

**SELDOVIA
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Wednesday
March 7, 2018



REGULAR MEETING
7:00pm
MULTI-PURPOSE ROOM

This page is intentionally left blank

**AGENDA FOR THE SELDOVIA PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MULTI-PURPOSE ROOM
Wednesday
March 7, 2018
7:00PM**

STONE PATRICK BATES CARLUCCIO
--

- A. Call to order;
- B. Roll Call;
- C. Approval of the Agenda;
- D. Approval of Minutes from January 3, 2018
- E. Public Comments Regarding Items Not on the Agenda;
- F. Public Hearings, Prior Notice;
- G. Consideration of Site Plans;
 - 1. Conditional Use Permit Application for SOS Response Team
 - A. Presentation by Staff or Commission
 - B. Public Presentation or Hearing
 - C. Commission Discussion
 - D. Action/Disposition
 - 2. Title 18 'Visibility at Access Points' amended DRAFT
 - A. Presentation by Staff or Commission
 - B. Public Presentation or Hearing
 - C. Commission Discussion
 - D. Action/Disposition
- H. Commission Business:
 - 1. Cedar St. Extension Update
- I. Staff Reports:
 - 1. Potential Upcoming Commission Considerations:
 - a. Variance Application
 - b. Petition To Vacate
 - c. Zoning
- J. Informational Items Not Requiring Action:
- K. Comments of the Public:
- L. Comments of the Commission:
- M. Next Meeting: Regular scheduled meeting, April 4, 2018
- N. Adjournment:

***If you require special assistance to attend the meeting,
Please, notify the City Office 24 hours in advance of the meeting and arrangements will be made.**

**Seldovia
Planning Commission
Contents Page
March 7, 2018**

Pages 1-4	Minutes of the Regular Meeting January 3, 2018
Page 5	SOS Conditional Use Permit Application
Page 6	SOS Requested Conditional Use Signage
Pages 7-9	Industrial District Code
Page 10	Trafficability Recommendations 3 and 4
Pages 11-13	Visibility at Access Points amended DRAFT

NOTES:

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES FROM THE SELDOVIA PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MULTI-PURPOSE ROOM
Wednesday
January 3, 2018
7:00PM**

PATRICK BATES CARLUCCIO STONE
--

- A. Call to order; MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:03PM BY COMMISSIONER CARLUCCIO
- B. Roll Call; IN ATTENDANCE; BATES, CARLUCCIO, AND STONE, PATRICK WAS EXCUSED
- C. Approval of the Agenda;
BATES/STONE MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA
NO OBJECTION/ MOTION CARRIED
- D. Approval of Minutes from October 4, 2017
BATES/STONE MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 4, 2017
CARLUCCIO- DISCUSSED AMENDING AN ERROR ON PAGE 1
SO MOVED/NO OBJECTION/MOTION CARRIED
- E. Public Comments Regarding Items Not on the Agenda;
WALT SONEN- Discussed that there was a public notice of permit posted at the post office concerning Backers Island, through the Army Corp, and asked if the city had any say on the permit. There is a vast bank the road will encroach on; will it become a public road?
CM CAMERON- Discussed that the notice of permit would be on the January 10th council meeting next week. The road does not start in city limits but will enter back into city limits and will be an agenda item.
STONE- Isn't that wet lands?
CARLUCCIO- Discussed that the notice of permit was not on the agenda, because it did not come under the planning and zoning guidelines.
- F. Public Hearings, Prior Notice;
- G. Consideration of Site Plans;
1. Rojas-Mickelson Request for Letter of Non-Objection for the Mickelson Building
- A. Presentation by Staff or Commission
CLERK/GEAGEL- Presented the Rojas-Mickelson's request for a letter of non-objection, along with a plat proposal and photos of the building and lot lines.
- B. Public Presentation or Hearing
VIVIAN ROJAS- Discussed that she was there in case there were any historical questions about the building in question. It was Frank Raby's shop for years and years. Part of the shop is on Church Street right of way, but mostly it is on the Church's property, part of the agreement with the church is to move the building in the spring. The borough is asking if there are any issues with the Mickelson building sitting there until the spring when it will be removable.
- C. Commission Discussion
CARLUCCIO- Read note number five on the proposed plat "approval of this plat by the Kenai Peninsula Borough does not grant approval to any encroachments. Existing structure will be moved in the future so that it does not fall within the right of way." The only thing they are interested in is the right of way. She asked staff if they could just write a letter of non-objection or if it would require a variance or conditional use. It would be nice to have a variance request with a sunset clause. Can you put that on the next agenda? If there is a problem they could potentially hold a special meeting.
CM CAMERON- Discussed that she thought they would need a variance request with a sunset clause stating that the building would be moved by a certain time.

D. Action/Disposition

NO ACTION REQUIRED AT THIS TIME

H. Commission Business:

1. Cedar St. Extension Update

CLERK/GEAGEL- Discussed that she spoke with one of the property owners that needed to agree to the replats a few weeks ago and was told that the owner had not received the letter explaining the request to extend Cedar Street. She resent the letter to the owner through email at the owners request after their conversation. It seemed from the conversation that the owner was hesitant to give a response as to her position on the replats until the co-owner had been reached. That has been a missing piece and without his approval, they cannot do anything anyways because they co-own the property. The owner had been in touch with her mother and Geagel contacted the mother as well at the owner's suggestion, to get the phone number of the co-owner, which was unfortunately not in-service. The mother will try to reach out to him as well, but at this time they are at a standstill until he can be reached.

CARLUCCIO- Inquired as to what they legally can do if the landowners cannot be reached, if it would be possible to invoke eminent domain, being in the best interest of the city and all the people around there to put in a road. Financially, the city would have to pay for the survey, but then the city would take as much as is needed from their property for the road. All the people on Cedar Street want the replats and it is being held up. She requested that if the landowners were unable to be reached by the next planning meeting that it be discussed with the attorney.

STONE- Asked if there was a timeline on how long they were going to try and reach him, and inquired that if they did invoke eminent domain would the city have to pay for the survey.

CM CAMERON- Requested that they set a timeline in the current meeting and inquired as to what their expectations were.

BATES- Inquired about the status of the current landowners that were unable to be reached, the co-owners are siblings.

2. Trafficability Recommendations 3 and 4- Visibility at Access Points

CLERK/GEAGEL- Presented the Trafficability Recommendations 3 and 4 that were referred from Council to the Planning Commission and listed on page 9 of the packet, the current code is on page 10 of the packet, with examples from other municipalities on pages 11-16. Page 11 is a very good example of visibility at intersections tied in with no parking at intersections.

WALT SONEN- Discussed that he does not recommend keeping #3 the visibility at access points triangle in the code because it encroaches on people's property, but he recommends #4 no parking ten feet from the edge of a driveway because it makes sense and 10 feet is not even a car length.

VIVIAN ROJAS- Thanked the Planning Commission for taking on these recommendations from Council. #3 would be a question of how to enforce and is somewhat more difficult when looking at scenarios around town and #4 would take care of some of those issues around town.

BATES- Discussed that in reference to #3 the 20x20 triangle is already on the books, they are not adding it, just down grading it to a 10x10 triangle. These are two separate issues, where you can park and what you can grow on your property.

STONE- Spoke in agreement that #4 made a lot more sense considering the way the roads are.

CARLUCCIO- Discussed that she found it very interesting to read what other municipalities have on the books. They cannot govern the state roads but there are state laws that do and the police officer is on contract with the state so that he can enforce state laws. All the examples given were good examples and visibility at access points should be reworded in zoning to make more sense. Do they want to include driveways in the visibility at access points? There is a difference between intersections and driveways where there is a setback and most property owners except along Shoreline Drive already should not be

planting or building in the 10 foot setbacks. She suggested it might be good to include a 1 foot wide clause in the visibility code so that people could have a tree as long as it is limbed that way those that have trees now would not have to cut them down. Mathematically #4 no parking would only need to be five feet from the driveway because the other five feet would be from the car. If they are going to ask people to not park so close to their driveways then they don't need a code enforcing visibility on people's properties.

CM CAMERON- Spoke in favor of Paulie's suggestions and discussed that it is not clear in the setback language what can be in the setback, only that it cannot be permanent.

CLERK/GEAGEL- Stated she would draft the changes for the next meeting.

3. Discussion on Existing Zoning Laws and Possible Changes

CM CAMERON- Discussed that this has been an ongoing discussion in the office about zones and how to explain zones to customers. She came up with a matrix with some of the more glaring issues, and with hopes of updating the zoning map. She is not asking for solutions tonight, but to begin the process and to consider how to connect the zoning laws with the fee schedule, which may not be possible currently with the codes. Current water and sewer rates are charged with how many services you have in each building, which is difficult to manage when services begin and end and it takes a lot of time. The goal is to clean it up and be more uniform with customers, right now the billing is very confusing for customers, and it is the responsibility of the owners to notify the office of any changes to services. She inquired as to what the options are for properties that are empty. The community's comprehensive plan is to build up Main Street. It is a fine line between putting the hammer down and encouraging businesses, should they go through each zone and make sure it is applicable to what is happening now?

VIVIAN ROJAS- Spoke in agreement with Cassidi. This is a tough one, they need to follow their guidelines and make it more clear with the fee schedule. The tough zone is Commercial Marine; customers are taking advantage of living in great spots with a view of the harbor. It is imperative to help the city office be it through either incentives or punitive. Right now it's not on people's radar to keep their businesses, they need to make the code enforceable and very clear. They make it pretty easy to not have a business; there is not enough incentive with people paying \$42.00 a month for water. To make any changes to how properties are zoned the owners need to be notified and in on the conversation. There could be incentive to have one month free in water if you are in business all year. The log cabin is just going to crumble.

WALT SONEN- Discussed the history of urban renewal, the building of the flats, and the beginning of Commercial Marine and how some property owners had perhaps parked a boat on their lots and fished a couple of seasons so they were considered Commercial Marine. It has always been a bother to see gorgeous properties right out front that don't comply, he would like to see the services rendered that are agreed upon when the properties are purchased.

SACHIKO SCOTT- Discussed that buildings in Commercial Marine were being used as residences and were not creating revenue for the city, but instead were only for personal use.

CARLUCCIO- Discussed the matrix presented. There are some good questions, one thing they cannot do is spot zone, but if changes make sense for more than one lot they could consider them. Properties along the water should definitely be waterfront. She stated that her understanding of Commercial Marine was that when they were originally sold they were supposed to put up a business, but then does that transfer when it is sold again? Can they put restrictions on properties for when they are sold of what they have to be legally? The Planning Commission does not have to consider any variances or building permits for buildings that are not in compliance. Commercial Marine needs to remain Commercial Marine it is prime property. They need to focus on where properties are zoned because they are not responsible for water rates. They could have some sort of fee for those not in compliance; she would like to see how other cities enforce zoning. What are the options for houses in commercial marine that are just residential, should they need to obtain a conditional use?

BATES- Inquired about the enforceability of property owners that are in violation, and asked why it was not updated when the zoning was in 2006. There are no timeframes on the fee schedule, is the penalty \$500 a day, a month, or a onetime fee? In a way it ties the hands of owners trying to sell, what investor wants to buy knowing they have to do something in set amount of time. If a business fails they will be penalized, that is not their job, their job is to make sure people are properly zoned. Zones should be just commercial, industrial, and residential, why make a stipulation between commercial marine and commercial waterfront?

STONE- Inquired how they could let one resident pay and the next resident does not have to. Why is it Commercial Marine, it should be focused on tourism.

I. Staff Reports:

J. Informational Items Not Requiring Action:

1. Findings of Fact- KPB Memorandum

K. Comments of the Public:

VIVIAN ROJAS- Thank you to your service of the City of Seldovia, great work.

WALT SONEN- Spoke in agreement with Vivian.

SACHIKO SCOTT- Thank you and thank you Cassidi.

L. Comments of the Commission:

BATES- Looks like we got a long road ahead here.

STONE- Thanked the public, Vivian, Walt, everyone, for bring up a lot of good points and the historical information helped and gave her a lot to think about.

CARRLUCIO- Thank you Rick and thank you Heather for coming tonight and being on the Planning Commission, it takes a lot of time and effort and she appreciates that. Thank you to the staff for putting everything together and Cassidi as the City manager for tackling all these tough issues, it is easy to just be complacent. Thank you to the public for coming to the meeting, it is always nice to have people from the public in the audience, keeps them on their toes.

M. Next Meeting: Regular scheduled meeting, February 7, 2018

N. Adjournment:

BATES/STONE MOVED TO ADJOURN AT 8:55 PM

I certify the above represents accurate minutes of City of Seldovia Planning and Zoning Commission meeting of January 3, 2018.

Heidi Geagel, City Clerk

Approved by Commission _____

CITY OF SELDOVIA
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
APPLICATION FORM
FEE: \$150.00

Name: SOS Response Team

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 194

Legal description of lot/lots: Parcel ID: 19201907 (See other Recovery Center)

Zoning District of lot/lots: Industrial

Description of neighboring land use: Perlys lot across the street (not in view of the sign) and boat yard / city lot.

Description of proposed use (include dimensional plot plan, and other maps and diagrams): A 80 inch X 36 feet wide triangle Removable Vinyl banner. Designed by Kathleen George.

Madeleine Cronin
Signature of land owner

7/9/18
Date

.....
Date Received: 07/14/18 For City Office use only
Receipt No: _____ P&Z Approval: _____
Public Hearing: _____ Attest: _____

THE WINNER!



Chapter 18.48 I--Industrial District

Sections:

- 18.48.010 Purpose.
- 18.48.020 Permitted Uses.
- 18.48.030 Conditional Uses.
- 18.48.040 Minimum Lot Size and Width.
- 18.48.050 Parking Area and Off-Street Loading Space.
- 18.48.060 Lot Coverage.
- 18.48.070 Building Setback.
- 18.48.080 Visibility at Access Points and Intersections.
- 18.48.090 Building Height.
- 18.48.100 Special Requirements.
- 18.48.110 Signage.

18.48.010 Purpose. This district is located and designed to provide an area suitable for the development of a viable industrial base for the community. Land adjacent the shoreline and located in Industrial Zone, shall be reserved for waterdependent and marine uses.

18.48.020 Permitted Uses. In the I District, permitted uses shall be as follows:

- A. Marine equipment sales, service, repair, construction and storage;
- B. Equipment sales, repairs and service;
- C. Seafood processing;
- D. Transportation and storage except for flammable, explosive or corrosive materials not for use on the site;
- E. Public utility plants;
- F. Manufacturing;
- G. Wholesale outlets and warehouses; H. Accessory uses;
- I. Retail sales.
- J. Attached residential dwelling units

18.48.030 Conditional Uses. The following uses shall be permitted if it is determined the requirements of Chapters 18.68 and 18.72 are met:

- A. Transportation and storage of flammable, explosive or corrosive materials;
- B. Gas stations.
- C. Signage uses in excess of those specified in Section 18.48.110
- D. Keeping of livestock may be permitted provided the provisions set forth in Chapters 18.48, 18.68, 18.72 are satisfied (Ord. 01-01, Ord. 17-05)

E. Marijuana cultivation facilities, manufacturing facilities, retail facilities, and testing facilities as defined by State law, SMC 18.78 and SMC Ord. 16-09. (Ord. 17-07)

18.48.040 Minimum Lot Size and Width. Lots shall be at least 20,000 square feet and have a width equal to or greater than 1/3 the length.

18.48.050 Parking Area and Off-Street Loading Space.

A. One (1) parking space is required for each four employees anticipated at peak operation levels plus 1 customer parking space for each 1,000 square foot of service area for uses which have local customers visiting the site.

B. One (1) off-street loading space measuring at least 60 feet long by 10 feet wide by 15 feet high, inside dimensions, shall be provided for each 20,000square foot of gross floor area.

C. Decks or Docks in this section shall be constructed to allow for the docking of water craft within the lot boundaries and in compliance with the provisions set forth in Chapter 18.48. (Ord. 17-06)

18.48.060 Lot Coverage. No minimum.

18.48.070 Building Setback. In the I District, building setback requirements shall be as follows:

A. Five (5) from all rights-of-way if the right-of-way meets existing requirements;

B. If the adjacent right-of-way is less than required by existing standards, the setback shall be equal to 1/2 the required right-of-way width plus 5 feet measured from the right-of-way centerline. Required right-of-way shall be that required by City plans or ordinance. If no City plan or ordinance exists, the right-of-way requirements of the Borough subdivision requirements shall apply;

C. Six (6) feet from all property boundaries not bordering right-of-way, unless adequate fire-walls are provided and adequate access to the rear of the building is otherwise provided. (Ord. 00-08)

18.48.080 Visibility At Access Points and Intersections. The following requirements apply to intersections of rights-of-way and to the intersection of exists from parking areas with a right-of-way. At the intersections, no fence, wall, hedge, or other planting or structure forming a material impediment to visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet shall be erected, planted, placed or maintained; and no vehicle so impeding visibility shall be parked within the triangular areas bounded by the right-of-way or driveway side-lines and a line joining points 20 feet along the intersecting right-of-way or driveway side line. (Ord. 00-08) (Ord. 06-10)

18.48.090 Building Height. Maximum building height shall be thirty-five

(35) feet measured from where the final grade meets the average of the two highest foundation corners. Below grade walls shall not exceed ten (10) feet and shall not cause the vertical height of the structure to exceed thirty-five (35) feet from where the final grade meets the average of the two highest foundation corners and not to exceed an overall height of forty-five (45) feet. (Ord. 00-08), (Ord. 0610).

18.48.100 Special Requirements.

A. Industrial uses located adjacent to Main Street shall provide pedestrian access from the ferry dock along Main Street

B. Water-dependent industrial uses shall be preferred along the waterfront. To be water-dependent, a use must meet the following criteria:

1. Requires a waterfront location or direct access to the waterfront to operate;

2. Provides goods and services essential to fishing, fish processing and marine transportation; and

3. Must be located in close proximity to fishing, fish processing and marine transportation activities to provide goods and services required by these activities.

18.48.110 Signage. Combined signage serving the Industrial District shall not exceed 15% of wall surface area as viewed from any lot line. (Ord. 01-01)

<p>#3 Replace all references to driveways in the "Visibility at Access Points" paragraphs in Title 18 – Zoning to reflect a 10' by 10' triangular area instead of the 20' by 20' currently.</p>	<p>The 20' by 20' triangle is difficult to maintain in many cases and the 10' by 10' triangle combined with a reduce speed of 20 miles per hour maintain an appropriate safety level.</p>		<p>See Title 18 for Visibility at Access points in all Zones</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>#4 Add a reference in the driveway portion of the "Visibility at Access Points" paragraphs in Title 18 prohibiting parking within 10' of a driveway.</p>	<p>This is connected to #3 above. If you approve #3 (10' X10' triangle) it would make sense that there should be no parking on the street adjacent to that sight triangle. Parking 10' away from the edge of the driveway would support the sight triangle.</p>		<p>See Title 18 for Visibility at Access points in all Zones</p>	<p>YES</p>

CITY OF SELDOVIA

ORDINANCE 18-xx

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SELDOVIA, ALASKA,
AMENDING TITLE 18.32.100, 18.36.090, 18.40.080, 18.44.080, 18.48.080, 18.52.080, 18.56.070
VISIBILITY AT ACCESS POINTS TO VISIBILITY AT INTERSECTIONS

SECTION 1. CLASSIFICATION. This ordinance is permanent in nature and shall become a part of the Municipal Code of the City of Seldovia.

SECTION 2. AMENDING TITLE 18.32.100, 18.36.090, 18.40.080, 18.44.080, 18.48.080, 18.52.080, 18.56.070 VISIBILITY AT ACCESS POINTS BY REMOVING LANGUAGE IN STRIKEOUT AND ADDING LANGUAGE IN HIGHLIGHT TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

18.32.100 Visibility at Access-Points Intersections. ~~The following requirements apply to intersections of rights-of-way and to the intersection of exits from parking areas with a right-of-way. At the intersections, no fence, wall, hedge, or other planting or structure forming a material impediment to visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet shall be erected,, planted, placed or maintained; and no vehicle so impeding visibility shall be parked within the triangular areas bounded be the right-of-way or driveway side lines and a line joining points 20 feet along the intersecting right-of-way or driveway side line. (Ord. 06-10)~~

A. No vehicle shall be parked within thirty feet (30') of any street intersection;

B. To ensure that a vehicle's driver has good visibility at street intersections, on corner lots both public and privately owned, there shall not be a fence, wall, hedge, planting or structure, or other obstacle including vehicles that will impede visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet and greater than one foot wide above the centerline grades of the intersecting streets unless parked in already approved and designated parking area.

18.36.090 Visibility at Access-Points Intersections. ~~The following requirements apply to intersections of rights-of-way and to the intersection of exits from parking areas with a right-of-way. At the intersections, no fence, wall, hedge, or other planting or structure forming a material impediment to visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet shall be erected,, planted, placed or maintained; and no vehicle so impeding visibility shall be parked within the triangular areas bounded be the right-of-way or driveway side lines and a line joining points 20 feet along the intersecting right-of-way or driveway side line. (Ord. 06-10)~~

A. No vehicle shall be parked within thirty feet (30') of any existing municipality street intersection;

B. To ensure that a vehicle's driver has good visibility at street intersections, on corner lots both public and privately owned, there shall not be a fence, wall, hedge, planting or structure, or other obstacle including vehicles that will impede visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet and greater than one foot wide above the centerline grades of the intersecting streets unless parked in already approved and designated parking area.

18.40.080 Visibility at Access-Points Intersections. ~~The following requirements apply to intersections of rights-of-way and to the intersection of exits from parking areas with a right-of-way. At the intersections, no fence, wall, hedge, or other planting or structure forming a material impediment to visibility between a height of 2-1/3~~

feet and 8 feet shall be erected, planted, placed or maintained; and no vehicle so impeding visibility shall be parked within the triangular areas bounded by the right-of-way or driveway side lines and a line joining points 20 feet along the intersecting right-of-way or driveway side line. (Ord. 00-08)

A. No vehicle shall be parked within thirty feet (30') of any existing municipality street intersection;

B. To ensure that a vehicle's driver has good visibility at street intersections, on corner lots both public and privately owned, there shall not be a fence, wall, hedge, planting or structure, or other obstacle including vehicles that will impede visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet and greater than one foot wide above the centerline grades of the intersecting streets unless parked in already approved and designated parking area.

18.44.080 Visibility At Access Points and Intersections. The following requirements apply to intersections of rights-of-way and to the intersection of exits from parking areas with a right-of-way. At the intersections, no fence, wall, hedge, or other planting or structure forming a material impediment to visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet shall be erected, planted, placed or maintained; and no vehicle so impeding visibility shall be parked within the triangular areas bounded by the right-of-way or driveway side lines and a line joining points 20 feet along the intersecting right-of-way or driveway side line.

A. No vehicle shall be parked within thirty feet (30') of any existing municipality street intersection;

B. To ensure that a vehicle's driver has good visibility at street intersections, on corner lots both public and privately owned, there shall not be a fence, wall, hedge, planting or structure, or other obstacle including vehicles that will impede visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet and greater than one foot wide above the centerline grades of the intersecting streets unless parked in already approved and designated parking area.

18.48.080 Visibility At Access Points and Intersections. The following requirements apply to intersections of rights-of-way and to the intersection of exits from parking areas with a right-of-way. At the intersections, no fence, wall, hedge, or other planting or structure forming a material impediment to visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet shall be erected, planted, placed or maintained; and no vehicle so impeding visibility shall be parked within the triangular areas bounded by the right-of-way or driveway side lines and a line joining points 20 feet along the intersecting right-of-way or driveway side line. (Ord. 00-08) (Ord. 06-10)

A. No vehicle shall be parked within thirty feet (30') of any existing municipality street intersection;

B. To ensure that a vehicle's driver has good visibility at street intersections, on corner lots both public and privately owned, there shall not be a fence, wall, hedge, planting or structure, or other obstacle including vehicles that will impede visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet and greater than one foot wide above the centerline grades of the intersecting streets unless parked in already approved and designated parking area.

18.52.080 Visibility at Access Points and Intersections. The following requirements apply to intersections of rights-of-way and to the intersection of exits from parking areas with a right-of-way. At the intersections, no fence, wall, hedge, or other planting or structure forming a material impediment to visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet shall be erected, planted, placed or maintained; and no vehicle so impeding visibility shall be parked within the triangular areas bounded by the right-of-way or driveway side lines and a line joining points 20 feet along the intersecting right-of-way or driveway side line. (Ord. 00-08) (Ord. 06-10)

A. No vehicle shall be parked within thirty feet (30') of any existing municipality street intersection;

B. To ensure that a vehicle's driver has good visibility at street intersections, on corner lots both public and privately owned, there shall not be a fence, wall, hedge, planting or structure, or other obstacle including vehicles that will impede visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet and greater than one foot wide above the centerline grades of the intersecting streets unless parked in already approved and designated parking area.

~~18.56.070 Visibility at Access Points and Intersections. The following requirements apply to intersections of rights of way and to the intersection of exists from parking areas with a right of way. At the intersections, no fence, wall, hedge, or other planting or structure forming a material impediment to visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet shall be erected, planted, placed or maintained, and no vehicle so impeding visibility shall be parked within the triangular areas bounded by the right of way or driveway side lines and a line joining points 20 feet along the intersecting right of way or driveway side line. (Ord. 00-08)~~

A. No vehicle shall be parked within thirty feet (30') of any existing municipality street intersection;

B. To ensure that a vehicle's driver has good visibility at street intersections, on corner lots both public and privately owned, there shall not be a fence, wall, hedge, planting or structure, or other obstacle including vehicles that will impede visibility between a height of 2-1/3 feet and 8 feet and greater than one foot wide above the centerline grades of the intersecting streets unless parked in already approved and designated parking area.

SECTION 4. EFFECTIVE DATE. This ordinance becomes effective upon its adoption by the City Council.

ADOPTED by a duly constituted quorum of the City Council of the City of Seldovia, Alaska this ____ day of _____, 2018.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Heidi Geagel, City Clerk

Dean Lent, Mayor

Vote:
Colberg-
Campbell-
Morrison-
Rojas-
Lethin-
Sweatt-

