# PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING APRIL 9, 2013 @ 6:30 PM LIBRARY MEETING ROOM MINUTES

- A. Call to order -
- B. Roll Call Present for roll call were Chairman Tom Bailer, David Reggiani, John Greenwood, Scott Pegau, Tom McGann, John Baenen and Roy Srb.

Also present was Planner Samantha Greenwood, Assistant Planner Shannon Joekay, Interim City Manager Donald Moore and Harbormaster Tony Schinella.

There were 9 people in the audience.

C. Approval of Agenda

M/Reggiani S/Greenwood <u>Upon voice vote, motion passed, 7-0</u> <u>Yea: Bailer, Reggiani, Greenwood, Pegau, McGann, Baenen, Srb</u> <u>Nay: None</u>

D. Approval of Consent Calendar

1. Minutes of 3-12-13 Planning Commission Public Hearing

2. Minutes of 3-12-13 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

- 3. Record unexcused absence for John Baenen from the March  $12^{th}$ , 2013 Regular Meeting and the March  $12^{th}$ , 2013 Public Hearing.
- 4. Record excused absence for Scott Pegau for the March 12th, 2013 Regular Meeting and the March 12th, 2013 Public Hearing.

M/Greenwood S/Reggiani

Upon voice vote, motion passed, 7-0

Yea: Bailer, Reggiani, Greenwood, Pegau, McGann, Baenen, Srb

Nay: None

E. Record Absences

None

F. Disclosure of Conflict of Interest

Tom McGann disclosed a conflict of interest on Lot 3A (was asked to build a building on it).

G. Correspondence

Letter from Paul and Linda Kelly re: Lot 3A

H. Communication by and Petitions from Visitors

1. Guest Speakers

None

Audience comments regarding items in the agenda

**Alexis Cooper**, representing CDFU, 501 First Street ~ I am here to represent CDFU and speak to the Lot 3A disposal recommendation. I attended the meeting last night where the Harbor Commission presented their plans for the land use by the "North Fill Ramp Revitalization Project". I just want to speak on behalf of the fleet and say this is a great opportunity and necessary to, presented by the Harbor Commission to use this land, and

help some of the congestion at the Harbor Ramp. I support option 1 that utilizes lot 3A. On the pictures it looks like a large amount of space but having taken a tour of that area, when you think of the size of the boats, the trailers, the vehicles used to move them: it's not that much space. It's seen outside of Baja and behind the Harbormaster's. An integral part of that plan is installing electrical hook ups and water in the portion that includes lot 3A. 9 spaces isn't that much when you consider the size of the fleet. There are 541 gillnet permits. I think it's a great opportunity and I really think it's a workable plan that the Harbor Commission presented. I would like to speak in support of that.

# 3. Chairpersons and Representatives of Boards and Commissions None

## I. Planners Report

Samantha Greenwood ~ We handed out the school preferred route, spoke with Gayle Groff at the Grade School, this is their supported route: up Third Street and left onto Adams. She would like to put this map into their handbook. So that's just an additional piece of information. Meeting reminders: Tom Bailer would like a call the day of the meeting; Reggiani, McGann, Srb, Pegau, Greenwood, Baenen would all like an email the day before the meeting. Put recorded absences into the consent calendar. If you disagree you can ask the Chairman to pull them out for discussion. Lawyer training tally: 7-Bailer, McGann, Srb, Greenwood, Baenen, Samantha Greenwood and Shannon Joekay; Reggiani and Pegau will be out of town.

#### J. New Business

# a. Lot 3A Disposal Recommendation to City Council (voice vote)M/Greenwood S/Srb

"I move to recommend to city council that the land disposal status of Lot 3A, Block 8, North Fill Development Park remain as NOT available."

**Greenwood** ~ After our meeting last night and our previous discussion I think it's a good idea to hang onto this lot for now and feel out what happens at least in the coming year and future years and see how this plan works and the program works done there. We can always sell it later if things don't work but for now we need to hang onto it.

**Srb** ~ It was a good presentation by the Harbor Commission and the Harbormaster yesterday. I do support, of course by my second, retaining that property for the time being and see what the Harbor can do with it and where they can go with it: giving the fleet some elbow room.

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{Pegau} & \sim \textbf{Definitely been thinking about holding onto the lot now.} \\ \textbf{Should hold it for the Harbor.} \\ \end{tabular}$ 

**Baenen** ~ Didn't get to go to the meeting last night so I'm not sure where everybody is headed. Prior to that I am for selling it.

**Reggiani** ~ Before coming into the meeting last night and getting the presentation from the Harbor Commission, I was thinking of making it available for sale, given the economic development aspects of the North Fill and what that land could be used for. I was encouraged to hear that the plan will be executed in the short term: cleared off, marked up and reorganized. I would be in favor of revisiting this in another year to see how the season went. I could support the recommendation to city council with a caveat that we review it again this time next year or at the end of the season get a report back-an evaluation of how it went.

**Bailer** ~ Want to thank the Harbor Commission. There are things such as traffic flow but I think those will get ironed out. They're not designing traffic flow but they can tune that up a bit. We can always revisit this. I was also struck today with a couple fisherman that asked me about this and I told them to come to the meeting. They said they already gave their input to the Harbor Commission. I think you fail to realize that the Harbor Commission, as a group, is also speaking to the people in the community. They're representing that group

then they're bringing it to us and we're representing another group. It's not like there's 10 people making this decision so I support the motion as not available for sale at this point.

Upon voice vote, motion passed, 5-1 Yea: Bailer, Reggiani, Greenwood, LoForte, Srb Nay: Baenen Conflict of Interest: McGann

# b. Design criteria for proposed Safe Routes to School Project

**Samantha Greenwood** ~ Shannon is going to type the questions to make sure we get them to the engineer. The engineer needs them as specific as possible so he can answer them. We'll send this to the engineer; he will address them and send them back to us. Then he will be on the phone at the meeting that it's presented to help answer any questions. And if it ever stops snowing we will have a survey. If it comes down to it we may have to push snow to get some corners before Leo (Americus) starts fishing.

**McGann** ~ Most of my questions, except for the survey, have already been addressed in this write up. It seems like the East side is the way to go but I'd like to see the survey.

Samantha Greenwood ~ That's going to be a big factor.

**Greenwood** ~ A lot of my questions were answered (in the write up). I guess one of my questions that remains is a rolled curb vs. raised curb as far as safety or an out of control vehicle being able to jump onto the sidewalk. In my mind, a normal raised curb is going to stop a vehicle a lot easier than a rolled curb. But I do understand there is access issues. **Samantha Greenwood** ~ So does, "Are vertical curbs safer than rolled curbs as far as jumping sidewalks is concerned and why?"

**Greenwood** ~ Yes, that's the main one. And it appears the east side is the lesser of the two evils there.

Pegau ~ I didn't have any questions to pass on to the engineer. Thank you.

**Reggiani** ~ Nothing really to pass onto the engineer. But with the Mt. Eccles principal with this preferred route, did she intend to have a one way, regardless of width? I know that's one of the things we're thinking about. If the survey comes in and we put a sidewalk on the street may narrow it a bit.

**Samantha Greenwood** ~ She didn't say that. We spoke about it a little bit. She didn't object to it. But I think when we get a sidewalk in and see what the width is. I think it's a possibility in the future, she wants to keep people going in that direction instead of across. I think that might be one of those things we can't address until we have a survey. If it's wide enough is it advantageous to keep that one way for the traffic flow?

**Reggiani** ~ My other question has to do with the water pipes and valve boxes. I guess those won't be part of this project. Do we know the cost?

**Samantha Greenwood** ~ Part of the reason is we aren't digging to put the sidewalk in. We don't have it funded. Those lines are all 6 feet deep, in the middle of the road, not where the sidewalk is. The valve box is the land owner's responsibility. Moe is the one who answered this so I assume he knew that but I can ask him.

**Baenen** ~ I know there's no survey done but if this overlay is anything close to accurate; this road is going to have to get moved over. I don't know if there is enough money to move the road over, the sidewalk is pretty much 8 feet wide: 6 foot sidewalk plus the 2 foot curb and gutter.

**Reggiani** ~ Maybe a good question for the engineer is the minimum size of this sidewalk. If we don't have 8 feet, can we get away with something smaller?

**Srb** ~ The majority of the utilities are on the west side. The map by CTC is hard to understand, but basically their lines are in the same place (west side). The one-way issue would get the homeowners involved.

Samantha Greenwood ~ Moe can come talk at a meeting for the public works questions. Gary Barnes, 704 Third Street ~ Where it shows these lot lines on the overlay is probably right on the money. I think my father in law's house siding is actually on road right of way. It's that close. I can show you where the survey stake is. The line that feeds the parsonage

where I live runs right under the drain from Adams Avenue. Arvidson's water line runs 2-3 feet out in the street further than that. I don't believe we're hooked into the same spot. There is no way you can pull out in our driveway and go uphill if you turned Third into a one-way street. The other thing that concerns me is watching the kids walk up that hill in the winter and watching the cars go sliding down that hill. It seems they luck out and miss vehicles and end up in the ditch or spin around and go downhill. Somehow can you think of having that walkway going up Adams and continue to that unmarked hill (Water Tower Hill)? There wouldn't be any traffic going up and down that hill. It would be just a matter of getting the kids re-trained to go to that hill.

**Robert Beedle, 609 Spruce Street** ~ I think it would be nice for the future to have a main running down Third Street. We used to take Water Tower Hill to and from school. Maybe put a tunnel or covered walkway to make it easier to use.

Srb ~ How married are we to Third Street?

Bailer ~ 35 %. We have the engineered drawings.

 $\mathbf{Srb} \sim \mathbf{All}$  our electrical is buried in conduit at 5<sup>th</sup> Street (water tower hill). That would be perfect for a covered walkway or stairway.

Samantha Greenwood ~ Can I ask a question to Pastor Barnes?

Bailer ~ Yes.

**Samantha Greenwood** ~ I'm curious if you ever attended the meetings when the engineer was here?

**Gary Barnes** ~ The first time I heard about it or got a notice was last month from the City. **Baenen** ~ There is a water main that runs down that street.

**Reggiani** ~ I don't think we should do this grant since we're only at the beginning of this planning process. If there are other options coming up I think we should look at those other options and make sure we are happy with our decisions. If we're just getting something and putting it in place and it could be a hazard or dangerous, I think that goes completely against the whole Safe Routes to School concept. I would rather look at some other options now rather than later, before we go much farther and flush those ideas out.

**McGann** ~ So, it's a State grant, what if we change what we, as a City, want. How does that affect the grant?

**Reggiani**  $\sim$  At the same time we're getting the survey, we should be looking at and exploring other options. If 5<sup>th</sup> Street is a good option, maybe it's a better idea.

**Bailer** ~ It looks like we'd like to look at other options. The survey should be done regardless.

**Reggiani**  $\sim$  I think Planning and Zoning Commission would flush out the idea of 5<sup>th</sup> Street, and hand a preferred option to Council. I think if we do that here the community would be involved.

**Donald Moore**, **602 Railroad Avenue** ~ Are there any elements of the 35% plan that could be kept over if you went to another option? Are there some elements that you can keep? **Reggiani** ~ Potentially the raised crosswalk, just move it down. The crosswalks on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street would remain unchanged.

Baenen ~ The sidewalk design could stay too.

Pegau ~ Support looking at another option.

**Greenwood** ~ A lot of the stuff on Adams would still be in effect. Would also need to extend the sidewalk. Would need to look into if there's room on Adams.

Bailer ~ Is this an issue that we can put on the agenda and do a site visit?

**Samantha Greenwood** ~ I have to check out the right of way. We might be able to get that for the next meeting or we can have a special meeting.

Baenen ~ It may look steep now but you can adjust the grade.

**Bailer** ~ I'm getting the just that we're all thinking we would be creating a hazard on Third Street if we are putting a sidewalk there. We should probably notify the local Safe Routes to School group that we are looking into getting information about another location.

# c. South Fill Commercial Area Public Meeting Discussion

**Bailer**  $\sim$  Just wanted to put this on the agenda so we can talk about what happened at the first meeting. I was also worried that the City's original plan wasn't represented at that first meeting.

Baenen ~ We need more property.

**Reggiani** ~ I think I understand what you're saying. People knew about that and were coming up with alternatives to that original plan. People were reacting to it even though it wasn't part of the record. I think having it part of the record would be valuable. I'm not sure if it was our plan or Mark Lynch's plan. I don't remember it coming to P&Z.

**Samantha Greenwood** ~ It came to P&Z with a resolution to support the planning purposes but I was told not to forward the map along with it. A lot of people in the room didn't like the idea because it appeared to be a pre-conceived notion. There has been no vested support in that plan.

**Reggiani** ~ I'm speaking from an historian point of view. Without knowing where the starting point in the story is I think we just need to get it into the record as the starting point of these discussions knowing there's not a whole lot of support for it.

**Bailer** ~ I'm not saying this is what the city wants to do, I just think it should be there for a record.

**Pegau** ~ I'm concerned that if we toss it out now, it becomes a stealth plan that is just hanging out there. That worries me. This is not the time to throw out new options. **Srb** ~ Maybe we just mention that this was the original option. Is there an action plan to do A and B and accomplish C?

**Reggiani** ~ It's just the planning process now. There's a big pile of dirt there from the Cordova Center that was thought to be used as fill.

**Bailer** ~ This is the long term vision. At least there would be a plan if things come up. There was a lot of good input. The elephant in the room was (the original plan).

**Reggiani** ~ I would see that if the original plan was there we could measure success from it. Look where we ended up with the community input.

**Samantha Greenwood** ~ I guess I don't feel there was an original plan. The map was not moved forward, there was no support.

 $\bf Srb \sim I'd$  like to see this new plan (that we'll make) married to taking down the hill at hippy cove and using that as fill.

Baenen ~ We definitely need to get some more land in Cordova somehow.

**Greenwood** ~ My initial take was this wasn't the venue to bring that forward. We're not recommending that or supporting it, but that's what started our conversations: the historic reason. I would be in favor of bringing that forward with the purpose of stating this is what started the whole conversation but we're not endorsing this as planning and zoning or the city but this is what started it.

Pegau ~ I can see providing that map as background information but not as an option.

## d. 2008 Comprehensive Plan Update

**Samantha Greenwood** ~ I attached the Big Lake Comp Plan as an example and also put links in your packets to other Comp Plans. I didn't realize that when we got a new website that our comp plan link wasn't put under Planning and Zoning but was put under Planning instead. So we will get that moved.

Bailer ~ Who did that award winning comp plan?

Samantha Greenwood ~ Shelly Wade from Agnew Beck.

Bailer ~ Any idea on the cost?

Samantha Greenwood ~ I have a quote request into her.

**Bailer** ~ I would be curious of the cost. My thought process is we go out to these different groups and get their plans (Parks and Rec is doing their Master Plan right now).

**Greenwood** ~ I spent 2-3 hours the other night going through this and I made it to page 12 with a highlighter before I ran out of time. I think we need to start over and tackle this as a project to make it a whole new thing. I think it needs to be re-done. There's a lot of outdated stuff. I think if we're going to do this let's do it right.

 $McGann \sim I$  agree. I think the basic format is fine. I don't think we really need to change the general format, just re-write.

**Greenwood** ~ We're directed to refer to this. This is a pretty important document, it's binding. Why don't we spend money with a consultant and do it right? We're required in our rules to consult to this. None of us are English majors and our staff doesn't have time to sit and write a 50 page document.

Reggiani ~ One of the questions was update or re-write. I feel strongly that it's ready for a re-write. I think it was a great document but it is outdated. I like the example in the Big Lake one: they have it broken down as a goal and strategies to achieve those goals. That shows me that there was obviously someone that knew what they were doing, a good consultant, that could take the community's interests down into written form and drill them down a bit. I've been involved in the strategic planning at the school and it has always been with a consultant or facilitator and with the community interfaced in. I have been a little reluctant with your idea of updating the comprehensive plan. It's time consuming. I think it can be a multi-year process to get the community focused on different sections. Let's do it right and let's come up with some good strategic planning and vision. As a community we need to come up with a vision. I think coming up with a vision takes some time with a facilitator as to what we want Cordova to look like in 10, 20 years or so. I'm wondering how to get started. But if we're wanting to start hiring a facilitator, it should go as a recommendation to city council to back what we'd like to do, some funds and a process.

**Baenen** ~ I think we should let Sam get some ideas of the cost. So that when we are going to Council they would know what it would cost and what we'd like to do.

**Srb** ~ I think if we have the vision for Cordova that we're growing and would like to present ourselves as a first level community with our civic center and potential harbor expansion then I think this is our opportunity to put our best foot forward: not only asking the council for money but also presenting it to them that this is something that we're trying to move a cut above. We want to attract the right type of business. If we do the public facilitating, the community buy in is the best ally.

**Bailer** ~ I agree. You want to refer back to this (Comp Plan). We can go back to our Comp Plan with other issues that come up. Do we need a resolution asking for support and money? How do we ask Council for this?

**Reggiani** ~ Can you get a summary from Shelly on the process of Big Lake? Maybe a good summary of that and a cost estimate and we can look at that again at Planning and Zoning for our resolution?

#### K. Old Business

None

### L. Pending Calendar

April 2013 Calendar May 2013 Calendar

#### N. Audience Participation

Robert Beedle, 609 Spruce Street ~ I would just like to thank you guys for looking at and reviewing the North Fill Ramp Plan. There were good questions and good ideas. To make it go forward and be successful. Some time when it's not for sale, it should be not for sale. It held this plan up. I would just like to see that not for sale means not for sale. There are no other options for the Harbor so if it's going to go up for sale makes that part of your plan. What will you do with this section that's displaced now? Thanks for your time.

Tony Schinella, 100 Eyak Drive ~ I want to thank Planning and Zoning for taking into account all the ideas and your recommendation. I agree with Robert. We can evaluate in a year but to consider that a cutoff point, we need to look at it more long term. It'll take a year to start training people. We'll get water in this year and hopefully next year we'll have the electrical peds in. Thank you to the staff for all the maps and help.

**Donald Moore,** 602 Railroad Avenue ~ I appreciate the work of the Planning and Zoning Commission. I'm sure you're all familiar with the adage that the work will flow to those most competent to do it. I think your staff is an example of that. What's often left out is the other half of that statement which is until it merges. I appreciate working with your staff. Just keep that in mind. You're dealing with some pretty heavy subjects right here now. It needs to be done, Cordova is an active authentic working Alaskan town and there's a lot to keep up with here. I think you folks are doing a great job.

### O. Commission Comments

**Pegau ~** I really like the direction you were talking about going with the comprehensive plan. You can really see that it needs some help. So I think that you guys have really outlined a nice approach to that. I think that will really help us in the future: a document we can use for planning purposes.

**Srb** ~ I think if you have a well completed plan it gives all entities the option to see what the vision is for Cordova not just a landmark of where we are but where we are going. I think this will be a strong asset for us.

**Baenen** ~ I think it'll make all our jobs a lot easier if we have one. I like that you won't just have a goal but you'll have a way to get there. I think that's important.

**Reggiani** ~ I wanted to talk a little back to the Safe Routes to School project. I feel frustrated coming into a project that's already been planned out. I think when we started to go back to the Safe Routes committee we look at options they explored before. It would be nice to know what they looked at.

**Greenwood** ~ We've heard public comment from people around there. I don't know the public process from '09. To do the process right, we all want to have a safe route. Now is the time to do it.

**McGann** ~ Getting back to the South Fill meeting- there was talk about infill. I don't know how you do it. It would be good for people to understand the zoning and off street parking. It limits the types of business to go in there.

Samantha Greenwood ~ It will be at the next meeting.

**Bailer** ~ If you can take your personal opinion out of things and refer back to (the comp plan) as this is the direction the majority wanted to go I think that sure helps. All good discussions. So we're all doing a site visit?

P. Adjournment

M/ Greenwood S/Reggiani Motion to adjourn at 8:24 pm

Shannon Joekay, Assistant Planner

Date