

MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH SPECIAL MEETING
ASSEMBLY/PLANNING COMMISSION/PLATTING BOARD JUNE 25, 2002

I. CALL TO ORDER

The special joint meeting of the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Assembly, Planning Commission, and Platting Board was held on June 25, 2002, at the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Assembly Chambers, Palmer, Alaska. The meeting was called to order at 6 p.m. by Mayor Timothy L. Anderson.

II. ROLL CALL

Assembly members present and establishing a quorum were:

Mr. J. Bruce Bush, Assembly District No. 1
Mr. Talis J. Colberg, Assembly District No. 3
Mr. Dan Kelly, Assembly District No. 4
Ms. Jody Simpson, Assembly District No. 5
Mr. Jim Colver, Assembly District No. 6 (arrived at 6:10 p.m.)
Ms. Kelly Ladere, Assembly District No. 7

Assembly members absent and excused were:

Ms. Sara Jansen, Assembly District No. 2

Planning commission member present and establishing a quorum were:

Mr. Chris Rose, District 1
Mr. Lee Sharp, District 3
Ms. Mary Kvalheim, District 4
Ms. Helen Kaye, District 5
Mr. Gary S. Wolf, District 6
Ms. Rose M. Jenne, District 7

Planning commission member absent was:

Ms. Cynthia Payne, District 2

Platting board members present and establishing a quorum were:

Ms. Janet Kincaid, District 2
Ms. Helga Larson, District 3
Mr. Larry Timmons, District 4
Mr. William H. Bruu, District 5
Ms. Janet Whitfield, District 6
Mr. Roger Anderson, District 7

Platting board member absent was:

Mr. Robert Tucker, District 1

Staff in attendance were:

Ms. Sandra A. Dillon, Borough Clerk
Mr. John Duffy, Borough Manager
Mr. Michael Gatti, Borough Attorney
Ms. Michelle M. McGehee, Deputy Clerk
Ms. Sandra Garley, Planning Director
Mr. George Strother, Engineering Division Manager
Mr. Paul Hulbert, Platting Officer
Ms. Heather Bovat, Chief of Planning
Ms. Marilyn McGuire, Platting Assistant

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Anderson:

- noted that item VII, D., Dale Bingham, would be removed from the agenda and that item VII, C., Jeff Dillon, would be moved to item VII., A;
- advised that the first item of business, VI., A., Introduction, is an assembly item only.

GENERAL CONSENT: The agenda, as amended, was approved without objection.

IV. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance was led by Marilyn McGuire, a member of the platting department staff.

V. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Mayor Anderson opened audience participation. There being no one who wished to speak, audience participation was closed.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Introduction (For public hearing B 07/16/02, 7 p.m., Borough Assembly Chambers)

1. Ordinance Serial No. 02-093: AN ORDINANCE ACCEPTING AND APPROPRIATING \$1,206,560 FROM THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FEDERAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY, TO FUND 450, FOR POINT MACKENZIE PORT DEVELOPMENT.

a. Resolution Serial No. 02-057: A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE SCOPE OF WORK AND BUDGET FOR POINT MACKENZIE PORT DEVELOPMENT.

b. Resolution Serial No. 02-058: A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT OF PHASE II CONSTRUCTION AT PORT MACKENZIE.

(1) IM No. 02-158

Mayor Anderson read the above legislation into the record.

MOTION: Assemblymember Simpson moved for introduction of Ordinance Serial No. 02-093, Resolution Serial No. 02.057, and Resolution Serial No. 02-058, and to set the public hearing for July 16, 2002.

GENERAL CONSENT: The motion passed without objection.

VII. SPECIAL JOINT ASSEMBLY/PLANNING COMMISSION/PLATTING BOARD MEETING

A. Jeff Dillon, Design North, re: Issues Associated with Cluster Housing and Planned Unit Development (Requested by Planning Commission)

Mr. Sharp:

- introduced the item;
- noted that the presentation relates to updating the Planned Unit Development (PUD) portion of the borough code.

Mr. Dillon, Design North:

- referenced the handouts containing an outline of his presentation and additional information on the subject matter;

- described his education, background, and expertise as a landscape architect and parks planner for Design North in Anchorage;
- pointed out that he is not an expert in PUDs but has an acute interest in community development;
- noted that he has lived in Alaska for approximately 28 years and has been involved with a lot of projects throughout the state;
- informed that he has been fortunate to have done a number of projects recently in the borough including the Mat-Su Visual Community Preference Survey and the Open Space Plan. He is currently working with the city of Palmer on the Trails With Rails Corridor;
- spoke to three major issues facing the borough making land use planning and regulations important: (1) rapid growth of the community, particularly in the core area, (2) quality of life issues, and (3) issues related to government in the borough and statewide;
- noted that the core area is anticipated to grow to where over 13 percent of the population will be living in the area by the year 2018;
- noted also the growing population of seniors as well as young families living in the area;
- said that urban sprawl and loss of land are the critical impacts on the community;
- pointed out that the quality of life events for which people came here for B open space, access to recreation, farm land, agricultural lifestyle B are being lost;
- spoke to the higher cost of services associated with housing;
- spoke to government issues B a lack of land use regulations that achieve what the community is saying they would like to have, concerns over zoning that make the regulations difficult to enact, property rights, incompatible land uses, and resource extraction;
- noted the borough has the lowest staff-to-citizens ratio which stretches existing resources;
- emphasized the critical impact on the ability of staff to meet some of the time commitments associated with additional regulations;
- explained the scoring for the community preference survey and spoke to the seven key elements that were identified: rural life style, connection to open space and outdoor recreation, small-town feeling, friendly, livable neighborhoods, safe streets, connections to the past, history, and desire for quality landscapes;
- described a number of options to apply to try to develop rural conservation and development standards, emphasizing that:
 - it must be a partnership between government and the community B residents, developers, land owners;
 - it needs to be based on a planning vision that has wide community support;
 - it needs to balance new development with community traditional uses;
 - it should not require a lot of professional staff; lay people should be able to understand these regulations;
 - it should be fair and equitable; and
 - it should be based on the sound community values such as are described in the community preference survey; and
- explained and discussed the following options:
 - subdivision covenants;
 - large lot residential zoning;
 - agricultural zoning;
 - flexible land use regulations;
 - overlay zoning;
 - growth guidance systems;
 - transfer of development rights;
 - design guidelines and standards
 - cluster zoning and development

Questions and lengthy discussion ensued, concerning:

- liability issues associated with open space;
- compatibility problems between farms and subdivisions;
- restricting development rights on open space; once and open space is identified, the need to have a deed restriction recorded and identification of a responsible party;
- regulations for development of commercial and residential areas;

- difficulties in combining agriculture with residential areas;
- federal money available in the next six years for preservation of agricultural land;
- methods of financing the options above mentioned;
- incentives for developers to lower the costs of development;
- education of the public as to the benefits of planned unit developments;
- cost of a PUD versus average income of borough resident; 60 percent of the workforce commutes to other areas; comes down to quality of life issues why people move to the valley B access to open space, rural values; and
- creating infrastructure in conjunction with job opportunities will be one of the challenges.

Mayor Anderson thanked Mr. Dillon for his presentation.

The meeting was recessed at 7:17 p.m. and reconvened at 7:18 p.m.

B. Subdivisions and Public Use Districts (Requested by Planning Commission)

Mr. Sharp:

- noted that the title of the subject should be Planned Unit Development rather than Public Use Districts;
- pointed out that the PUD provision in the borough code focuses mostly on residential PUDs;
- introduced for discussion whether to revise the code, as it relates to PUDs, to allow for things like a certain amount of commercial use that serves the area, increased densities, and trade-offs such as open space for decreased setbacks; and
- noted the topic has also been raised in the platting board and are taking the opportunity of this special joint meeting with the assembly to discuss it.

Assemblymember Colver:

- commented on some of the issues raised in Land Design North's presentation;
- spoke to platting code requirements mandating community water, sewer, and half-acre lots or lots no smaller than 40,000 square feet;
- suggested that the borough should be looking at it more from an engineering view: soil quality and capacity of property.
- emphasized the need to pre-plan for location of sewer lagoons and water systems; that they need to be mainly gravity systems, that pressurized systems don't work according to the city of Wasilla;
- suggested looking at more flexibility in our regulations in order to keep the marketability of the Valley and to accomplish the concept of the cluster development, open space, and preserve the characteristics for which people come here;
- suggested providing a mechanism that can be adjudicated before the platting board for developers to come in with their proposals and plans for development;
- noted a key problem with the open space is the receiving entity of the open space; said that ultimately, over time it is rarely kept as open space; and
- emphasized the need for developing policy decisions on how to deal with open space development if the borough is to be receiving entity.

Mayor Anderson:

- noted that public use districts were advertised and not planned unit development so will not continue further discussion for planned unit development.

Assemblymember Ladere:

- informed that several groups have approached her stating that 58 private land owners all in the historical area of downtown Talkeetna want to eliminate the property line setbacks because of significant factors common to all of them;
- suggested that downtown Talkeetna is a planned land use district;

- spoke to the commonality being that many of the structures are listed in the National Historical Register, most are all used for commercial purposes, the area is served by sewer and water, and the lots are very small, most of them only 25' x 50';
- noted that she has been asked to do something about removing the setback requirements for this common downtown area; and
- advocated development of a procedure through planning/platting/assembly for handling an entire district of 58 lots.

Mr. Rose

- clarified that this is on the agenda because during the course of working on zoning regulations and the conditional use permit system, the issue of how subdivisions might develop in the future repeatedly came up; and
- noted that the planning commission and platting board hope to receive input and direction from the assembly as to how these developments should take place.

Ms. Garley:

- spoke to development standards and the provision in Title 16 which permits the adoption by the assembly of a special development district; and
- noted its use most recently at Pt. McKenzie.

Mr. Wolf:

- advocated addressing some of the subdivision requirements; and
- spoke to how modern urban design theories and practices have shown how these new subdivisions can create better neighborhoods and communities.

Ms. Kincaid:

- spoke to rewriting Title 16 and the Subdivision Manual; and
- advocated incorporating the use of narrower streets and alleyways as a solution to some of the safety problems on subdivision streets.

Ms. Larson:

- spoke to land use regulations B what can you do with the land;
- said she doesn't think there will be a change unless there are some regulations and tools to enforce those regulations; and
- stressed the importance of education to make people understand that it is to their benefit to do things differently from the way it has been done in the past.

Assemblymember Ladere:

- spoke to community development;
- encouraged the use of cluster neighborhoods;
- noted that if we're advocating safe, stable communities, then we're speaking about a community that is working together on many layers; and
- encouraged platting and planning to help the assembly accomplish it.

Assemblymember Kelly:

- spoke to this being a comp plan issue and should be worked on through the appropriate committees; and
- stated that he doesn't want to force anything on the general public that they don't want, which is why the

comprehensive plan is so important.

Mr. Bruu:

- spoke to the economic reality of cluster developments.

Ms. Jenne:

- spoke to quality of life issues and noted that she thinks the borough has an obligation to consider a variety of subdivisions, whether they be PUDs or clustered housing ;
- noted the growing senior community and changing times; and
- advocated becoming educated as to where we need to go with this B giving people options or the developer options to create such developments.

Mr. Timmons:

- spoke to the fact that the platting board has no choice but to approve a subdivision, no matter how small the lot size, if it meets the requirements of Title 16;
- noted that the platting board feels responsible for development that people don't like;
- discussed the need for Title 16 to be updated and rewritten with the input of the planning commission and the assembly;
- noted that just having staff rewrite it based upon what they think that people want isn't going to address all of the problems and issues being discussed today; and
- expressed appreciation for this joint meeting to discuss each body's functions, powers, and limitations, but without the input of the assembly, planning commission, and public, we'll continue to see the fractured development that is happening right now.

Ms. Larson:

- responded to the comment that there may not be the economic resource in the Valley to pay for some of these options B she doesn't agree;
- cited the example of Mt. Rose Estates Subdivision for seniors, stating that it is a totally new concept for the Valley and it sold out very quickly; there is a large population of seniors wanting this type of subdivision;
- discussed that the first-time home buyer is doing better now than 20 years ago where they could only buy an \$80,000 home as opposed to today at \$157,000 plus;
- suggested leaving it up to the banks and financial institutions to come up with different types of financing to supplement the interest rate; and
- spoke to looking forward to a concept that is unbeatable and that will attract people.

Mayor Anderson queried the manager if there were plans for a revision of Title 16.

Mr. Duffy:

\$ responded that the rewrite has been stalled because of work on the zoning ordinance which is now complete; work on Title 16 is expected to start back up.

Discussion continued concerning:

- the rewrite of Title 16;
- the need for development options;
- a work session between the planning and platting boards to set down some basic guidelines and goals;
- contracting out certain elements of the Title 16 revision to relieve some of the workload burden on staff (Mr. Duffy will follow up with Ms. Garley to discuss the best approach);
- the current draft revision document does not take into account the issues discussed here tonight;
- the need to address subdivision roads systems and their access; when to require road upgrades and when not.

- the borough has transportation models that address the problems (Mr. Duffy will provide copies of the models to planning and platting);
- the need for acquiring rights-of-way for road development; and
- the need to address the issue of new subdivisions that have access from an existing road through another subdivision, thereby doubling and tripling the traffic on roads not designed for such high use B will create major problems in near future.

C. Water body Setback Variances (Requested by Assemblymember Simpson)

Assemblymember Simpson:

- informed that Big Lake residents are frustrated with the variance process and waterbody setback regulations;
- noted a variance request just denied that recently went to appeal which when reviewed by many was thought to be ideal for passage of a variance;
- spoke to the topographical constraints on Big Lake, Flat Lake, and Mud Lake and many of the other lakes in the valley;
- requested that the process for granting variances be reviewed and perhaps relax the cookie-cutter standards that are applied;
- asked that consideration and common sense be applied when addressing requests for variances of water body setbacks;
- spoke to best management practices; and
- brought the topic up for discussion to find out if code changes are being considered and what the level of discussion is among the planning commission.

Mayor Anderson:

- pointed out that the planning commission and platting board are bound by the code and apply it equally to all; and
- noted that if the assembly feels a need to address the issue, then the code needs to be changed.

Assemblymember Colver:

- stated that one of the hardest decisions to make as a planning commissioner was on lake and waterbody setback variances;
- noted that the commission must apply state law;
- recalled that Big Lake requested a 45-foot setback;
- noted the required 75-foot setback was adopted by the board via initiative and is not sure whether the assembly would feel comfortable violating that;
- suggested perhaps it's a ballot issue to be put out for Big Lake; and
- spoke to problems with enforcement requirements.

Mr. Gatti:

- advised that the 75-foot setback is a component of the State of Alaska Coastal Management Plan which the borough is obligated to follow;
- pointed out that if an amendment of the 75-foot water body setback were to be considered, we would have to work with the coastal policy council for a plan amendment; and
- believed Mr. Hudson had already addressed some of the pros and cons with the council concerning this issue and supplied memoranda to the assembly.

Mr. Rose:

- spoke to some of the conflicts;
- noted that there are probably many people who are not bothering to request a variance because the talk is they

- will probably get denied and there=s a lack of enforcement;
- said that it is ironic that the people who are trying to do it right and exercise best use are not being granted their request, and the people who are doing what they want are getting away with it because there=s not enough enforcement; and
- advocated incorporating best management practices into the ordinance so it can be part of the findings.

Ms. Larson:

- spoke to variances being addressed at the last planning seminar; said what she learned helped in determining when and when not to issue a variance; and
- encouraged everyone to attend the seminars B not only are there good speakers but valuable input from other boroughs as to how they handle certain issues.

Mr. Bruu:

- talked about the platting board spending a great deal of time dealing with subdivisions, especially in the Big Lake area, that are not feasible;
- noted the lots being too small for septic or a house; and
- spoke to the need for strong enforcement on variances that are afforded in order to start cleaning up some of the situations that have occurred.

Assemblymember Simpson:

- noted many of the lots were put in place when there were no regulations;
- spoke to pre-existing nonconforming lots and acknowledged that some lots are substandard;
- said that there should be ways to compromise and not harm the environment;
- restated that she is carrying a message from constituents and is looking for options; and
- emphasized that she would be happy to work with the manager and the planning department to put together some best management guidelines.

Mr. Duffy:

- stated that he found the variance issue one of the most difficult to deal with, but it was one of the most interesting as well;
- suggested variances be separated into two categories B one where development has occurred and one where development has not occurred;
- noted it is very difficult to grant a variance after development has occurred;
- emphasized that we are bound by state law and the code;
- suggested that there is more flexibility before development has occurred; and
- advocated development of best management practices into the Big Lake Management Plan.

Mr. Sharp:

- acknowledged that state statutes set out the standards that one must adhere to when granting a variance;
- emphasized that if there is a setback problem common to a whole neighborhood, then the code needs changed regarding the setbacks, but you don=t relax the requirements for a variance; and
- spoke to identifying the various problems in the code (such as the pie-shaped lots not wide enough to build on and steep topography) and then prescribe what relaxation of the setback requirement can occur.

Assemblymember Ladere:

- informed that the coastal zone management plan originated in federal law;
- cautioned that it is not something that can be manipulated too much;
- spoke to this not being only a Big Lake problem, that throughout the borough there are communities that pre-date our municipality; and

- expressed support for whatever solutions could be put forth.

Ms. Jenne:

- expressed compassion for the Big Lake problems because her area faces similar problems;
- noted the need to find a solution;
- voiced the fear that we're creating the perception of Ajust go ahead and do it@, that we're not making things better; and
- favors a work session to find solutions to these problems.

Mr. Timmons:

- concurred with Mr. Rose and Mr. Sharp regarding relaxing the regulations to allow some discretion; and
- said that he doesn't want a lot of discretion granted to the platting board; they need specific guidelines to go by regarding variances.

Mr. Gatti:

- spoke to the question of discretion when dealing with a variance--each case turns on its own circumstances and the facts may change the outcome based on the rules that you apply;
- emphasized that it is very important to exercise good judgment and reasonable discretion with respect to each case;
- suggested code amendments should be thoughtfully considered and established as an objective; and
- recognized that going to the coastal management policy council to make the change from the 75-foot to a 45-foot setback is an option.

Assemblymember Simpson:

- clarified her position, noting the need for options and tools to deal with peculiarities on a case-by-case basis; and
- emphasized that she is not advocating removal of the 75-foot setback.

D. Dale Bingham, Department of Natural Resources, Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation, and Herman Griese, Biologist/Habitat Specialist, Fish and Game, re: Presentation on Design and Criteria for Bear-Proof Containers (Requested by Planning Commission)

(This item was removed from the agenda as Mr. Bingham was not available.)

E. Planning Commission's Role in Land Classification Issues Brought Before the Commission for Action (Requested by Planning Commission)

Mr. Sharp:

- spoke to classification and re-classification of land by the planning commission;
- noted the commission has no authority to recommend any restrictions on the use of the land or conditions of sale, only to approve or deny; and
- requested that the commission have a more substantive role in making recommendations with respect to the use of the land.

Ms. Larson:

- queried the process.

Mr. Sharp:

- noted that land management makes recommendations and in some instances the planning commission may want

to recommend, but it is ultimately up to the assembly to approve classifications.

Mayor Anderson:

- noted that the planning commission can make recommendations and it is up to the assembly to choose whether to use the recommendations; and
- queried the manager if this was a borough policy.

Mr. Duffy:

- responded that it is not a borough policy, that it has varied from commission to commission;
- indicated that some commissions have been very active in making recommendations on land use and other commissions have not; and
- said that it is up to the planning commission if it wants to make recommendations.

F. Borough Code Change re: Address Enforcement Issues and Implementing a Permit System to Find a Solution to Peculiar Situations When Dealing with Variances (Requested by Planning Commission)

Mr. Sharp:

- spoke to the problems of after-the-fact variances;
- discussed the effectiveness of acknowledgment of borough regulations;
- noted no follow up of compliance; and
- suggested that the only way to ensure compliance is to require a permit.

Mr. Bruu:

- spoke to an alternative to the permit system; and
- suggested the borough needs to enlist allies in enforcing the regulations, which allies would include banks, real estate brokers, and all those involved in a real estate transaction; and educate them through a public relations effort as to borough policy, and to let them know that the borough won't be approving variances as easily as in the past.

Assemblymember Simpson:

- spoke to the goal of the coastal zone management plan is to protect water fowl, fish, and wildlife habitats;
- expressed confusion as to what we're trying to do; and
- emphasized that the discussion is about land that people own and even though we're bound by the letter of the law, the practical outcome is people are going to sell, buy, build, and use the land that they own.

Assemblymember Colver:

- pointed out the borough is the district coastal zone manager for this coastal district, so it can initiate a coastal zone plan amendment;
- suggested we need advice as to the options;
- noted the planning commission has been burdened with a lot of these variances; and
- queried the manager whether to initiate an amendment, change state statute, or institute best management practices.

Brief discussion continued.

Ms. Larson:

- noted not all lots are created around water bodies;
- advocated land use permits; and

spoke to increased violations not only being on the lakes but everywhere.

Ms. Jenne:

- spoke in favor of the permit system, stating that it may solve a lot of problems before they happen; and
- noted that it may also address variance requests, stating that most of them are problems that have evolved over time.

Ms. Kincaid:

- noted one area that a permit system could be very helpful is in making people understand that it is their responsibility to know where their lot lines are, that it is not the borough's responsibility to fix it after they've built the house, the driveway, the shed, or whatever; and
- spoke in favor of the permit system.

Mr. Wolf::

- noted that most of the variances he has seen after the fact could have been resolved if someone would have taken the setbacks into account; and
- spoke in favor of the permit system.

Ms. Kaye:

- spoke in favor of land use permits that address the footprint of the building and the use of the property.

Assemblymember Bush:

- noted that it should only be a foundation building for permitting, as most other structures are moveable.

Mr. Rose:

- suggested a mandatory acknowledgment system of the regulations; and
- pointed out that this system would provide us the opportunity to at least educate people at the front end.

Ms. Larson:

- pointed out the importance of indication of the well and septic system; and
- noted that banks and title companies require an as-built survey; if the title company does not insure title, then the banks will not loan.

Mr. Bruu:

- commented that it is time to get off of the idea that Alaska has no rules.

VIII. MAYOR, ASSEMBLY, PLANNING COMMISSION, PLATTING BOARD, AND STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Dillon:

- explained that the clerk's office is getting more calls requesting copies of the zoning ordinance;
- noted they are telling the public that the zoning plan, as adopted by the planning commission, is available now, however, if they want all the information that will be going to the assembly for the July 16 meeting, she will have that information on July 8, and will arrange for copies at that time; and
- indicated that all have opted to wait for the assembly packet.

Ms. Garley:

- expressed appreciation to have all three bodies together, that it was very informative; and
- noted it will make the follow up session easier to address issues.

Mr. Hulbert:

- commented that he is looking forward to seeing the zoning ordinance and getting back to the rewrite of Title 16.

Mr. Gatti:

- thanked everyone for the good conversation and debate and wished all good luck in developing options for resolution of the problems.

Mr. Duffy:

- commented that the meeting was very informative, that he has gotten some good ideas;
- noted that these are the three bodies in the borough that deal with development issues on a regular basis; and
- supported these groups to meet quarterly to address the issues of the day B variances, zoning, rewrite of Title 16, transportation plan B because they are all interrelated.

Ms. Kincaid:

- echoed appreciation for the joint meeting, that it gives insight into issues on other levels;
- noted the platting board is in the process of revising its fee schedule as the borough fees are very low; and
- commented that she is looking forward to the hiring of more staff members.

Mr. Timmons:

- echoed thanks for the joint meeting; found it very informative to hear other=s perspectives; and
- spoke in favor of quarterly meetings.

Mr. Anderson:

- thanked everyone for the informative meeting.

Ms. Larson:

- expressed appreciation for the opportunity to meet all of the members;
- noted that it a lot easier to discuss the issues in a round table fashion and hopefully solve some problems; and
- agreed that quarterly meetings would be a very good idea.

Mr. Bruu:

- thanked the bodies for the joint meeting and the members of the public for taking their time to participate and listen to the issues of the day.

Ms. Whitfield:

- thanked everyone for joint meeting opportunity; and
- indicated strong support for quarterly meetings .

Mr. Rose:

- thanked everyone and indicated that it was very helpful to hear other=s perspectives and looks forward to doing it more often.

Mr. Wolf:

(No comments given.)

Ms. Kaye:

- commented that she was pleased to find out that the issues discussed by all the boards are similar; and
- advocated quarterly meetings.

Ms. Kvalheim:

- thanked everyone for coming; and
- emphasized the need for education at every level from cluster housing to land use acknowledgment.

Ms. Jenne:

- commented that this has been a first step in resolving some of the problems.

Mr. Sharp:

- expressed that he is pleased at the concurrence in identifying the problems and agreement as to some of the options; and
- expressed thanks for the opportunity of the joint meeting.

Assemblymember Bush:

- questioned who is going to pay for the open space in this new concept of subdivisions;
- indicated that open space is not an immediate concern for him;
- stated that planned use should be with the support of the whole community;
- emphasized the need for education on land use and advocated a common sense approach;
- noted that the variance problems should be looked at with common sense; and
- spoke to technology changing--that we don't set the law so solid in stone that our future generations can't make necessary changes.

Assemblymember Colberg:

- expressed appreciation for the meeting;
- noted that he did not know that the planning commission was not aware of the transportation plan B thinks it will be useful to answer some of their questions;
- expressed appreciation to the planning commission for their efforts regardless of what happens in zoning; and
- spoke to looking at options to make growth more reasonable in this area.

Assemblymember Kelly:

- commented that it is good to be part of such a large body that is doing so much to make the borough a better place to live;
- spoke to priorities;
- noted that it needs to be done in a way that all can be involved in solving our problems and the rewrite to Title 16 and Title 17;
- spoke to the zoning ordinance, noting it is an effort to make some changes to zoning within a given area;
- noted the comprehensive plan was first written in 1970 and it has never been totally rewritten since then;
- emphasized that the comp plan is key to answering many questions and by state law needs to be reviewed frequently;
- spoke to the need to be concerned about compatibility issues with the various communities;
- spoke to the long-range transportation plan and the need to bring all these issues together to make sure that we have met the needs of future growth;
- spoke to the need to absolutely address all elements of enforcement;

- thanked everyone for serving on the boards and meeting to make the borough a better place to live; and
- emphasized setting priorities according to what each other's needs are and trying to help each other get the job done.

Assemblymember Colver:

- thanked everyone for their dedication;
- noted that it was good to hear a consensus that this kind of meeting was necessary;
- spoke to the overwhelming work load of our staff and the need to focus on what the near-term and long-term goals are in order to more efficiently use our staff; and
- asked that the planning commission consider addressing the problem of model airplane enthusiasts flying the airplanes near residential areas in Palmer.

Assemblymember Simpson:

(No comments given.)

Mayor Anderson:

- echoed the sentiments of everyone and thanked all the members for their dedication;
- noted it is good to see the groups coming together and thanked them for a good meeting; and
- advised of a site visit he made to the borough campground on the Deshka River.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting was adjourned at 9:24 p.m.

TIMOTHY L. ANDERSON, Borough Mayor

ATTEST:

SANDRA A. DILLON, Borough Clerk

(SEAL)

Minutes approved: July 16, 2002