



Hillside District Plan

Explanation of Comment Format

To be most successful, the Hillside District Plan needs to reflect the knowledge and preferences of Hillside residents, property owners, and others with a stake in the future of the Hillside. The online comment form presents a place to express and share community views, which will be used to shape the plan and help find common ground.

Because of the complexity of the Hillside District Plan and because a large number of comments are anticipated, there are a variety of ways for people to express their views. One of the most important is the series of public workshops (which began March 26). Another means for those who won't attend the workshops or want to add additional comments is the online comment form, which is designed to efficiently record and use community input.

For each "question" in the online form, there are listed some of the most common responses that have been heard so far. These comments have been compiled from interviewing Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) members, meeting with Hillside Community Councils, and researching previous issues scoping efforts (e.g. HALO's September 2005 Community Meeting notes). For each statement listed, individuals using the form have the option to check the box next to that statement to add their support (and can check as many boxes as they like). To add to the list or modify a statement on the list, there is a text box provided for each question.

Periodically, the comments submitted through the online form were compiled into this report. Items in bold text with a green background and a number next to them are the already-expressed comments listed on the online form. The number column represents the number of individuals who added their support to that comment.

A paper version of the comment form was created for distribution at the public workshops, and contains only the questions posed in the online form, with space to write comments. Any paper comment forms were entered into the online form. Written statements that were identical to those listed on the online form were recorded as having added support to the statements from the online form. All other statements are listed as additional comments.

As of March 2008, the comment form was modified to become more open-ended. Comments received after that change will be recorded and added to this document in their original text form.

| Public Water & Sewer Issues: | total number |
|--|---------------------|
| Number one issue is AWWU service areas, as it singularly forces higher development densities | 13 |
| Many people would want public sewer service, if it doesn't drive dramatic increases in the amount & density of development. | 6 |
| I would *love* to have water mains go up the main E-W roads - Abbott, O'Malley, Huffman, DeArmoun to support fire hydrants. | 7 |
| (I have private well + septic) and prefer it. | 25 |
| It's not cost effective to have public utilities so far from the core center of the city. It is not cost effective & promotes urban sprawl & it is not in compliance with 2000 policies to extend facilities away from core center | 16 |
| Cost of access for existing development vs. new development - new development should pay equal or more. | 4 |
| I'm satisfied with my public water + sewer | 3 |
| I am strongly against installing water tanks in existing neighborhoods where no resident in neighborhood benefits from tank. | 21 |
| maintenance of large-lot zoning so onsite systems are still possible. | 18 |
| Make sure that any expansion of public water + sewer does not result in zoning lot size reduction | 19 |
| don't want to be forced to connect - especially Upper Hillside | 22 |
| I'd be happy to connect to community water/sewer if available | 7 |
| Disturbance of groundwater flows. Density. Cost. | 6 |
| I don't have it and cannot build without it | 0 |
| Not knowing enough about what it would mean in terms of *cost* to bring it to my neighborhood. Would it not be worth a feasibility study to evaluate and educate area not served? | 9 |
| If people object to public water & sewer because that lets in high density housing, then the appropriate response is to enact minimal lot sizes (e.g. 3/4 acre), not fight against public water & sewer. | 8 |
| Please keep Public Water and Sewer lines out of the Hillside. | 10 |
| My concerns are: 1. city water doesn't taste as good as my well so I do not want to be forced to hookup if it becomes available. 2. disruption/destruction of property to install utilities (who pays for repairing landscaping, fences etc,?) 3. cost forced on owners (assessments) to bring water, sewage in. | 9 |
| The biggest issue is the cost to the homeowners; in the early '80's it cost my family \$48,000 (this was in the Jewel Lake area). HOW MUCH WILL IT BE NOW?? | 5 |
| Residents of the Hillside need to be told just how much it costs to have community water and wastewater hooked up to their homes. Comparing that to the cost of their onsite systems would certainly be an eyeopener. The question then should be asked how many still want to be hooked up. We are asking questions of people without a full understanding of the facts. Emotional answers won't help here. | 8 |
| I would be happy to have city water and sewer but I don't think I can afford the tax increase above the already ridiculous tax rate. | 1 |
| Do not force a cost prohibitive unnecessary sewer and water project on many, many people. Please listen to the voices of these people before you ruin their lives. We don't need a dictator forcing more excessive costs on us. | 1 |
| DO NOT want public water and sewer. Water quality is poorer than my well and sewer would add MORE pollution to Cook Inlet. | 1 |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Good management of our individual properties, conserving water, power etc should be a goal. There are great examples of large lots, large homes in other states which are wholly self sustained and doing well economically. Over the long run they claim their systems pay for themselves. These are: water, electric, waste, sewer and the like. We know personally of one.</p> | 1 |
|--|---|

| Strategies to Address Public Water & Sewer Issues: | total number |
|--|--------------|
| Many people who are not enthused about extension of community water might ultimately favor extension of water lines as a fire safety strategy | 7 |
| Ensure that extension of community water and sewer does not force high-density development | 17 |
| Counter the perception among residents that the Planning department and especially AWWU has a growth agenda that is based on supporting the extension of the public water and sewer systems | 6 |
| large lots on Hillside with high-tech systems & pump @ 2 yrs for traditional systems + always search for newer high tech systems | 13 |
| Charge 'new development' fees to help cover the cost of redevelopment fees. | 4 |
| would it be possible to utilize a public sewer system to deal with waste from lots with livestock (ie horses)? | 3 |
| Look into low-cost alternative transport strategies for sewage from areas with soils unsuitable for on-site systems to be pumped to the public sewer system. Change AWWU design standards as necessary to allow this. | 3 |
| Alternative wastewater disposal methods. | 12 |
| feasibility study to evaluate and educate area not served | 4 |
| We don't need feasibility studies; our taxes are already high enough. We study the daylight out of things in this town with little resulting from it. Common sense goes a long way itself. | 8 |
| Institute the concept of Concurrency and Impact fees on development to offset negatives that must be dealt with if we continue to overbuild. | 1 |
| Protect and preserve large lot R-6 suburban residential zoning district. | 4 |
| Permanently define the urban/rural boundary once and for all and stick with it. Do not extend public water and sewer to upper areas of the hillside. Focus instead on redevelopment of areas near proposed town centers. | 4 |
| Below ground (freeze protection) water reservoir tanks (~10-50K gallons) could serve fire protection without cost and impact of water lines. | 1 |
| Cease all this pre-determined, MOA/Developer pseudo planning and just let us be. | 1 |
| Keep development in the high density areas of our town. Leave the rural areas rural. Once you ruin the rural areas, they are gone. Remember, a spruce tree with a 12 inch diameter trunk is 100 years old. It takes only minutes to remove it but takes more than a lifetime to replace it. Think before cutting. | 2 |
| There are strong possibilities of redevelopment near proposed town centers and many areas in the bowl other than the Hillside. This is a great opportunity that can support good development and a chance for our city to redeem itself..... to create a model development of high density near other dense areas. Again we want development for the people and the city that is feasible, creates a healthy living environment and is in keeping with the area. We highly support the re-development idea near existing high density areas in mid-town, Muldoon etc. This would upgrade these areas, be a desirable place to live (if planned well) and solve many of the development issues asked about in this questionnaire. | 1 |