

**HAINES BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORKSESSION MINUTES
MARCH 18, 2004**

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** 6:00pm
2. **PLEDGE TO FLAG:** Led by Dawne **THOMSEN**.
ROLL CALL:

Present: Dawne **THOMSEN** (chair), Rob **GOLDBERG**, Lee **HEINMILLER**,
Bill **STACY**, Jim **STANFORD**, Herb **VANCLEVE**

Absent: Harriet **BROUILLETTE**

Staff Present: **SCOTT HANSEN** (Administrative Assistant)

Visitors: Dan **COLEMAN**, Patricia **BLANK**, Al **GILLIAM**, Pam
COULTER, Carolyn **WEISHAHN**, Lucy **HARRELL** (Borough Assembly
representative), Stephanie **SCOTT** (Borough Assembly)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

M/S STANFORD/GOLDBERG to approve the agenda.

Motion passed unanimously.

3. NEW BUSINESS:

a) Draft Comprehensive Plan

STANFORD reported that in Wednesday's meeting the Borough Assembly did not approve the submitted Comprehensive Plan for introduction and wanted the Commission to perform one more public hearing on the document. **THOMSEN** expressed satisfaction that the document had come this far. **GOLDBERG** noted the hundreds of corrections made to the document throughout the planning process. **HARRELL** noted the existing time constraint and suggested that since the substance of the document is virtually complete they approve the Plan so that the Assembly may put ordinances in place. It is possible that the document will be changed after the Assembly's public hearing process. She described a number of economic development projects and others needing the support of a Comprehensive Plan for their success. Added to this is an 18-month consolidation time constraint, so she recommended that the document pass immediately. **STANFORD** suggested that there is more time than is perceived, and the document should be done right the first time, even if it takes longer. He suggested a second meeting to handle written public comments received after some deadline. **SCOTT** said that there is no reason for concern over a timeline,

and the commission can relax and work on the document. She noted that there has never been a true public hearing on the document as a whole. She said that the Borough has spent too much money on a consultant with incomplete results. She also said that the Plan doesn't really affect economic development projects as described by **HARRELL**. She cited a recent memo describing a conversation with the Manager and Local Boundary Commission staffer Dan Bockhorst and said that the memo releases immediate consolidation deadlines and significant need for the Plan to be able to pass land use ordinances. **STANFORD**, referring to the memo, stated that the memo does identify a time constraint. He also said that there have been numerous public hearings on sections of the Plan each time they were produced, and there's little difference after it's all put together. He said that few people attended these publicized meetings - he wished there were more, and he thanked the visitors present for their participation. He also said that the Plan is intimately tied to land use regulations and is necessary prior to passing land use regulations. After all, the heliport zone code language was rejected by the Assembly due to a missing Comp Plan. **VANCLEVE** agreed, saying that the Assembly can't both reject proposed land use code language and adopt language later using the same rationale. It can't be both ways. **HANSEN** said that funding for the consultant was from a grant from DCED, and the Commission decided who would complete individual portions of the Plan. The consultant took direction from the Commission. **STACY** questioned some of **SCOTT**'s blanket references to "City" and suggested that not all needed be changed to "Borough", such as police protection.

HEINMILLER suggested that the commission still target a quick completion date for the Plan, as the Assembly is required to have their own public hearing process. **SCOTT** objected, saying that the commission should have so completed the public process that there should almost be a "rubber stamp" through the Assembly - the process should be quick by that time. The public attention should be on the Commission - the Assembly's involvement is only technical. Figdor said that the Plan shouldn't be rushed along. **GOLDBERG** suggested that there be a deadline for comments and then the commission should have one more public hearing over the document. **HEINMILLER** suggested that the Assembly make some substantive comments prior to the deadline - all that's been seen so far is typos - no comments with substance have been offered. **VANCLEVE** agreed, noting that criticism to date has basically slowed the process. **STACY** noted that with each public hearing on the Plan there has been significant input, and it has been appreciated. Weishahn

suggested altering the future growth map and adding SUDs to the text. **STANFORD** noted that Fish and Game animal habitat maps need updating. **BLANK** expressed hope that many comments come in. Other, more specific changes were discussed and noted for change.

b) Recommendation to Assembly

M/S GOLDBERG/VANCLEVE to extend the Comprehensive Plan public comment period through March 29 and review written comments at an April 1 meeting.

Motion carried unanimously.

M/S STANFORD/STACY to make sure the Borough Assembly has a copy of the Comprehensive Plan by next Wednesday's meeting, and urge them to have comments in by March 29.

Motion carried unanimously.

4. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** no further comment

5. **MEMBER COMMENT:** no further comment

6. **NEXT MEETING DATE:**

- a. Comprehensive Plan public hearing - Thursday, April 1, 6:00 pm, in the Assembly Chambers
- b. Regular meeting - Thursday, April 8, 2004, 6:00 pm, in the Assembly Chambers.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

M/S STACY/HEINMILLER to adjourn.

Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted:

SCOTT HANSEN, Haines Borough Administrative Assistant