



City of Homer

www.cityofhomer-ak.gov

Planning

491 East Pioneer Avenue
Homer, Alaska 99603

Planning@ci.homer.ak.us

(p) 907-235-3106

(f) 907-235-3118

Memorandum

Agenda Changes/Supplemental Packet

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: TRAVIS BROWN, PLANNING TECHNICIAN
DATE: JUNE 17, 2020
SUBJECT: AGENDA CHANGES AND SUPPLEMENTAL PACKET

REGULAR MEETING

Public Hearings

- A. Staff Report 20-38, Proposed Ordinance to create the Medical Zoning District by rezoning a portion of the Residential Office Zoning District and adding the Medical Zoning District to HCC 21.58.030 permission for communications towers and HCC 21.60.060 signs on private property

Public Comments **page 1**

Plat Consideration

- A. Staff Report 20-41, Jack Gist Subdivision No. 3 Preliminary Plat

Public Comments **page 4**

From: Andrei <andrei_t10@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2020 12:40 PM
To: Department Planning
Subject: Medical zoning Public testimony

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I reside in "Office Residential" zone, that part being proposed to be re-zoned "Medical". I would like to raise an objection to the verbiage utilized in the proposed paragraph 21.17.020(r), line 81-84, referencing permitted harboring of <...>, fowl but only "as long as such animals are kept as pets". It is not unheard of to treat chicken as "... animal kept for companionship or pleasure", which appears to be the prevalent definition of the word pet. However, so far I am predominantly interested in eating their eggs. I may even end up eating the above mentioned chicken. This can only be interpreted as I would be eating my pets and I find that weirdly offensive. While this is an established formulation in HCC for other zones, I would like to propose a change for this paragraph to be composed as significantly more appropriate "... as long as such animals are kept for non-commercial purposes". Otherwise, I would like to find guidance on how much companionship shall be accomplished and what kind of pleasure should be extracted from these pet chickens to avoid running afoul of HCC.

Respectfully,
Andrei Tsyganenko

From: Roy Thomas <Rjaythomas@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2020 7:48 PM
To: Department Planning
Cc: ltdawn@live.com
Subject: Proposed Medical District Zoning

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

The comments included herein are submitted as written testimony for the public hearing by the Homer Planning Department scheduled for Wednesday, June 17, 2020.

1. The proposed ordinance states, in part, whereas, the Homer Planning Commission considered the effect of the change on the district and surrounding properties.

What effects were considered by the Planning Department and how were negative effects mitigated for existing uses with particular emphasis on existing residential uses? I don't see any of this discussion in the public documents. I submitted written comments to the prior public hearing notice (several months ago) and received no reply from the Planning Department.

2. The proposed ordinance states that conflicts created by this zoning change will be resolved in favor of non-residential use. A person's home is normally their single largest financial asset, it is where they spend most of their time, where they raise families, and residential land use forms a property tax base that supports schools, utilities and government functions. Residences are the backbone of any community.

This ordinance, for example, could result in a helipad constructed adjacent to an existing family residence. Deference should be given to current and existing use. The burden of conflict resolution should bear on the proposed new uses which will result from this ordinance.

3. A number of additional requirements should be incorporated directly into the ordinance that protect existing uses from future conditionally permitted buildings with a maximum height of 65 feet. Please consider transition heights with greater separation distances, greater property boundary setbacks, the effect of sunlight shading, loss of privacy and loss of viewshed. These are all important to neighborhood wellness, resident quality of life and character of the City of Homer.

Sincerely,

Roy Thomas
3895 Main Street
Rjaythomas@outlook.com

6/15/2020

From: todd aksteiners.com <todd@aksteiners.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 13, 2020 10:58 AM
To: Department Planning
Cc: Department Clerk
Subject: Proposed medical district zone

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.
Everyone,

I live on Bartlett in the area which is currently under consideration of becoming re-zoned as a medical district as opposed to residential office. I have lived on Bartlett for ten years.

I have read the proposed ordinance and there is one item in particular that I am asking you to reconsider. Item 204 regarding the use of flags as signage.

I can understand flags being considered a sign if they are hung from two points horizontally as opposed to the traditional method of two points vertically. I can also understand a flag being used as a sign if it was strung up from four points as a banner.

It is a stretch to consider a traditional style flag pole or flag pole off of one's porch as a sign. I am assuming that the planning commission means well and did not intend to interfere with individual property rights or rights of free speech through a flag as a symbol. However I believe that the ordinance as written is just that. If my neighbor who has invested their time, money, and years into their home wants to fly a rainbow flag, or a Trump flag, or a Jolly Roger flag, or a Hello Kitty flag on their own property that is their business. It certainly isn't my business or any of yours either. I do not intend to sound rude or too forward but personal property rights are important and I am trying to make a point.

I am not personally the kind of person who fly's a flag at my house, I never have. Having said that I have noticed that many people do, at both their homes and businesses. I do not believe it is fair for the city to dictate that they can only fly the American, Alaskan, of any nationally "approved" flag. (I am paraphrasing a bit here).

Many people invest their life's work into their homes. It is their single largest investment. They deserve the freedom to fly a symbolic flag on their property if they should choose to do so.

I am respectfully asking that you reconsider the language in the proposed ordinance regarding the use of flags as signs. We have all invested into our neighborhood, please remember that it is currently "Residential Office" and to most of us here it is our residence. It is not purely a business district.

Thanks for your consideration and feel free to contact if you would like.
Todd Steiner
907-299-1992

From: Anne Wieland <agpacsu@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 1:36 PM
To: Department Planning
Subject: Comments on proposed Jack Gist Subdivision No. 3 Preliminary Plat

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I am a resident of Meadow-wood Place Subdivision and am writing to comment on the proposed Jack Gist Subdivision No. 3. I have several concerns.

1. If the plat is accepted as is presented now, the traffic from 30 lots would exit onto Early Spring Street. To balance the traffic impact, North Court Street should instead open into Jack Gist Lane to Adams Drive thus adding 14 lots to the ten there for a total of 24 lots. That would leave 16 lots exiting onto Early Spring thus closer to balancing the traffic generated by 40 lots. This is essential.
2. The effects to vehicular and pedestrian traffic of the new subdivision as proposed will be significant. Rochelle Road in addition to its substantial traffic already supports it from Shannon Lane and Shannon Court, as well as the seven cabins that are in a northerly extension of Early Spring Street, the entire southerly Early Spring Street, a portion of Mark White Avenue, Frisbee Court, Aspen Lane and Aspen Court. The traffic from 30 new lots would overwhelm Rachelle Road, Shannon Lane and Early Spring and create a significant deterioration in the current circumstances for the many residents who like to walk around the subdivision as well for children who venture out on the street.
3. Early Spring Street and Shannon Lane are unpaved. The surface needs grading several times a year. They are often dusty if no moisture absorbing chemicals are spread on them. Shannon Lane has a chronic tendency to develop large deep pot holes in its western half which when addressed, return soon after treatment. The grading process has caused gravel to be left on some people's properties. As Sabrina and Rochelle are paved, it is high time that Early Spring also be paved.
4. Making left turns from Rachelle Street onto East End Road is difficult. There is a slight curve on East End Road about 500 feet east of the Rochelle St intersection making it difficult to see oncoming traffic at that point. Vehicles generally approach from the east going at least 45 mph and often speeding. Thus to make a safe left turn, one must wait sometimes for a couple of minutes or more. If all 30 lots are allowed to turn left onto Early Spring Street there will be longer waits and potentially more accidents at the East Road turn. The situation is worse in the winter as snow is plowed into piles blocking views in either direction.
5. There are occasional speeding vehicles roaring up Early Spring Street and Rochelle Street from the south. A study should be made and a speed limit posted for safety reasons. Perhaps even a speed bump should be created south of the intersection of Early Spring Street and Shannon Lane.

6. More Spruce and Birch trees should be left in large subdivisions such as this one as there are large gaps in the proposed subdivision where there are no trees at all or only Alders. As is, many lots will have no trees at all. Buyers will need to purchase trees and shrubs for aesthetic, wind breaking and privacy reasons rather than having remaining natural vegetation especially trees.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed Subdivision

Anne Wieland
Homer

From: Alder Snow <aldertree11@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 4:55 PM
To: Department Planning
Subject: Regarding Jack Gist proposed subdivision

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hi Julie,

I hope you are well!

I'm writing as a homeowner on Rochelle Road. We received the city's proposed subdivision plans for the new subdivision, and I have a question. Would it not be better to consider having two street outlets for this subdivision go off of Adam street to the East, and one off of Early Spring, instead of two on Early Spring and one on Adam?

I can attest to the large level of traffic already coming up from the rest of the neighborhood below- Frisbee, Aspen etc. I can only imagine how much busier Early Spring, Shannon and Rochelle will become with those extra 40 homes' worth of vehicle use. And because Early Spring is unpaved, many cars come speeding up Rochelle instead. This is a busy neighborhood with lots of kids playing near and in the road- mine will be one of them soon.

Please consider this suggestion/question in your planning process- I very much appreciate your time!

All my best,
Alder K Snow
4618 Rochelle Road

From: David Dvorak <daviddkd@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 7:41 AM
To: Department Planning
Subject: Jack Gist Subdivision No. 3

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear sirs,

I have six main concerns about the above-mentioned subdivision. First, you may remember that I tried a year or two ago to get Shannon Lane and Early Spring St. paved because of the extreme number of potholes on Shannon Lane - regularly and often numbering over 200 on that short street. My concern at that time was with the development of the lot above Early Spring with the large number of cabins each likely to have at least one car traveling on Shannon Lane daily. Now we are about to dump 30 more cars onto Shannon lane daily. Surely this will not be good!

Second, Early Spring St. is already a very dusty street and many cars travel over the speed limit on our street. Again, paving this street would seem to me to be a necessity.

Third, we often have to wait for several minutes at the top of Rochelle for the traffic to die down enough to get access to East End Road. A smart stop light would seem to me to be a necessity for this kind of added traffic needing access to East End Road.

Fourth, I don't see any pedestrian access to the Ball park and recreation area to the East of this subdivision. This is very likely to cause hard feelings to those lot owners who will, no doubt, be having heavy foot traffic across their lots to access that recreation area.

Fifth, for most of the daytime and evening hours we have minimal traffic on the long block to the West of this subdivision that includes Early Spring, Shannon Lane and Rochelle. This is used often by many people during the day as a safe walking place. With increased traffic on Early Spring and Shannon, maybe people would traverse the subdivision to get to the recreation area which would add foot traffic across the subdivision to the mix.

Sixth, somehow, we will need to warn people on Early Spring St. that they shouldn't allow small kids to freely ride bikes and walk on the road. Or, maybe a safe foot path would be in order.

I do see some advantages to the subdivision. I am convinced that the city of Homer and businesses here will profit from this subdivision along with those of us who live in this area who are likely to see the value of our property rise - so long as this is done correctly.

Sincerely,

Dave & Marilyn Dvorak
4697 Early Spring Street
Homer, AK 99603

I am writing about my concerns for the Jack Gist Subdivision #3 Proposal.

I feel there has not been enough time or notice given due to the Covid-19 Pandemic to really get more information on this proposed subdivision. I know, I for one am social distancing from people and businesses, thus not allowing to obtain more information about this plan, also receiving information in the mail did not give enough time to thoroughly look through all the information. More time to look over the proposal would be most beneficial.

I live on Shannon Lane and have been a property owner for over 20 years, and I admit progress is great, however serious thought needs to be put into the entrance and exits on Shannon Lane and Early Spring Rd. With 7 cabins that were built a few years ago, and all the other residents that use these roads, we have seen these two roads become unsafe, dusty, muddy and pot-hole filled and mostly unacceptable. Add 30+ homes, with 30+ vehicles, and all this added traffic will be too much for these roads to withstand. Paving may help, but all of this should be considered and reviewed BEFORE submitting this proposal. Please find an alternate and safe route to consider, possibly using Scenic View Dr and/or Adams Rd.

I am truly hoping that more time and effort go into this proposed housing project.

Sincerely,



Leslie Lord-Coffing

2041 Shannon Lane

Homer, AK 99603

June 16, 2020

City of Homer

Planning Commission

Subject: Jack Gist Subdivision No. 3

I have lived on Shannon Lane, which connects to the top of Early Spring, for 17 years. I routinely walk and drive Early Spring and am familiar with the area. An overriding concern that I have regarding this proposed subdivision is the potential significant increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic on both Early Spring and Shannon Lane that will result from the proposed street layout.

Both Early Spring and Shannon Lane are gravel roads. During autumn and spring these streets become muddy and rutted. During summer they are very dusty. Traffic, and associated noise, on these two streets has increased significantly in the past several years. Providing access via Early Spring from both North Court and South Court will result on a greater negative impact to the health, welfare and safety of the residents living east of this proposed subdivision.

The proposed subdivision is not simply "west of Jack Gist Park on Early Spring" as indicated on the first page of the Staff Report (packet page 47). It is "on Jack Gist Lane" as much as it is "on Early Spring" - east of Early Spring and west of Jack Gist Lane.

Proposed North Court should not connect with Early Spring but should be extended easterly to connect with Jack Gist Lane. This would provide a more balanced distribution of vehicular and pedestrian traffic from this subdivision to both Early Spring and Jack Gist Lane.

The surveyor has requested the City to support an exemption to Kenai Peninsula Borough Code 20.30.030 (Proposed Street Layout Requirements) due to the fact that North Court does not provide access to Jack Gist Lane, as it should. This proposed exemption to the Kenai Peninsula Borough code should not be granted. North Court should connect to Jack Gist Lane.

While I appreciate and support responsible urban development, I do so with an understanding that responsible development includes both short term and long term benefits for families and our community, perhaps at the expense of a few redesigned property lots during the design and approval process. Now is the time to "get this right."

Sincerely,

Michael Coffing



2041 Shannon Lane

Homer, AK 99603