

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

**Minutes of the Worksession
Denali Borough Planning Commission
Tri-Valley Community Center
July 16, 2013**

Call to Order: Presiding Officer, Sid MICHAELS, called the Planning Commission Worksession to order at 6:22 PM.

Roll Call: Planning Commissioners present were Patricia GRIGGS, Steve JONES, Molly MCKINLEY, Baxter MERCER, and Sid MICHAELS. Ryan JUSZAK and Mark MENKE were absent.

1. Draft 14 Chapter 4.25 Classification of Borough-owned Land

The original intent of modifying Chapter 4.25 focused on addressing land classification issues that arose, which were not adequately covered in code. The commission began the process by editing the chapter, but then opted to replace Chapter 4.25 in its entirety. The format and language of the rewrite was adjusted to reflect the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Area Plans' method of classifying land in order to delineate a distinction between classifying land vs. zoning land. Some on the commission felt the language used in Chapter 4.25 was too similar to zoning terminology and deemed this to be confusing to the public. Others did not agree with this assessment, but allowed the process of editing to continue. At the June meeting, the commission determined that a side-by-side comparison of an earlier editing effort, one more akin to what is in code, and the DNR's model was in order.

The following discussion points were deliberated during the July worksession:

- a. The state's area plan model was selected for the rewrite because the language was perceived to be more focused on planning rather than zoning.
- b. The commission, in trying to plan for the future, is avoiding the term zoning and has chosen to use a term that is more grey, classification. Zoning is enforceable; classifying is not. The Yukon-Tanana Area Plan states classification is, "management guidance without designation."
- c. The state's area plans are designed to classify large tracts of land (square miles) vs. the borough, which will be classifying acres of land.
- d. There are too few classifications with too broad a range in Draft 14; there are too many classifications in the version based on code.
- e. Draft 14 of 4.25 designates three broad classification categories with multiple uses listed under each category. The list, of uses, reflects what is presently listed in code as classifications. Under Draft 14, a land area could be classified under one of the three broad categories, but allow uses from all three categories to occur. This process does not succeed in creating a clear classification for the land, is complicated, and less understandable than what is presently in code. The commission should revert back to using classification terms and steer clear of referring to them as uses.
- f. Draft 14 includes a form for listing recommended and non-recommended uses for land. The planning commission can recommend uses that might or might not occur on a given piece of land via the resolution it submits to the assembly outlining its recommendations. Other means of addressing specifics for land use can be included in lease documents and deed restrictions.
- g. Procedural Requirements 4.25.030 as written in Draft 14 and the version based on code are the same except the latter deletes E, which defines the form identifying primary, secondary and non-recommended uses.
- h. Land classifications need to be broadly defined within Chapter 4.25 (vs. in a separate chapter, i.e. Proposed Chapter 4.01 Definitions).

- 1 i. Should the borough be proactive in classifying all its municipal entitlement lands or should it address land
2 classification as the need arises?
3 a. In being proactive on this issue, the borough would have greater influence in steering and
4 influencing development on borough lands. Classifying all the land would essentially create a Land
5 Use Plan, which under the Comprehensive Plan falls under the purview of the commission. It is
6 prudent to classify all the lands now and then react to changes in vision down the road. The
7 process to change a land classification is relatively simple to accomplish.
8 b. Classifying all the land now would be difficult and lengthy as the process involves nominating land,
9 hosting of public hearings by the administrator and the planning commission, making
10 recommendations to the assembly, which would hold public hearings and grant or deny final
11 approval. In order to classify all the lands, a vision extending 20-30-50 years out is required.
12

13 There was general agreement that the commission will revisit the entirety of their approach to Chapter 4.25. Both
14 versions of Chapter 4.25, the state's area plan model and the one based on code, will be in the August meeting
15 packet. The code based version will be referred to as a proposed amendment to Draft 14 4.25.
16

17 **2. Draft 9 Chapter 4.10 Management of Borough Real Property**

18 Two versions of a proposed amendment to 4.10.050 Leasing borough real property were before the commission.
19 Largely, the intent of modifying the language is to provide the borough with more than one option for leasing land.
20
21
22

23 The worksession concluded prior to the commission being able to address the last two items on the worksession agenda.
24

25 **3. Draft 1 Chapter 9.21 Zoning Nenana Scenic Corridor (Proposed)**

26
27 **4. Draft 1 Chapter 9.22 Zoning Airport Reserve (Proposed)**
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Adjournment:** The Presiding Officer closed the Planning Commission Worksession @ 7:15 PM.
39
40
41

42 APPROVED: Sidney W. Michaels

43 Sid MICHAELS, Presiding Officer
44
45

46 ATTEST: Linda P. Paganelli

47 Linda PAGANELLI, Deputy Clerk
48

Date Approved: August 20 2013