



Hillside District Plan – Notes from 10/27/08 Public Workshop

General

- Is there going to be a CAC report? (this is it)
- How does all this get decided on?

Additional Comments Submitted

- Natural vegetation retention – require clear standards stricter than title 21
- Keep housing especially high density away from Rabbit Creek canyon. Do not reduce required parking spaces for churches, see the line of cars on OS Hwy at new Russian orthodox church.
- Neighborhoods need to agree on addition to a huge Hillside transportation service plan. (Road maintenance. Require new institutions schools and churches be attached to sewer and water. Plan is getting better!

Land Use

- Enforcement / implementation of plan – how can encroachment into open space and stream setbacks be addressed (neighbors don't like to turn their neighbors in but if one encroaches with a shed, then others follow suit).
- Need a “bigger stick” to enforce rules; monetary enforcement; a need for more enforcement staff
- Trails – bears/creeks/safety concern/ distance between creek and trail
- No increased density on “Lower Hillside”
- No downsized zoning (? No smaller lots)
- Move “Lower Hillside” designated to areas currently on Muni services i.e. Lake Otis corridor
- Delete references to “housing types” – Wording needs to be “single family residential” as “housing types” is code for “high density”
- How much of Lower Hillside area? Currently open space that might be developed with new (proposed) zoning?
- Remove BLM lots from Lower Hillside; add to Central. Allows connectivity to Rabbit Creek Drainage and access for Rabbit Creek Road; steep and dangerous
- No additional commercial on Old Seward (Potter Marsh area)
- If no teeth, “encourage/discourage” means nothing – concerned about enforcement
- Covenants difficult to enforce when behind house, away from street, out of sight
- Goldenview / Rabbit Creek area – developers terming undevelopable areas as greenbelts, not considering as open space
- 4.9 – DCM does not equal concept

- Concern about using old (+ inaccurate) plans (particular – AWWU 2005 Master Plan)
- Why must we give 20% increase in density in order to get people to do what they should be doing anyway
- I heard overwhelming opposition to commercial development at previous workshops, so how is it still in the plan?
- Seems like the land use boundary has moved in the 11th hour of this plan – why is that?

Additional Comments Submitted

- Remove BLM from lower Hillside and move it to central Hillside to follow the Rabbit Creek drainage. Keep BLM lots low density. Rabbit Creek Road is too steep. Do not put a trail along Rabbit Creek, it's "bear country". No addition to commercial area behind Potter Marsh (Old Seward Hwy). Overlay commercial to compliment Potter Marsh – no quick stops, Carrs is 3 miles away.
- Are there wetland classification maps?

Drainage

- Standards – mixed views; some say excessive; some say need to strengthen – capture of rooftop runoff big step
- the plan should specifically require replanting vegetation, including trees damaged due to high winds.
- Incorporate some of the specific construction techniques that were presented in the white papers for drainage control
- Reevaluate, identify and preserve certain 'B' wetlands for their hydrologic functions and their value for runoff retention and attenuation. This should be done in this plan and not deferred to a subsequent plan.
- The wet area along Elmore Creek between 145th and Manytell should be designated as wetlands and preserved from development.
- The Rabbit Creek greenway should be maintained, since it is used by moose and bear.
- The plan should consider impacts on and protection of anadromous streams
- Will there be any monitoring of surface water for nitrates, fecal coliform, or other pollutants?
- level of detail – consider specific policy to move – protect streams and wetlands
- specific problem areas – more to note/add (Snowbear Drive and 6700 Paula Place)
- move emphasis on piped vs. road-side and natural systems; consider planning for piped runoff?
- want to see teeth in policies; watershed approach
- The plan should assure that the recommendations get implemented.
- Love the green infrastructure idea, but how to compensate developer if the development is in a green zone? What about a credit/debit system?

Additional Comments Submitted

- Make note of area between 145th and Manytell, Elmore to west, this area is a wetland and needs to be designated as such. Elmore Creek runs through it. Create drainage areas – storm drains in some problem areas.

Transportation - Road & Trails

- Upper Huffman (Birch to Hillside) – concern about extending, due to grades, wetlands, concerns about hydrology/ water-table and adjacent wells.
- Draining of federal wetlands that are adjacent to the Greenbook home owners association community well which has 70+ homes getting water from.
- Remove the Elmore Road connection between DeArmoun and Rabbit Creek
- Elmore connects with Rabbit Creek at a blind corner
- Future trailheads – concern about management and trash
- Concern locals taking over \$ of state owned woods
- Road & trails alignments – be more flexible
- Flexibility about trail locations means obligation for trails/trailheads gets pushed to last subdivider
- Joe B. – 3 new trails on 160 parcel
- Connectivity of trails is key
- Avoid on big trailhead; have multiple “local” trails
- MOA should take over more of state owned roads
- Concerned about AM gridlock at GoldenView Drive
- What’s the projection of the number of people using these trails in the future?
- I have a concern with not doing very specific plans for trailheads – can you make it so that no one neighborhood gets slammed – identify specific properties for trailheads?
- How do you enforce? Last guy to develop get stuck being the parking lot?
- Locations of trails – lack of connectivity is the biggest concern – can connectivity be ensured, leaving the exact location to be decided in future? (that is the intent of the plan)
- The trail along Rabbit Creek should be reconsidered; since this is a bear movement corridor.
- The plan estimates that there may be another 5,000 dwellings at buildout, would assure greater taxbase – what is the likelihood of the MOA taking over State-owned roads up there? (City is willing to take over any state-owned roads if they are built to MOA road standards, either urban or rural road standards).
- The morning gridlock on Rabbit Creek Road is bad, and I can only see it getting worse – don’t see any solutions to these problems in the plan. Are there? (sort of but not really; tough issue that the plan might not resolve)
- Only solution I see is to minimize density.
- Move the trail illustrated on the north side of upper Huffman to the south side of the road and instead of running the trail up Toilsome Road to Glenn Alps, use the one illustrated on the map on Sultata Dr and upper Huffman connecting to Upper Huffman trail head
- On Page 4-7 of the Public Review Draft, clarify the text regarding road next work and the Base Case and Build-Out land use.
- OK with Areawide maintenance concept, except the inclusion of State owned roads, they should continue to maintain them. The State does a good job plowing snow.
- “we pay taxes for services we don’t receive”.. afraid of more taxes
- No strip-paving on new roads, particularly in Bear Valley {*lance’s comment....I don’t know if the individual that made this comments would rather have gravel streets?*}

- Consider topography when determining primary and secondary roads (ie near Rabbit Creek Canyon, Davidson Park)
- Protect Moen Trail: Do **not** move it to plan identified for Legacy Pointe condo development. That project may never go so why plan for it in this plan? Protect the Moen trail where it is now!
- Do not put a 200 car parking lot off of Honey Bear or Snow Bear (an existing platted, but not built right-of-way/easement). It will ruin the neighborhood. There are better alternatives in Section 36 and Brewster's Rd / Homestead area.
- The destination of hikers that currently use the 5 car parking lot is to the Parks land just north of the subdivision, and west of Rabbit Creek, so why not access it from Section 36th and put the trailhead there?
- Move proposed Potter Heights Drive trailhead parking lot to an area where there is **no** homes already there. I've invested a lot while there are absentee land owners who have not. It will also increase partying and gunplay in the area which is not well patrolled. {John DeCarlo is the landowner where the trailhead is illustrate on the HDP trial map}
- Who would maintain the trailheads, not on the park boundary, like the one at Potter Heights and Brewster's?
- The trailhead near Potter Heights Drive could operate like the one in Eagle River that hikers use to start walking to Symphony Lake at the end of Hiland Road.
- Watch out for the wetlands near the Mt. Air Road alignment.

Additional Comments Submitted

- Do not connect DeArmoun and Rabbit Creek via Elmore road – the curve is too steep on RCR. Support commercial area complimentary to Potter Marsh on O. Seward. How will OS and RCR be fixed to accommodate traffic? Protect Moen Trail, fix the alignment permanently
- Page 4-7 says that the existing road system is adequate to meet projected traffic. What was modeled was not the existing system. What was modeled included additional lanes that are needed on lower Hillside arterials. The plan should clarify this so there is an understanding the 4 lane segments are needed on the lower Hillside. – David Post 269-0512
- I strongly oppose the Huffman Road connection. It will destroy wetlands owner's wells, ambiance of the neighborhood, and it is too expensive to do. These same reasons stopped the connection last time. – Jay Naylor 345-4757
- Your stated plan is not to impact one neighborhood unfairly. Bear Valley has already had a 5 car trail access put in. Putting in 200 car parking lot priority trailhead 1000 yards or less from the one put in 2 years ago is not consistent with your stated plan. We are suffering enough already from the existing access. Find a section 36 or Brewsters alternative – Bill Morrissey 830-1019

Water & Wastewater

- Groundwater monitoring needed: shallow, deep; lots of locations – maintain wetlands support/wells (e.g. Huffman)
- Re: sewer boundary (Elmore area), people commented that the sewer boundary in the furrow creek drainage basin should not be not moved
- Updated maps (water tank outdated)
- Is there a plan to establish baseline monitoring of surface water quality?
- How to monitor groundwater quality? Especially when there are many small, fractured aquifers/systems?
- If you're going to push Huffman through, how are you going to deal with the wetland? Drain it or build a bridge over it? Concern – local wells are dependent on the wetland.

Additional Comments Submitted

- Fix RCR lift station. How many decades must it stink? When will the city be upgrading it's sewage treatment? EPA waiver, beluga whales?
- Can you fix the lift station on Rabbit Creek Road to keep it from stinking?
- Please move the designation “lower Hillside” to the area of high density R-1 zoning and Muni utilities. The areas from the Lake Otis corridor east are R-6 suburban residential. Existing rural and suburban life and homes need to be protected. The areas along Elmore are large lot single family and must be kept. Thanks!

Implementation

- As a road fund manager for a subdivision, I'd say that each family pays about \$500/year, so your \$300/year estimate is low.
- My dad worked on this stuff 33 years ago – same issues; would like to see some teeth in this plan so we're not still trying to address these same issues another 33 years from now. Like the watershed approach.
- Any projected cost analysis been done for all these improvements?
- Hillside pays taxes on MOA services they don't use – Muni argues that Hillside residents use the in-town roads, but in-town visitors also use Hillside roads when they come up to use the trails, etc., so why shouldn't the cost be spread around more?
- I pay 60% of my monthly house payments in property taxes and I see taxes written all over this plan...

Additional Comments Submitted

- RRSA's like Goldenview for roads. RRSA's to manage money for capitol improvements. Impact fees for developers and real enforceable drainage plans. ON a municipal level- how much revenue does Hillside provide and how much does it use?