning does not support this change.

Objective 2.h. provides direction to transportation planning for the community. The issue of connectivity is being addressed in the 2006 Chugiak–Eagle River Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update. Planning does not support this change.

20. Issue: Long-Range Transportation Plans

- Add a new sentence to Policy/Strategy 3.c. on page 54: “Reconcile the recommendations from the Anchorage Long-Range Transportation Plan and from the Chugiak-Eagle River Long-Range Transportation Plan that pertain to the Glenn Highway and public transportation.” (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: Planning concurs.

21. Issue: Responsibility for Over Sizing Drainage Facilities

- Add a new Policy/Strategy on page 54: “Developers shall build and pay for over sizing drainage facilities (storm drains, inlets, and manholes) as requested by the Municipality. The only exception would be if the over sizing has been programmed in the six-year capital improvement program and sufficient funds have been appropriated for reimbursement in the capital improvement budget for the current fiscal year. The next upstream developer shall be required to reimburse the original developer’s cost for the over sizing if the next developer completes his/her development within five years.” (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: The sizing of drainage improvements is determined through the subdivision process based on determined need, and implemented through subdivision agreements. Requirements will vary based on development size, location and other factors. The Comprehensive Plan is a generalized document and this level of specific detail in the Guidelines for Growth is out of place. Planning recommends this issue be addressed in the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River or as an amendment to Title 21 Subdivision Standards: Improvements.

22. Issue: Responsibility for Required Improvements

- There need to be clear statements in Title 21 that cannot be misinterpreted as they were on the Eagle River High School Subdivision which has cost the taxpayers huge amounts of money for legal services. The C-ER Comp Plan addresses the need for developers to be responsible for collectors or higher. If the new code is not adequate, the Comprehensive Plan is meaningless. (*G. Dial*)

Response: New language will be proposed in the next draft of the Title 21 Rewrite to address this issue, based on comments from Citizen Advisory Committee members and from municipal staff.

23. Issue: Traffic Congestion

- In the Central Business District, transportation congestion remains at Old Glenn and Artillery Road; at Old Glenn and Monte Road; and at Old Glenn Rachel/Snow Machine Drive. (*Chugiak-Eagle River Chamber of Commerce*)

Response: Congestion at these and other intersections is being addressed in the 2006 Chugiak-Eagle River LRTP Update.

Street Lighting

24. Issue: Minimize Light Pollution

- Change Objective 2.d. on page 55 for clarity: “Minimize light pollution from street lighting.” (*Chugiak Community Council, Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: Planning concurs.

25. Issue: Residential Lighting Requirements

- Add a new Objective 2.e. on page 55: “Allow neighborhoods to opt out of street lighting requirements.” (*Chugiak Community Council*)
- Add a new Policy/Strategy 3.f. for the above objective on page 56: “Identify street lighting as an optional improvement in zoning districts for Chugiak-Eagle River.” Residential street lighting should only be required where the residents want it and where it would significantly enhance public safety. (*Chugiak Community Council*)
- (Comment references Objectives 2.a. and 2.c. on page 55 regarding street lighting along municipal and state roadways.) Birchwood does not want street lighting on state and local roads in Birchwood. This would have a negative impact on this rural area. Street lights in rural residential areas should be an option, not mandate. (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: Municipal code (21.85.030) establishes subdivision improvement requirements by improvement areas. Street lighting is required for subdivisions in urban areas, but not in suburban and rural areas. (Improvement areas are defined by zoning district in 21.85.020). If the intent of the suggested new objective and policy/strategy is to prevent street lighting from being required in rural areas, then the changes are not needed as current code provides for this already.

Regarding the comment about Objectives 2.a. and 2.c.: Objective 2.a. says “encourage” not “require” street lighting. Objective 2.c. discusses maintenance of this lighting “as needed.” The language as written does not recommend mandates.

AMC 27.30.560, which established the Eagle River Street Light Service Area, is administered by the Municipality. MOA Project Management and Engineering staff reviewed the Street Lighting section in the Public Hearing Draft and did not recommend changes. As discussed above, Planning does not believe the suggested changes are needed.

26. Issue: Existing Street Light Service Area

- (1) Response to Policy/Strategy 3.c. (1) on page 55 requiring developer to petition to annex a subdivision into an existing street light service area as one option: Code does not allow this unless a developer assumes responsibility for present and future payment under the Street Light Service Area concept. This is a local utility requirement and under MOA street light service areas. (*Birchwood Community Council*)
- (2) There is an existing street light service area for Eagle River to provide for maintenance and operation of street lights in the area (AMC 27.30.560). The section proposed in the Guidelines (page 55) requiring maintenance is redundant in light of the code requirement. (*G. Dial*)

Response: (1) Planning is not aware that this is a code requirement. Operation and maintenance is provided for in the street light service area administered by MOA. (2) There may be some redundancy in the language, but the Guidelines provide direction should changes to current procedures be considered in the future.

27. Issue: Energy Component

- Add an energy component to address energy needs and alternative energy as the community grows and develops in the future. (*J. Barlow-Public Testimony*)

Response: This is an appropriate matter to consider in the growth and development of the community. The scope of the Plan Update did not include developing new components, but this issue should be considered in the future on a municipal-wide basis.

Land Use Plan Map

28. Issue: Intent of Land Use Plan Map

- (Comment references page 59, second paragraph, first sentence: “The Land Use Plan Map is intended to capture Chugiak-Eagle River’s long-term vision for future development.”) The Land Use Plan Map should not be implemented as part of the Comprehensive Plan until the specific land use regulations governing development and growth in this area are conceptually committed to paper. The draft re-written land use regulations, specifically

written to implement the Anchorage 2020 Bowl Comprehensive Plan, had to be conceptually known prior to bringing forth their Land Use Map (two year delay). (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: A land use plan map graphically depicts how a community wants to grow. As an essential part of a comprehensive plan, it illustrates the preferred future pattern of land uses throughout the community. The current Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map was last updated in 1982. Profound changes have occurred since then, and adoption of *Anchorage 2020* in 2001 effectively outdated the 1982 map. *Anchorage 2020* set a new direction for long-term growth in the Bowl, but it did not include a land use plan map. A completely new map has been created for the Bowl to replace the outdated 1982 version and to reflect the intent of *Anchorage 2020*.

The current *Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan* was adopted in 1993. As previously stated, a re-evaluation of that Plan in 2005 did not find major deviations from trends and policies to warrant a complete rewrite of the 1993 Plan. The Land Use Plan Map has been updated but it builds on the 1993 version and does not propose significant differences in land use patterns or policies from the 1993 Plan, unlike the major changes for the Bowl that were part of *Anchorage 2020*.

Planning does not support delaying approval of the Land Use Plan Map pending development of draft land use regulations for Chugiak-Eagle River. The Land Use Plan Map is generalized and, once adopted, will provide direction for the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River and for implementation of other recommendations in the Plan Update.

29. Issue: Amending the Land Use Plan Map

- (Comment references page 60, paragraph 4, second sentence: “It can be updated and amended just like other parts of the Comprehensive Plan.”) The Land Use Map should not be developed or approved until land use regulations are written, approved, and known for our area. (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: The Land Use Plan Map is not a fixed predetermination of land use through 2025. The Plan Update recognizes that community growth is dynamic not static and provides a vehicle for amendments, so that as the community continues to grow and change, the Land Use Plan Map can also change. General criteria for review and approval of such amendments are provided in the Plan Update (page 60). As stated previously, the Land Use Plan Map will provide direction for the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River and for implementation of other recommendations in the Plan Update.

30. Issue: Maximum Residential Density

(Note: There are differing opinions in the community on the recommended maximum residential density of 16 to 35 dwelling units per acres (dua) in and around the downtown Eagle River area. Concerns were expressed during the Plan Update process about the compatibility of higher density development in the community; in particular, about potential negative impacts related to higher traffic volumes, reduced environmental quality, social stress factors, and poor develop design. A sampling of comments is provided below. Please refer to Attachment B for detailed comments from the sources listed below.)

- Eliminate the proposed maximum residential density of 16-35 dua and change the proposed 11-15 dua to 11-20 dua, so that density is capped at 20 dwelling units per acre. This preserves the small town character and scale of the area. The downtown infrastructure does not support high density with limited pedestrian crossings and high traffic volumes. Existing roads, schools, and parks cannot support higher density. Affordable, quality housing can be provided at 20 dua. Title 21 proposes that residential development shall occur at the maximum density; but we are not out of land, we have a different character and lifestyle, and what fits the Bowl is not appropriate for Chugiak-Eagle River. (*Chugiak Community Council, A. Voehl, S. Rasic, Birchwood Community Council*)
- Approval of higher density housing in and around downtown makes sense due to proximity of local services but high density housing needs to be supported by stricter design standards. (*Chugiak-Eagle River Chamber of Commerce*)

Response: Areas on the Land Use Plan map with the 16 to 35 dua designation are located immediately around the Eagle River downtown area. These are areas, largely developed, that are already zoned to allow 35 or more dwelling units per acre. In fact, many existing developments in these areas are well above 20 dua. The Plan Update does not propose expanding these areas or increasing allowed densities. The proposed maximum of 35 dwelling units per acre reflects existing zoning and development patterns around downtown Eagle River.

It also reflects several goals and objectives in the draft Plan Update, such as the need to provide diverse housing opportunities to meet the needs of residents, and to support higher density residential development that is convenient to employment, commercial centers and major transportation corridors. (See Guidelines for Growth, Housing and Residential Development, pages 38-39.) Lowering the maximum density would limit the community's ability to provide affordable housing options, such as apartment rentals, when the demand for this type of housing is increasing.

The Locational Criteria for Residential 16-35 dua include convenient access to major transportation corridors; public water and sewer service; location immediately around downtown Eagle River; established multi-family housing development patterns and zoning; and proximity to transit, shopping and employment, and community facilities.

In many cases, the quality of building and site design is more critical to neighborhood compatibility than what the density may be. While the draft Plan Update proposes that multi-family housing continue at existing densities, it also recommends establishing new design standards to ensure better quality development. Some public comment appears to be reacting to building and site design issues rather than actual development density. Comments received have not clearly demonstrated a rationale for capping the density at 20.

Planning recommends the Residential 16-35 dua classification for the areas shown on the Land Use Plan Map. The classification reflects existing zoning and development patterns, as well as goals and objectives of the Plan Update. Planning recommends the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River develop design standards for multi-family housing that respond to the Guidelines for Growth and to resident concerns about better quality development.

31. Issue: Reduce Residential Density in Eagle River Valley

- Reduce the density from the 3-6 dwellings per acre to 1 dwelling per acre along all sections of Eagle River Road and Eagle River Loop Road for all new subdivision plats. Reasons cited include negative impacts to the Eagle River Valley community from increased road maintenance costs, icy steep driveways with limited sight distance, drainage problems and urban housing that impacted the majestic views of Eagle River Valley. (*A. Voehl*) Reduce the density in this area to 2 dua for all new development for similar reasons. (*S. Rasic*)

Response: Planning believes the area referenced is vacant land zoned R-3 SL in Eagle River Valley on the south side of Eagle River Road. The 3-6 dua designation on the Land Use Plan Map reflects existing development patterns and existing zoning. This is the same density shown in the 1993 Comprehensive Plan. Vacant residential land east of this area extending out Eagle River Road is recommended for lower density residential at <1 – 1 dua.

32. Issue: Avoid Downsizing Residential Density

- Some areas, especially R-7, are showing lower density because of the lot size requirement for on-site well and septic. If zoning is changed to reflect lower density, it will be uneconomic to extend public sewer for higher density if it is available in the future. (*E. Loken–Public Testimony*)

Response: There are properties on the Land Use Plan Map that are zoned R-7 that are in areas with public utilities and in areas without. The recommendations on the map are based on exiting density and development patterns, and on areas that may receive public sewer within the 20-year time frame of the Plan Update. Planning does not recommend a change.

33. Issue: Number of Residential Classifications

- There is a concern about the increased number of residential classifications on the draft Plan Land Use Plan Map. (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: The 1993 Comprehensive Plan had 5 residential density classifications. The 2006 Plan Update has 6 residential density categories. The highest density category in 1993 was >10. The 2006 Update proposes two categories, 11-15 du/a and 16-35 du/a, rather than >10, to reflect existing conditions.

34. Issue: Spring Brook Drive Vacant Industrial Land

(Note: During the Plan Update process, comments for retaining the industrial classification noted that this will protect the existing supply of industrially-zoned land especially in an area where there is little available; that the property could be used to store heavy equipment; that residential development has occurred around existing industrial uses in that area and the property's physical characteristics would allow new industrial use without negative impact on surrounding homes and businesses.)

- Keep Spring Brook Drive (and Artillery Road) industrial properties classified as industrial since industrial property is extremely scarce in Eagle River and additional residential property is not justified according to MOA Planning's projected residential demand for year 2025. (*Chugiak Community Council*); Keep Spring Brook Drive industrial. (*A. Voehl, S. Rasic*)
- Do not rezone currently zoned industrial property in Eagle River unless an equal or greater amount of land is identified and designated/zoned industrial to replace that which is lost. (*Eagle River Community Council*)
- Certain industrial uses could be employment producers and serve needs of adjacent industrial properties. Future residential need has been met, but not industrial. High density residential will overload the future carrying capacity of Eagle River Loop Road. (*Birchwood Community Council*)
- The west side of Spring Brook Drive should remain industrial to efficiently provide industrial type uses close to the business sector. The east side of Spring Brook zoned I-2 is a concern since gravel quarries and central business districts may not co-exist easily. There is the question of the landowner's proposal to convert this to high density residential. We would request that a study be done to determine "highest and best use" of the property extending east of the intersection. (*Chugiak-Eagle River Chamber of Commerce*)
- This is a good location for high-end residential, on a hillside and highly visible, where industrial could be unsightly. (*E. Loken-Public Testimony*)

Response: This vacant area is designated industrial in the 1993 Comprehensive Plan. It is zoned I-1, Light Industrial (about 14 acres) and I-2, Heavy Industrial (about 18 acres). The property has been zoned for industrial use for decades but, other than gravel extraction, never developed for industrial use. The property owner has expressed an interest in developing the land as multi-family residential. While additional residential land may not be required to support the projected 20-year housing demand in the overall community, this location near downtown Eagle River is not inappropriate for a residential designation. The draft Comprehensive Plan Update supports the location of higher density residential development that is convenient to employment, commercial centers and major transportation corridors. (See Guidelines for Growth, Housing and Residential Development, pages 38-39.)

The Land Use Plan Map locational criteria for the Industrial classification include areas with an established industrial development pattern; areas large enough for more intense industrial uses; and areas with access to truck routes without the need to travel through incompatible uses. For residential use, the 11-15 dua classification would be appropriate to consider for this area. Locational criteria for 11- 15 dua include areas immediately around downtown Eagle River that are served by public water and sewer; that are within walking distance of facilities such as transit and commercial services; and that have access to major streets without traveling through less intensive uses.

Without the benefit of an industrial land demand analysis, it is difficult to assess the need for this land to remain classified as industrial. Planning recommends the I-1 area (off Spring Brook Drive) be designated Industrial and the I-2 area (adjacent to Eagle River Loop Road) be designated Residential, 11-15 dwelling units per acre, which provides for a range of single- and multi-family housing choices. Both of these areas have environmental constraints, such as slope, drainage, and bedrock, which will restrict the amount of developable area. The sloping character of the overall property provides a natural separation opportunity between the developable area on the I-1 parcel and new residential in the existing I-2 area. No change is recommended for existing industrial on the west side of Spring Brook Drive.

35. Issue: Development Reserve Classification for Eklutna property north of Peters Creek, west of the Glenn Highway

Comments presented differing views:

- Leave it as Development Reserve but add a note to the Land Use Plan Map: “It is anticipated that the area north of the Mirror Lake Middle School and south of the Eklutna River, currently classified as development reserve, will ultimately be developed as residential at <1-1 dua.” The Residential <1 – 1 dua classification would preserve and enhance the identity of the surrounding area and would be in line with Chugiak’s vision statement. This classification also supports that denser residential development is not justified according to projected residential demand for 2025. (*Chugiak Community Council, Birchwood Community Council*)

- Leave it as Development Reserve to provide a public process for any major changes or development that takes place. (*A. Voehl; S. Rasic*)
- Leave the land undesignated until Eklutna, Inc. has developed a proposal. (*Chugiak-Eagle River Chamber of Commerce*)

Response: The proposed Development Reserve classification is intended for areas that are generally suitable for development but where the location and absence of public facilities and lack of projected demand make near-term and intermediate-term development uncertain. Large-lot, single-family residential development would be allowed by right -- this is the Residential, <1 – 1 dwelling per acre category, with on-site well and septic systems. The Development Reserve classification requires a public master planning process before development of anything other than large-lot, single-family residential can occur.

Planning recommends this area be classified as Development Reserve, but does not support adding the proposed note to the Land Use Plan Map.

Planning also recommends that the area in Eklutna Valley south of Eklutna River be changed from Residential, <1-1 dua to Development Reserve.

36. Issue: Eklutna 770 Area Classification

- Add a note to the Land Use Plan Map for this area: “For the Eklutna 770 area, residential areas of greater density shall be clustered around the south side of the Eklutna 770 property near the commercial center.” (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: The Eklutna, Inc., land between the Old and New Glenn Highways, referred to as the “Eklutna 770,” is designated as Residential 1-2 dua with a grey line pattern. This pattern indicates that the 1-2 dua is an overall average density. This allows for different housing types and lot sizes within different portions of the property. The exact size and location of these areas will be determined through an area-specific master planning process for the 770 that will involve public review and comment. Areas for commercial and industrial use will also be determined through a master planning process.

Planning does not support adding the proposed note to the Land Use Plan Map.

37. Issue: Development Reserve Classification for Powder Reserve Tract B

- This area is unsuitable for development and especially more dense, higher dwelling ratio/acre, due to multiple and varied maneuvers typically occurring day and night on base, including excessive noise, ammunitions discharge and dust from military activities including digital multi-purpose on training range, landing and firings on ranges in area, heavy artillery and airborne drops in drop zone. (*D. Shutt – USAG AK/ Fort Richardson*)

Response: The proposed Development Reserve classification is intended for areas that are generally suitable for development but where the location and absence of public facilities and lack of projected demand make near-term and intermediate-term development uncertain. Large-lot, single-family residential development would be allowed by right -- this is the Residential, <1 – 1 dwelling per acre category, with on-site well and septic systems. The Development Reserve classification requires a public master planning process before development of anything other than large-lot, single-family residential can occur.

However, there is a concern about potential incompatibilities between programmed military activities and future residential development in some areas of Tract B of the Powder Reserve. Planning recommends this area remain Development Reserve, but the definition of this classification on pages 70-71 should be expanded to include the following: “This classification includes Tract B in the western portion of the Powder Reserve, adjacent to Fort Richardson Military Reservation. Master planning in this area should provide for low-intensity development to avoid potential conflicts with programmed military activities.”

38. Issue: Residential 3- 6 DUA Classification for Powder Reserve Southern Tract A

- This area has minimal impact from military activities although the population density is undesirable contiguous with Army Installation border. (*D. Shutt – USAG AK/Fort Richardson*)

Response: No change.

39. Issue: Residential <1-1 DUA Classification for Area West of Glenn Highway South of Artillery Road

- This area is currently underdeveloped and can be accessed via Artillery Road in Eagle River. There are no none or low impact military activities in the vicinity. (*D. Shutt – USAG AK/Fort Richardson*)

Response: No change.

40. Issue: Rural/Suburban/Urban Boundary

- Add a boundary line on the Land Use Plan Map clearly delineating urban areas from rural/ suburban areas. (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: The Land Use Plan Map is generalized—adding a boundary such as this suggests a level of specificity and detail that was not part of the scope of the Plan Update. The Plan Update carries forward the recommendations of the 1993 Plan in terms of identifying general areas for public water and sewer service and for

on-site systems (page 25, Water and Wastewater section). Planning's response to Issue #3 in this summary provides discussion on the terms urban, suburban and rural relating to these services. Planning does believe this boundary is needed.

41. Issue: Alaska Mental Health Trust Parcel

- (1) On the Vacant Land Suitability Map, page 17, change the north half of the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority's parcel at the northeast corner of Yosemite Drive and Eagle River Loop Road from "vacant unsuitable" to "vacant suitable." The old landfill comprises only 30 percent of the parcel and is unsuitable for development while 70 percent is suitable for development. (*A. Smith - Alaska Mental Health Trust*)
- (2) On the Land Use Plan Map, change the southern portion of the Alaska Mental Health Trust parcel from Park and Natural Resource to Development Reserve. (*A. Smith - Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority*)
- (3) On the Land Use Plan Map, identify a small area for mixed-use density on the east side of Yosemite Drive.

Response: (1) Planning recommends the area designated for Residential, 3-6 dua on the Trust's property be changed to vacant suitable on the Vacant Land Suitability Map.

(2) The description of the Park and Natural Resource classification on page 70 specifically addresses the Trust property: "This classification also includes the former borough landfill site off Eagle River Loop Road. This site may be used as park or open space on an interim basis until a permanent use has been designated." Because of the former landfill status and because Development Reserve implies suitability for development, Planning recommends no change until a permanent use has been identified.

(3) Planning does not believe commercial development beyond what is recommended on the west side of Yosemite Drive is supported in this area. Also, see response (2) above.

42. Issue: Reserve Mental Health Trust Property for School Parking

- Reserve the area immediately south of the Eagle River High School for additional school parking that will be needed in the future. (*J. Vicente-Public Testimony*)

Response: No change. The referenced property is recommended for Residential 3-6 dua. The high school was built for a smaller 800 student capacity, but the 50-acre site was selected to accommodate the full 1,600 student facility in the future.

43. Issue: Town Center Boundary

- The “Central Business District” may or may not be smaller in area than what is called “Town Center” on the Land Use Plan Map. (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: “Town Center” is a proposed land use classification on the Land Use Plan Map primarily intended for existing commercially-zoned areas in downtown Eagle River. The Eagle River Central Business District (CBD) boundary, as defined in the 2003 Revitalization Plan, focuses on the area along the Old Glenn Highway from the south to north interchange of the New Glenn Highway, and along Business Boulevard. The CBD boundary includes both Town Center and Commercial classifications on the Land Use Plan Map. The Town Center classification is intended to assist with implementation of the Eagle River CBD Plan.

44. Issue: Town Center Classification

- Delete “Town Center” as a separate classification, but include as an additional description under “Commercial.” There is a concern that proposed Title 21 regulations may be applied to Eagle River and that the Town Center designation will force Mixed-Use in the downtown, and with the CMU zoning district, downtown will have commercial on the ground floor with mandated 70 percent residential use within the structure. (*Birchwood Community Council*)
- Reserve the option of mixed use where sections of the downtown may be developed or redeveloped. There is a concern about maintaining the viability of small businesses in the city core. Continuing to develop a strong economic base in the downtown is an essential goal and should include mixed use where lower levels are commercial and upper levels are apartments or condominiums. This would be a new land use for the area. (*Chugiak-Eagle River Chamber of Commerce*)

Response: The Town Center classification implements recommendations of the approved Eagle River CBD Plan. The recommendation is to develop a separate Title 21 chapter for Chugiak – Eagle River, not apply proposed zoning districts now under review such as the CMU. Planning recommends the Town Center classification as proposed in the Plan Update (page 69).

45. Issue: Park and Natural Resource Locational Criteria

- Change the locational criteria, first bullet on page 70 to “Areas dedicated as a park or under the management of the local Parks and Recreation Board.” Not all areas used as park or natural resource are dedicated. (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: Planning concurs and for further clarification suggests: Areas designated or dedicated as a park use or under the management of the local Parks and Recreation Board.”

46. Issue: Transportation Facility Classification

- Expand the explanation for Transportation Facility classification on page 70 so the reasoning behind the designated locations can be understood. This misleading classification could also impact the C-ER Long Range Transportation Plan implementation criteria, as well as the CIP. *(Birchwood Community Council)*

Response: Planning recommends the section be amended to: “The Transportation Facility classification applies to areas with existing or planned public facilities that are directly related to transportation by rail and air. The classification applies to Birchwood Airport properties, owned and managed by the State of Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, and to Alaska Railroad land holdings and railroad utility corridors.”

47. Issue: Map Symbols, Eklutna 770 and Powder Reserve (page 71)

- (1) What is depicted for Eklutna 770 is not reflected in other documents such as the 2005 Water Master Plan by AWWU. However, Eklutna does not have an approved Master Plan for this area. *(Birchwood Community Council)*
- (2) Eklutna has consistently asked for and received more intense development than depicted in their Master Plan for the Powder Reserve and this trend should be reflected on the Land Use Plan Map. *(Birchwood Community Council)*

Response: (1) The map on page 191 of the 2005 Water Master Plan prepared by Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utility (AWWU) shows the Eklutna 770 as one of the areas where water service hook up is possible via the existing Eklutna water pipe in the 20-year horizon of the Plan. AWWU’s plan also shows a proposed water connection pipe along South Birchwood Loop, at the south end of the 770 for the years 2006-2010. An update of the 1995 AWWU Wastewater Master Plan is underway and sewer service to the 770 is proposed in the 20-year horizon of the Plan.

(2) Eklutna, Inc. has recently submitted a revised master plan for Tract A of the Powder Reserve depicting an overall residential density of 3-6 du/a which reflects the recommendation of the draft Land Use Plan Map. The Master Plan requires approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Assembly.

48. Issue: Map Symbol, Intermodal Transit Facility (page 72)

- Clarify the depiction of an intermodal transit facility in downtown Eagle River and on Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC) holdings that divide Eklutna's two residential tracts. (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: The Intermodal Transit Facility is a symbol on the Land Use Plan Map. In downtown Eagle River, it identifies the existing transit service center on Business Boulevard and recognizes the possible future expansion of transit services in the downtown area. The Intermodal Transit Facility depicted on Tract C owned by ARRC in the Powder Reserve identifies a potential future transit service center that could include a future commuter railway station. (See page 72 for a description of this map symbol.)

49. Issue: Mapped Roadways

- Update the roads on the Land Use Plan Map. For example, Oberg Road in Peters Creek extends further north than depicted. (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: The map coverage includes roads that are designated collector and above. The coverage will be updated to include the referenced section of Oberg Road on the map.

Implementation

50. Issue: Natural Environment Action/Subsurface Aquifer Study

- Add an Implementation Action on page 76 "Complete a subsurface aquifer study to guide future development" and add to the Implementation Schedule on page 80 in the 1 -5 year timeframe. (*Chugiak Community Council, Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: Planning concurs with the intent, but recommends the action read "Evaluate the feasibility of funding and conducting a subsurface aquifer study to guide future development" in the 6-15 year time frame with MOA/PM&E and State/DEC as Proposed Implementers. This will be a complex, costly project and will be competing with many other implementation items in the C-ER Plan Update.

51. Issue: Emergency Response Action/Emergency Operations Center

- Add an Implementation Action on page 78 that would establish an Emergency Operations Center as already described in the Guidelines for Growth page 45 item 3.i. (*Birchwood Community Council, Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: Planning recommends a new Implementation Action on page 78: “Pursue funding and development of a local Emergency Operations Center.” Place this item on the Implementation Schedule page 80 in the 1-5 year time frame. The Municipality requested a state grant in 2006 to help fund a Town Center with an Emergency Operations Center in Eagle River so this change is supported.

52. Issue: Community Design Action/Landscaping for Roadways

- Change the last bullet on page 78. Landscaping of local roads in large-lot rural areas does not need landscaping or a plan. (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: To conform with suggested wording changes in Policy/Strategy 3.d. on page 37, Planning recommends this action read: “Develop a plan for street and highway landscaping that identifies categories of roadways to be appropriately landscaped and maintained in the Chugiak-Eagle River area.”

53. Issue: Time Frame for Chugiak - Eagle River Title 21 Chapter

- Change the schedule to include a separate chapter in Title 21 for Chugiak-Eagle River from one to five years to one to three years. (*Chugiak Community Council*)

Response: Many projects on the Implementation Schedule on page 80 recommended for one to five years are either already underway or planned to be. A state grant has been awarded to fund the development of the Title 21 chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River so that project is already within the one to five year category. Planning does not believe the change is needed.

54. Issue: Elementary School Site Selection

- Change the second action item in the Implementation Schedule on page 80 to: “Determine the need and placement for a new elementary school site to serve the Powder Reserve area” in the event that development there has less than the number of children needed to require a new school or if most of the children are not elementary school age or if a site cannot be located in the Powder Reserve. (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: Planning recommends the action be changed to: “Select and acquire a new elementary school site in the Chugiak-Eagle River area, which should include evaluation of a site in the Powder Reserve.”

55. Issue: Areawide Trails Plan Update/Proposed Implementers (page 80)

- The trails plan should be updated by the Traffic Department as well as the Parks Department since many trails are recreational. (*Chugiak Community Council*)
- Why is the Traffic Department listed to update the Trails Plan? Trails are recreational. Bike paths or sidewalks are public transit. (*Birchwood Community Council*)

Response: The 1997 Areawide Trails Plan was prepared by the MOA Department of Community Planning and Development (now Planning) with support from the Department of Cultural and Recreational Services (now Parks and Recreation) and the Department of Public Works. At that time, Transportation Planning with the AMATS Coordinator was part of the Planning Department. Transportation Planning and the AMATS function were later moved to the Traffic Department.

An update of the Areawide Trails Plan, which includes Chugiak-Eagle River, has begun, and will consist of three phases: a pedestrian plan, a bike plan, and a trails plan. Together these components will comprise the updated Areawide Trails Plan. The Traffic Department is coordinating with Parks and Recreation on this effort.

Planning recommends adding Parks and Recreation to Proposed Implementers for the “Update the Areawide Trails Plan” action item on page 80.

APPENDIX B
CHUGIAK-EAGLE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
ISSUE - RESPONSE SUMMARY
ADDENDUM
AUGUST 21, 2006

This Issue/Response Summary Addendum responds to comments received from Eklutna, Inc., that were not included in the Issue/Response Summary dated August 14, 2006. Written comments from Eklutna, Inc., including a map of the issue areas, are attached.

Issue 1:

- Clarify in the Plan narrative that “natural resource extraction” and “commercial recreation” uses are permitted conditional uses within the Development Reserve land use designations. Eklutna, Inc., has a significant landholding within the Plan area. Eklutna, Inc., recognizes that there may be interim uses of its landholding that meet its needs and accommodate future development needs. Natural resource extraction and processing, as well as commercial recreational use appear appropriate as interim uses.

Response: Development Reserve is not a zoning district but a land use classification that allows large-lot, single-family residential by right. Any other development requires a master planning process with proposed rezonings to active development districts. Permitted conditional uses are not identified with the Land Use Plan Map. Currently, new development in this area is subject to existing zoning requirements. The property is zoned PC, Planned Community, and T, Transition. Without a master plan, the PC-zoned area is restricted to uses and regulations of the R-8 rural residential district (AMC 21.40.250.A.3). The Transition district allows natural resource extraction as a conditional use (AMC 21.40.240.D.4). Planning does not recommend the change.

Issue 2:

- As part of the Mount Baldy/Mirror Lake land exchange, there is an agreement for an “access corridor” through the Municipality of Anchorage’s (MOA) Park and Natural Resources designated area (see Map). This access corridor should be modified to “Development Reserve” to clearly reflect the anticipated use in the future.

Response: New road access corridors are outside the scope of the Comprehensive Plan. The 2006 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update for Chugiak-Eagle River is underway. The Draft LRTP recommends a study be conducted to help determine the advisability of using the Mirror Lake Interchange as the primary

access to Eklutna's undeveloped land and to determine the best route through the park in order to limit its impact. Based on comment from the Heritage Land Bank (HLB), Planning recommends approximately 20 acres in the northwest corner of Mirror Lake Park be shown as Development Reserve on the Land Use Plan Map.

Issue 3:

- Identify the area southwest of the Birchwood Airport as a dual designation -- industrial and transportation related. This area, previously identified as residential and now recommended for industrial, will likely be used for the expansion of the Birchwood Airport. A dual designation better represents what uses may occur in this area.

Response: The Land Use Plan Map reflects expansion plans for the Birchwood Airport based on information from Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facility's 20-year Airport Master Plan. Based on available information, Planning does not support this change.

Regarding the "Eklutna 770," the parcel located between the Old and the New Glenn Highways:

Issue 4a:

- A proposed interchange midway between the South Birchwood interchange and the North Birchwood interchange should be represented on the map. This area could accommodate a "commercial" node of approximately 40 acres. Additionally, an interchange at this location will better serve development on either side of the Glenn Highway.

Response: The 2006 Draft LRTP Update identifies this corridor as a potential Study Area. The LRTP defines a Study Area as an area where not enough information is available to make a reasonable prediction of the future collector and arterial needs. These areas will require additional study prior to identifying any functional designations. Potential future road corridors are outside the scope of the Comprehensive Plan and are not proposed on the Land Use Plan Map.

The Land Use Plan Map identifies a portion of the Eklutna 770 as commercial; however, the exact location and size of this area is intended to be determined through an area-specific master planning process for the property. Planning recommends the proposal for a 40-acre commercial node be considered during that process.

Issue 4b:

- The area along the Old Glenn Highway, approximately midway north-south, has industrial directly across the street. Due to the need to provide

approximate amounts of industrial land that is well located for access, approximately 120 acres are identified for potential industrial use. This area would be developed as independent 40-acre industrial parks, buffered from the Old Glenn Highway and residential properties. The independent nodes control the size and accommodate phasing with demand, as the community continues to grow.

Response: As with commercial use noted above, the Land Use Plan Map identifies a portion of the Eklutna 770 for industrial use with the exact location and size to be determined through an area-specific master planning process for the 770. Planning recommends the proposal for industrial use be considered during that process.

Issue 4c:

- The residential density of the “770” is depicted as 1-2 DUA. This area will be served by sewer and water which suggests a higher density of development is appropriate. The total number of dwelling units should be calculated on a gross basis with the clear allowance for clustered development at higher densities.

Response: The 1-2 dua represents an overall average density for the Eklutna 770. This designation allows for a variety of housing types and lots sizes within different portions of this property. While the overall average density is 1-2 dua, some areas will develop at a greater density than 2 housing units per acre, which provides for clustered development at higher densities. The recommended density is to be calculated based on residential portions of the property, not the entire 770 acres.

Issue 5:

- The old trailer park adjacent to the Chugiak Senior Center is currently depicted as residential, less than 1 DUA. This area should be able to be developed in a similar fashion or density as the Senior Center. The density should be modified to 16-35 DUA.

Response: Planning does not recommend this change. The designation for this area is <1-1 dua and provides for large-lot residences in a rural environment. The designation also implies that homes are served by private wells and on-site septic systems. The 16-35 dua residential classification provides for a diversity of multi-family and attached housing choices and an efficient use of residential land near public services and downtown Eagle River. The locational criteria for the 16-35 dua residential classification include areas near downtown Eagle River, areas adjacent to designated intermodal transit stations, areas served by public sewer and water, and areas with an established multi-family housing development pattern and zoning.

Issue 6:

- The small triangle shaped parcel north of the North Birchwood access is identified as residential less than 1 DUA. This property is a great location for a recreational vehicle park, adjacent to Peters Creek. It would need to be identified as “Commercial” to accommodate this.

Response: While there may be some merit to this suggestion, there is no specific proposal to review at this time. Planning believes this would be better addressed as a future Land Use Plan Map amendment, when more information is available to review and consider.

Issue 7:

- Parcel “C” of the Powder Reserve is identified as Transportation-related. It may be more appropriate to identify this as “Development Reserve,” requiring a Master Plan prior to any future development.

Response: Planning does not recommend this change. The property is depicted as Transportation-related based on the property’s current ownership by the Alaska Railroad (ARRC). If a land transfer occurs in the future between Eklutna, Inc., and the ARRC, the Land Use Plan Map can be amended to reflect the change in ownership and land use classification.

Eklutna Village area has a variety of designations that are not necessarily compatible:

Issue 8a:

- Ensure the residential area currently associated with the Eklutna Village site is retained as residential.

Response: The Land Use Plan Map shows a Residential, <1-1 dua classification for the area referenced as 8a on the Eklutna, Inc., map.

Issue 8b:

- Change the Transportation-related and Industrial areas north of Eklutna Village to “Development Reserve.” Heavier transportation and industrial use would have significant potential impacts upon residential and Village uses, as access would go through the Village. The Development Reserve classification would require a master plan prior to development affording appropriate consideration of compatibility.

Response: These classifications are carried forward from the 1993 Comprehensive Plan. Planning recommends retaining the Transportation-related classification for

the Alaska Railroad property. Planning concurs with changing the Industrial classification on the other property to Development Reserve.

Issue 8c:

- Clarify that the area identified as commercial between the Old and New Glenn Highways can be utilized as a staging, loading and conveyor uses, as conditional uses.

Response: The Land Use Plan Map recommends generalized land use classifications. Specific permitted uses are determined by zoning districts. The ancillary uses listed above are not allowed in the B-3 zoning district, which is the current zoning for this property. If this is the intended use for this land, a rezoning would need to take place.

Issue 8d:

- Identify a 40-80 (acre) industrial park site, north of Eklutna Road, east of the Glenn Highway. This area is flat, vegetated and enjoys easy access to the Highway exchange. One of the biggest issues associated with industrial areas currently designated on the plan is their poor locational characteristics. Making industrial park locations available at appropriate locations offers the community the opportunity to re-designate areas that may have that designation now but are poorly suited if not inappropriate.

Response: The scope of the Plan Update did not provide for an industrial needs analysis. While there may be some merit to considering an industrial park use here, it is difficult to assess whether or not more industrial land is needed in this particular location or if the scale of the proposed industrial acreage is appropriate at this time, without an industrial needs assessment. If such a study were done that recommended industrial at this location, a Land Use Plan Map amendment could be proposed.

Issue 9:

- Eklutna has land located at Hiland Road and Eagle River Loop Road that is currently designated residential, less than 1 DUA. Given its proximity, physical conditions and potential to be served by public sewer and water, it is appropriate to modify this area to residential at a density of 3-6 DUA.

Response: The referenced area is part of a larger tract that was zoned before this section of Eagle River Loop Road was constructed. The zoning is R-1A SL with a special limitation requiring site plan review with the site plan showing transition space between rural and urban residential densities and designating protection of areas in excess of 25 percent slope and within floodplains. Most of the referenced area is in the Eagle River Loop Road right-of-way except for portions south of the

road. These areas are considered mostly marginally suitable for development, which in this case is defined as an area with steep slopes from 25 to 45 percent. (See the Vacant Land Suitability Map on page 17 of the Plan Update.) Based on the SL and the limited development suitability, Planning does not recommend this change.

Issue 10:

- The area directly adjacent to Clunie Lake, within Eklutna's Powder Reserve Tract B should be represented as "Development Reserve."
- The environmentally sensitive designation should be a layer of the mapping; however it should not be suggested as a land use designation.

Response: The area referenced on Powder Reserve Tract B is part of the Development Reserve area.

The Environmentally Sensitive Area overlay was identified in the 1993 Plan as a map classification for areas shown as "unsuitable" on the Vacant Land Suitability Map. The 2006 Plan Update illustrates the Environmentally Sensitive Area as an informational overlay rather than a classification. Planning will add language to the description of the classification on pages 70-71 to clarify this.