In those matters coming before the Cordova Planning Commission at 7:00 p.m.;
Tuesday, September 11, 2012 in the City Hall Conference Room, 602 Railroad Ave,
Cordova, Alaska, are as follows:

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL
   Chairman Tom Bailer, Commissioner David Reggiani, John Greenwood, Roy Srb, Greg
   LoForte, Tom McGann and Scott Pegau.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR
   Minutes from the August 14, 2012 Regular Meeting (Pages 1-4)

E. RECORD ABSENCES

F. DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

G. CORRESPONDENCE

H. COMMUNICATIONS BY AND PETITIONS FROM VISITORS
   1. Guest Speakers (10-15 minutes per item)
   2. Audience comments regarding items on the agenda (3 minutes per speaker)
   3. Chairpersons and Representatives of Boards and Commissions

I. PLANNERS REPORT (Page-5)

J. NEW BUSINESS
   1. Vacation of right-of-way request by the City of Cordova (Pages 6-16)
   2. Preliminary Plat Approval request by The Tatitlek Corporation (Pages 17-24)
      for Lots 1B & 3B, Original Townsite.
   3. Variance request by Samuel & Kathleen Zamudio from the corner lot side 10’ setback
      requirement in low density residential zone to build a carport at a zero lot line at 600 Birch Street.
   4. Variance request by Diana Riedel from the 10’ front yard setback Requirement in medium density residential zone to build a single family home with a 3’-6’ varying front setback at 305 Observation Avenue (Pages 43-86)
   5. Variance request by Trident Seafoods from the 20’ front yard setback requirement in Waterfront Industrial Zone to build a three story bunkhouse at a 10’ setback at 301 Jim Poor Avenue.
6. Site Plan Review for Trident Seafoods to construct 2 three story bunkhouses at 301 Jim Poor Avenue

K. OLD BUSINESS
   1. Resolution 12-06 ~ Vacating a 10’ Utility Easement

L. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS
   None

M. PENDING CALENDAR
   September 2012 Calendar
   October 2012 Calendar

N. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

O. COMMISSION COMMENTS

P. ADJOURNMENT

If you have a disability which makes it difficult for you to participate in City-sponsored functions, Please contact 424-6200 for assistance.
In those matters coming before the Cordova Planning Commission at 6:30 p.m.;
Tuesday, August 14, 2012, in the City Hall Conference Room, 602 Railroad Road Cordova,
Alaska, are as follows:

A. Call to order –

B. Roll Call Present for roll call were Chairman Tom Bailer, David Reggiani, John Greenwood, Roy Srb, Greg LoForte,
Tom McGann and Scott Pegau

Also present were City Planner Samantha Greenwood and Assistant Planner Faith Wheeler-Jeppson.
There were 0 people in the audience.

C. Approval of Agenda

M/Reggiani S/Greenwood
Upon voice vote, motion passed, 7-0

D. Approval of Consent Calendar
Minutes from the June 12, 2012 Regular Meeting

Bailer ~ I have one comment on it, Tom McGann brought up a possible conflict of interest on the lots with Paul Kelly, I
mentioned that I would get back to it and I did not. For the record, it was a discussion on are we going to sell the lot. If at any of
these meetings I miss something please bring it up and bring it back to my attention. I don’t have the final say in it, you guys do.

M/Reggiani S/Srb
Upon voice vote, motion passed, 7-0

E. Record Absences
Scott Pegau was unexcused from the July 10, 2012 Regular Planning Commission meeting.

F. Disclosure of Conflict of Interest
Tom Bailer disclosed that he has a conflict of interest with items 1 and 2 under New Business.
Roy Srb disclosed that he may have a conflict with items 1 and 2 under New Business as he works for Cordova Electric.
(no conflict of interest for Roy Srb)

G. Correspondence
None

H. Communication by and Petitions from Visitors
1. Guest Speakers
None

2. Audience comments regarding items in the agenda
None

3. Chairpersons and Representatives of Boards and Commissions
None

I. Planners Report
McGann ~ Land Use Permits for AML and Eyak Preservation?
Samantha Greenwood ~ So, AML leased the lot (Lot 2, Block 3 CIP) for six weeks, Eyak Preservation is having a big meeting
with multiple people coming in to town and asked to be able to park cars and an RV at 5 mile for this coming weekend.
McGann ~ And what’s the Encroachment Permit, the last one?


Samantha Greenwood ~ Virginia Lacy’s house is built 1’ onto the right-of-way on the entire width of the one side of the house. It’s like 70 or 80 years old and it just recently sold, so the Encroachment Permit says that the City knows that they are encroaching on City property and allows them to get financing.

LoForte ~ I had a question on Lot 2, Block 3 and Lot 6, Block 2, NFDP sealed proposals. The packets went out?

Samantha Greenwood ~ We recommended to City Council to put that out for sale. So Lot 6 and Lot 2 will both be in the newspaper on Friday and there will be proposals. So they will be in the paper on Friday, proposals will be accepted for a month and then they will come back to you all to rate and then your recommendations will go to City Council.

Samantha Greenwood ~ I just have one thing that I wanted to talk about. Tom McGann’s email, Faith included it on top of your packets tonight. So we talked a little bit about this last time after Chapter 16 Building Codes, we are definitely in Category E. But I guess what we need to talk about is do we want to make a local amendment to have our building regs be to Category D?

Bailer ~ I looked at Anchorage and they are D, I think D2 actually. The reason I’m looking is that it’s hard for me to find anything in the Code book that gives me a clear reference. It does require a lot more engineering.

McGann ~ Some yeah, if you’re doing anything other than pretty conventional stuff. I’m not opposed to going to D I just have a program that is USGS, you dial in your latitude and longitude and it gives you the initial values that you need to make your calculations and they call out Seismic Design Category E. But I’m not opposed to a local amendment.

Srb ~ So we are recognized as being an E? So, if we are actually an E based on the amount of outside financing that we get if we choose not to build to that standard does that inhibit people with regards to their financing and resale ability once that standard has been recognized?

McGann ~ It hasn’t in the past, it doesn’t currently.

Samantha Greenwood ~ That’s a good question I can try to find that out.

Pegau ~ I’m trying to figure out what they are basing the thing on because I would think that fill area might be a different class than the solid rock.

McGann ~ This is based on Site Class D which is consolidated rock.

Bailer ~ Let’s see if we can get some more information and bring it back.

Chairman Bailer turned the meeting over to Co-Chair David Reggiani due to a conflict of interest

J. New Business

1. Utility Easement vacation for Lot 7, Knute Johnson Subdivision

Reggiani called for a 5 minute recess

M/Pegau S/Greenwood “I move to approve vacating the 10-foot utility easement along the west boundary Lot 7, Knute Johnson Subdivision, Plat no. 79-1, Cordova Recording District.”

Yeas: Greenwood, McGann, Reggiani, Srb, LoForte, Pegau
Nay: None
Absent: None
Conflict of interest: Bailer

6-0 motion passed

2. Replat of Utility Easement for Lot 7, Knute Johnson Subdivision

M/Srb S/Pegau “I move to approve the replat of Lot 7, Knute Johnson Subdivision Plat 79-1 showing the vacation of a 10 feet utility easement on the west boundary of the lot 7 and creating a new variable width utility easement on the north end of the lot, at the 15 foot wide driveway easement.”

Pegau ~ I have one question, ‘variable width utility easement” what does that mean?

Samantha Greenwood ~ It means that its 20 feet on one end and 29 feet on the other. The way this one is laid out it is not equally across.

Pegau ~ Okay, but we don’t need to say ‘as drawn on the map’ or anything? How do you interpret it in the future?

Samantha Greenwood ~ Because it has it on the plat.

Pegau ~ That’s all I needed.

Yeas: Greenwood, McGann, Reggiani, Srb, LoForte, Pegau
Nay: None
Absent: None
Conflict of interest: Bailer

6-0 motion passed

Reggiani turned the meeting back over to Bailer
3. Lease request by the Prince William Sound Community College

Reggiani ~ As this shows in here, Prince William Sound Community College is interesting and so was the Cordova School District in having the Community College rent some space over at the High School. There is a letter in here from the President of the College to the City Manager basically starting the process of what would be our normal process in 5.22. Since then there has been quite a bit of discussion from the School Board and City Council did a Joint Work Session with the School Board. Basically it doesn’t quite fit exactly into what the College and school wanted to do as far as fast tracking them getting into the High School for this semester, normally our process takes a good bit of time to work through 5.22 and all of the steps that are there. So what City Council did at the last Council meeting was to approve a Special Use Permit through the end of December, to basically allow them to use the space. We didn’t approve the Special Use Permit, we directed the City Manager to enter into a Special Use Permit. That would get the College into the High School through the end of December and give Council a little bit more time to craft maybe an amended Ordinance to deal with renting space in a City Building and somehow fold in into 5.22. What we need to do here right now is to just refer it back to staff.

LoForte ~ I have a question, do they want property or do they want part of the building.
Reggiani ~ Basically what they’re looking for is about 3 rooms.
LoForte ~ I read it and thought that they were talking about acreage.
McGann ~ So they’re still going to be up in the upstairs of the CEC area.
Reggiani ~ No, they would totally move out of that and move into the High School which is what the idea is.
Srb ~ It was a little confusing far as the inflexibility of the way our language currently is and I couldn’t quite get it down, what do they want to occupy specifically. So, is this essentially going to be night classes then?
Reggiani ~ Yes and no because there are day classes for the High School kids too. I don’t think that it’s really been worked out as far as what’s going to happen. That’s one nice thing you know about 5.22 is plenty of opportunity for public input and community input to get the sense of the community and what they want.
Pegau ~ I read through the materials and there is no information to make a reasonable decision on whether or not this makes sense. It doesn’t say how much space; the letter doesn’t say how much space, how much parking they anticipate for day or night classes, what’s the role within the High School for putting adults in the High School?
Bailer ~ That’s kind of the problem I had, I didn’t know. Did the School Board have a discussion, did they have a hearing?
Reggiani ~ They didn’t have a public hearing.
LoForte ~ I read it and I thought it was really confusing, again I go back to 3.39 acres and all I thought was how does this affect our developments or our future plans for that area down there. My point is, is how is it going to impact us in the future?
Srb ~ I understand the concern with having just anybody who might sign up for a class to have free movement in the High School and I would hope that between Council and the School Board that they would focus on that and address those concerns.

M/Reggiani S/McGann to refer to staff

Yeas: Bailer, Greenwood, McGann, Reggiani, Srb, LoForte, Pegau
Nay: None
Absent: None

7-0 motion passed

4. Hazard Mitigation Plan

Samantha Greenwood ~ I don’t know did anybody go through and look at the projects?
McGann ~ That was the best part of the whole thing, but half of them I didn’t even know what they were talking about, like the dike at 6.5 Mile.
Samantha Greenwood ~ That was a big deal and the Forest Service looked into it pretty heavily and I don’t know if it was the Native Village of Eyak or the Eyak Corporation but there was some studies done and some talk about trying to prevent Ibeck from flowing into Eyak, thinking that was what was causing all of the flooding back up the creeks.
Srb ~ It really pitted the 6 mile people against the townspeople. The 6 mile people were essentially trying to get the City to spend what they had in their permanent fund to run a dike all the way from the headwaters of Ibeck all the way down.
McGann ~ I read it and thought that they were talking about acreage.

Samantha Greenwood ~ Somewhere in this the page numbers are different from this and the link, but in the flood section the mitigation was to require people to elevate their structures in flood areas. Is that something that we’re currently doing or?
Samantha Greenwood ~ Right now we are part of the FEMA mapped flood zone, it’s kind of confusing. We were mapped in 1979, so we are to those smaller City boundaries so 6 mile is not mapped as a flood zone. So there are no base flood elevations for out there, in town technically you are supposed to build to bas flood elevations. But, the North Fill, the South Fill those are all built to that base flood elevations so you don’t have to deal with that. It is something that we could look at doing at 6 mile, first of all we would have to get a base flood elevation and then say that this is what you need to build to.
McGann ~ So there currently nothing in our permitting, there’s no flood areas in town are there?
Samantha Greenwood ~ Yes, there are areas that are mapped flood, all around Eyak and part of Eyak Lake.
McGann ~ So is there anything in our current permitting that addresses that?
Samantha Greenwood ~ Yeah, if you are in a mapped flood zone you have to address it and recently with all of the bank refinancing and issues there’s been a lot of people coming in saying “I’m in a mapped flood zone and I’m 20’ above the lake” so you have to go through the process of getting a LOMA (Letter of Map Amendment) but the boundaries that we have now are so limited that they really don’t do much for 6 mile.
McGann ~ One thing in the mitigation projects that you might want to add in is under the severe weather we all talked about monitoring the snow loads.
Samantha Greenwood ~ Snow loads and then some kind of early warning. And if you guys think of things as time goes on, this is going to be an ongoing project we’re not going to be finished overnight. We will look at this again with a copy that is updated and clean, we need to do these public processes to actually get it to pass. So if you guys are good with the link we’ll continue to do it that way. And if anyone wants one that’s printed we’ll certainly get one for you.

The Commission had a lengthy discussion about FEMA mapping Cordova and Cordova Tsunami Zone

K. OLD BUSINESS
None

L. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS
None

M. PENDING CALENDAR
None

N. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION
None

O. COMMISSION COMMENTS

Samantha Greenwood ~ I had a question that somebody brought up about the trail across the South Fill, any updates?
Samantha Greenwood ~ A facilitator is supposed to be sending me a quote by the end of this or next week.
McGann ~ No comment
LoForte ~ With the Harbor Department in the middle of a transition have you (Sam) talked with anyone at the Harbor itself about Lot 3A, Block 8, NFDP?
Samantha Greenwood ~ I have talked with Dale, he relayed to me that he did not want to sell that property.
Reggiani ~ Just to clarify what I was talking about earlier with the North Fill ramp, the State funded grant was awarded for the improvements for the North Fill ramp.
Srb ~ Coincidentally right after our last meeting it looked like SERVS had everything (inaudible). It looks like it’s usable from the perspective of the City.
Pegau ~ The deal with the High School is going to be very challenging I think, the City needs to be talking to a lot of people and a lot of groups including the PTA and explaining what in the world is happening because there are a number of parents that I am aware of that do not like the idea that this is going through before a chance to provide input.
Bailer ~ (Explained an incident about loose gravel that had been dropped on Whitshed Road and after calling Dispatch to inform them of the situation Dispatch said that it was a State Road that he would have to call the State) People have to step up and take care of things.

P. ADJOURNMENT
M/Reggiani S/Greenwood
Motion to adjourn at 7:20 pm

____________________________________________
Thomas Bailer, Chairman   Date

____________________________________________
Faith Wheeler-Jejppson, Assistant Planner  Date
Planners Report

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Department Staff
Date:
Re: Recent Activities and updates

- Assistant Planner completed the minutes from the August 14, 2012 Regular Meeting.
- Assistant Planner issued Building Permits in the last month:
  1. John Thomas, 705 Railroad Avenue; replacing the existing roofing material.
  2. Curtis Herschleb, 301 Railroad ROW; replacing roof and adding dormers.
  3. Thomas Andersen, 409 Adams Avenue; rebuilding warehouse and adding a living quarters.
  4. Cordova Telephone Cooperative, 611 Second Street; replacement of nine windows.
  5. Malani Towle; Lot 1B, Block 49, OT; construction of a 16’x20’ two story single family residence.
- Assistant Planner met with Jane Curran regarding the ground sloughing off to the south of her residence on West Davis Avenue.
- Assistant Planner accompanied Fire Marshal Paul Trumblee to 604 First Street regarding unpermitted construction, photo documentation was taken for the file and a building permit application was sent to the owner.
- Its time of year to consider doing some training. It never seemed to work out last year but would like to set a date in October for a training with Holly here in Cordova. So please consider October schedules.
- Working on Utility plan for Samson and legal documents are being reviewed by Samson
- Shoreside land sale went to city council for first reading September 5th
- Meet with Joanie on updates to Hazard mitigation plan –tentative plan is have rough draft on October meeting.
- Work with Chief and addressing code went to city council for first reading September 5th
- Finalizing Heney trailer court encroachment issue
- Updated ROW application and procedures
- Part of harbor master hiring committee
To: City of Cordova Planning Commission
From: Planning Staff
Date: 9/6/2012
Re: Vacation of Right-Of-Way,

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION:

File No.: 02-072-630 & 633
Requested Action: Vacation of Right Of Way
Applicant: City of Cordova
Zoning: Waterfront Industrial
Applicable Regulations: Chapter 13.24 – Street Vacation Procedures

PART II. BACKGROUND:

The City of Cordova is petitioning to vacate Boat Dock Road (approximately 10,400 Square Feet) and portions of Barnacle Boulevard (approximately 2,000 square feet) see attached plat both are located in the Ocean Dock Subdivision. The purpose of this vacation is to promote a land trade between the City of Cordova and Samson Tug and Barge; this land trade would allow the ship yard area to be a contagious piece of property.

PART III. REVIEW OF APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

The Planning Commission shall not grant a vacation of right-of-way if that proposed vacation shall result in:

1. A substantial detriment to vehicular or pedestrian traffic circulation;
The vehicular or pedestrian traffic circulation will not incur a substantial detriment by the vacation of this right away. The land trade will make the current right of way private property. The two businesses will have separate entrances possibly improving traffic flow.

2. **Interference with the rights of access to any private property:**

   Barnacle Avenue will still be in place providing an entrance to the shipyard and the other private lot. Access to Samson’s business will be through their private driveway.

3. **Inhibiting of access for fire protection or any emergency purpose, or interference with utility lines or service:**

   This vacation of right-of-way will not inhibit access for fire protection and emergency purposes. A public utility easement will be created to accommodate the current utilities.

4. **Obstruction or diminishing of significant view, or elimination of a view point:**

   This requested action will not block, diminish or eliminate any view point or view shed.

5. **Elimination of street space adjacent to an existing or proposed public facility, such as a park, where retention of the street might be of advantage to the public facility:**

   The elimination of this street will not remove any public parking the current use of the street and the portion to be vacated is access to industrial areas. The City property that is adjacent will have adequate access through the remaining of the right of way.

6. **Removal of significant natural features, or detriment to the scale and character of surrounding development:**

   No natural features will be removed through this vacation.

7. **A substantial adverse affect upon any element of the comprehensive plan:**

   There is nothing in the Comprehensive Plan that will be adversely affected by this action.

8. **A substantially greater cost being required to develop alternate access routes:**

   No alternative routes will be required to accommodate the loss of this street.

9. **The release of a street area in any situation in which the future development or use of such street area and any property of which it would become a part, is unknown:**

   The release of this street to vacation and the implications are known to City staff and staff is prepared to make a recommendation for approval.
10. On the basis of findings made on the record, the commission finds that the vacation would not be in the interests of the City.

Staff finds, and the City Manager concurs, that the vacation of this right-of-way will be in the best interest of the City.

PART V. SUGGESTED FINDINGS:

1. The this requested vacation of right-of-way is not contrary to the comprehensive plan.
2. The elimination of this street will not will not remove any public parking.
3. This requested action will not block, diminish or eliminate any view point or view shed.
4. This vacation of right-of-way will not inhibit access for fire protection and emergency purposes.

PART VI. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the request for a vacation of right-of-way of Boat Dock Road (approximately 10,400 Square Feet) and portions of Barnacle Boulevard (approximately 2,000 square feet), be approved by the Planning Commission and that the Planning Commission forward a resolution to the City Council for approval.

PART VII. SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

1. A public utility easement will be surveyed, created and recorded at the state recording office for the existing public utilities that exist in the public right of way at the corner of Boat Dock Road and Orca Cannery Road of approximately 6 feet by 13 feet.

PART VIII. SUGGESTED MOTION:

"I move that that the Planning Commission APPROVE resolution 12-6 a resolution of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the city of Cordova, Alaska, authorizing the vacation of boat dock road and a portion of barnacle road of the ocean dock subdivision.”
A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CORDOVA, ALASKA, AUTHORIZING THE VACATION OF BOAT DOCK ROAD AND A PORTION OF BARANCLE ROAD OF THE OCEAN DOCK SUBDIVISION.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Chapter 13.24.060A. of the Cordova Municipal Code, the Cordova Planning and Zoning Commission, at its meeting of September 11, 2012, reviewed and approved a request from the City of Cordova, for the vacation of the rights-of-way as described above; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Chapter 13.24.060A the Planning and Zoning Commission applied the condition to the vacation that a public utility easement will be surveyed and a plat created to accommodate the current public utility use; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission found that it is the City’s best interest to vacate these rights-of-way based on the following Findings of Fact:

1. The requested replat and vacation of rights-of-way is not contrary to the comprehensive plan.
2. The elimination of these streets and alleys will not remove any public parking.
3. This requested action will not block, diminish or eliminate any viewpoint or view shed.
4. This vacation of rights-of-way will not inhibit access for fire protection and emergency purposes;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CORDOVA

1. That the above described rights of way is hereby vacated.
2. That a public utility easement will be surveyed and a plat created to accommodate the current public utility use.
3. That this resolution and replat are eligible for recording and will be deemed void if not recorded within 90 days of adoption.
4. That this Resolution becomes effective upon being properly recorded with petitioner being responsible for payment of recording fee.

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS 11th DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2012

___________________________
Tom Bailer, Chairman

ATTEST:

____________________________
Samantha Greenwood, City Planner
# VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY APPLICATION

## CITY OF CORDOVA

### INSTRUCTIONS
Print or type requested information. Incomplete applications will delay the processing of your request. All applications must be filed with the Planning Department 21 days prior to the next Planning Commission meeting date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone [home]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone [business]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business FAX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY/PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address of subject property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owner [name/address]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current zoning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY APPLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner of property (if different than applicant).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If multiple owners, list names and addresses of each and indicate ownership interest. Attach additional sheet if necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Real Estate Firm/Broker handling sale of property. Provide name and address. **Note**: If you do not own the property, you must provide a copy of a Purchase Agreement or instrument acceptable to the city indicating the owner is fully aware of, and in agreement with, the requested action. |

| City Business License Permit Number (if applicable) |
APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I (we) certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my (our) knowledge, true and accurate. Furthermore, I (we) hereby authorize the City and its representatives to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting necessary site inspections.

By: [Signature] By: [Signature]

Name: [Type/Print] Name: [Type/Print]

Date: 9/5/2012 Date: ______________________

Appeal Procedures: A decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment. An appeal must be filed in writing with the City Clerk within ten (10) days of the decision. In accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 18.64.030 of the City of Cordova Zoning Code.

CITY USE ONLY - PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date application received:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee paid:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does application require a public hearing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff review date/reviewer name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission final action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council final action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZONING APPLICATION continued

Project/Request Description Page:

1 Please describe your request in complete detail. Feel free to add additional pages and/or drawings, maps, photographs of the site, and other documentation that might be helpful to the Planning Commission as they make a decision on your request.

Please describe your request. Add additional pages, drawings and required information.

The City of Cordova is proposing to trade city land to Semson in order consolidate the area that the boat haul out facility is located. Vacating Boat Dock road and a part of Barnacle road will help to accomplish the land trade.
The Planning and Zoning Commission may only forward an approval to City Council if the Commission finds that ALL of the following 10 standards are satisfied. A resolution granting the vacation shall be submitted to the City Council for approval, at the regular scheduled meeting. Upon approval by City Council applicant will have 30 days to pay for property and record the amended plat. The city will deed the property to appropriate owners at this time.

1. Explain how the proposed VROW will not result in a substantial detriment to vehicular or pedestrian traffic circulation.

   The flow of traffic will not be harmed by this vacation it will be improved, the two business located in the area will be consolidated allowing for traffic to enter each business without going through or around the other business.

2. Explain how the proposed VROW will not interfere with the rights of access to any private property.

   The only piece of private property that is located within this subdivision does not abut the right of way that is being vacated. The access to this lot will remind through the remaining portion of Barnacle Avenue.

3. Explain how the proposed VROW will not inhibit access for fire protection or any emergency purpose, or interfere with utility lines or service.

   The majority of Barnacle Avenue will still be in place providing emergency access. The utilities that are in place are being accommodated with a public utility easement.

4. Explain how the proposed VROW will not obstruct or diminish significant view, or eliminate a view point.

   This requested action will not block, diminish or eliminate any view point or view shed.

5. Explain how the proposed VROW will not eliminate street space adjacent to an existing or proposed public facility, such as a park, where retention of the street might be of advantage to the public facility.

   Parking on the street is not advisable in this area due to the large equipment used by both the ship haul out and Samson Tug and Barge. Vacating this area of street will allow the two businesses to provide adequate parking within their boundaries.

6. Explain how the proposed VROW will not cause the removal of significant natural features, or detriment the scale of character of surrounding development.

   No natural features will be removed through this vacation.
7
Explain how the proposed VROW will not cause a substantial adverse affect upon any element of the comprehensive plan.

The comprehensive plan supports economic development, fish processing and local business expansion. This vacation will promote all of these comprehensive plans goals.

8
Explain how the proposed VROW will not require a substantially greater cost to develop alternate access routes.

An alternate access route will not need to be developed if the road is vacated the area will become private property that will be access by a driveway. The remainder of Barnacle Avenue will provide adequate access to the remaining area.

9
Explain how the proposed VROW will not cause the release of a street area in any situation in which the future development or use of such street area and any property of which it would become a part, is unknown.

The future development of the road area being vacated is known. A land swap will occur between the City and Samson. The road area will become a property of Samson Tug and Barge will will be used in their freight business.

10
Lastly, explain how the proposed VROW will, on the basis of findings, be in the city’s best interest.

This vacation will benefit the city by allowing the boat haul out area to be located in a contagious space making it more efficient and economical to run. It will also allow for the possible expansion of this area including providing for a boat haul out building.

**OTHER REQUIREMENTS**

Describe why you wish the city to vacate the street right-of-way:
The City of Cordova wishes to vacate the street ROW in order to facilitate a land swap between the city and Samson Tug and Barge.

Existing use of subject right-of-way:
The current street is used to access Samson Tug and loops around the ship haul out area. See attach plat

Proposed use of subject right-of-way:
Will become Samson Tug and Barge private property and will be used in their freight company.

Dimensions of area to be vacated:
Width: _______ 50 ft. Depth: _______ 263 ft. Total Area _______ 13,130 S.F.
The City of Cordova is petitioning to vacate Boat Dock Road (approximately 10,400 square feet) and portion of Barnacle Boulevard (2,000 square feet) located in the Ocean Dock Subdivision. The purpose of this vacation is to promote a land swap between the City of Cordova and Samson Tug and Barge; this land swap would allow the ship yard area to be a contiguous piece of property. There will be a Public Hearing on September 11, 2012 at 6 pm at city hall in the upstairs conference room.

To complete the application a signature from all property owners is needed. Please sign below and return to the planning department.

Adjacent Land Owners

Samson Tug and Barge

[Signature] 8/29/12

Jim Subole for the owner
Samson Tug and Barge
P.O. Box 559
Sitka, AK 99835
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
Thru: Planning Department Staff
Date: August 22, 2012
Re: Preliminary Plat

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION:

File No.: 02-273-101 thru 104

Requested Action: Preliminary Plat approval

Applicant: The Tatitlek Corporation

Owner's Name: The Tatitlek Corporation

Zoning: Central Business District

Applicable Regulations: Title 17, Subdivision Regulations
Title 18, Zoning Regulations

PART II. BACKGROUND:

This is not a typical subdivision per say because the lots exist on the ground and are developed. This is adjusting lot lines so that the existing buildings can be on legal lots. This is a highly visible area and the staff wanted to the commission to be informed and understand how the lots were being divided.

The Tatitlek Corporation currently owns four 25’x100’ lots on Second Street; their old office building currently sits on Lot 4 and a portion of Lot 3 and the newer office building sits on Lot 2 and a portion of Lot 3. Merging Lots 1 and 2 to create 1A will bring the Tatitlek Corporation into compliance with regards to setbacks and will create a lot that is 5,522 square feet. Merging Lots 3 and 4 into Lot 3A will bring the old office building into compliance with regards to setbacks and create a lot that is 4,475 square feet and meets the minimum size requirements for construction.
PART III. SUGGESTED FINDINGS:

1. The proposed subdivision conforms to the purposes and requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance; State Statutes and the Comprehensive Plan Policies and serves the public use, health and safety

2. There are no known physical conditions present which may be hazardous to the future inhabitants with this Subdivision

3. Completing this action will bring the lots in compliance with current city code.

PART V. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the request for Preliminary Plat approval for The Tatitlek Corporation Lot 1A and Lot 3A be approved by the Planning Commission.

PART VI. RECOMMENDED MOTION:

Motion for Approval:
"I move to approve the Preliminary Plat of Lot 1A and Lot 3A, Block 10, Cordova Townsite.”
**SUBDIVISION - ZONING APPLICATION**
**CITY OF CORDOVA**

**INSTRUCTIONS**
Print or type requested information. Incomplete applications will be returned to the applicant and will delay the processing of your request. All applications must be filed with the Planning Department 21 days prior to the next Planning Commission meeting date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF REQUEST</th>
<th>FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisions</td>
<td>varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Plat</td>
<td>$150**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>plus $20 per lot</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Plat</td>
<td>1/2 of Prelim Plat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plat Amendment</td>
<td>$75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>plus $15 per lot</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPLICANT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tatitlek Corp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>S. E. 3rd Ave, Anchorage, AK 99503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Name</td>
<td>Tatitlek Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone [home]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Architect/Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of Architect/Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone of Architect/Engineer</td>
<td>424-3199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPERTY/PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address of Subject Property</th>
<th>502 S. 6th Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Identification Number</td>
<td>02-273-101,102,103,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner [name/address]</td>
<td>Tatitlek Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning</td>
<td>Central Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed use</td>
<td>Business/Residential?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Start Date</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ZONING APPLICATION

Owner of property (if different than applicant). If multiple owners, list names and addresses of each and indicate ownership interest. Attach additional sheet if necessary.

Real Estate Firm/Broker handling sale of property. Provide name and address. **Note:** if you do not own the property, you must provide a copy of a Purchase Agreement or instrument acceptable to the city indicating the owner is fully aware of, and in agreement with, the requested action.

| Linden O'Toole  
| Cadova Realty  
| P.O. Box 1875  
| Cordova, AK 99574  
| 424-3199 |

# APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I (we) certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my (our) knowledge, true and accurate. Furthermore, I (we) hereby authorize the City and its representatives to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting necessary site inspections.

By: **Linden O'Toole, Agent**  
(Signature)

By:  
(Signature)

Name: **Linden O'Toole**  
(Type/Print)

Date: 7/20/12  
Date:

**Appeal Procedures:** A decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment. An appeal must be filed in writing with the City Clerk within ten (10) days of the decision. In accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 18.64.030 of the City of Cordova Zoning Code.

# CITY USE ONLY - PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date application received:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee paid:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does application require a public hearing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff review date/reviewer name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission final action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council final action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RE: The Tatitlek Corporation Lot in Cordova

Mon 8/6/2012 3:12 PM
From: Michelle Vlasoff
To: reality@cordovaalaska.net
Cc: Travis Vlasoff

Hello Linden,

Please use this email as authorization for you to conduct work on behalf of, and to designate yourself as the contact for, The Tatitlek Corporation in regard to the lot-line revision in Cordova.

Thanks Linden!

Michelle

From: reality O'Toole [mailto:reality@cordovaalaska.net]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2012 1:26 PM
To: Michelle Vlasoff
Subject: re: The Tatitlek Corporation Lot in Cordova

Hi Michelle,

Thanks so much for getting back to me, that is great that Travis is pre-occupied with such big deals!

I am attaching that counter offer that we verbally discussed in response to the offer I presented. Travis mentioned that you guys may prefer to see what offers may come in after the fishing season, but at least you will have this for your file.

The other thing I need from you is something in writing that states that I am authorized to work on behalf of the Tatitlek Corporation as their designated contact for the lot-line revision that we need to bring before the planning commission. You could send a simple email and we can see if that will suffice.

Thanks so much Michelle!

Linden O'Toole
Cordova Realty
907-424-3199

From: "Michelle Vlasoff" <mvlasoff@tatitlek.com>
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2012 11:43 AM
To: "reality@cordovaalaska.net" <reality@cordovaalaska.net>
Subject: The Tatitlek Corporation Lot in Cordova

Hello Linden,

I was able to get with Travis quickly today and he asked that I contact you and identify myself as your POC for the sale of our lot in Cordova. Travis is in the midst of a very large real estate transaction(s) and will not be have any additional time in the foreseeable future.
UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD AN AS-BUILT BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION OR FOR ESTABLISHING BOUNDARY OR FENCE LINES. THE SURVEYOR TAKES RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE INITIAL TRANSACTION ONLY AND ASSUMES FINANCIAL LIABILITY ONLY FOR THE COST OF THE SURVEY. LISTED DISTANCES PREVAIL OVER SCALING. REPRODUCTION MAY CAUSE ERRORS IN SCALE.

LOT SURVEY
FOUNDATION AS-BUILT
FINAL STRUCTURE AS-BUILT
PLOT PLAN AS-BUILT
LOT SURVEY TOPOGRAPHY
AS-BUILT NO CORNERS SET
RECERTIFICATION AS-BUILT NO CORNERS SET
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Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Staff
Date: 8/26/2012
Re: Variance Request by Keith Kathleen Zamudio

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Actions: A Variance request for a zero (0) feet (zero lot line) setback on the corner side of the property from the ten (10) foot required corner setback in the Low Density Residential Zone

Applicant/Owner: Keith and Kathleen Zamudio
Address: 600 Birch Street
Zoning: Low Density Residential
Lot Area: 5,400 Square Feet.

PART II. BACKGROUND

The property owner has requested a variance from the setback requirements of 10 feet for a corner lot in Low Density Zone to 0 feet meaning the building is sitting on the lot line. This variance will accommodate the 21.3’ X 14’ attached carport at their residence located 600 Birch Street in Vina Young Subdivision.

PART III. REVIEW OF APPLICABLE CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED FINDINGS

The applicable regulations for this variance request are the following sections:
Chapter 18.20 Low Density Residential District

18.20.060 - Side yard.
   A. There shall be a side yard in the R low density district of not less than five feet. The minimum side yard on the street side of a corner lot shall be ten feet.

Condition 18.20.060 A is what the variance request is based upon.

Chapter 18.64 Exceptions, Variances and Appeals

18.64.020 Variances

An application has been filed pursuant to this section of code. Below is the review of the variance criteria.

PART III. REVIEW OF APPLICABLE CRITERIA

A Variance may be granted only if all four of the following conditions exist:

1. That there are exceptional physical circumstances or conditions applicable to the property or to its intended use or development which do not apply to the other properties in the same land use district.

   This condition has not been met. The lot is located at the corner of Birch Street and Young Drive and is 5400 square feet. The lot is mainly flat with a gentle downward slope on the southwestern corner coming onto Birch Street. There are many corner lots in this land use district which are similar in make up to this lot therefore there are no exceptional physical circumstances or conditions.

2. That the strict application of the provisions of this title would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship.

   This condition has not been met. Not having a carport on the corner side of the house does not warrant an unnecessary hardship or practical difficulties.

   In his application, the Applicant alleged that the former City planner advised him that no building permit was needed for the construction of a car port. However, the City planning department has no record of any such statement by the former planner and Applicant has submitted no documentation supporting his allegation. Further, over three years have passed since the information was allegedly communicated to Applicant and in the past two year numerous radio, scanner and advertising efforts have been made to alert people of a building permit requirement.
3. Granting this Variance request would not result in material damage or prejudice to the other properties in the neighborhood or be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

The condition of material damage or prejudice has been met at the time of this writing the planning department has received no input from neighbors. If there is additional information received by planning department it will be included in the packet. There will also be the opportunity for public comment at the hearing.

The condition of public health, safety or welfare has been partially met. The departments of public works, fire, and police department have been consulted and have provided their input, please see attached write ups.

4. Granting this Variance request would not be contrary to the objectives of the Comp Plan.

This condition has been partially met. The carport will potentially add value to the property thus protecting property value.

PART V. SPECIAL CONDITIONS
In the event that the commissions grants the variance staff recommends that the following special conditions apply.

1. A Building Permit must be obtained from the Planning Department.

3. A new as-built shall to be provided by the land owner done by a licensed surveyor showing that the carport is not encroaching on City property. If the carport is encroaching the land owner will apply for an encroachment permit from the city.

PART VI. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends that this variance application be denied and the findings 1-4 in this staff report be adopted.

PART VII Suggested Motion

“I move that the Variance request by Samuel and Kathleen Zamudio from the corner lot setback requirements in the Low Density Residential Zone District (LDR) be approved and special conditions and findings 1-4 be adopted as contained in the staff report.”
Sam Greenwood.

After looking over the documents provided by your office and visiting that location, I have determined that under Condition 3, Part 2, I see no detrimental impact to the public health, safety or welfare in the request Keith and Kathleen Zamudio are asking in their variance.

Paul Trumblee

From: Sam Greenwood
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2012 12:40 PM
To: Public Works; Oscar Delpino (fire@cityofcordova.net); Bob Griffiths
Subject: Zamudio variance

On August 28, 2012 we met to discuss and review a variance request made by Keith and Kathleen Zamudio. Keith and Kathleen Zamudio are requesting a variance of a 0 (zero) lot line from the corner side yard setback requirement of 10 feet in the Low Density Residential zone. At our meeting we reviewed the application and drawings that were received from the Keith and Kathleen Zamudio.

In order for a variance request to be granted 4 conditions must be met. I am asking for your input on the second part of condition 3 below:

Condition 3. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

Your comments/input will be included in the packet that is provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission to aide in the decision-making process. Please reply to this email with your input
concerning Keith and Kathleen Zamudio’s variance request.

Samantha Greenwood  
City Planner  
City of Cordova  
PO Box 1210  
Fax 907-424-6000  
Phone 907-424-6233
From: Bob Griffiths
To: Sam Greenwood
Subject: RE: Zamudio variance
Date: Tuesday, September 04, 2012 8:46:38 AM

After looking over the documents provided by your office and visiting that location, I have determined that under Condition 3, Part 2, I see no detrimental impact to the public health, safety or welfare in the request Keith and Kathleen Zamudio are asking in their variance request

Chief Bob Griffiths
Cordova Police Department
(907)424-6100
(907)424-6120
policechief@cityofcordova.net

From: Sam Greenwood
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2012 12:40 PM
To: Public Works; Oscar Delpino (fire@cityofcordova.net); Bob Griffiths
Subject: Zamudio variance

On August 28, 2012 we met to discuss and review a variance request made by Keith and Kathleen Zamudio. Keith and Kathleen Zamudio are requesting a variance of a 0 (zero) lot line from the corner side yard setback requirement of 10 feet in the Low Density Residential zone. At our meeting we reviewed the application and drawings that were received from the Keith and Kathleen Zamudio.

In order for a variance request to be granted 4 conditions must be met. I am asking for your input on the second part of condition 3 below:

Condition 3. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

Your comments/input will be included in the packet that is provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission to aide in the decision-making process. Please reply to this email with your input concerning Keith and Kathleen Zamudio’s variance request.

Samantha Greenwood
City Planner
City of Cordova
PO Box 1210
Fax 907-424-6000
Phone 907-424-6233
The Zamudio request for lot line clearance of zero poses some concern for the Public Works department. The snow shed from the new carport will add to the snow moved to the shoulder from the street. With no buffer to accept the snowfall from the private residence the public-owned area along the street will be used. In periods of heavy snowfall this will necessitate using public equipment to remove snow accumulated from private property.

Additionally, access to utilities within a City-owned right of way is made much easier with a little breathing room to operate around a private residence.

Thank you,
Moe Zamarron

Moe Zamarron
Director of Public Works
City of Cordova
PO Box 1210
Cordova, AK 99574
Ph 907-424-6231
publicworks@cityofcordova.net

On August 28, 2012 we met to discuss and review a variance request made by Keith and Kathleen Zamudio. Keith and Kathleen Zamudio are requesting a variance of a 0 (zero) lot line from the corner side yard setback requirement of 10 feet in the Low Density Residential zone. At our meeting we reviewed the application and drawings that were received from the Keith and Kathleen Zamudio.

In order for a variance request to be granted 4 conditions must be met. I am asking for your input on the second part of condition 3 below:

Condition 3. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

Your comments/input will be included in the packet that is provided to the Planning and Zoning
Commission to aide in the decision-making process. Please reply to this email with your input concerning Keith and Kathleen Zamudio’s variance request.

Samantha Greenwood
City Planner
City of Cordova
PO Box 1210
Fax 907-424-6000
Phone 907-424-6233
VARIANCE APPLICATION
CITY OF CORDOVA

INSTRUCTIONS
Print or type requested information. Incomplete applications will be returned to the applicant and will delay the processing of your request. All applications must be filed with the Planning Department 21 days prior to the next Planning Commission meeting date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT INFORMATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Samuel Keith and Kathleen Zamudio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>600 Birch Street, Cordova, AK 99574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone [home]</td>
<td>907-424-3111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Name</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Address</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone [business]</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business FAX</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project architect/engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of architect/engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone of architect/engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY/PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address of subject property</td>
<td>600 Birch Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel identification number</td>
<td>02-072-530 Lot3, Block3, Vina Young Subd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owner [name/address]</td>
<td>Samuel Keith and Kathleen Zamudio 600 Birch Street, Cordova, AK 99574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current zoning</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed use</td>
<td>Car Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction start date</td>
<td>6-8-2012, completed 6-10-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ZONING APPLICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner of property (if different than applicant). If multiple owners, list names and addresses of each and indicate ownership interest. Attach additional sheet if necessary.</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Firm/Broker handling sale of property. Provide name and address. <strong>Note</strong>: if you do not own the property, you must provide a copy of a Purchase Agreement or instrument acceptable to the city indicating the owner is fully aware of, and in agreement with, the requested action.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Business License Permit Number (if applicable)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPLICANT CERTIFICATION**

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I (we) certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my (our) knowledge, true and accurate. Furthermore, I (we) hereby authorize the City and its representatives to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting necessary site inspections.

By: [Signature] By: [Signature]

Name: Samuel Keith Zamudio Name: Kathleen Zamudio

(Type/Print) (Type/Print)

Date: 8-12-2012 Date: 8-12-2012

**Appeal Procedures:** A decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment. An appeal must be filed in writing with the City Clerk within ten (10) days of the decision. In accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 18.64.030 of the City of Cordova Zoning Code.

**CITY USE ONLY - PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date application received:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee paid:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does application require a public hearing? Planning Commission: City Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff review date/reviewer name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission final action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council final action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project/Request Description Page:

1. Please describe your request in complete detail. Feel free to add additional pages and/or drawings, maps, photographs of the site, and other documentation that might be helpful to the Planning Commission as they make a decision on your request.

2. If you are requesting a dimensional variance, you must include a basic site plan drawing showing the location of your property lines, existing and proposed buildings, existing and proposed easements, building setbacks, and other items necessary to adequately and accurately show the nature of your request.

3. In order to receive a zoning compliance permit, you must meet the standards of the relevant zoning code. PLEASE REFER TO THE FOLLOWING PAGES OF THIS APPLICATION FOR A COPY OF THE RELEVANT SECTION STANDARDS.

Please describe your request. Add additional pages, drawings and required information.

This is a request for a variance for our carport located at 600 Birch Street in Cordova, Alaska.

600 Birch Street is a corner lot located in the Vina Young subdivision - Lot 3, Block 3. The variance will allow us to maintain a carport that was constructed on June 8-10, 2012.

We constructed the carport in good faith. In the spring of 2009 we scheduled a meeting with city planner, Ann Cervanka. She informed us that given the location of the property and its buildings, we could not build a garage, but that we could build a carport, a nonpermanent structure. We were informed that a garage would be considered a permanent structure, but that a carport was acceptable because it is not a permanent structure and does not require a building permit.

Attached is a copy of the as built survey that we received when we purchased the home along with photographs of carport as built. The carport is 21.3’ x 14’ (see attachment and photographs). According to the as built survey, the carport is on our property line and hence the request for a variance.
VARIANCE STANDARDS 18.64.020

The Planning and Zoning Commission may only approve the variance if the Commission finds that ALL of the following 4 standards are satisfied. Each standard must have a response in as much detail as it takes to explain how your project satisfies the standard. Use additional paper if needed.

1
Exceptional physical circumstances or conditions that apply to the property or to its intended use or development which do not apply generally to the other properties in the same land use district.
EXPLAIN: Our property is in a unique situation. It is at the corner of Birch Street and Young Drive. Given the situation of the adjoining properties, the carport as it stands does not encroach upon other private properties in the vicinity or interfere with the use of Young Drive. Young Drive dead ends and its right of way is blocked by a home. See Photo 1.

2
That the strict application of the provisions of this title would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship.
EXPLAIN: This request for a variance of this title would not result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship for any other private properties in the vicinity.

3
That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.
EXPLAIN: This request for a variance does not result in material damage or prejudice to other private properties in the vicinity, and is not detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

4
That the granting of the variance will not be contrary to the objectives of the comprehensive plan.
EXPLAIN: To our knowledge, the granting of the variance will not be contrary to the objectives of the comprehensive plan. This variance request supports 6. Aesthetic Improvements Strategies on Pg. 46 under Chapter 1 - Economic Development. As stated, “It is the intent of the City to clean up Cordova and make it more visually attractive by using the following strategies.” The stated strategy is the fifth item, “Provide incentives to encourage property owners to fix up their property and buildings.” See Photo 2.
This variance request does not encroach upon any private properties in the vicinity.

OTHER REQUIREMENTS
1. A legal description of the property involved.
2. Site and Building Plan: Plot plan showing the location of all existing and proposed buildings or improvements, elevations of such buildings or alterations, and such other data as may be required.
3. Evidence of the ability and intention of the applicant to proceed in accordance with the plans within six months after the effective date of the variance.
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Staff
Date: 9/6/2012
Re: Variance Request by Diana Riedel

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Actions: A variance request with varying widths starting with the front North corner of the of the house being 3 feet from the property line and angling back so that the south corner of the house is 6 feet from property line from the required 10 foot setback required in Medium Density Zone.

Applicant: Diana Riedel
Owners Name: Diana Riedel
Address: 305 Observation Avenue
Parcel Number: 02-060-213 & 215
Zoning: Medium Density District
Lot Area: 5,147 square feet

PART II. BACKGROUND

The property owner has requested a variance with varying widths starting with the front North corner of the of the house being 3 feet from the property line and angling back so that the south corner of the house is 6 feet from property line. The variance will provide for the construction of a single family residential house.
The applicable regulations for this variance request are the following sections:

Chapter 18.24 Medium Density

18.24.040 – Front Yard.

A. There shall be a front yard in the R medium density district of not less than ten feet from curb line.

Condition 18.24.040 A is what the variance is based upon.

Chapter 18.64 Exceptions, Variances and Appeals

18.64.020 Variances

An application has been filed pursuant to this section of code. Below is the review of the variance criteria.

PART III. REVIEW OF APPLICABLE CRITERIA

A Variance may be granted only if all four of the following conditions exist:

PART IV. SUGGESTED FINDINGS

1. That there are exceptional physical circumstances or conditions applicable to the property or to its intended use or development which do not apply to the other properties in the same land use district.

   This condition has been met. The lot is narrow, steep and is located on a cliff side with multiple rock terraces. The Eastern lot line is approximately at 100 feet elevation and the Western lot line is approximately 70 feet elevation. The majority of lots in the Medium Density do not have these geographical conditions.

2. That the strict application of the provisions of this title would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship.

   This condition has been met. The engineer has addressed the need for meeting the building requirements for downhill slope distance and anchoring requirements which requires the house to be placed closer to than the ten feet from the lot line. The engineer also describes that allowing the variance from the ten foot setback will provide relief from the backfill pressure.
3. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

The condition of material damage or prejudice has been met. At the time of this writing the planning department has received no input from neighbors. If there is additional information received by planning department it will be included in the packet. There will also be the opportunity for public comment at the hearing.

The condition of public health, safety or welfare has been partially met. The departments of public works, fire, and police department have been consulted and have provided their input, please see attached write ups.

4. That the granting of the variance will not be contrary to the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

This condition had been met. The Cordova Comprehensive plan addresses residential zoning and encourages development in the residential zone.

PART V. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. Prior to a building permit being issued PE Consulting Engineer will review and compare the 2006 IBC &IRC with the 2009 codes.

2. Seismic design criteria will be addressed in the 2006 IBC code.

3. A Building Permit must be obtained from the Planning Department prior to the construction of the bunkhouses.

PART VI. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends approval of the request of a variance of varying widths starting with the front North corner of the of the house being 3 feet from the property line and angling back so that the south corner of the house is 6 feet from property line from the required 10 foot setback required in Medium Density Zone.

PART VII. SUGGESTED MOTION

“I move that the Variance request by Diana Riedel from the 10’ front yard setback in the Medium Residential Density Zone to a 3’ front setback on the North Corner of the house and 6’ front setback on the South corner of the house be approved based upon the findings and special conditions as contained in the staff report.”
Sam Greenwood.

After looking over the documents provided by your office and visiting that location, I have determined that under Condition 3, Part 2, I see no detrimental impact to the public health, safety or welfare in the request Diana Riedel is asking in her variance.

Paul Trumblee

From: Sam Greenwood
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2012 1:53 PM
To: Public Works; Oscar Delpino (fire@cityofcordova.net); Bob Griffiths
Subject: Riedel Variance Request

On August 28, 2012 we met to discuss and review a variance request made by Diana Riedel. Diana Riedel is requesting a variable variance starting with one corner of the house being 3 feet from the property line and angling back so that the other corner of the house is 6 feet from property line, this is a variance from the front yard setback requirement of 10 feet in the Medium Density Residential zone. At our meeting we reviewed the application and drawings that were received from the Diana Riedel.

In order for a variance request to be granted 4 conditions must be met. I am asking for your input on the second part of condition 3 below:

Condition 3. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

Your comments/input will be included in the packet that is provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission to aide in the decision-making process. Please reply to this email with your input concerning Diana Riedel’s variance request.
After looking over the documents provided by your office, I have determined that under Condition 3, Part 2, I see no detrimental impact to the public health, safety or welfare in the request Diana Riedel is asking in her variance.

Chief Bob Griffiths  
Cordova Police Department  
(907)424-6100  
(907)424-6120  
policechief@cityofcordova.net

From: Sam Greenwood  
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2012 1:53 PM  
To: Public Works; Oscar Delpino (fire@cityofcordova.net); Bob Griffiths  
Subject: Riedel Variance Request

On August 28, 2012 we met to discuss and review a variance request made by Diana Riedel. Diana Riedel is requesting a variable variance starting with one corner of the house being 3 feet from the property line and angling back so that the other corner of the house is 6 feet from property line, this is a variance from the front yard setback requirement of 10 feet in the Medium Density Residential zone. At our meeting we reviewed the application and drawings that were received from the Diana Riedel.

In order for a variance request to be granted 4 conditions must be met. I am asking for your input on the second part of condition 3 below:

Condition 3. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

Your comments/input will be included in the packet that is provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission to aide in the decision-making process. Please reply to this email with your input concerning Diana Riedel’s variance request.

Thanks

Samantha Greenwood  
City Planner  
City of Cordova  
PO Box 1210  
Fax 907-424-6000  
Phone 907-424-6233
From the Public Works’ standpoint, the setback in the Riedel case is noteworthy concerning ease of street maintenance. This is a narrow street with a number of houses constructed close to- or right at the property lines. With the close proximity to the corner and the topography of the shoulders, this section of street has regularly been difficult to keep clear during winter conditions. Taking care not to adversely affect the new owner’s property will mean extra attention to maintain the quality of care currently provided, especially during periods of heavy snow.

Thank you,
Moe Zamarron

Moe Zamarron
Director of Public Works
City of Cordova
PO Box 1210
Cordova, AK 99574
Ph 907-424-6231
publicworks@cityofcordova.net

---

From: Sam Greenwood
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2012 1:53 PM
To: Public Works; Oscar Delpino (fire@cityofcordova.net); Bob Griffiths
Subject: Riedel Variance Request

On August 28, 2012 we met to discuss and review a variance request made by Diana Riedel. Diana Riedel is requesting a variable variance starting with one corner of the house being 3 feet from the property line and angling back so that the other corner of the house is 6 feet from property line, this is a variance from the front yard setback requirement of 10 feet in the Medium Density Residential zone. At our meeting we reviewed the application and drawings that were received from the Diana Riedel.

In order for a variance request to be granted 4 conditions must be met. I am asking for your input on the second part of condition 3 below:

Condition 3. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

Your comments/input will be included in the packet that is provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission to aide in the decision-making process. Please reply to this email with your input.
concerning Diana Riedel’s variance request.

Thanks

Samantha Greenwood
City Planner
City of Cordova
PO Box 1210
Fax 907-424-6000
Phone 907-424-6233
**CITY OF CORDOVA**

**VARIANCE APPLICATION**

**CITY OF CORDOVA**

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Print or type requested information. Incomplete applications will be returned to the applicant and will delay the processing of your request. All applications must be filed with the Planning Department 21 days prior to the next Planning Commission meeting date.

### APPLICANT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Diana Riedel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>P.O. Box 6 Cordova, AK 99574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone [home]</td>
<td>(907) 424-4364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone [business]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business FAX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project architect/engineer</td>
<td>Andrew Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of architect/engineer</td>
<td>P.O. Box 241043 Anchorage, AK 99524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone of architect/engineer</td>
<td>(907) 947-9303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPERTY/PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address of subject property</th>
<th>305 Observation Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel identification number</td>
<td>the north 18.5 ft. of lots 192 and all of lots 45,46, Block 2, Railway Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owner [name/address]</td>
<td>Diana F. Riedel, P.O. Box 6 Cordova, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current zoning</td>
<td>Medium Density Residence District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed use</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction start date</td>
<td>Sept. 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ZONING APPLICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner of property (if different than applicant).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If multiple owners, list names and addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of each and indicate ownership interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attach additional sheet if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Firm/Broker handling sale of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property. Provide name and address. <strong>Note</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you do not own the property, you must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide a copy of a Purchase Agreement or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument acceptable to the city indicating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the owner is fully aware of, and in agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with, the requested action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| City Business License Permit Number (if |
| applicable) |

**APPLICANT CERTIFICATION**

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I (we) certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my (our) knowledge, true and accurate. Furthermore, I (we) hereby authorize the City and its representatives to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting necessary site inspections.

By: **Diana R. Riedel**

(Signature)

By: 

(Signature)

Name: **Diana R. Riedel**

(Type/Print)

Name: 

(Type/Print)

Date: 

Date: 

**Appeal Procedures:** A decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment. An appeal must be filed in writing with the City Clerk within ten (10) days of the decision. In accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 18.64.030 of the City of Cordova Zoning Code.

**CITY USE ONLY - PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date application received:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee paid:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does application require a public hearing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff review date/reviewer name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Commission final action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council final action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 2
Project/Request Description Page:

1 Please describe your request in complete detail. Feel free to add additional pages and/or drawings, maps, photographs of the site, and other documentation that might be helpful to the Planning Commission as they make a decision on your request.

2 If you are requesting a dimensional variance, you must include a basic site plan drawing showing the location of your property lines, existing and proposed buildings, existing and proposed easements, building setbacks, and other items necessary to adequately and accurately show the nature of your request.

3 In order to receive a zoning compliance permit, you must meet the standards of the relevant zoning code. PLEASE REFER TO THE FOLLOWING PAGES OF THIS APPLICATION FOR A COPY OF THE RELEVANT SECTION STANDARDS.

Please describe your request. Add additional pages, drawings and required information.

Requesting a Front Variance based on recommendations from our consulting engineer. Please see attached material.
VARIANCE STANDARDS 18.64.020

The Planning and Zoning Commission may only approve the variance if the Commission finds that **ALL** of the following 4 standards are satisfied. Each standard must have a response in as much detail as it takes to explain how your project satisfies the standard. Use additional paper if needed.

1. **Exceptional physical circumstances or conditions apply to the property or to its intended use or development which do not apply to other properties in the same land use district.**

   **EXPLAIN:**
   
   SEE VARIANCE STANDARDS 18.64.020

2. **Granting the variance will not permit a use that is not otherwise permitted in the district in which the property lies and will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.**

   **EXPLAIN:**
   
   SEE VARIANCE STANDARDS 18.64.020

3. **Granting the variance would be in harmony with the objectives of the zoning ordinance.**

   **EXPLAIN:**
   
   SEE VARIANCE STANDARDS 18.64.020

4. **Strict application of the provisions of the zoning ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district.**

   **EXPLAIN:**
   
   SEE VARIANCE STANDARDS 18.64.020

**OTHER REQUIREMENTS**

1. A legal description of the property involved.
2. Site and Building Plan: One copy of a site plan, drawn to scale, showing the location of all existing and proposed buildings or improvements, elevations of such buildings or alterations, and such other data as may be required.
3. Evidence of the ability and intention of the applicant to proceed in accordance with the plans within six months after the effective date of the variance.
2. The application shall contain a statement and adequate evidence showing the following conditions, all four of which must exist before a variance may be granted.

a. That there are exceptional physical circumstances or conditions applicable to the property or to its intended use or development which do not apply generally to the other properties in the same land use district,

Due to safety and code considerations, the engineer or record would like to increase the distance from the downhill slope to the edge of the foundation footing. Per International Residential Code R403.1.7.2, this lot does not allow for a standard foundation footing due to the size of the lot. Two measures have been taken into consideration to mitigate the risk of building on this lot. The first measure requires that the distance from the slope is increased, and the second measure is the use of an anchoring system. Both are key to ensuring safety and reducing the risk of building on this property.

b. That the strict application of the provisions of this title would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship.

The strict application of the setback provisions outlined by the City of Cordova for this lot create a hardship due to the slope or the lot. A smaller house would not achieve the code provisions for standard construction. The current design as proposed by the engineer of record allows for minimizing lateral loads due to backfilling, which increases the likelihood of the building performing as well in a seismic or high wind event. Additionally, the proposed location allows for a maximization of anchor embedment into rock opposed to anchoring through layers of fill.

c. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare,

Based on the adjacent properties’ building placement, the variance is consistent with actual lot setbacks and “grand-fathered” standards. The proposed placement takes into account minimum drainage requirements and site stability.

d. That the granting of the variance will not be contrary to the objectives of the comprehensive plan.

Safety is a consideration for all planning. The risk mitigation requirements for building access and structural performance during a lateral loading event are consistent with public policy and building code criteria. Civil site conditions have also been considered for run off, parking and snow collection.
305 Observation Avenue
Cordova, Alaska
Site Layout and Foundation Design

For:
Diana Riedel

By:
Andrew P. Adams, PE
Consulting Engineer

Date Prepared: 8/16/12
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August 16, 2012

Diana Riedel
PO BOX 6
Cordova, Alaska

Ms. Riedel:

The purpose of this design package is to provide structural engineering for the new residential construction located at 305 Observation Avenue in Cordova, Alaska. It is my understanding that a variance is required to obtain a building permit. The primary focus of this engineering package is to provide a technical review of the site and to provide a structural solution for this site. Andrew P. Adams, PE Consulting Engineer does not provide surveying services nor legal advice. It is the responsibility of the land owner to provide all variance applications and testimony for the variance. Andrew P. Adams, PE or his representative is available to provide civil and structural engineering support for this process.

Given the site conditions, local reference points will be used to determine structural components. For the purposes of this design, the finished floor elevation for the main level of the house will be used as elevation “0”. Additionally, the site layout should be verified by a license surveyor prior to beginning any construction. The site layouts for this structural engineering package are based on public records and does not account for any lot alterations that may have occurred due to earth moving operations on your site.

Upon reviewing the City of Cordova meeting minutes, it may be advantageous for you to reduce the building footprint to obtain a lot variance. However, limitation to the site based on the International Residential Code 2009 Section R403.1.7.2 “Footing setback from descending slope surfaces”. It is not possible to achieve the code minimum offsets for slopes on this lot. Engineering design measures have been taken to ensure a safe foundation design for the structure, but by moving the buildings foundation as close to the uphill side of the property, risk can be further mitigated. See that attached code excerpt for explanations and figures.

The structural engineering plans will be based on a “worst-case” loading for the building components, and will be noted according to the site condition limits. If the building size or configuration change, you should notify the engineer of record to review the changes.

I trust that this is the information you require. Please contact the undersigned if we may be of further assistance.

Respectfully,

Andrew P. Adams, P.E.
Owner
CE – 12282
Appendix 1: Project Description and Design Basis

Scope of Work:

Provide structural engineering and site layout for a residential, two-story with full basement building that has a 26 foot by 32 foot footprint. The structure will have a single story above the Observation Avenue street level, and will have a single floor and basement level below the street level. The “uphill” portion of this building will have a retaining wall that is approximately 20’ tall.

Design References

The project will be designed to the following standards (as required):

- INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE, (IBC) 2006
- INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL CODE, (IRC) 2006
- AMERICAN CONCRETE INSTITUTE (ACI) 318 LATEST ADDITION
- AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF STEEL CONSTRUCTION (AISC) 13TH EDITION
- NATIONAL DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS FOR WOOD CONSTRUCTION (NDS) 2005
- LOCAL REGULATIONS AND AMENDMENTS
Design Basis:

Site Soil Conditions:
A site soil analysis was not conducted due to the shallow depth of bedrock. The fill observed on the site appeared to be silty-gravel with large fractured rock. The rock on the site and adjacent to the building was suitable for a drilling and grouted rod application.

Snow Load:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASCE 7 2005 - Snow Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Snow Load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Snow Load</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-2 Exposure Factor (C_e)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terrain Category</th>
<th>Fully Exposed</th>
<th>Partially Exposed</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above treeline in windswept mountainous areas</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Alaska, in areas where trees do not exist within a 2 mile radius of the site</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-3 Thermal Factor (C_t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermal Condition</th>
<th>C_t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All structures except as indicated below</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures kept just above freezing and others with cold, ventilated roof in which the thermal resistance (R-Value) between the ventilated space and the heated space exceeds 25 F-hrs-sf/btu</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unheated structures and structures intentionally kept below freezing</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously heated greenhouses with a roof having a thermal resistance (R-Value) less than 2.0 F-hr-sf/btu</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-4 Importance Factor - Snow Loads (I_s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermal Condition</th>
<th>C_t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All structures except as indicated below</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures kept just above freezing and others with cold, ventilated roof in which the thermal resistance (R-Value) between the ventilated space and the heated space exceeds 25 F-hrs-sf/btu</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unheated structures and structures intentionally kept below freezing</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously heated greenhouses with a roof having a thermal resistance (R-Value) less than 2.0 F-hr-sf/btu</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[ p_s = p_C \]

**Input**
- **Exposure Factor**
  \[ C_e = 0.9 \]
- **Thermal Factor**
  \[ C_t = 1.2 \]
- **Importance Factor**
  \[ I_s = 1 \]
- **Ground Snow Load**
  \[ p_g = 150 \text{ psf} \]
- **Roof Snow Load**
  \[ p_f = 113.4 \text{ psf} \]

Snow Load of 113 psf to be used.

**Wind Load:**
Wind analysis for the structure above street level:

**Wind Analysis for Low-rise Building, Based on ASCE 7-05 / IBC 2009 / CBC 2010**

**INPUT DATA**
- **Exposure category** (B, C or D)
- **Importance factor, pg 77, (0.87, 1.0 or 1.15)**
  \[ I = 1.00 \text{ Category II} \]
- **Basic wind speed (IBC Tab 1609.3.1V)\]**
  \[ V = 120 \text{ mph} \]
- **Topographic factor (Sec.6.5.7.2, pg 26 & 45)**
  \[ K_{zt} = 1 \text{ Flat} \]
- **Building height to eave**
  \[ h_e = 9 \text{ ft} \]
- **Building height to ridge**
  \[ h_r = 15.6667 \text{ ft} \]
- **Building length**
  \[ L = 26 \text{ ft} \]
- **Building width**
  \[ B = 32 \text{ ft} \]
- **Effective area of components (or Solar Panel area)**
  \[ A = 0 \text{ ft}^2 \]

**DESIGN SUMMARY**
- Max horizontal force normal to building length, \( L, \text{ face} \) = 6.50 kips
- Max horizontal force normal to building length, \( B, \text{ face} \) = 7.83 kips
- Max total horizontal torsional load = 32.32 ft-kips
- Max total upward force = 16.86 kips
ANALYSIS

Velocity pressure

\[ q_h = 0.00256 K_h K_d V^2 I \]

where:
- \( q_h \) = velocity pressure at mean roof height, \( h \), (Eq. 6-15, page 27)
- \( K_h \) = velocity pressure exposure coefficient evaluated at height, \( h \), (Tab. 6-3, Case 1, pg 79)
- \( K_d \) = wind directionality factor, (Tab. 6-4, for building, page 80)
- \( h \) = mean roof height

\[ K_h = 0.85 \]
\[ K_d = 0.85 \]
\[ h = 12.33 \text{ ft} \]

Design pressures for MWFRS

\[ p = q_h [(G C_{pf}) -(G C_{pi})] \]

where:
- \( p \) = pressure in appropriate zone. (Eq. 6-18, page 28)
- \( p_{min} = 10 \text{ psf} \) (Sec. 6.1.4.1 & 6.1.4.2)
- \( G C_{pf} \) = product of gust effect factor and external pressure coefficient, see table below. (Fig. 6-10, page 53 & 54)
- \( G C_{pi} \) = product of gust effect factor and internal pressure coefficient. (Fig. 6-5, Enclosed Building, page 47)
- \( a \) = width of edge strips. Fig 6-10, note 9, page 54, \( \text{MAX}[ \text{MIN}(0.1B, 0.1L, 0.4h), \text{MIN}(0.04B, 0.04L), 3] = 3.00 \text{ ft} \)

### Net Pressures (psf), Basic Load Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Roof angle ( \theta ) = 22.62</th>
<th>Roof angle ( \theta ) = 0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( G_{C_{pf}} )</td>
<td>Net Pressure with ((+G C_{pi})) ((-G C_{pi}))</td>
<td>( G_{C_{pf}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-16.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-17.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>-23.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>-22.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-20.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-16.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-16.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Pressures (psf), Torsional Load Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Roof angle ( \theta ) = 22.62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( G_{C_{pf}} )</td>
<td>Net Pressure with ((+G C_{pi})) ((-G C_{pi}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1T</td>
<td>1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2T</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3T</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4T</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \mathrm{Roof \ angle \ \theta = 0.00} \]

| Surface | \( G_{C_{pf}} \) | Net Pressure with \((+G C_{pi})\) \((-G C_{pi})\) |
|---------|-------------------------------|
| 1T | 0.40 | 1.46 | 3.86 |
| 2T | -0.69 | -5.79 | -3.40 |
| 3T | -0.37 | -3.66 | -1.27 |
| 4T | -0.29 | -3.13 | -0.73 |
## Wind Analysis for wind forces “uphill”

### Basic Load Cases in Transverse Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Area (ft(^2))</th>
<th>Pressure (k) with ((+GC_p))</th>
<th>Pressure (k) with ((-GC_p))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>-5.86</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>-5.97</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-2.49</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Basic Load Cases in Longitudinal Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Area (ft(^2))</th>
<th>Pressure (k) with ((+GC_p))</th>
<th>Pressure (k) with ((-GC_p))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>-8.48</td>
<td>-4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>-5.36</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>-4.17</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-2.81</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Torsional Load Cases in Transverse Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Area (ft(^2))</th>
<th>Pressure (k) with ((+GC_p))</th>
<th>Pressure (k) with ((-GC_p))</th>
<th>Torsion (ft-k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-2.49</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1T</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2T</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3T</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4T</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Torsional Load Cases in Longitudinal Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Area (ft(^2))</th>
<th>Pressure (k) with ((+GC_p))</th>
<th>Pressure (k) with ((-GC_p))</th>
<th>Torsion (ft-k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>-6.53</td>
<td>-3.83</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>-4.13</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-2.81</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1T</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2T</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3T</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4T</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Horiz. Torsional Load, \(M_T\) = 22, 22

### Design pressures for components and cladding

\[
p = q(GC_p - (GC_p)) \]

where: \(p = \) pressure on component. (Eq. 6-22, pg 28)

\(p_{min} = 10.00\) psf (Sec. 6.1.4.2, pg 21)

\(GC_p = \) external pressure coefficient.

see table below. (Fig. 6-11, page 55~58)

### Effective Area (ft\(^2\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comp.</th>
<th>Zone 1 (GC_p - GC_p)</th>
<th>Zone 2 (GC_p - GC_p)</th>
<th>Zone 3 (GC_p - GC_p)</th>
<th>Zone 4 (GC_p - GC_p)</th>
<th>Zone 5 (GC_p - GC_p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comp. & Cladding Pressure (psf)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 1 Zone 2 Zone 3 Zone 4 Zone 5</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp. 18.11</td>
<td>-20.76</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>-55.40</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>-74.04</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>-34.09</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>-42.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: If the effective area is roof Solar Panel area, the only zone 1, 2, or 3 apply.
Seismic Load:

Seismic design category = D

Latitude: 60.429
Longitude: -143.157

\[ S_S = 201.721 \text{ %g} ,\ S_{mf} = 2.017 \text{ g},\ F_a = 1.000 \]
\[ S_1 = 71.910 \text{ %g},\ S_{mf} = 1.079 \text{ g},\ F_v = 1.500 \]
\[ S_{DS} = 1.345 \text{ g} ,\ S_{DI} = 0.719 \text{ g} \]
Three Story Seismic Analysis Based on IBC 09 / CBC 10

Determine Base Shear (Derived from ASCE 7-05 Sec. 12.8 & Supplement 2)

\[ V = \max \{ \min \left[ \frac{S_{D1}}{(RT)}, \frac{S_{DS}}{R} \right], \max(0.044S_{DS1}, 0.01) \}, \frac{0.5S_1}{R} \} W \]

\[ = \max \{ \min(0.4W, 0.21W), 0.06W, 0.05W \} \]

\[ = 0.21 W, \text{ (SD) } \]

\[ = 0.15 W, \text{ (ASD) } = 10275.68 \text{ kips} \]

Where

- \( S_{DS} = 1.345 \) (ASCE 7-05 Sec 11.4.4)
- \( S_{D1} = 0.719 \) (ASCE 7-05 Sec 11.4.4)
- \( S_1 = 0.71 \) (ASCE 7-05 Sec 11.4.1)
- \( R = 6.5 \) (ASCE 7-05 Tab 12.2-1)
- \( I = 1 \) (IBC 09 Tab 1604.5 & ASCE 7-05 Tab 11.5-1)
- \( C_t = 0.02 \) (ASCE 7-05 Tab 12.8-2)
- \( h_n = 33.0 \) ft
- \( x = 0.75 \) (ASCE 7-05 Tab 12.8-2)
- \( T = C_t (h_n)^k = 0.275 \) sec, (ASCE 7-05 Sec 12.8.2.1)

Calculate Vertical Distribution of Forces & Allowable Elastic Drift (ASCE 7-05, Sec 12.8.3 & 12.8.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>( W_x )</th>
<th>( h_x )</th>
<th>( h_x^k )</th>
<th>( W_xh_x^k )</th>
<th>( F_x ), ASD (12.8-11)</th>
<th>( \delta_{x, \text{allowable}, \text{ASD}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>31283.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1032346</td>
<td>6850.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>19120.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>344160</td>
<td>2283.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND</td>
<td>19120.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>172080</td>
<td>1141.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where \( k = 1 \) for \( T <= 0.5 \)

\[ \delta_{x, \text{allowable}, \text{ASD}} = \frac{\Delta_a}{(1.4C_d)}, \text{ (ASCE 7-05 Sec 12.8.6) } \]

\[ C_d = 4, \text{ (ASCE 7-05 Tab 12.2-1) } \]

\[ \Delta_a = 0.02h_{sx}, \text{ (ASCE 7-05 Tab 12.12-1) } \]

Calculate Diaphragm Forces (ASCE 7-05, Sec 12.10.1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>( W_x )</th>
<th>( \Sigma W_x )</th>
<th>( F_x )</th>
<th>( \Sigma F_x )</th>
<th>( F_{px} ), ASD, (12.10-1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>31283.2</td>
<td>31283.2</td>
<td>6850.2</td>
<td>6850.2</td>
<td>6850.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>19120.0</td>
<td>50403.2</td>
<td>2283.7</td>
<td>9133.8</td>
<td>3464.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND</td>
<td>19120.0</td>
<td>69523.2</td>
<td>1141.8</td>
<td>10275.7</td>
<td>3428.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where

- \( F_{min} = 0.2 S_{DS} I W_x / 1.5, \text{ ASD} \)
- \( F_{max} = 0.4 S_{DS} I W_x / 1.5, \text{ ASD} \)

Wind Controls
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Appendix 2: Design Analysis
Roof Diaphragm Analysis

Minimum Gravity load requirements for roof sheathing: \( \frac{3}{4}'' \) @ 16” per Table 2304.7(5)

Lateral Load: 5.8 kips
Length of Diaphragm: 32 ft

Minimum sheathing to resist shear
19/32 Sheathing with 6” edge nailing and 6’’ panel nailing. Nailing 10d (3”x.148), minimum embed 1 ½”.

Gravity load requirements controls thickness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roof Sheathing</th>
<th>3/4” Structural</th>
<th>10d</th>
<th>6” Edge</th>
<th>6” Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Truss Loading Analysis

Scissor trusses to be sized to resist applied loads and submitted to the engineer of record for approval. Spacing for trusses to be 16” on center.

Holddown Analysis

Truss/Rafter Spacing: 16”
Span: 32’
Wind Zone: 120 MPH, EXP C
Uplift for Roof: 17 kips
Uplift Resistance Per Connection: 450 lbs (no DL reduction)
USE SIMPSON H2.5 at all rafters and studs.

Floor Framing Analysis

\[ 14 \text{ BCI 6500 1.8} \]
Span \( (l) = 24 \text{ ft} \quad 288 \text{ in} \]
\[ 
\begin{align*}
\text{EI} & = 515000000 \quad \text{lbs-in}^2 \\
\text{K} & = 8000000 \quad \text{lbs} \\
\text{Spacing} & = 12 \quad \text{in} \\
\text{DL} & = 10 \quad \text{psf} \quad \text{ASCE 7-05, Appendix C}
\end{align*}
\]
LL = 40 psf Per IBC 2006 TABLE 1607.1
SL = 0 psf ASCE 7-05, Chapter 7

Ultimate
DL = 10.00 plf 0.83 lb/in
LL = 40.00 plf 3.33 lb/in
SL = 0.00 plf 0.00 lb/in
Total 4.17 lb/in
D+L 4.17 lb/in

\[ \Delta = \frac{5wl^4}{384EI} + \frac{wl^2}{K} \]

\( \Delta = \) deflection [in]
\( w = \) uniform load [lb/in]
\( l = \) clear span [in]
\( EI = \) bending stiffness [lb-in²]
\( K = \) shear deformation coefficient [lb]

\[ \Delta = 0.6 \text{ in} \quad \frac{L}{468.8} \quad \text{L} \]
\[ \Delta = 0.8 \text{ in} \quad \frac{L}{375.0} \quad \text{D+L} \]
\( \Delta \text{ (allowed)} = 0.8 \text{ in} \quad L/360 \text{ for combined loads} \)

Reactions
L 960.0 lbs
D+L 1200.0 lbs

Floor Hangers (Top Flush)
Hanger to ICF Wall:
Max Reaction for ICF Hanger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>480.0 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+L</td>
<td>600.0 lbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Span (l) = 12 ft
ICFVL – 14 gage @ 24” o.c.

Anchor Analysis

12.11.2 Anchorage of Concrete or Masonry Structural Walls. The anchorage of concrete or masonry structural walls to supporting construction shall provide a direct connection capable of resisting the greater of the following:

a. The force set forth in Section 12.11.1.

b. A force of $400S_D S_f$ lbs. linear ft (3.84$S_D S_f$ kN/m) of wall

c. 280 lbs/linear ft (4.09 kN/m) of wall

Structural walls shall be designed to resist bending between anchors where the anchor spacing exceeds 4 ft (1,219 mm).

12.11.2.1 Anchorage of Concrete or Masonry Structural Walls to Flexible Diaphragms. In addition to the requirements set forth in Section 12.11.2, anchorage of concrete or masonry structural walls to flexible diaphragms in structures assigned to Seismic Design Category C, D, E, or F shall have the strength to develop the out-of-plane force given by Eq. 12.11-1:

$$ F_p = 0.8S_D S_f W_p $$

(12.11-1)

$F = 400(1.3)(1.0) = 520$ plf

Uplift = 338 lbs/ft
**INPUT DATA & DESIGN SUMMARY**

- **CONCRETE STRENGTH** $f'_c = 3.5$ ksi
- **SPECIFIED STRENGTH OF FASTENER** $f_{uta} = 60$ ksi

(The strength of most fastenings is likely to be controlled by the embedment strength rather than the steel strength, so it is usually economical to use ASTM A307 Grade A fastener.)

- **FACTORED DESIGN TENSION LOAD** $N_{ua,1} = 1.352$ k
- **FACTORED DESIGN SHEAR LOAD** $V_{ua,1} = 2.08$ k
- **EFFECTIVE EMBEDMENT DEPTH** $h_{ef} = 7$ in
- **FASTENER DIAMETER** $d = 0.625$ in
- **FASTENER HEAD TYPE** 1 Square

(1 = Square, 2 = Heavy Square, 3 = Hex, 4 = Heavy Hex, 5 = Hardened Washers)

**DIST. BETWEEN THE FASTENER AND EDGE** $c = 16$ in

**SEISMIC LOAD ? (ACI 318 D3.3)** Yes

---

**ANALYSIS**

**EFFECTIVE AREA OF FASTENER** $A_{se} = 0.226$ in$^2$

**BEARING AREA OF HEAD** $A_b = 0.693$ in$^2$, (or determined from manufacturer's catalogs.)

**CHECK FASTENER TENSILE STRENGTH (ACI 318, D.3.3.6):**

$$
\phi N_{ts} = \phi_n A_n \left( f'_{uta} \right) = 7.628 \text{ k} > N_{ua} = 3.380 \text{ k} \quad \text{[Satisfactory]}
$$

where: $\phi = 0.75 \times 0.75 = 0.5625$, (ACI 318-08 D.4.4 & D.3.3.3)

**CHECK CONCRETE BREAKOUT STRENGTH : (ACI 318, D.5.1.2)**

$$
\phi N_{cb} = \phi_n A_n \psi_{a,N} \psi_{c,N} N_{cb} = \phi_n A_n \left( f'_{c} \right) \left( \frac{0.7 + 0.3c}{1.5} \right) \psi_{c,N} \left( 24 \sqrt{f'_c h_{ef}^{1.5}} \right)
$$

where: $\phi = 0.75 \times 0.75 = 0.5625$

$\psi_{c,N}$ term is 1.0 for location where concrete cracking is likely to occur.

**CHECK PULLOUT STRENGTH : (ACI 318, D.5.3.1)**

$$
\phi \psi_p N_{pm} = \phi \psi_{p,N} \left( A_b \sqrt[3]{f'_c} \right) = 10.915 \text{ k} > N_{ua} \quad \text{[Satisfactory]}
$$

where: $\phi = 0.75 \times 0.75 = 0.5625$

$\psi_{p,N}$ term is 1.0 for location where concrete cracking is likely to occur.

**CHECK SIDE-FACE BLOWOUT STRENGTH : (ACI 318, D.5.4.1)**

$$
\phi N_{sb} = \phi \left( 160 c \sqrt[3]{A_b \sqrt[3]{f'_c}} \right) = 70.919 \text{ k} > N_{ua} \quad \text{[Satisfactory]}
$$

where: $\phi = 0.75 \times 0.75 = 0.5625$
Foundation Design

Soil pressure on the retaining wall will be significantly low due to the stability of the rock face. However, a conservative approach assuming retained soil will be used to ensure the retaining wall is sufficient.
INPUT DATA & DESIGN SUMMARY

SOIL SPECIFIC WEIGHT \( \gamma_b = 110 \) pcf
SOIL INTERNAL FRICTION ANGLE \( \phi = 30 \) deg
SLOPE OF BACKFILL \( \beta = 0 \) deg
EXTERNAL FRICTION ANGLE \( \delta = 20 \) deg
RACK ANGLE OF WALL FACE \( \theta = 90 \) deg

The Active Earth Pressure:
\[ P_a = 33 \text{ psf / ft} \]
\[ P_{a,h} = 31 \text{ pcf (horizontal equivalent fluid pressure)} \]

The At-rest Earth Pressure:
\[ P_0 = 55 \text{ psf / ft} \]

The Passive Earth Pressure:
\[ P_p = 330 \text{ psf / ft} \]

ANALYSIS

DETERMINE ACTIVE EARTH PRESSURE

\[ P_a = \gamma_b K_a = 33 \text{ psf / ft} \]
\[ P_{a,h} = P_a \sin(\theta - \delta) = 31 \text{ pcf (horizontal equivalent fluid pressure)} \]

\[ K_a = \frac{\sin^2(\theta + \phi)}{\sin^2(\theta - \delta) + \frac{1}{\sin(\phi + \delta)} \frac{\sin(\phi - \delta)}{\sin(\phi + \delta)}} = 0.297 \]

(Coulomb, AASHTO Figure 5.5.2A)

The total active resultant, \((0.5 \, H \, P_a)\), acts \(H/3\) above the base.

DETERMINE AT-REST EARTH PRESSURE

\[ P_0 = \gamma_b K_0 = 55 \text{ psf / ft} \]

\[ K_0 = 1 - \sin \phi = 0.500 \] (AASHTO 5.5.2-2)

The total horizontal resultant at rest, \((0.5 \, H \, P_0)\), acts \(H/3\) above the base.

DETERMINE PASSIVE EARTH PRESSURE

\[ P_p = \gamma_b K_p = 330 \text{ psf / ft} \]

\[ K_p = \frac{1 + \sin \phi}{1 - \sin \phi} = 3.000 \] (Rankine, AASHTO Figure 5.5.2D)

\[ \delta = 0 \text{ deg} \]
\[ \theta = 90 \text{ deg} \]

The total horizontal resultant at rest, \((0.5 \, H \, P_p)\), acts \(H/3\) above the base.
Retaining Wall:
Mid-height floor framing neglected as a conservative approach for bracing.

### Retained Retaining Concrete Wall Design Based on ACI 318-08

**INPUT DATA & DESIGN SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Strength f_c</td>
<td>3 ksi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebar Yield Stress f_y</td>
<td>60 ksi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Soil Pressure P_a</td>
<td>31 pcf (equivalent fluid pressure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Pressure P_p</td>
<td>330 psf / ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backfill Specific Weight γ_b</td>
<td>110 pcf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surcharge Weight w_s</td>
<td>100 psf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Lateral Force w_lat</td>
<td>30.1 psf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Gravity Load P</td>
<td>0.65 kips / ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentricity e</td>
<td>9 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction Coefficient μ</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Soil Pressure Q_a</td>
<td>2 ksf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness of Stem t</td>
<td>12 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toe Width L_t</td>
<td>2 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heel Width L_h</td>
<td>0.5 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of Fence Stem H_f</td>
<td>0.5 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of Stem H</td>
<td>21 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrainted Height H_r</td>
<td>21 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footing Thickness h_f</td>
<td>12 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrained Bottom? 1=Yes, 0=No</td>
<td>1 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Depth h_k</td>
<td>0 &lt;=No ReqD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Over Toe h_k</td>
<td>4 in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEM REINF. (A_s,1)**
- # 6 @ 6 in o.c.
- Location (0=at inside face, 1=at middle, 2=at each face) 0 at inside face

**BOT. REINF. OF FOOTING (A_s,2)**
- # 5 @ 24 in

**TOP REINF. OF FOOTING (A_s,3)**
- # 5 @ 18 in

[The wall design is adequate.]
ANALYSIS

SERVICE LOADS

\[ H_b = 0.5 P_a H_f \]

\[ H_s = w_s P_a \]

\[ H_p = 0.5 P_p (h_p + h_f + h_k)^2 \]

\[ H_{lat} = W_{lat} (H_f + H_p) \]

\[ W_b = w_b L \]

\[ W_e = H_b L \]

\[ W_t = (H_t + L_t) \gamma_c \]

\[ W_k = h_k t \gamma_c \]

\[ W_w = t (H_f + H) \gamma_c \]

\[ R_T = 0.5 H_{lat} (H_f/H_t + h_p/H_p + H/H_f) + P_e/H_r \]

\[ R_B = H_{lat} + H_b + H_b - R_T \]

\[ V_B = W_w + P \]

FACTORED LOADS

\[ \gamma H_b = 1.6 H_b \]

\[ \gamma H_s = 1.6 H_s \]

\[ \gamma H_{lat} = 1.6 H_{lat} \]

\[ \gamma W_b = 1.6 W_b \]

\[ \gamma W_e = 1.2 W_e \]

\[ \gamma W_t = 1.2 W_t \]

\[ \gamma W_k = 1.2 W_k \]

\[ \gamma W_w = 1.2 W_w \]

\[ \gamma P = 1.6 P \]

OVERTURNING MOMENT

\[ R_B \]

\[ \gamma H \]

\[ y \]

\[ H_y \]

\[ \gamma H_y \]

\[ \Sigma \]

VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W</th>
<th>[ \gamma W ]</th>
<th>x [ W x ]</th>
<th>[ \gamma W x ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W_b</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_b</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_b</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_k</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_k</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_w</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ \Sigma ]</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>14.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERTURNING FACTOR OF SAFETY

\[ SF = \frac{\Sigma W_x}{\Sigma H_y} = 2.83 > 1.5 \]

[Satisfactory]
CHECK FLEXURE CAPACITY FOR CONCRETE STEM

(ACI 318 15.4.2, 10.2, 10.3.5, 10.5.4, 7.12.2, 12.2, & 12.5)

\[
S = P_a \left[ \frac{w_{Lat} \cdot H + H_p}{H} \right] + \left( P_a \cdot \frac{H + H_p}{H} \right)^2 - 2P_a \left( R_{Rb} + w_{Lat} \cdot h_p \right)
\]

= 9.04 ft

\[
P = V_B - W \cdot \frac{S}{H + H_F} = 2.52 \text{ kips, } @ \text{ M}_{\text{max}} \text{ section}
\]

\[
M_{\text{max}} = S \cdot R_{Rb} - 0.5 \cdot H \cdot S^2 - 0.5 \cdot (H - S) \cdot S^2 / 2 - 0.5 \cdot w_{Lat} \cdot (S - h_p)^2 = 21.35 \text{ ft-kips}
\]

\[
\rho_{\text{max}} = \frac{0.85 f_c \cdot \varepsilon_u}{f_y} = 0.015 \quad \rho_{\text{min}} = \min \left( \frac{4}{3} \frac{\varepsilon_u}{d}, 0.0018 \frac{h_f}{d} \right) = 0.002
\]

\[
\rho = \frac{0.85 f_c \left( 1 - \frac{1 - M_s}{\sqrt{0.383b d^2 f_c}} \right)}{f_y} = 0.007
\]

\[
\phi V_H = 2 \phi b d f_c
\]

\[
\phi V_H = 2 \phi b d f_c > V_u = 1.5 V
\]

[\text{Satisfactory}]

CHECK SHEAR CAPACITY (ACI 318 15.5.2, 11.1.3.1, & 11.2)

At restrained section

\[
V = \text{Max. Horiz. Shear}
\]

\[
V = 2.91 \text{ kips , } 5.14 \text{ kips}
\]

At bottom of wall

\[
\phi V_H = 2 \phi b d f_c > V_u = 1.5 V
\]

[\text{Satisfactory}]

CHECK HEEL FLEXURE CAPACITY, A_{s,3}, FOR FOOTING (ACI 318 15.4.2, 10.2, 10.3.5, 10.5.4, 7.12.2, 12.2, & 12.5)

\[
\rho_{\text{max}} = \frac{0.85 f_c \cdot \varepsilon_u}{f_y} = 0.015 \quad \rho_{\text{min}} = \frac{0.0018 h_f}{2d} = 0.001
\]

\[
M_{s,3} = \frac{L_s}{2} \left( \gamma_{w_s} + \gamma_{w_b} + \frac{L_s}{L} \gamma_{w_f} \right) - \frac{\left( q_u,3 + 2q_u,\text{fwd} \right) b L_s^2}{6}, \text{ for } e_u \leq \frac{L}{6} = 0.28 \text{ ft-kips}
\]

\[
M_{s,3} = \frac{L_s}{2} \left( \gamma_{w_s} + \gamma_{w_b} + \frac{L_s}{L} \gamma_{w_f} \right) - \frac{q_u b S^2}{6}, \text{ for } e_u > \frac{L}{6}
\]

\[
\rho = \frac{0.85 f_c \left( 1 - \frac{1 - M_{s,3}}{\sqrt{0.383b d^2 f_c}} \right)}{f_y} = 0.000
\]

\[
e_u = 0.33 \text{ ft} \quad q_{u,\text{fwd}} = 3.15 \text{ ksf} \quad A_{s,3} = 0.03 \text{ in}^2 / \text{ft}
\]

\[
S = \text{n/a} \quad q_{u,\text{heal}} = 0.86 \text{ ksf} \quad (A_{s,3})_{\text{required}} = 0.13 \text{ in}^2 / \text{ft} < A_{s,3} \quad \text{[Satisfactory]}
\]
Footing Design:
Minimum footing design will be per IRC Table 403.1 – 32”

Gabion Analysis:
Lateral Loads:

**INPUT DATA & DESIGN SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOIL SPECIFIC WEIGHT</th>
<th>$\gamma_b$</th>
<th>110 pcf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOIL INTERNAL FRICTION ANGLE</td>
<td>$\phi$</td>
<td>30 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE OF BACKFILL</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>30 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL FRICTION ANGLE</td>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>20 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACK ANGLE OF WALL FACE</td>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>90 deg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Active Earth Pressure:  
$P_a = 88$ psf / ft  
$P_{a,h} = 83$ pcf (horizontal equivalent fluid pressure)

The At-rest Earth Pressure:  
$P_0 = 55$ psf / ft

The Passive Earth Pressure:  
$P_p = 330$ psf / ft

**SERVICE LOADS**

$H_b = 0.5 P_a (H_T + H_b + h_f)^2 = 0.25$ kips

$H_s = w_s P_a (H_T + H_b + h_f) / \gamma_b = 0.11$ kips
\[ H_p = 0.5 \cdot P_b \left( h_b + h_t + h_k \right)^2 = 1.49 \text{ kips} \]
\[ W_s = W_b \left( L_H + t_b - t_l \right) = 0.13 \text{ kips} \]
\[ W_b = [H_t \left( L_H + t_b - t_l \right)] \gamma_b = 0.14 \text{ kips} \]
\[ W_l = h_l \left( L_H + t_b + L_T \right) \gamma_l = 1.50 \text{ kips} \]
\[ W_k = h_k \gamma_k = 0.00 \text{ kips} \]
\[ W_{w,t} = t_b \gamma_{w,t} = 0.06 \text{ kips} \]
\[ W_{w,b} = t_b \gamma_{w,b} = 0.06 \text{ kips} \]
\[ W_{w,t} \]
\[ W_{w,b} \]
\[ W_{w,t} \]
\[ W_{w,b} \]

FACTORED LOADS

\[ \gamma_{H_b} = 1.6 \cdot H_b = 0.40 \text{ kips} \]
\[ \gamma_{H_s} = 1.6 \cdot H_s = 0.18 \text{ kips} \]
\[ \gamma_{W_s} = 1.6 \cdot W_s = 0.20 \text{ kips} \]
\[ \gamma_{W_b} = 1.2 \cdot W_b = 0.17 \text{ kips} \]
\[ \gamma_{W_l} = 1.2 \cdot W_l = 1.80 \text{ kips} \]
\[ \gamma_{W_k} = 1.2 \cdot W_k = 0.00 \text{ kips} \]
\[ \gamma_{W_{w,t}} = 1.2 \cdot W_{w,t} = 0.08 \text{ kips} \]
\[ \gamma_{W_{w,b}} = 1.2 \cdot W_{w,b} = 0.08 \text{ kips} \]

OVERTURNING MOMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>(\gamma H)</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>H y</th>
<th>(\gamma H y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H_b</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H_s</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Sigma)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESISTING MOMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W</th>
<th>(\gamma W)</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>W x</th>
<th>(\gamma W x)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W_s</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_b</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_l</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_k</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_{w,t}</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_{w,b}</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Sigma)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ M_{sp} = 0.36 \text{ ft-kips/ft} \]

OVERTURNING FACTOR OF SAFETY (1806.1)

\[ SF = \frac{\sum W x + M_{sp}}{\sum H y} = 6.8 > 1.5 \]

[Satisfactory]

No Reinforcement is required.
Appendix 3:

Design Drawings (Scaled to 11x17)
R403.1.5 Slope. The top surface of footings shall be level. The bottom surface of footings shall not have a slope exceeding one unit vertical in 10 units horizontal (10-percent slope). Footings shall be stepped where it is necessary to change the elevation of the top surface of the footings or where the slope of the bottom surface of the footings will exceed one unit vertical in ten units horizontal (10-percent slope).

R403.1.6 Foundation anchorage. Sill plates and walls supported directly on continuous foundations shall be anchored to the foundation in accordance with this section.

Wood sole plates at all exterior walls on monolithic slabs, wood sole plates of braced wall panels at building interiors on monolithic slabs and all wood sill plates shall be anchored to the foundation with anchor bolts spaced a maximum of 6 feet (1829 mm) on center. Bolts shall be at least 1/2 inch (12.7 mm) in diameter and shall extend a minimum of 7 inches (178 mm) into concrete or grouted cells of concrete masonry units. A nut and washer shall be tightened on each anchor bolt. There shall be a minimum of two bolts per plate section with one bolt located not more than 12 inches (305 mm) or less than seven bolt diameters from each end of the plate section. Interior bearing wall sole plates on monolithic slab foundation that are not part of a braced wall panel shall be positively anchored with approved fasteners. Sill plates and sole plates shall be protected against decay and termites where required by Sections R317 and R318. Cold-formed steel framing systems shall be fastened to wood sill plates or anchored directly to the foundation as required in Section R505.3.1 or R603.3.1.

Exceptions:

1. Foundation anchorage, spaced as required to provide equivalent anchorage to 1/2-inch-diameter (12.7 mm) anchor bolts.

2. Walls 24 inches (610 mm) total length or shorter connecting offset braced wall panels shall be anchored to the foundation with a minimum of one anchor bolt located in the center third of the plate section and shall be attached to adjacent braced wall panels at corners as shown in Figure R602.10.4.4(1).

3. Connection of walls 12 inches (305 mm) total length or shorter connecting offset braced wall panels to the foundation without anchor bolts shall be permitted. The wall shall be attached to adjacent braced wall panels at corners as shown in Figure R602.10.4.4(1).

R403.1.7 Footings on or adjacent to slopes. The placement of buildings and structures on or adjacent to slopes steeper than one unit vertical in three units horizontal (33.3-percent slope) shall conform to Sections R403.1.7.1 through R403.1.7.4.

R403.1.7.1 Building clearances from ascending slopes. In general, buildings below slopes shall be set a sufficient distance from the slope to provide protection from slope drainage, erosion and shallow failures. Except as provided in Section R403.1.7.4 and Figure R403.1.7.1, the following criteria will be assumed to provide this protection. Where the existing slope is steeper than one unit vertical in one unit horizontal (100-percent slope), the toe of the slope shall be assumed to be at the intersection of a horizontal plane drawn from the top of the foundation and a plane drawn tangent to the slope at an angle of 45 degrees (0.79 rad) to the horizontal. Where a retaining wall is constructed at the toe of the slope, the height of the slope shall be measured from the top of the wall to the top of the slope.

R403.1.7.2 Footing setback from descending slope surfaces. Footings on or adjacent to slope surfaces shall be founded in material with an embedment and setback required to provide equivalent anchorage to the connections required by Section R404.2 are used, the force transfer shall have a capacity equal to or greater than the connections required by Section R602.11.1 or the braced wall panel shall be connected to the wood foundations in accordance with the braced wall panel-to-floor fastening requirements of Table R602.3(1).

R403.1.6.1 Foundation anchorage in Seismic Design Categories C, D, and D. In addition to the requirements of Section R403.1.6, the following requirements shall apply to wood light-frame structures in Seismic Design Categories D, D, and D and wood light-frame townhouses in Seismic Design Category C.

1. Plate washers conforming to Section R602.11.1 shall be provided for all anchor bolts over the full length of required braced wall lines except where approved anchor straps are used. Properly sized cut washers shall be permitted for anchor bolts in wall lines not containing braced wall panels.

2. Interior braced wall plates shall have anchor bolts spaced at not more than 6 feet (1829 mm) on center and located within 12 inches (305 mm) of the ends of each plate section when supported on a continuous foundation.

3. Interior bearing wall sole plates shall have anchor bolts spaced at not more than 6 feet (1829 mm) on center and located within 12 inches (305 mm) of the ends of each plate section when supported on a continuous foundation.

4. The maximum anchor bolt spacing shall be 4 feet (1219 mm) for buildings over two stories in height.

5. Stepped cripple walls shall conform to Section R602.11.2.

6. Where continuous wood foundations in accordance with Section R404.2 are used, the force transfer shall have a capacity equal to or greater than the connections required by Section R602.11.1 or the braced wall panel shall be connected to the wood foundations in accordance with the braced wall panel-to-floor fastening requirements of Table R602.3(1).
R403.1.7.3 Foundation elevation. On graded sites, the top of any exterior foundation shall extend above the elevation of the street gutter at point of discharge or the inlet of an approved drainage device a minimum of 12 inches (305 mm) plus 2 percent. Alternate elevations are permitted subject to the approval of the building official, provided it can be demonstrated that required drainage to the point of discharge and away from the structure is provided at all locations on the site.

R403.1.7.4 Alternate setback and clearances. Alternate setbacks and clearances are permitted, subject to the approval of the building official. The building official is permitted to require an investigation and recommendation of a qualified engineer to demonstrate that the intent of this section has been satisfied. Such an investigation shall include consideration of material, height of slope, slope gradient, load intensity and erosion characteristics of slope material.

R403.1.8 Foundations on expansive soils. Foundation and floor slabs for buildings located on expansive soils shall be designed in accordance with Section 1805.8 of the International Building Code. Exception: Slab-on-ground and other foundation systems which have performed adequately in soil conditions similar to those encountered at the building site are permitted subject to the approval of the building official.

R403.1.8.1 Expansive soils classifications. Soils meeting all four of the following provisions shall be considered expansive, except that tests to show compliance with Items 1, 2 and 3 shall not be required if the test prescribed in Item 4 is conducted:

1. Plasticity Index (PI) of 15 or greater, determined in accordance with ASTM D 4318.
2. More than 10 percent of the soil particles pass a No. 200 sieve (75 µm), determined in accordance with ASTM D 422.
3. More than 10 percent of the soil particles are less than 5 micrometers in size, determined in accordance with ASTM D 422.
4. Expansion Index greater than 20, determined in accordance with ASTM D 4829.

R403.2 Footings for wood foundations. Footings for wood foundations shall be in accordance with Figures R403.1(2) and R403.1(3). Gravel shall be washed and well graded. The maximum size stone shall not exceed 3/4 inch (19.1 mm). Gravel shall be free from organic, clayey or silty soils. Sand shall be coarse, not smaller than 1/16-inch (1.6 mm) grains and shall be free from organic, clayey or silty soils. Crushed stone shall have a maximum size of 1/2 inch (12.7 mm).

R403.3 Frost protected shallow foundations. For buildings where the monthly mean temperature of the building is maintained at a minimum of 64°F (18°C), footings are not required to extend below the frost line when protected from frost by insulation in accordance with Figure R403.3(1) and Table R403.3(1). Foundations protected from frost in accordance with Figure R403.3(1) and Table R403.3(1) shall not be used for unheated spaces such as porches, utility rooms, garages and carports, and shall not be attached to basements or crawl spaces that are not maintained at a minimum monthly mean temperature of 64°F (18°C).

Materials used below grade for the purpose of insulating footings against frost shall be labeled as complying with ASTM C 578.

R403.3.1 Foundations adjoining frost protected shallow foundations. Foundations that adjoin frost protected shallow foundations shall be protected from frost in accordance with Section R403.1.4.

R403.3.1.1 Attachment to unheated slab-on-ground structure. Vertical wall insulation and horizontal insulation of frost protected shallow foundations that adjoin a slab-on-ground foundation that does not have a monthly mean temperature maintained at a minimum of 64°F (18°C) shall be in accordance with Figure R403.3(3) and Table R403.3(1). Vertical wall insulation shall extend between the frost protected shallow foundation and the adjoining slab foundation. Required horizontal insulation shall be continuous under the adjoining slab foundation and through any foundation walls adjoining the frost protected shallow foundation. Where insulation passes through a foundation wall, it shall either be of a type complying with this section and having bearing capacity equal to or greater than the structural loads imposed by the building, or the building shall be designed and constructed using beams, lintels, cantilevers or other means of transferring building loads such that the structural loads of the building do not bear on the insulation.
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Staff
Date: 9/6/2012
Re: Variance Request by Trident Seafoods Corporation

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Actions: A Variance request for a ten (10) front foot setback from the required front setback of 20 feet in the Waterfront Industrial Zone

Applicant: Kurt Esveldt
Owners Name: Trident Seafoods Corporation
Address: 211 Jim Poor Avenue
Parcel Number: 02-060-213 & 215
Zoning: Waterfront Industrial District
Lot Area: 36,000 Square Feet combined total of both lots

PART II. BACKGROUND

The property owner has requested a variance from the 20 feet front yard setback requirements to a 10 foot setback in the Waterfront Industrial zone. The variance will provide for the construction of a 133 foot by 53 foot, 3 story main bunkhouse adjacent to Jim Poor Avenue and a smaller 68 foot by 48 foot bunkhouse behind the main structure on Lots 7 & 8, Block 1, Cordova Industrial Park.
The applicable regulations for this variance request are the following sections:

Chapter 18.33 Waterfront Industrial District

**18.33.060 - Setbacks.**

A. Minimum Setbacks.
   1. Front yard-Twenty feet.

Condition 18.33.060 A(1) is what the variance request is based upon.

Chapter 18.64 Exceptions, Variances and Appeals

**18.64.020 Variances**

An application has been filed pursuant to this section of code. Below is the review of the variance criteria.

**PART III. REVIEW OF APPLICABLE CRITERIA**

A Variance may be granted only if all four of the following conditions exist:

**PART IV. SUGGESTED FINDINGS**

1. That there are exceptional physical circumstances or conditions applicable to the property or to its intended use or development which do not apply to the other properties in the same land use district.

   This condition has been met. The majority of lots in the Waterfront industrial zone are not fronted by water or tidelands. The lots that are boarded by tidelands or water are developable to the property lines. The remaining small numbers of lots have development limited by the geography of the tidelands.

2. That the strict application of the provisions of this title would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship.

   This condition has been met. The strict application of this front setback would limit the development of this lot due to the requirements of access and other building requirements.

3. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

   The condition of material damage or prejudice has been met at the time of this writing the planning department has received no input from
neighbors. If there is additional information received by planning department it will be included in the packet. There will also be the opportunity for public comment at the hearing.

The condition of public health, safety or welfare has been met. The departments of public works, fire, and police department have been consulted and have provided their input, please see attached write ups.

4. That the granting of the variance will not be contrary to the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

This condition had been met. The Cordova Comprehensive plan addresses Fish and Fish Processing Development Strategies in chapter 1 Economic Development and encourages incentives for fish processors by working to provide for best and most efficient use of remaining waterfront land.

**PART V. SPECIAL CONDITIONS**

In the event that the commissions grants the variance staff recommends that the following special conditions apply.

1. The Planning Department must be in receipt of a Site Plan approval from The Division of Fire and Life Safety prior to issuance of a Building Permit

2. A Building Permit must be obtained from the Planning Department prior to the construction of the bunkhouses.

**PART VI. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff recommends *approval* of the request for a ten (10) foot front setback variance, from the required front setback of 20 feet in the Waterfront Industrial Zone.

**PART VII. SUGGESTED MOTION**

“I move that the Variance request by Trident Seafoods from the 20’ front yard setback in the Waterfront Industrial District (WID) to a 10’ front setback be *approved* and special conditions and findings 1-4 be adopted as contained in the staff report.”
Sam Greenwood.

After looking over the documents provided by your office and visiting that location, I have determined that under Condition 3, Part 2, I see no detrimental impact to the public health, safety or welfare in the request Trident Seafood’s is asking in their variance.

Paul Trumblee

From: Sam Greenwood
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2012 12:22 PM
To: Public Works; Oscar Delpino (fire@cityofcordova.net); Bob Griffiths
Subject: variance request --Trident

On August 28, 2012 we met to discuss and review a variance request made by Trident Seafood. Trident is requesting a variance of 10 feet from the front setback requirement of 20 feet in the waterfront industrial zone. At our meeting we reviewed the application and drawings that were received from Trident.

In order for a variance request to be granted 4 conditions must be met. I am asking for your input on the second part of condition 3 below:

Condition 3. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

Your comments/input will be included in the packet that is provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission to aide in the decision-making process. Please reply to this email with your input concerning Trident’s variance request.
After looking over the documents provided by your office and visiting that location, I have determined that under Condition 3, Part 2, I see no detrimental impact to the public health, safety or welfare in the request Trident Seafood’s is asking in their variance.

Chief Bob Griffiths  
Cordova Police Department  
(907)424-6100  
(907)424-6120  
policechief@cityofcordova.net

On August 28, 2012 we met to discuss and review a variance request made by Trident Seafood. Trident is requesting a variance of 10 feet from the front setback requirement of 20 feet in the waterfront industrial zone. At our meeting we reviewed the application and drawings that were received from Trident.

In order for a variance request to be granted 4 conditions must be met. I am asking for your input on the second part of condition 3 below:

Condition 3. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

Your comments/input will be included in the packet that is provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission to aide in the decision-making process. Please reply to this email with your input concerning Trident’s variance request.

Samantha Greenwood  
City Planner  
City of Cordova  
PO Box 1210  
Fax 907-424-6000  
Phone 907-424-6233
From a Public Works’ standpoint, granting this variance should have no effect on the ability to maintain public services in this area.

Thank you,
Moe Zamarron

Moe Zamarron  
Director of Public Works  
City of Cordova  
PO Box 1210  
Cordova, AK 99574  
Ph 907-424-6231  
publicworks@cityofcordova.net

On August 28, 2012 we met to discuss and review a variance request made by Trident Seafood. Trident is requesting a variance of 10 feet from the front setback requirement of 20 feet in the waterfront industrial zone. At our meeting we reviewed the application and drawings that were received from Trident.

In order for a variance request to be granted 4 conditions must be met. I am asking for your input on the second part of condition 3 below:

Condition 3. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.

Your comments/input will be included in the packet that is provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission to aide in the decision-making process. Please reply to this email with your input concerning Trident’s variance request.

Samantha Greenwood  
City Planner
VARIANCE APPLICATION
CITY OF CORDOVA

INSTRUCTIONS
Print or type requested information. Incomplete applications will be returned to the applicant and will delay the processing of your request. All applications must be filed with the Planning Department 21 days prior to the next Planning Commission meeting date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone [home]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone [business]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business FAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project architect/engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of architect/engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone of architect/engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY/PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address of subject property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel identification number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owner [name/address]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction start date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ZONING APPLICATION**

| Owner of property (if different than applicant). | TRIDENT SEAFOODS |
| If multiple owners, list names and addresses of each and indicate ownership interest. | |
| Attach additional sheet if necessary. | |

| Real Estate Firm/Broker handling sale of property. Provide name and address. **Note:** If you do not own the property, you must provide a copy of a Purchase Agreement or instrument acceptable to the City indicating the owner is fully aware of, and in agreement with, the requested action. | NA |

| City Business License Permit Number (if applicable) | EXIST, PLAN 5000 FILE |

---

**APPLICANT CERTIFICATION**

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I (we) certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my (our) knowledge, true and accurate. Furthermore, I (we) hereby authorize the City and its representatives to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting necessary site inspections.

By: ___________________________ By: ___________________________
(Signature) (Signature)

| Name: KURT ENDICOTT | Name: |
| (Type/Print) | (Type/Print) |

| Date: 08/17/12 | Date: 08/13/12 |

**Appeal Procedures:** A decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment. An appeal must be filed in writing with the City Clerk within ten (10) days of the decision. In accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 18.64.030 of the City of Cordova Zoning Code.

---

**CITY USE ONLY - PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date application received:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee paid:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does application require a public hearing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff review date/reviewer name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission final action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council final action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project/Request Description Page:

1. Please describe your request in complete detail. Feel free to add additional pages and/or drawings, maps, photographs of the site, and other documentation that might be helpful to the Planning Commission as they make a decision on your request.

2. If you are requesting a dimensional variance, you must include a basic site plan drawing showing the location of your property lines, existing and proposed buildings, existing and proposed easements, building setbacks, and other items necessary to adequately and accurately show the nature of your request.

3. In order to receive a zoning compliance permit, you must meet the standards of the relevant zoning code. PLEASE REFER TO THE FOLLOWING PAGES OF THIS APPLICATION FOR A COPY OF THE RELEVANT SECTION STANDARDS.

Please describe your request. Add additional pages, drawings and required information.

REQUEST TO PROVIDE 10' FRONT SETBACK WITH EXISTING ZONING REQUIRING 20'. SEE ATTACHED EXISTING SITE PLAN FOR EXISTING/PROPOSED BUILDING LOCATIONS.
VARIANCE STANDARDS 18.64.020

The Planning and Zoning Commission may only approve the variance if the Commission finds that ALL of the following 4 standards are satisfied. Each standard must have a response in as much detail as it takes to explain how your project satisfies the standard. Use additional paper if needed.

1. Exceptional physical circumstances or conditions that apply to the property or to its intended use or development which do not apply generally to the other properties in the same land use district.
   EXPLAIN: PROPERTY IS RESTRICTED IN UPLAND DEPTH FROM THE ROW TO TIDELANDS LIMITING NORMAL SITE DEVELOPMENT. SIMILAR CONDITIONS OCCUR ALONG THE WATERFRONT IN THE ZONE.

2. That the strict application of the provisions of this title would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship.
   EXPLAIN: STRICT APPLICATION OF THE 100' FRONT SETBACK CREATES UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP IN REASONABLE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LOT BECAUSE OF LIMITED DEPTH AND PRACTICAL DISTANCES BETWEEN STRUCTURES FOR LIGHT AND ACCESS.

3. That the granting of the variance will not result in material damage or prejudice to other properties in the vicinity nor be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.
   EXPLAIN: NO DAMAGE OR PREJUDICE WILL OCCUR TO OTHER PROPERTIES IN THE VICINITY ENHANCES PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE AND IS SIMILAR TO NEARBY DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA.

4. That the granting of the variance will not be contrary to the objectives of the comprehensive plan.
   EXPLAIN: THE SIZE AND PROPOSED BULK, HEIGHT, AND CHARACTER OF THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

OTHER REQUIREMENTS

1. A legal description of the property involved.
2. Site and Building Plan: Plot plan showing the location of all existing and proposed buildings or improvements, elevations of such buildings or alterations, and such other data as may be required.
3. Evidence of the ability and intention of the applicant to proceed in accordance with the plans within six months after the effective date of the variance.
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Staff
Date: 9/6/2012
Re: Site Plan Review ~ Trident Seafoods Corporation 2 bunkhouses

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Actions: Site Plan Review
Applicant: Kurt Esveldt
Owners Name: Trident Seafoods Corporation
Address: 211 Jim Poor Avenue
Parcel Number: 02-060-213 & 215
Zoning: Waterfront Industrial District
Lot Area: 36,000 Square Feet combined total of both lots

PART II. BACKGROUND

Trident Seafoods is proposing to construct 2 separate three story bunkhouses to ensure the ability to provide on-site housing for their seasonal employees. Trident currently has 20 units and they house 160 employees, the new housing will alleviate the load in the other bunkhouses they have, providing better accommodations and increase the number of employees that they can house. The main bunkhouse adjacent to Jim Poor Avenue will be 133’ by 53’ three stories tall and the smaller 68’ by 48’ bunkhouse will house additional employees behind the main bunkhouse on Lots 7 & 8, Block 1, Cordova Industrial Park.
The applicable regulations for this variance request are the following sections:

Chapter 18.33 Waterfront Industrial District
Chapter 18.42 Site Plan Review
Chapter 18.44 Signs
Chapter 18.48 Off Street Parking, Loading and Unloading

PART III. REVIEW OF APPLICABLE CRITERIA & SUGGESTED FINDINGS

1. Uses within the Waterfront Industrial District are intended to be marine-dependent or marine-oriented, and primarily those uses which are particularly related to location or commercial enterprises that derive an economic benefit from a waterfront location.

   Trident Seafoods Corporation business is dependent on waterfront access.

2. A Site Plan Review is required in the Waterfront Industrial District prior to a building permit being issued.

   Trident Seafoods Corporation submitted a Site Plan application on August 20, 2012 which satisfies the requirements for CMC Chapter 18.42.

3. Signs are allowed in the Waterfront Industrial Park District, subject to type, size and location.

   Trident’s proposed construction will not require signage.

4. Off street parking requirements for the Waterfront Industrial Zone and for manufacture uses is one space for every two employees, plus as required if retail or warehouse uses on premises.

   The proposed construction is for seasonal employees the majority of which do not have transportation locally. Needed parking for employees can be provided by Trident Seafoods between the
bunkhouses and the existing screen house and other Trident Seafoods lots in the immediate area.

PART IV. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. The Planning Department must be in receipt of a Site Plan approval from The Division of Fire and Life Safety prior to issuance of a Building Permit

2. Trident will consult with Public Works about the water and sewer services and provide a water sewer connection permit to planning prior to a building permit being issued.

PART V. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council to approve the Site Plan Review requested by Trident Seafood Corporation for the construction of two bunkhouses on Lots 7 & 8, Block 1 in the Cordova Industrial Park.

PART VI. SUGGESTED MOTION

“I move that Planning Commission recommend to City Council to approve the Site Plan by Trident Seafoods Corporation to construct one 21,150 sq. ft. bunkhouse and one 9,792 sq. ft. bunkhouse on Lots 7 & 8, Block 1, Cordova Industrial Park based upon the findings as contained in the staff report.”
# SITE PLAN REVIEW - ZONING APPLICATION
CITY OF CORDOVA

## INSTRUCTIONS
Print or type requested information. Incomplete applications will be returned to the applicant and will delay the processing of your request. All applications must be filed with the Planning Department **31 days prior to** the next Planning Commission meeting date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF REQUEST</th>
<th>FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Review</td>
<td>varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## APPLICANT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>TRIDENT SEAFOODS, KURT BENTZEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>EAGLE SHIELD HOUSE ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone [home]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone [business]</td>
<td>907-747-3818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business FAX</td>
<td>907-747-1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project architect/engineer</td>
<td>STEPHEN PETERS ARCHITECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of architect/engineer</td>
<td>501 WATER ST, KODIAK, AK 99704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone of architect/engineer</td>
<td>907-747-7077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROPERTY/PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address of subject property</th>
<th>501 SEAFOOD LANE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel identification number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owner [name/address]</td>
<td>TRIDENT SEAFOODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current zoning</td>
<td>WATERFRONT INDUSTRIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed use</td>
<td>FRONT HOUSES TO SEAFOOD PROCESSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction start date</td>
<td>1/1/1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Zoning Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner of property (if different than applicant). If multiple owners, list names and addresses of each and indicate ownership interest. Attach additional sheet if necessary.</th>
<th>Trident Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Firm/Broker handling sale of property. Provide name and address. Note: If you do not own the property, you must provide a copy of a Purchase Agreement or instrument acceptable to the city indicating the owner is fully aware of, and in agreement with, the requested action.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Business License Permit Number (if applicable)</td>
<td>Existing Plant 3L643028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applicant Certification

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I (we) certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my (our) knowledge, true and accurate. Furthermore, I (we) hereby authorize the City and its representatives to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting necessary site inspections.

By: [Signature] By: [Signature]

Name: Kurt Ebywat | Name: |

(Type/Print) (Type/Print)

Date: 06/17/19 Date: 06/17/19

**Appeal Procedures:** A decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment. An appeal must be filed in writing with the City Clerk within ten (10) days of the decision. In accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 18.64.030 of the City of Cordova Zoning Code.

### City Use Only - Please Do Not Write in This Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date application received:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee paid:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does application require a public hearing? Planning Commission: City Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff review date/reviewer name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission final action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council final action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SITE PLAN REVIEW 18.42**

A zoning compliance permit for property within the City of Corvallis expires eighteen (18) months after the date it is issued. Excavation is not considered construction.

1. Please describe the proposed construction/alteration and intended use: **Mixed Use - Single Family / Commercial/Industrial Development.**

2. Please give dimensions and square footage of construction: **1,500 - 2,000 sq ft.**

3. Intended use: { } Single Family { } Duplex { } Multifamily { } Commercial/Industrial Development { } Mobile Building { } Change of use

4. No. of Living Units: **2**

5. No. of Bedrooms: **1**

6. Has a variance been granted? { } Yes { } No


8. Is there an apartment above the garage? **NA**

9. Off-street parking: Existing: **NO CHANGE** Proposed: **NO CHANGE**

10. Required setbacks: Front: **20'** Right side: **10'** Rear: **20'** Height: **20'**

11. Proposed setbacks: Front: **20'** Right side: **10'** Rear: **20'** Height: **20'**

12. Sewage disposal: { } Private marine outfall: **X** Existing: { } New Specify owner/rental:

   { } Private on-site sewer: { } ADEC Certification Attached

   **NOTE:** Property owners with a private system need an ADEC permit showing sewer system is operational before Permit can be issued. Please contact ADEC at (907) 226-6260.

13. Water supply: { } Cistern (show on site plan) **X** City

14. Is the construction occurring on a grandfathered structure (build prior to August 7, 1967)? **NO**

15. Is there a building currently on the property? **X** Yes { } No

   If YES, an As-built survey must be attached.

16. Which licensed surveyor will be doing your foundation/as-built survey? **ROBERT KENYON**

17. Is your driveway exit and adjoining roads shown on the site plan? **NA**

   Are you building a new driveway that exits onto a State road or highway? **NA**

   If YES, an ADOT Driveway Permit is required. (See bottom page 4)

18. Does this property contain drainage, creeks, wetlands, or other water features? { } Yes **X** No

   Does your lot have salt water? { } Yes { } No

   Have you or will you be using fill to develop your lot? { } Yes { } No

   (If you answered YES to any of the above three questions, you may need to contact the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or other State agencies about additional permitting requirements. Please see Planning staff for information.)

19. Is this permit for a tax-exempt use? { } Yes { } No

20. Has a Conditional Use Permit been issued? { } Yes { } No

21. Is this permit for a mobile building? { } Yes { } No

   Year ________ Model ________ Serial No. ________

22. Is your property within a Flood Plain or Coastal Zone? (see staff for interpretation)

   Elevation Certificate/Flood Hazard form attached

<sup>*</sup> **AREA:** (1) **TOOXY: B1 150 SF**

   **AREA:** (2) **MILL: B1 9742 SF**

   **TOTAL BUILDING:** 20,942 SF
Memorandum

To: Planning and Zoning
From: Planning Department Staff
Date: 9/6/2012
Re: Utility Vacation

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION:
Requested Action: approval of Resolution to Vacate Utility Easement
Address & Survey: Lot 7, Knute Johnson Subdivision

PART II BACKGROUND:
At the August 14th meeting the commission approved the vacation of the utility easement at Lot 7, Knute Johnson Subdivision. At this meeting I am asking that the resolution provided be approved so that it can be record at the Cordova Recorders Office along with the plat that was approved on August 14, 2012.

PART III. REVIEW OF APPLICABLE CRITERIA:
In order for a utility easement to be vacated all utilities private and public must be review and agree to the vacation. This has done and there has been an alternate utility easement created to incorporate the utilities at the North end of the lot.

Also all neighbors within a 300 foot radius have been notified of the proposed vacation. No comments were received by the City.

The final step is for Planning and Zoning to pass a resolution which will be recorded at the Cordova Recorders Office. Along with the resolution a re-plat will be done and recorded showing the vacated utility easement and in this case showing the newly created utility easement.

PART IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
The staff, land owner and utility companies have worked together and come to agreement on the vacation of this utility easement and creation of new utility easement. Staff suggests that the request for the utility easement vacation on Lot 7 of Knute Subdivision be granted.

PART V. SUGGESTED MOTION:
“I move to approve resolution 12-06 a resolution of the planning and zoning commission of the city of Cordova, Alaska, vacating the 10-foot utility easement along the west boundary Lot 7, Knute Johnson subdivision, plat no. 79-1, Cordova Recording District.”
CITY OF CORDOVA, ALASKA
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION 12-06

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CORDOVA, ALASKA, VACATING THE 10-FOOT UTILITY EASEMENT ALONG WEST BOUNDARY LOT 7, KNUTE JOHNSON SUBDIVISION, PLAT NO. 79-1, CORDOVA RECORDING DISTRICT

WHEREAS, a request has been received from Tom and Barbara Bailer of Cordova, Alaska to vacate a utility easement granted by Knute Johnson Subdivision (Plat No. 79--1); and

WHEREAS, affected utility companies have provided written non-objections to the vacation; and

WHEREAS, the easement is not in use by the utility companies; and

WHEREAS, no surrounding properties will be denied utilities; and

WHEREAS, a proposed replat, which will grant alternate utility easement on the same lot, has been granted approval; and

WHEREAS, on August 14, 2012, the Cordova Planning Commission addressed all concerns about the proposed vacation; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has found that vacating the utility easement will not be detrimental to the public interest; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CORDOVA

Section 1. That the above described utility easement is hereby vacated.

Section 2. That this resolution is eligible for recording upon and will be deemed void if not recorded within 90 days of adoption.

Section 3. That this Resolution becomes effective upon being properly recorded with petitioner being responsible for payment of recording fee.

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS 13TH DAY OF JULY, 2012

Dave Reggiani, Vice Chairman

ATTEST:

Samantha Greenwood, City Planner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CITY HALL CLOSED</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL MEETING</td>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION 6:30PM CITY HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosh Hashanah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL MEETING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autumn begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:30PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITY HALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL</td>
<td></td>
<td>CITY HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CITY MEETING</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLOSED</td>
<td>CLOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alaska Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Halloween</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>