



Planning@ci.homer.ak.us (p) 907-235-3106 (f) 907-235-3118

Memorandum 22-165

TO: MAYOR CASTNER AND HOMER CITY COUNCIL

FROM: HOMER PLANNING COMMISSION

THRU: ROB DUMOUCHEL, CITY MANAGER

DATE: SEPTEMBER 26, 2022

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATIONS ON ORDINANCE 22-42

Background:

City Council referred Ordinance 22-42 to the Planning Commission for input at their regular meeting of July 25, 2022.

Ordinance 22-42 came before the Commission at the regular meeting on August 17, 2022. Councilmembers Erickson and Davis attended the worksession and provided comment on the Ordinance prior to the regular meeting.

At the September 7, 2022 meeting date the Commission devoted an entire worksession to discuss the ordinance and the intent of Council and addressed the item at their regular meeting under Pending Business.

Recommendations:

- 1. Vote Ordinance 22-42 down as written to allow:
 - The Planning Commission to expend the proper time to develop responsible and reasonable development standards to avoid possible future litigation and not dissuade desirable development; and
 - b. Update and refine the definitions regarding road descriptors; and
 - c. Provide the Commission further direction on the deliverables that City Council expects.
- 2. Currently the Master Transportation Plan is in development which will include updates to all adopted transportation related plans.
- 3. The Planning Department requires resources with expertise in Transportation Planning.
- 4. The Planning Commission is very supportive of implementing Non-Motorized Transportation.

Attachment:

Excerpt of the September 7, 2022 Approved Meeting Minutes

PENDING BUSINESS

B. Staff Report 22-57, Review of Ordinance 22-42, Sidewalks

Chair Smith introduced the topic and deferred to City Planner Abboud.

City Planner Abboud provided a summary of Staff Report 22-57 for the Commission. He noted the points from the worksession; reviewed the discussion and recommendation from the Parks, Art, Recreation & Culture Advisory Commission; and that a future worksession will be had with Julie Engebretsen and Brad Parsons who will be making a presentation to the Commission in relationship with the current transportation planning when fully developed.

Chair Smith reiterated the recommendations of the City Planner and then noted the ordinance in the packet with proposed amendments.

City Planner Abboud facilitated discussion and responded to questions and comments on the following:

- Commission putting forth an ordinance that applies to the general requirements that developers must construct sidewalks/non-motorized transportation when proposing a development.
 - Using generic terms within the ordinance since there is an unknown on where the development will be constructed, how large it will be, etc. This action may appease the citizenry that Council has taken steps to address their concerns.
 - City Attorney input would be required
- The City has or maintains the road once they are constructed to the required standards. If a road exists does the City has the authority to require pedestrian amenities in current developments such as Quiet Creek or Lillian Walli.
 - o If it is platted with the dedication it does come under the authority of the City
- Commission express that their concerns are shared and would like to receive more direction or setting the stage to move forward.
- Concern expressed if the Commission issued some vague regulations or requirements that may lead to litigation. It would not be difficult to bring in experts to provide minimum standards required to develop those criteria for roads and developments to have pedestrian friendly travel options.
- The Commission will gain more information when they hear the presentation from Mr. Parsons.
- Commission should submit a memo to Council requesting an additional six weeks to submit their recommendations, stating the Commission is working on this.
- The list of documents shown in the packet on page 72 are dated Design Criteria Manual April 1985
 Revised February 1987; Master Roads & Streets Plan 1986; and The Non-Motorized Transportation & Trail Plan 2004
- The Ordinance 22-42 was submitted by Council those amendments are made by Councilmembers Davis and Erickson.
 - This does not legally accomplish the intent of the Councilmembers as defined in Staff Reports 22-22-57, 22-54 and Memorandum dated August 8, 2022 re: Trails & Sidewalks in Code and Plans

City Planner Abboud reiterated the Council request to the Commission is to review this.

Deputy City Clerk Krause responded that Ordinance 22-42 is scheduled for Public Hearing and Second Reading and the Council referred it to the Planning Commission and Parks Commission for their recommendations. Council can adopt the Commission recommendations and postpone action, vote down or vote to approve this ordinance at their September 26th meeting. It is the decision of the Council.

City Planner Abboud stated that the recommendations need to come from the Commission and the Clerk is very competent and will draft the memorandum to Council from the list given. She is very good at that.

Discussion ensued on the content of the recommendations to Council by the Commission. Further discussion included points of why the Commission is requesting Council delay action on this subject due to the actions being taken by various personnel and recommending a moratorium on new developments like the moratorium on new medical office development when they were working on the creation of a medical district.

City Planner Abboud stated that he could not support a moratorium on development as there is no definitive time frame.

Commissioner Highland advocated for the Commission to include some time frame for action and regulations to be in place as Councilmembers Erickson and Davis requested.

City Planner Abboud facilitated further discussion on:

- Existing requirements for including easements in developments
- Requirements outlined in the Comprehensive Plan provide the Commission or City the authority for the requirement to have sidewalks
- The existing road standards, who then pays for the sidewalk to be installed
- Where would a future development be constructed within central location, the one possible location would only have a small cul de sac
 - This leaves development in the outlying areas of the city
- Could a utility easement be used for pedestrian paths or sidewalks
 - o In theory a sidewalk could be built in a utility easement
 - o No requirements for a pedestrian access to be concrete or asphalt
 - o This would provide a dedication but City Code would require amendments

Deputy City Clerk Krause responded to Chair Smith that the minutes of the meeting are a permanent record and can be included or attached to the memorandum so Council is fully aware of the Commission's concern. The memorandum is submitted to Council in response to their referral of Ordinance 22-42 and it will then be their decision to take action or not on the Commission's recommendation.

City Planner Abboud noted that the information in his Staff Reports are available, he then stated that the funding would probably come to Planning, but currently they are working on the Public input portion.

Deputy City Clerk Krause noted that she did not get some of what would be consider valid points down, such as possible litigation, which can be included as well when the recording is listened to later.

HIGHLAND/BARNWELL MOVED THE PLANNING COMMISSION, SUBMITS A MEMORANDUM TO CITY COUNCIL REGARDING ORDINANCE 22-42 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONTENT AS READ BY DEPUTY CITY CLERK KRAUSE:

AFTER TWO MEETINGS AND TWO WORKSESSIONS OF ROBUST DISCUSSION REGARDING ORDINANCE 22-42 THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDS TO CITY COUNCIL THE FOLLOWING ACTION:

- 1. VOTE ORDINANCE 22-42 DOWN AS WRITTEN TO ALLOW:
 - a. THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO BE ABLE TO EXPEND THE PROPER TIME TO DEVELOP RESPONSIBLE AND REASONABLE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS TO AVOID FUTURE LITIGATION AND NOT DISUADE DESIRABLE DEVELOPMENT; AND

- b. CURRENTLY THE HOMER NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION & TRAILS PLAN IS IN THE BEGINNING PROCESS OF BEING UPDATED: AND
- c. DEFINITIONS REQUIRE REFINEMENT REGARDING ROAD DESCRIPTORS; AND
- d. THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT REQUIRES RESOURCES WITH EXPERTISE IN TRANSPORTATION; AND
- e. THE PLANNING COMMISSION IS REQUESTING FURTHER DIRECTION ON THE DELIVERABLES THAT CITY COUNCIL DESIRES; AND
- f. THE PLANNING COMMISSION IS VERY SUPPORTIVE OF IMPLEMENTING NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION.

BARNWELL/VENUTI MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO CORRECT NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION & TRAILS PLAN TO TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

Chair Smith asked if there was any additional comments.

STARK/BARNWELL MOVED TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE AVOIDING FUTURE LITIGATION AND NOT DISSUADE DESIRABLE DEVELOPMENT AT THE END OF FIRST BULLET POINT.

There was a brief discussion on proposing another amendment.

VOTE. (Secondary Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Deputy City Clerk Krause restated the primary amendment as amended to the main motion at the request of Chair Smith:

"Moved to amend the motion to correct "Non-Motorized Trails and Transportation Plan" to "Transportation Plan" and amend the first line after "development standards" by adding, "to avoid future litigation and not dissuade desirable development."

Commissioner Highland requested clarification on the Transportation Plan versus Homer Non-motorized Trails and Transportation Plan.

City Planner Abboud stated that all the documents will be wrapped into one updated Transportation Plan and the consultant is working on all aspects that are elements of that plan.

There was a brief comment regarding the funding part is the scope of what they are working on includes sidewalks and specifying parameters and requirements are for the new developments.

VOTE. (Primary Amendment). NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Smith inquired if there was further discussion on the main motion as amended, noting the secondary and primary amendments to the motion that were just passed.

VOTE. (Main as amended) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.