

January 29, 2004
City of Craig
Planning Commission Meeting

7:00 p.m. Craig Council Chambers

Roll Call

Sue Kanen (chair), Roger Sadler, Gail Slentz present; Crystal Beseau absent/excused.
A quorum was established.

Also present were John Moots who was sworn in as a commissioner after a quorum was established and Lonnie Walters who was sworn in at the end of the meeting after Sue Kanen stepped down.

Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve minutes of July 24, 2003.
Slentz/Sadler: Approved

Public Comment

No members of the public were present.

Public Hearing

Public hearing was held for a City of Craig Application for replat of ASLS 98-38.
There was some discussion about liability issues and the process of transfer to the State of Alaska for the property to be transferred to Shaub-Ellison.
Motion to approve preliminary plat by Craig PC Resolution 462-04-PC.
Sadler/Slentz: Approved

New Business

1. Planning Commission Vacancies. The vacant position was filled by John Moots and Lonnie Walters was ready to assume the position vacated by Sue Kanen.
2. Review of CUP 01-12091, Zat's Pizza, Alcohol Service. There were no complaints, protests or law enforcement problems over the last year.
Motion that the Planning Commission recommends no further reviews on this CUP.
Slentz/Moots: Approved
3. Administrative extensions for Preliminary Plat for Lots 10 and 12, USS 2611.
Information to the Commission that this preliminary plat approval was extended until 2006.
4. Conceptual Design for Ward Cove Fisheries Site – Senate Bill 1778. Information was provided to the commission about future involvement in the Ward Cove Fisheries Site development. Copies of the concept drawings were provided to commission members. There was some discussion about available parking, lot size and proposed uses of the property.

5. Report on 2003 Building Permits. Information was provided to the commission on the year's building permits. There were 28 new permits, 6 renewed permits and 1 site plan review. Gail had a question why there was only \$25 charges for commercial permits. Staff researched the permits for Bait Box, AP&T and Richard Trojan were all renewals. The original commercial permits were charged at \$100.

6. Report on HB 191 and changes to Craig Coastal Management Plan. Information was provided to the commission on legislative changes to the Coastal Management Program. There is a requirement for plan updates over the next 18 months. Sue Kanen asked about a Flood Plain plan. Staff said that they would research the need and scope of a flood plain plan and present information at the next commission meeting. Sue Kanen asked if a flood plan would be separate or part of the coastal management plan. Brian said that it would probably be separate, but would research.

Old Business

1. Planning Commission Workshop for Title 18 changes. The commission recalled working on the changes over the past year and agreed that the synopsis provided in the staff packages was pretty complete. The changes need to be formally reviewed and approved prior to submittal to the City Council. Sue Kanen asked if any of the changes would require public hearings. Brian replied that none of the individual changes would require public hearing, but the revised title 18 would be available for review through the public readings and ordinance adoption process. It was decided that the review could be done in a single workshop to be held on Wednesday, February 18, 2004 at 7:00 p.m. in the Craig City Council chambers. It was requested that all commission members get a copy of the revised title 18 prior to the meeting.

New Member/Officer Business

1. Sue Kanen stepped down from the commission and was given a certificate in recognition of her service to the Planning Commission. Roger Sadler (vice-chair) assumed chairmanship. Sue was allowed to take her name plate.

2. Lonnie Walters was sworn in and filled the newly vacant position.

3. Roger Sadler was nominated to be the new commission chairman.
Slentz/Moots: Approved

Roger chose Gail Slentz to be the vice chairman.

Adjourn

Next Meeting scheduled for February 26, 2004.

Motion to Adjourn at 8:00 p.m.

Chair Roger Sadler

Attest
Brian Templin, City Planner

CITY OF CRAIG
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Meeting of February 24, 2005
7:00 p.m., Craig City Council chambers

Roll Call

Roger Sadler (chair), Gail Slentz, John Moots, and Lonnie Walters were present.

Reappointment of Commissioners

Roger and Gail signed oaths of office and were resworn in to the commission. Their commissions will expire in 2008.

Approval of Minutes

Meeting of January 27, 2004.

Motion to approve minutes of the January 27, 2005 meeting.

Motion: Moots/Walters

Approved

Public Comment

A letter from Walt Bolling regarding sideline setbacks along Beach Road. There was some discussion about reducing the sideline setback requirement.

Brian shared setback requirements from other municipalities. They showed that although 10' was toward the larger end of the spectrum, it was within what other municipalities were using.

The commissioners looked at the setback requirements in Juneau, Petersburg and Wrangell. Commissioner Slentz said that we needed to consider the things that we are trying to achieve by the setbacks. The issues of safety, utilities and aesthetics were discussed. It was mentioned that it was particularly important on the beachfront lots since there was emergency access from only one side. The question was raised if we want to start a standard of 10' between houses as an aesthetic/quality of life issue. There was some discussion about firefighting impact of reducing the setbacks. It was felt that if we allowed houses 10' apart, and the eaves to extend a couple of feet into that setback then it made too much of a reduction and not enough room for firefighting.

The general consensus of the commission was that there was not support to change the ordinance. They felt that developers could come to the commission with a variance request for reducing setbacks if they met all variance requirements.

Public Hearing

1. There was no public comment on any item.

New Business

1. Reappointment – Oath of Office for Roger Sadler and Gail Slentz were taken care of at the top of the meeting.
2. (Added Item) Noise ordinance discussion. Brian shared that he ran across some noise ordinances and included them in the staff packages. The end result was that zoning codes only covered uses and activities and not individual circumstances (like occasional bands). Most ordinances for noise or disturbing the peace were discussed as a police power, not a zoning issue.

Old Business

1. Planning Commisison Vacancy – Oath of Office for John Ward. John did not make it to the meeting so his swearing in was tabled.
2. Brian let the commission know that the residential zoning ordinance was postponed to a future meeting to allow Kim Patotzka an opportunity to address the ordinance. Brian will talk to Jon, Dennis and Kim to determine if the ordinance can get on the March 3, 2005 City Council agenda. Brian also shared that it was brought up that a corner of the helipad might be a better measure for the tideland fill than the road. Brian asked the commission how they felt about that change.

All of the commissioners agreed that it was a good measurement and they would support the council making that change to the ordinance.

3. There was a short discussion on the status of the Sunnahae Mountain land exchange. Brian shared that the city was working on an appraisal of the mountain top and trail and was looking for the exchange to be included in the next budget cycle. Gail asked where the money would come from for the appraisal. Brian said that it would probably come from the city general fund.

Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made.

Motion: Slentz/Moots

Approved

Roger Sadler, Chairman

Brian Templin, City Planner

City of Craig
Planning Commission
Meeting of March 25, 2004
7:00 p.m., Craig city council chambers

Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. and roll was called.
Present: Roger Sadler (chair), Gail Slentz and John Moots
Absent (Excused): Crystal Beseau and Lonnie Walters
A quorum was established.

Approval of Minutes

Meeting of January 29, 2004
Moots/Slentz Approved

Public Comment

No public were present.

Public Hearing

No public testimony on Changes to Craig Land Development Code

New Business

1. Changes to Craig Land Development Code were discussed. There were a number of general changes that clarified language, made administrative changes and deleted some outdated sections. Specific substantive changes discussed are as follows:

18.02.050 Order of Business was changed to:

1. Roll Call
2. Special Business (if any)
3. Approval of minutes of previous meetings, as amended or corrected
4. Public Comment on non-agenda items
5. Public Hearing
6. New Business
7. Old Business
8. Correspondence
9. Adjourn

18.03.002(D)(1)(a) Land Use Violations paragraph was changed to:

- a. The Code Enforcement Officer shall notify the violator of all violations, and may order cessation of activity to take place immediately. Notice of intention to issue a citation to enforce or revoke shall be made in writing at least ten (10) days prior to an

enforcement action. A notice of citation is to contain the following:

18.03.002(D)(2)(b) was changed to become 18.03.002(D)(3)

18.04(A)(3) Time Limit for Appeal. The second sentence of the paragraph was changed to the following:

An appeal states an appellant's alleged illegal activities and enforcement proceedings unless the board or a court issues an enforcement order based on a certificate of imminent peril to life or property made by the Code Enforcement Officer.

18.05 Zone Designations. Logging was removed from the list of Conditional Uses in all residential zones.

18.05 Prohibited Uses. There were two major changes to this section:

The phrase "Uses not qualifying as Permitted or Conditional" was added to the list of prohibited uses in all zones.

The phrases "Uses which degrade air, water or land resources quality", "Disturbances" and "Hazards" were deleted from the list of prohibited uses in commercial and industrial zones.

18.05 Density Standards were reworded to make application clearer.

18.05.004(A) Permitted Uses. Religious Assembly was added to the list of permitted uses in the commercial zone.

18.05.006(A) Permitted Uses. Language was changed to clarify residential use accessory to permitted uses in industrial zones.

18.06.001(C)(1) Building Permits Required. The phrase "No logging may occur within the Craig city limits without submission of a logging plan to the city and the subsequent issuance of a City of Craig building permit" was added.

18.06.002. Reference to conveyance lands was deleted from all sections.

18.10.002(A) Approval of Construction Plans. Three items were added to this section:

A sentence was added at the end of the first paragraph which states "Construction plans shall include design for curb, gutter, buried storm drain and asphalt surfacing."

A paragraph was added that states “Construction plans drawn on drafting software will be provided to the City of Craig via disk or another electronic format acceptable to the city.”

A paragraph was added that says “Upon completion of the subdivision streets, utilities and other facilities, the subdivider shall provide to the City of Craig a complete set of as-built documents prepared by a registered engineer or licensed surveyor. The as-built documents must show accurately the placement of streets, utilities and other facilities, and detail specific components installed. The as-built documents must be printed on mylar or similar material. Approval of as-builts by the City Public Works Director is necessary prior to final plat approval or release of subdivision improvement guarantee. If the as-built is prepared with electronic drafting software completed files will be provided to the City of Craig via disk or another electronic format acceptable to the city.”

18.11.008(A) Cul-de-sacs. The right-of-way width was increased from thirty feet to forty feet.

18.13(G) Setbacks. The phrase “natural stand of timber above” was changed to “natural shoreline vegetation above”.

18.15(C) Nonconforming Uses and Structures. There were several changes to this section:

In subparagraph three the time period was changed from one year to six months.

In subparagraph four the phrase “structure” was changed to “non-conforming structure”.

In subparagraph five the phrase “a conforming use changed may not revert to a non-conforming used” to read “a conforming use. Once changed, a non-conforming use may not revert to a non-conforming use. One non-conforming use may not be changed to another non-conforming use.”

A subparagraph eight was added that says “8. Change in Ownership – A non-conforming use that changes ownership is void. Non-conforming uses may not continue upon change of ownership.”

Resolution 463-04-PC was passed recommending submittal of these changes to the Craig City Council.

Moots/Slentz Approved

The commission discussed two additional changes to the Land Development Code. The first was to add a requirement to developers to install streetlights in new subdivisions. The second change discussed was to only consider usable land area in calculating development standards. Fill, wetland and steep ground were discussed as factors for usable land area.

The commission directed staff to develop language regarding the addition of streetlights to the development standards and the use of fill on tideland lots to determine development standards.

Adjourn

Slentz/Moots Approved

Minutes Approved April 22, 2004:

Roger Sadler, Chairman

Attest: Brian Templin, City Planner

CITY OF CRAIG
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
April 22, 2004
7:00 p.m., Craig city council chambers

Roll Call

Roger Sadler (chair), Gail Slentz, Crystal Beseau, John Moots, Lonnie Walters

All commission members were present. A quorum was established

Approval of Minutes

Meeting of March 25, 2004

Motion: Moots/Beseau Approved

Public Comment

Present at the meeting was the Klawock Middle/High School Student Council and their advisor, Sonny Anderson. The group was welcomed by the planner and the planning commission. Sonny thanked the commission for allowing the Student Council to participate.

Public Hearing

1. Application to Replat Lots 1 and 2, Block 5A, USS 1430 CTA by Walter Bolling. There was no public comment on this item.

2. Application for Variance by Walter Bolling. Charles Hawks (adjacent landowner) submitted written comment that he did not have any objection to the variance request.

The city planner commented that he had received some verbal comments regarding the blockage of the view if two story units were developed on the land. Commissioner Roger Sadler stated that he felt that the option to develop was up to the landowner as long as they did not exceed the development height restrictions without a height variance. Consensus of the commission was that height development should not have a bearing on the variance application at hand.

The city planner commented that in discussions with the Director of Public Works there was a major concern about the variance restricting access to the rear of the sewer lift station located adjacent to the area being discussed.

Commissioner John Moots made comments that he felt that the setbacks were very important not only for public works access, but for access by the fire department.

3. Changes to Craig Land Development Code. There were no public comments on this item.

New Business

1. Application for Replat 04-04-22. Staff briefed the commission that this was a routine replat and met all City of Craig subdivision standards.

John Moots asked if the replat was conditional on the variance that was being requested by Walt Bolling at the same time. Staff said that their conversations with Walt indicated that Walt would still be interested in developing a multiple family dwelling unit or units and that the replat would be necessary, even if the variance was denied.

Motion was made to approve PC Resolution 464-04-PC for Preliminary Plat approval.

Motion: Slentz/Moots Approved

2. Application for Variance 04-04-22. Staff briefed the commission that Walt Bolling had applied for a variance to the setback requirement. Walt has asked to be able to build 10' into the setback on the southerly edge and about 3' into the setback on the northerly edge of Lot 1A, Block 5A, USS 1430 CTA (preliminary plat just approved by the commission). Staff discussed the fact that allowing the variance would prejudice public works access to the rear of the lift station adjacent to the property.

Commissioner John Moots added that a variance that far into the setback would make fire department access difficult.

Motion was made to approve PC Resolution 465-04-PC, Denying approval of the variance.

Motion: Beseau/Slentz Approved

3. Streetlight Nominations. Staff briefed the commission on the streetlight nomination process. Each year the public is invited to nominate locations for a new streetlight. This year two nominations were received. The first was from Jim Seley nominating JS Drive between the Craig-Klawock Highway and Lot 10 of USS 2611. The second nomination was from the Craig Community Foundation nominating the entrance to the CCA Parking Lot for a streetlight. Because either location would require installing a utility pole the city budget will allow for one streetlight to be installed.

The commission discussed the merits and safety considerations of both locations. The concensus of the commission was that both locations had strong safety considerations and strongly merited installation of a streetlight.

Commissioner Slentz stated that she felt that the CCA Parking lot had a higher safety consideration but that both nominations had merit.

Commissioner Sadler commented that there was currently three streetlights in the vicinity of the CCA Parking lot but that there were none on JS Drive.

There was some discussion about the option of changing bulbs in some of the lights. Commissioner Moots said that it would significantly add electricity costs.

It was discussed that the streetlight at JS Drive would probably be more expensive due to the conduit from underground utilities vs. an overhead connection at the CCA parking lot.

Commissioner Slentz asked if JS Drive was a city street. Staff answered that the street was turned over to the City of Craig when the subdivision was completed.

Commissioner Beseau made the comment that she felt that it was a lot darker along JS Drive than along the highway. She also commented that Jim Seley has put in a nomination for JS Drive the last couple of years.

Commissioner Slentz stated that the fact that Jim has put in a nomination for at least the last two years in a row and it should be given more weight.

Commissioner Walters commented that the CCA parking lot entrance was dangerous especially in the winter when there was snow on the ground.

Commissioner Sadler commented that the CCA parking lot entrance does need to be more clearly marked for safety concerns and that they have a valid consideration for a streetlight.

Commissioner Slentz asked staff about the process for the planning commission to make a motion. Staff answered that the planning commission needed to nominate a location to the City Council for their consideration at the next council meeting.

The commission decided that JS Drive was their choice and that a streetlight should be put about halfway between the highway and Lot 10 of USS 2611.

A motion was made to propose a priority list to install a streetlight along JS Drive, about halfway between the highway and Lot 10 of USS 2611 and that CCA is encouraged to nominate again next year. The city should also look at the possibility of helping to place reflective markers or protective rocks at the CCA parking lot.

Motion: Slentz/Moots Approved

Note: The Craig City Council approved the nomination and directed city staff to install a streetlight along JS Drive. Public Works staff is considering the options to delineate the entrance to the CCA parking lot but is constrained by what they can do on State DOT/PF Right of Way or on private Property.

Old Business

1. Changes to Craig Land Development Code. The planning commission spent a great deal of time at the March planning commission meeting. At that meeting the commission directed staff to propose language to add two new items to the Land Development Code. The first item was to add streetlights to the development process for new subdivisions. Staff submitted the following language:

A new paragraph will be added in section 18.10 to identify the requirement for streetlights when developing subdivisions. Proposed language is as follows:

18.10.005(C). Streetlights will be installed by the developer. One streetlight will be placed at every intersection, one streetlight will be placed in each cul-de-sac and one streetlight will be placed on every other utility pole along a street. If the utilities are underground a pole and streetlight will be placed along the right-of-way no more than 300' apart.

This item was discussed as accepted as written. It will be included in the public hearing during the May 27, 2004 commission meeting.

The second item was to draft language for specifying usable, filled area for development standards for tideland lots. Staff submitted the following language:

A new subparagraph will be added in each residential zone's development standards to restrict residential development of tideland lots based on the amount of usable, filled land. Proposed language is as follows:

18.05.001(E)/.002(E)/.003(A)(E)/.003(B)(E) Development standards for all tideland lots shall be computed based upon filled area. When submitting plans for property development of tideland lots (building permit applications, construction plans, use permit applications, etc.) the applicant must submit an as-built survey of the lot showing the toe and top of fill. The as-built survey must clearly give the square footage of the fill measured at the toe of fill. Minimum lot size, density and maximum lot coverage will be based on the amount of fill shown on the as-built survey.

Commissioner Walters asked how buildings on pilings would be treated. It was decided that language needed to be included that took pilings into account. There was some discussion about how to include pilings into the calculation. It was decided that the square footage of the outside perimeter of pilings could be added to fill in order to meet development standards. The new language is as follows:

18.05.001(E)/.002(E)/.003(A)(E)/.003(B)(E) Development standards for additional structures or dwelling units for all tideland lots shall be computed based upon the combined total developed square footage of the lot, this includes the square footage of the filled area and the square footage of the area defined by the outside perimeter of pilings that are intended to support a structure. When submitting plans for property development of tideland lots (building permit applications, construction plans, use permit applications, etc.) the applicant must submit an as-built survey or a construction plan of the lot showing the toe and top of fill and any pilings. The as-built survey or the construction plan must show property lines, all existing improvement and utilities, clearly give the square footage of the fill measured at the toe of fill and the square footage of the area encompassed by the outer perimeter of pilings. If a construction plan is submitted prior to fill or pilings being placed on the lot the city may require that an as-built survey be completed prior to beginning construction of any structures. Density and maximum lot coverage for additional structures or dwelling units will be based on the area of fill plus the area defined by the outer perimeter of pilings shown on the as-built survey or plan proposal.

Adjourn

Motion: Slentz/Moots Approved

Roger Sadler, Chairman

Attest: Brian Templin, City Planner

CITY OF CRAIG
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
Meeting of May 27, 2004
7:00 p.m., Craig city council chambers

Roll Call

Roger Sadler (chair) – Excused Absent, Gail Slentz - Present, Crystal Beseau - Present, John Moots - Present, Lonnie Walters - Absent

A quorum was established.

Approval of Minutes

Meeting of April 22, 2004 minutes were approved with minor corrections.

Motion to Approve Minutes as Amended: Moots/Slentz Approved

Public Comment

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment Items. Doug Russell contacted the City Planner and asked that the Planning Commission consider restricting the use of residential property for 4-wheeler tracks. He felt that it was a safety issue and potentially could harm property values for adjacent properties. The Planning Commission commented that the safety issue was not something that it wanted to address. They felt that there were better avenues to pursue safety issues on private property. Because of the potential affect on property values however, the Commission directed staff to draft some language that might be incorporated into the Land Development Code changes that would restrict 4-wheeler tracks. Staff agreed to draft the language and present get it to the Commission for discussion at the June meeting.

Public Hearing

1. Land Development Code Changes. There were a number of representative from the public present to discuss changing the building height and other development standards, especially along the beach in West Craig. A letter and petition were presented to the Commission addressing these issues. Jim See and Frank Permenter talked about the damage to the viewshed if development on the beach were done at maximum current standards. Greg Head made a comment that he chose to buy the beachfront lots in front of his property and did not want to see overly restrictive standards if he chose to develop in the future.

New Business

1. Discussion of Setback Variances on 50' Lots along Beach Road. Walt Bolling had made a request for the Commission to conduct a general discussion of variances for setbacks on some of the narrower beachfront lots. The Commission discussed the issue and decided that without specific applications for variances it was impossible to make any decisions or recommendations.

CITY OF CRAIG
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
June 24, 2004, 7:00 p.m., Craig city council chambers

Roll Call

Roger Sadler (chair) - Present, Gail Slentz – Absent Excused, Crystal Beseau - Present, John Moots - Present, Lonnie Walters - Present

Approval of Minutes

Meeting of May 27, 2004 minutes were tabled until July meeting. The extra time will give the commission members a chance to double check the meeting minutes.

Motion to table minutes: Moots/Walters Approved

Public Comment

No Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items.

Public Hearing

1. Changes to Craig Land Development Code – No public spoke at the meeting but Jim See had stopped by the City Planner’s office to make sure that there was continuing discussion on the maximum height issue. He also commented that he would like to see some additional discussion on the issue of maximum fill.

John Moots commented that he felt that by limiting the height of fill that the city would be open to additional liability. Brian Templin said that he would check, but we could limit liability by allowing for conditional use permits and variances where special circumstances could be brought to the commission.

Crystal Beseau said that it would have been nice to keep the fill to the street level but that there were several lots already filled above street level.

John asked if there was a differentiation between fill on the beach and upland lots around Craig.

Roger Sadler said that he preferred not to see another zone or overlay created but he would like to see some limits. He said that we need to consider the expense that developers have already put into the beachfront lots and that he would probably fill high if he owned one in order to protect from the waves. He said that we need to choose an elevation that we are looking for and restrict building height based on additional fill.

John Moots said that cost of materials and labor would probably keep the fill limited. He said that the biggest concern that he had about the fill was the potential for liquification in an earthquake.

Roger asked if any engineering or design was given on the filled lots. He asked if a retaining wall over a certain height needed an engineer's drawing. He asked if there was any requirement for retaining walls over a certain height.

Crystal mentioned that she had to do a building permit for her rock wall.

Brian said that he didn't recall seeing any requirements but would check.

Note: After researching the Craig Development Code it was found that retaining walls over 4' in height do require a building permit and a plot plan to insure that setbacks are met. Building Permit 34-95, which was renewed in 2002 was issued to Walt Bolling for the lots that we have been discussing the last couple of months. There is no requirement for engineering drawings for Craig Building Permits.

Brian asked if there was any interest by the commission in going forward on the maximum fill issue.

John replied that he didn't see any value in it. Roger asked that if Brian ran across another city's reference to maximum fill that he would be interested in looking at it. Lonnie Walters said that if you didn't put some sort of restriction that it would eventually get out of hand. Roger suggested that limiting the amount of fill based on the road was a possibility but that it would be difficult to apply to upland lots.

Roger suggested road level or natural ground (average height on a lot), whichever is greater.

Brian mentioned that the commission could set a maximum height based on the grade of the road as a permitted development and higher construction based on a conditional use. Brian also mentioned that natural ground would be difficult because of development over the years. Allowing conditional exceptions would give the commission a great deal of latitude to make individual determinations.

Brian mentioned that if the commission was interested in putting a combined limit of fill and building height that it might want to consider a larger height to allow for both fill and construction. John said that he felt it should be two different things.

John said that he preferred to get the maximum height issue taken care of and table the fill issue until we could get further information. This would allow the commission to get the current list of changes to the City Council and look at fill changes later.

Roger mentioned that the commission could direct Brian to research additional fill issues to discuss at the next meeting. Brian said that he could look for other

cities' code and write some language for the next meeting. Brian asked what the commission would like to see if he could not find any other municipal codes that addressed the issue. John suggested a maximum of 6' of fill based on the average grade of the road and the highest point of fill.

Lonnie said that even though the fill issue came after the building height issue, it should be dealt with first. John reiterated that we should address building height first and get the current problems addressed before additional construction took place under the current code.

Roger said that the commission could incorporate building height and fill height together and look at most projects on a case by case basis. He said that using the average natural grade of the lot and a maximum building height could be used. Frank Permenter (public) mentioned that it would be difficult to define the natural ground since most lots and road have been filled. Brian asked where the grade should be measured on unfilled lots since the natural ground might go to several feet below sea level. He said that we have to be able to clearly define exactly where we are going to measure from and to. Brian mentioned that from an enforcement standpoint natural ground would be difficult, but road level would be much easier to understand and enforce.

Roger suggested that the commission consider a maximum height based on average contour of the original ground or road level, whichever is greater to the highest point of the roof. He said that Brian should write language for the next meeting to reflect this.

Brian mentioned again that the commission may want to consider changing the maximum height if they wanted to include the fill height.

Motion: John Moots made a motion that we use a maximum fill height based on the average contour or road height, whichever is greater and a maximum building height of a residential building no more than 30' from the finished grade.

Motion: Moots/No Second Motion did not carry due to a Lack of a second.

Motion: Crystal Beseau made a motion that there be a maximum building height of 30' from the average natural grade of the lot or the average grade of the road, whichever is greater, to the highest point of the roof.: Beseau/Walters
Approved (3 to 1)

John Moots agreed with the concept but felt that 30' was too low.

New Business

1. Changes to Craig Coastal Management Plan, PC Resolution 466-04 PC. Brian explained that the current Craig Coastal Management Plan needed to be updated

to meet Alaska legislative requirements. Brian said that the resolution was to indicate that the Planning Commission was willing to participate in the rewrite process.

Motion: Walters/Moots Approved

Old Business

1. Changes to Craig Land Development Code

- a. Existing List of Changes –
No comments were made by the commission.
- b. Building Height Changes –
No further discussion. See Public Hearing Item 1.
- c. Recreational Track Prohibition

Brian talked to the commission and let them know that Doug Russell had approached him and talked about the problem in his neighborhood. Brian had mentioned the problem to the planning commission at the May 27 meeting and the commission had directed Brian to write some language to address the issue. Language was provided to the commission making Motorized Vehicle Tracks a prohibited use in residential zones and a definition of Motorized Vehicle Track as “A course or structures used for racing or recreational use of ATV’s, 4-wheelers, 3-wheelers, motorcycles, go carts or other motorized equipment. Motorized Vehicle Track does not include routine use of equipment for snow removal or other maintenance.” Brian mentioned that this should only apply to residential zones as it may be a good development for commercial or industrial property.

Adjourn

Motion: Walters/Beseau Approved

Approved:

Roger Sadler, Chairman

Brian Templin, City Planner

**CITY OF CRAIG
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

Meeting of August 26, 2004
7:00 p.m., Craig City Council chambers

Roll Call

Present: Roger Sadler (chair), Crystal Beseau, John Moots, Lonnie Walters
Absent Excused: Gail Slentz

Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve minutes of Meeting of July 22, 2004
Moots/Beseau Approved

Public Comment and Public Hearing

No Public Present

New Business

Crystal was thanked for her service to the commission over the last several years and was given a certificate of appreciation and a photo of Craig. Crystal also got to take her name tag. She handed over her copy of the land development code.

John Moots asked if the changes to the planning code had gone through the city council yet. Brian responded that it was scheduled for first reading on September 16 and second reading on October 7.

Helipad Use. Roger Sadler asked about recent use of the helipad. Brian responded that the City Administrator had contacted Temsco and the Coast Guard to remind them that the helipad could only be used for emergency purposes.

John Moots asked about Walt Bolling's construction plans since his variance request was denied. Brian responded that Walt is currently working on designs that do not encroach into the setbacks. Brian said that he didn't have any building permit requests yet. There was some additional discussion regarding the building height changes and their relation to Walt's lot and to other beach front lots.

Old Business

None

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn. Beseau/Moots Approved

Roger Sadler, Chairman

Brian Templin, City Planner

**CITY OF CRAIG
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

October 27, 2005
7:00 p.m., Craig City Council chambers

Roll Call

Roger Sadler (chair), Gail Slentz, John Moots (absent excused), Lonnie Walters

Approval of Minutes

Minutes of August 25, 2005
Minutes of September 22, 2005

Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of August 25, 2005, and the minutes of September 22, 2005. Minutes approved.

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES SLENTZ/WALTERS APPROVED

Public Comment

None

Public Hearing

None

New Business

1. Open discussion on Mobile Building Restricted Overlay and the Craig Comprehensive Plan.

Brian added a couple of pages to the meeting packet from the 2000 Comprehensive Plan, which covers about a dozen different issues, one of those being Land Use, and it has some general goals. The plan was put together by a contractor for the city, was coordinated and approved at some point by the planning commission and then was also approved by the city council. Brian went on to say that one of the strategies in the plan is on mobile building restricted overlay. There are three specific recommendations on the strategy. The first is mobile building restricted overlay shall be applied to blocks 3A, 4A, 5A, 6A, and 17A, USS 1430 and to all platted residentially zoned upland lots bordering on the mean high water line of record. The second is application of the mobile building restricted overlay is allowed on all zone designations. The third is residential standards for marine industrial zoned property. Brian went on to say that he has mentioned a couple of times that there are several blocks in the area that they had been discussing that were already identified in the comprehensive plan as being areas with a mobile building restricted overlay.

Gail pointed out that this was just a recommendation, there was no ordinance was ever in place. These specific places were just identified in the plan.

Roger said that he would like to see mobile home restriction overlays in the future. He said that the commission would have to decide how to go about it (majority vote by property owners, ect), as there may be objections by property owners on a block of lots proposed for an overlay.

Gail suggested that individual land owners have the right to say yes or no before the commission decides on an overlay.

Lonnie said that each land owner on block 17 got a notification letter before the first decision of the mobile restricted overlay.

Gail asked in a mobile home overlay situation (or similar situations), is there was a statute saying that each property owner gets a letter, or is it published in the paper ahead of time. Brian answered yes, for this particular action, the requirement is that at least 10 days before the public hearing, each property owner within 300 feet of the affected property gets a letter by first class mail, and he has an affidavit notarized with all the names and addresses on it. He further said that although it's not required, it can be published in the paper. In this case, it was published about 2 weeks before the hearing.

Gail suggested that the commission publish an article in the paper about P&Z, not just about overlays, but more of a public education article.

Brian asked if the commission wanted him to do anything pursuing this, such as sending out a letter to property owners identified in the comprehensive plan asking if they would be interested in an overlay.

Roger said that before a group was to come to P&Z with an overlay issue, the commission needs to decide how it would be handled beforehand, such as the simple majority of people that respond to the issue (by showing up or in a letter) and vote on it. If someone chooses not to respond, their vote doesn't count.

Old Business

1. Update on Alley Vacation for Block 17, USS 1430

Brian said that the Alley Vacation and Mobile Building Restricted Overlay were separated from each other and sent back to City Council, and the City Council decided to indefinitely table the mobile building restricted overlay. The city council ordinance is written so that four affirmative votes are needed to pass an issue. There were only four at the council meeting, and since one of the council members would benefit from the alley vacation, that left three to vote, so they ended up without a quorum and they could not vote on the issue. Brian went on to say that he gave them the alternative to take no action and let the alley vacation occur by natural process, since technically they do not have to approve it. They chose to wait until an appointed time when the council could make a vote on it, and so they tabled it. The second council meeting in November should have enough voting members to vote on the issue.

MOTION MADE TO ADJOURN
Meeting Adjourned

SLENTZ/WALTERS

APPROVED

Chairman Roger Sadler

Attest: Brian Templin City Planner

**CITY OF CRAIG
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

November 30, 2005
7:00 p.m., Craig City Council chambers

Roll Call

Roger Sadler (chair), Gail Slentz (absent), John Moots, Lonnie Walters

Approval of Minutes

Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of October 27th, 2005.

MOTION TO APPROVE WALTERS/MOOTS APPROVED

Public Comment

None

Public Hearing

1. Craig Coastal Management Plan Public Review Draft – No Public Comments

New Business

1. Craig Coastal Management Plan, Public Review Draft

Brian said that he will post the announcement for the Public Review Draft at the post office, bank and city hall, and it will also show up in the newspaper December 5th, 12th, and 19th. He said that the announcement schedules the public hearing for December 22nd, with all comments due by December 29th. The 21 day public review is mandatory by the state. The state agencies will eventually decide what policies are or are not acceptable. So far, each district that has sent in their Coastal Management Plan to the state has gotten it back with a long letter requesting more information on several topics. Some of the topics and policies are controversial and could generate a lot of comments. Policies cannot duplicate or be stricter than any state or federal laws. This eliminated about half of our enforceable policies, as they were too general or were duplicative. Policies need to be specific. No action needed to be taken by the commission on this item at this time.

John Moots asked if this plan was taking into account the coast within the city boundaries. Brian answered yes, as a first class city; our coastal boundary is the same as our municipal boundary.

Brian said that he would make copies of chapter five the old Coastal Management Plan for the commission to compare with chapter five of the new Coastal Management Plan.

Deleted:

2. Swearing in of new member (Bill Altland)

The city council unanimously voted for Bill’s appointment to the Planning Commission at their last meeting. Bill signed the oath and officially became the 5th member of the Planning Commission.

Old Business

1. Update on Alley Vacation for Block 17, USS 1430

Brian said that the city council approved the Alley Vacation for Block 17, USS 1430.

2. Starting point for elevations on Beach Road

The commission discussed starting point elevations on Beach Road. Brian said that it is a fairly simple process that involves measuring the road against the lot. Lots can only be filled two feet higher than the road.

3. Mobile Building Restricted Overlay

The commission discussed starting small, and then as the community grows and develops, restrict trailers and mobile homes to specific areas in Craig. Brian said he would bring some information from the comprehensive plan to the next meeting.

Other discussion

Brian said that he got several planning and zoning books from the Department of Commerce, and that the commission could stop by and borrow them.

Brian also said that DCCED and Tlingit Haida Housing was working on a community map for Craig. Craig has given some funds through the Coastal Management program and from the city, the project includes brand new aerial photograph maps matched with land line data. He said that the photo details were very sharp details with lot information, although it is not survey grade. Brian further said that eventually they will replace the community maps online.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

MOOTS/WALTERS

APPROVED

Meeting adjourned.

Chairman Roger Sadler

Attest: Brian Templin City Planner

Brian said that there is money for road improvements this year. There has been discussion on 8th Street through to Water Street, but the road's plat doesn't necessarily work at Water Street. One of the options is buying the property from the Forest Service. Brian said that now that the Forest Service house is gone, the option is going around the bank instead of trying to get up over it, making it easier to get on 8th Street. Brian said that he would get information together about the old access discussions to the floatplane terminal.

Brian said that he wanted to let the commission know that he sent out a notice of violation at the beginning of the month regarding a storage shed within the setbacks.

New Business

Old Business

Adjourn

Motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

ALTLAND/WALTERS

MEETING ADJOURNED

John Moots, Acting Chair

Attest: Brian Templin, City Planner