

Executive Board Members Present:

Dean Syta
Peggy Robinson
Steve Sommerfeld

Bob Reupke
John Floyd

Absent:

Josh Green
Bill Wielechowski
Bobby Scott
Troy Carlock

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Call to Order: Approx 7:10 pm. Meeting began late awaiting a quorum of the Executive Board.

Business:

1) Muldoon Area Middle School, Replacement of Buffer Vegetation

- John Paxson, ASD project manager for the Muldoon Area Middle School, and Elise Huggins, Earthscape Inc, landscape architect for the project reviewed the revegetation plan developed by the ASD mitigation committee. Jean Fischer, principal for the new school was also present.
- The revegetation plan is designed to address the unauthorized overclearing of buffer areas along Debarr road by the ASD's contractor.
- The mitigation committee, consisting of ASD, the project Architect, Contractor, and NECC members met three times and devised a plan. This plan was submitted to the MOA UDC (Sharon Ferguson), who requested additional species of trees be added, which is being considered.
- The planting plan includes 80 spruce (5 to 7 feet tall) and 82 birch trees (3-inch caliper). Plantings are generally on a shallow, meandering berm, with breaks for drainage.
- The overall width of the planting is generally as wide, or wider than the platted buffer requirements, at least along Debarr. There is some question as to width of buffer, or clearing that occurred on the west end of the site near the fire station. Approximately 20 older trees in this area were cleared or scheduled to be cleared that members of the NECC believe were original supposed to remain.
- There is a two year warranty on the plant materials.
- ASD requested approval of the plan, so that they could begin implementing it within the next several weeks. As this issue has some time sensitive component, it is in the purview of the Executive Board to act upon it.

Accordingly, the following motion was made:

NECC Executive Board July 20, 2006 Motion (1a):

- 1) *[The NECC Executive Board] accepts the landscaping plan as proposed; except that*
- 2) *After an investigation is completed by the mitigation committee, if it is determined that the old growth trees on the western portion of the property were to have been retained (approximately 20 trees), then these trees shall be replanted with plant materials of equivalent worth; and*
- 3) *No additional existing old growth trees shall be removed without the approval of the landscape architect.*

This motion passed: 5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstaining.

2) **Rezone of Warner and Peck Circle: Presentation by Harvey Prickett, Dean Architects**

- At the July 20th Northeast Community Council executive board, Harvey Prickett of Dean Architects presented the proposed rezoning of Eastview Estates Subdivision from R2M to R3. Mr. Prickett had been scheduled for several earlier opportunities to present to the NECC membership, but failed to appear at these meetings. As this executive board meeting was his last opportunity to present to the council prior to the Assembly meeting of July 25th, the NECC Executive board agreed to meet to hear his presentation. Five members of the nine person Executive board were present, as well as approximately twelve members of the NECC, plus a number of non-members.
- The proposed development includes 66 units of multistory residential, with single, double, and three bedroom units. The project includes the extension of Peck, all the way to Muldoon.
- Reportedly on 3.1 acres, with 40,000+ square feet of open space / green area and areas designated for snow storage. However, most of the open area is found in 10 foot strips around the buildings. Site amenities are limited to a 15' landscape buffer on the south.
- Developer has not spoken to the neighboring properties at all.
- Current zoning is R2M, and would apparently allow 45 units. Rezone is to R3, which would apparently allow as many as 105 units, provided open space, parking, etc could be met (which is doubtful due to site grades). In any case, developer is seeking approval for 66 units, which is a stipulated condition of approval on the MOA rezone request.
- Developer indicated that proposed site plan was concept, was likely to change again.
- The NECC Executive Board does not object to the development of Eastview Estates Subdivision, however we do have considerable concerns with the proposed density. The NECC also believes that the proposed development has not adequately addressed open space, traffic, parking, or amenities for the families and children who are likely to live in this high density development.

Accordingly, the following motion was made:

NECC Executive Board July 20, 2006 Motion (1):

The NECC Executive Board does not object to the rezone of Peck and Warner Circle to R3 from R2M, provided the following recommended conditions of approval are made part of the rezone:

- 4) The development be limited to the 66 units proposed, either by plat note or zoning condition;*
- 5) The developer shall be required to present site plans, floor plans, and elevation drawings before the NECC membership for community review and comment at concept, 65% and 100% design levels.*

This motion passed: 3 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstaining.

- The presenter, Mr. Prickett was accepting of these conditions.
- John Floyd volunteered to present at the Assembly as Peggy Robinson wasn't sure she could attend.

3) **Announcement: Wal-Mart Development:**

- Wal-Mart has appealed the denial of their rezoning request by the planning and zoning commission to the MOA Assembly. Their case will be heard August 15, 2006.
- Paul Bauer: There will be an Assembly worksession the Friday prior to this meeting.

RECESS: Approx 8:30 pm

SPECIAL NECC TITLE 21 WORKSESSION

Call to Order: Approx 7:40 pm. (John Floyd and Steve Sommerfeld left at end of executive meeting).

Business:

1) Review of Title 21 Rewrite Procedures: Assemblywoman Debbie Ossiander

- Debbie has cochaired the MOA Title 21 rewrite committee for the past three years.
- In the early 1970's, Title 21 was formed as a loose compilation of items, without any consideration for overall planning or city development. Various parts have been amended numerous times, but the code is hard to use, and parts of it conflict with itself.
- The Anchorage 2020 comprehensive plan laid out a concept for the long term development of Anchorage, but did not include a land use map, or any enabling legislation. That is the purpose of the Title 21 rewrite, to implement the 2020 plan.
- The Title 21 rewrite draft was prepared three years ago by a consultant. There have been three subsequent drafts. The final draft is due this summer, which would then go before the planning and zoning commissions, and finally the assembly.
- Mayor's office has pulled this final draft back from the original release schedule. Now expecting a September date for the release. The Mayor has some concerns that certain items have not been dealt with satisfactorily, or haven't been resolved yet, or that there is still too much opposition to some of the changes.
- The Assembly Title 21 Committee is composed of Debbie Ossiander, Dan Coffey, and Pam Jennings. The notes of this group are available on the MOA website --- look for Project 21: Assembly Committee on Title 21.

2) Open Discussion of Title 21

- Ainslie Phillips. Concerned that the actual language used to write Title 21 be reviewed for clarity, intent and definition. It is very important that the language be direct, and not contain loopholes caused by inaccurate wording. Debbie Ossiander: Some folks want clarity, and some folks want flexible language. No matter how many times people review items, things will be missed.
- Ainslie Phillips: Some concern that mixed use planning can alter tax basis. Debbie Ossiander: Some of the assembly want an economic impact analysis performed.
- Clinton Hodges: Title 21 (the rewrite) appears to encourage high density development in R2M areas, but not every existing R2M area is well suited to this growth. How do we go from protecting existing neighborhoods to encouraging bigger development? Debbie: The planning staff would say that Title 21 does both--- it does encourage growth, but it also requires amenities and planning.
- Dean Syta: Regarding the nature of the Title 21 text: At present, the requirements of the existing Title 21 are largely up to the interpretation of the planning staff, and each new development or design is subject to the whims of planning. Planning seems to enjoy interpreting the code, as it enables them to manipulate the process to some degree. However, this is not fair to the developers, the designers or the citizens. Therefore, the Title 21 language needs to be clear enough to define just what is, and isn't required, so that everyone can expect to be treated in the same manner.
- Dean Syta: Regarding the economic impact analysis. It is important to consider not just the monetary costs, but the social costs as well. Planning ordinances of this time are not just about growth, they are about social engineering. Title 21 is where you prevent slums, where you prevent crime ridden neighborhoods, where you avoid setting up class divides. You must consider the considerable social benefits of building a more desirable city to live in, not just the monetary costs of doing so.
- Ainslie Phillips: Are there going to be impact fees (payment intended to offset a development's impact on public facilities)? They were included in Draft 1 and 2, but were out of Draft 3. Debbie: Probably will not be included in final draft. However, the final draft is going to mandate open space and other amenity requirements.

Adjournment at approximately 9:30 pm.