

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
November 12, 2013**

Call to Order: Presiding Officer, Sid MICHAELS, called the Planning Commission Worksession to order at 6:17 PM.

Roll Call: Planning Commissioners present were Patricia GRIGGS, Steve JONES, Molly MCKINLEY, Baxter MERCER, and Sid MICHAELS; Ryan JUSZAK arrived at the Worksession @ 6:22 PM. Mark MENKE was absent.

1. Draft 15 Chapter 4.25 Classification of Borough-owned Land

The 4.25 Committee reported on two issues it was tasked to address and made the following recommendations to the Planning Commission:

- 4.25.030 A – Delete “or reclassified” from the third sentence and add a fourth sentence to read as follows: “Any changes to existing classifications or current stated uses will require that the classification process be conducted in its entirety.”
- Retain the term “recommended” in the chart on page 3 Section E used to describe primary, secondary, and non-recommended uses. No change is proposed to the chart.

It was determined, via correspondence between the mayor, the attorney, and the Department of Natural Resources the borough can classify lands over which it has management authority.

The commission continued to debate the merits and shortcomings of the two proposed models for classifying borough-owned land: State Area Plan vs. conventional model, which is presently in code. The former emphasizes uses, with more than one classification category and up to many uses recommended and/or not recommended on a piece of land, and the latter, which classifies land definitively. The list of uses utilized by the area plan model is near on identical to the list of classifications used in the conventional model.

A recommendation to reconcile the two models was made, which would allow for more than one classification to be assigned to one piece of land and to eliminate employing uses. One or two classifications may be reasonable, but more than that creates confusion. Draft 15 is viewed by one side of the debate as cumbersome and non-workable vs. the other side which views it as flexible. If a parcel is classified under multiple categories with multiple recommended uses, how does one determine which area within the parcel is subject to which categories and which uses?

It was proposed that incorporating a multiple-use classification modeled after the Kenai Peninsula’s zoning ordinance may assist in resolving the commission’s impasse on this issue. A multiple-use classification as used in Kenai allows for a broad range of uses on a parcel of land for a temporary period of time until more information is gathered, via public hearings, to determine the best use of the property. Using multiple-use as an automatic classification for all borough properties would allow for temporary use of the land without the need to determine the long-term best use of the property and could be helpful to the administration in addressing requests for temporary use of land.

The process of classifying land will most likely be an ongoing process that will require continual reassessment.

1 **2. Draft 12 Chapter 4.10 Management of Borough Real Property**

2 It was noted that at the last meeting the commission voted to change J. (2.) from 'After Sales Gross' to 'Percentage
3 Lease.' There was no further discussion on this issue.
4

5 **3. Draft 2 Chapter 9.21 Zoning Nenana Scenic Corridor (Proposed)**

6 It was proposed that the name of the ordinance be changed to Zoning Nenana River Scenic Corridor. At present,
7 there is a lack of consistency in commission documents as to how this area is being labeled.
8

9 There are two proposals before the commission to amend the purpose statement. Proposed Amendment 2 was
10 discussed. The commissioners determined that the term 'residents' was preferable to the term citizens.
11

12 Section 9.21.030 Geographic Location requires modification. Discomfort was expressed with the term meander as a
13 location reference. Sid MICHAELS developed language options for the description, which was distributed at the
14 meeting and will be included in the next meeting packet. It was recommended that minimally the commission
15 adjust the southern boundary to avoid Junco Creek.
16

17 **4. Draft 1 Chapter 9.22 Zoning Airport Reserve (Proposed)**

18 There are three geographic location versions before the commission. Versions 1 and 2 will be further deliberated;
19 version 3 was deemed to be too terse.
20

21 Steve JONES provided the commission with a draft sunset clause for inclusion in the ordinance. The commission will
22 discuss the period of time to designate for the sunset date during the regular meeting. It was emphasized that this
23 ordinance should move forward sooner rather than later lest the window of opportunity for an airport closes due to
24 incompatible development, including a predicted intertie upgrade with taller towers, in or around the area.
25

26 It is possible that this ordinance can be moved to the assembly early in 2014.
27

28 **Adjournment:** The Presiding Officer closed the Planning Commission Worksession @ 7:15 PM.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39
40 APPROVED:

Sidney W. Michaels

 Sid MICHAELS, Presiding Officer

41
42
43
44 ATTEST:

Linda L. Paganelli

 Linda PAGANELLI, Deputy Clerk

45
46
47
48 Date Approved: *Jan 21, 2014*