

Birchwood Community Council

Meeting Minutes of October 27, 2010

Bobbi Wells called the regularly scheduled Birchwood Community Council meeting to order at 7:00 pm. Meeting attended by Chairs from Chugiak and Eagle River Valley Councils, who each took prepared C-ER Consortium (version 26) handout packets home with them. A quorum was present but barely.

Minutes for Sept. meeting approved as written (Gail 1, Susan 2nd)

Announcements:

Handouts were available for the future Nov 10th meeting regarding the **Official Streets & Hiway Plan**, (to be presented by Van Le from MOA transportation dept) showing those streets nominated for collector and up status. Some streets had been listed through several updates and a review needs to take place to ensure those nominations were still valid. Members were to take home this reference for their use as documents had not been posted for public review by the MOA.

Elections:

By **MOTION** duly made and approved (Susan 1, Cindy 2nd) Officers seated are:

--Gail McCain as continuing Secretary

--Bobbi Wells as primary with Jill Flanders-Crosby as alternate as Birchwood representatives on the C-ER Consortium Board.

--Unfilled is Assistant Secretary and a Birchwood Council delegate to the Federation of Councils.

These were the only positions up for election this year.

Holiday Meetings;

The members agreed we should adjourn for the months of December and January, and by **Motion** duly made and approved, (Randy, 2nd Susan) the Officers of the council were to act for the membership on time-sensitive matters until the council reconvened.

Old or Continued Business:

1) C-ER Consortium Land Use Regulations. Bobbi led the review while the membership and others followed along in the Chapter 10 binders provided. The makeup and history of the C-ER Consortium and the relationship with the MOA was presented.

The binders contained C-ER Chapter 10, version 26, the zoning breakdown by number of properties for both Chugiak and Birchwood councils, with special packets on the requirements and repercussions of reducing the minimum lot size of existing and future R-6 properties & further information on the proposed C-ER Advisory Board. Then it was explained why our most important regulations were written as stated. Randy gave additional input for clarification to the membership during the discussion. All were encouraged to submit comments or suggestions to enhance our Chapter 10 regulations, now, at the future Community Introduction of Chapter 10, and to the P&Z and the Assembly.

The ER Valley Chair used some past and current development in ER Valley as examples of why current standards and oversight of subdivisions don't meet our expectations.

Pg.6-16 covers our zoning districts, uses, standards and such, demonstrating where our more compact development in the future will be found. Character and lifestyle and the diversity of our area seems important to those that live here according to comments received by the Consortium. We followed the MOA example of different standards for Class A & B which are catch words for rural and urban areas. The size and placement within the A & B classification of a property governs what would allow certain accessory uses. Right-of-ways and setbacks are contentious, no matter how we wrote it. The benefits of accessory dwelling units as opposed to increasing the zoned density was shown, same with expanded home occupation standards and uses on larger lots. We modified future uses we currently don't have, like heli-ports. With our semi-agricultural roots in the 99567 zip code we have paid special attention to protecting our right to have animals. When discussing minimum lot size, changing the method of where you measure lot depth and front yard setbacks, reducing the minimum lot size to 1 acre from 1.25 ac is very contentious and Birchwood was the lone council that voted to not change from the current regulations.

Randy pointed out we will be bringing into the discussion with the MOA, a legal opinion that should help those R-6, R-8, R-9, and R-10 lots out here, which are the only zone districts affected, and the difference between Birchwood and the rest of the councils is the reduction to 1 acre to avoid becoming a non-conforming property. Bobbi asks the members to study the wording and the discussion and the legal opinion then exercise your own judgment on whether we should accept the reduction. If we accept it, many of the impacted members have asked that our yard setbacks be 25/15/25 rather than the current 50/25/50. The same goes for the stream setback width, to revert to the smaller setback of current code.

Members were told that the final Chapter 10 will be posted at www.aswcd.org and the Consortium will soon have a community meeting for all of C-ER so we encourage you to attend when we set the date. The ERV council asked for an explanation of why the Consortium was carrying forward the R-5A zone district since it was also a 1 acre minimum. Since Birchwood has the most R-5A zoning & few R-5, we included it to allow large lot development to have mobile homes, while Chugiak council area is the opposite, having mostly R-5 for small lot with mobile home use & few R-5a. Mobile homes are the viable and ultimate 'affordable housing' for low income residents.

2) Dan Saddler was introduced but was cautioned to not 'politic' since our bylaws require that his opposition must be present in order to do so. So he told us who he is and his occupation and his serious hobbies and interests. Mr Saddler is running for Nancy Dahlstrom's former position which includes Birchwood.

3) Bobbi presented the concepts put forth under the **Eagle River Central Business District Circulation Study** and informed the members that MOA Transportation/Traffic Dept want all councils to select a priority. Maps were presented to the members for our discussion. The state projects were pointed out. Randy pointed out that Eklutna, Inc does want that connecting road going in thru the back of their development but they do not want to have to pay for it. We then discussed the school site selection impact. On the connectivity segments, those will mostly be local roads so the cost will fall on our

local road board which looks to C-ER for funding thru mill levy and State grants. The P&Z hearing is Dec 6th but we have to have a council recommendation in by tomorrow. The council discussed the development going in where the Lazy Mtn Mobile Home Court was located in relation to this Study. We also discussed the future of limited road service area boards, including the MOA Hillside. Randy suggested the members be mindful that this is a 20 year build-out and maybe we should follow what ER Council suggests. Some suggested we follow what the Road Board decided. Another suggested we follow what the Chamber wanted. The council members, by duly approved **Motion**, takes no position in deciding which of the 3 concepts was our preferred choice but would like to see the State project changes at the Artillery Rd interchange to funnel traffic directly to ER Rd be built ASAP and strongly suggests that the local Road Board, as well as the local Chamber be given preference. ER Council position is unknown.

The meeting then adjourned.

Bobbi Wells, Chair
Jill Flanders Crosby, Vice Chair
Gail Davidson-McCain, Secty