

PUBLIC COMMENT TRACKER

City of Homer, Alaska

Zoning Code (Title 21) Revision, March 2026 Public Review Draft

Updated June 30, 2026: This tracker now includes four additional sets of comments, comprising 20 individual comments, that were not included in the June 17, 2026 version. Comments submitted by City staff or Council members as part of their City role are not included in this tracker and were considered separately. Comments submitted by City staff or Council members as Homer residents are included.

This tracker summarizes all public comments received during the Public Review Draft comment period, along with corresponding recommended actions (Change, Partial Change, No Change, or To Be Determined) and team recommendations if a 'No Change' or 'TBD' is noted. It is organized in alphabetical order by topic. In reviewing comments, the project team considered all public input to date, including prior engagement activities and planning data. Revisions are recommended for incorporation where appropriate, and additional explanation is provided where requested changes are not recommended. In some cases, individual comments were divided into multiple entries to clarify the location, topic, or plan component addressed.

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
1	21.20.040(b)	Administrative Adjustments	shouldn't have a numbered list of only one item. It seems like administrative adjustments are a bit scattered across the title? There are approval criteria spelled out for variances, but nothing for administrative adjustments. I would like to see this bounded with some language.	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
2	21.20.040(b)	Administrative Adjustments	I would like to see a table comparing existing and proposed new administrative adjustments.	No Change	Provide this table as an educational item	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
3		"Levels"	For the different "level" requirements (site plans, drainage and erosion control, landscaping, others?) - is generally 1 the most stringent/robust, and then it gets less stringent/robust from there? It doesn't seem completely clear this is the case	No Change	No, level 1 is the least robust and 3 is the most.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
4		ADA / Accessibility	The Americans with Disabilities Act requires newly designed and constructed or altered State and local government facilities, public accommodations, and commercial facilities to be readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. The ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the activities of places of public accommodation (businesses that are generally open to the public and that fall into one of twelve categories listed in the ADA, such as restaurants, movie theaters, schools, day care facilities, recreational facilities, and doctors' offices) and requires newly constructed or altered places of public accommodation-as well as commercial facilities (privately owned nonresidential facilities like factories, warehouses, or office buildings) to comply with the ADA Standards. 42 U.S.C. 12181-12189.	No Change	ADA compliance is required for all new construction, regardless of zoning district, and is therefore not appropriate for Title 21.	5/14	Email	Franco	Venuti	Homer Planning Commission
5		ADA / Accessibility	There is no mention of ADA accessibility in this version of Title 21. It is important that we address this issue in our codes in order to assure that all individuals in our community have equal access to the property uses we are permitting in the City of Homer.	No Change	ADA compliance is required for all new construction, regardless of zoning district, and is therefore not appropriate for Title 21.	5/14	Email	Franco	Venuti	Homer Planning Commission
6	21.10	Administrative Adjustment	8a. 21.10.040 I am opposed to Administrative Adjustments in all cases because non-elected staff of uncertain tenure and qualifications should not be allowed to make decisions previously held by the Planning Commission or City Council. I am particularly opposed to using Administrative Adjustments to expand legal nonconforming uses. Our goal should be to restrict and eliminate nonconforming uses, not expand them. Please delete the concept of administrative adjustments.	No Change	Recommend keeping the one administrative adjustment in the public hearing draft: setbacks up to 2 feet.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	

Code						Project Team Recommendation				
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
7		Administrative Adjustment	21.10.040 Administrative Adjustments. a. An administrative adjustment is a process where applicants may seek minor and limited reductions, deviations or modifications from certain dimensional or site design standards of this title. Administrative adjustments may be approved through application and approval from the City Planner pursuant to Table 21.06.a. My comments: The City depends on public input to provide transparency to the processes of zoning. It is alarming to consider that the City Planning Commissions' decisions can be over-ridden by the City Planner. As a councilmember, I agree that the Homer Planning Commission should provide maximum local involvement in planning to implement and recommend modifications to the Homer Zoning ordinance, Title 21, and subdivisions Title 22. To allow any one individual, the City Planner, to over-ride the decision voted on by the Planning Commission is not in the best interests of the City.	No Change	Recommend keeping the one administrative adjustment in the public hearing draft: setbacks up to 2 feet.	4/1	Comment Form	Caroline	Venuti	City Council
8		Administrative Adjustment	21.05.020 City Planner c. Administration and enforcement functions and powers of the City Planner include, but are not limited to, the following: Table 21.06.a Review Matrix Administrative Adjustments Planning Department City Planner I DO NOT AGREE THAT THE CITY PLANNER SHOULD HAVE UNLIMITED ABILITY REGARDING ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT POWERS.	No Change	Recommend keeping the one administrative adjustment in the public hearing draft: setbacks up to 2 feet.	4/1	Comment Form	Franco	Venuti	Planning Commission
9	21.10	Administrative Adjustment	8d. There needs to be criteria for approval of an Administrative Adjustment, just as there are criteria for approval of a variance.	No Change	Criteria for approval is the same as the criteria for variance approval as stated in 21.10.050.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
10		Administrative Adjustment	21.10.040 Administrative Adjustments a. An administrative adjustment is a process where applicants may seek minor and limited reductions, deviations or modifications from certain dimensional or site design standards of this title. Administrative adjustments may be approved through application and approval from the City Planner pursuant to Table 21.06.a. I DO NOT AGREE THAT THE CITY PLANNER SHOULD HAVE THE ABILITY TO OVERRIDE THROUGH AN ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT, ANY DECISIONS MADE BY THE PLANNING COMMISION.	No Change	Staff does not have any override authority of Planning Commission decisions. Administrative adjustments are for certain standards, and in certain amouts, <i>before</i> or <i>instead of</i> Planning Commission review.	4/1	Comment Form	Franco	Venuti	Planning Commission
11		Administrative Adjustment	Highlighting an important KBWC comment - The Planning Team is pursuing a code framework that would grant the Planning Director unchecked power to allow nonconforming uses, when no survey indicates the public's desire for such a broad and significant undermining of basic zoning structure, and the Planning Commission as a body said that they thought this was a terrible idea.	No Change	Legal nonconforming uses (those that were legally established before zoning changes that disallowed the use) are, by law, required to be allowed to continue unless expanded or changed. There is no administrative power over nonconforming uses in the PRD.	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	
12		Administrative Adjustment	To be honest, I don't trust the current Planning Director or his team to represent the community's interests or needs; he has proven himself to do the opposite, seeking to change Homer in profound ways that no one has asked for and refusing to work on issues that the public, City Council and the Planning Commission want included in current code changes.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. Public input is a valued contribution to the development of the Title 21 update.	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
13		Administrative Adjustments	I am also opposed to any changes in administrative adjustments. I fear it will "move the goalposts" so to speak.	No Change	Recommend keeping the one administrative adjustment in the public hearing draft: setbacks up to 2 feet.	5/12	Email	David	Schneider	
14		Affordable Housing	It seems to me that the response from our community on a long range comprehensive plan has been in strong support for affordable housing, open spaces, and concerns over investors of B+B's, among other concerns.	No Change	Comment does not indicate a change to the ordinance	4/5	Comment Form	Annette	Bellamy	
15		Affordable Housing	Ask that Townhouses at least have a maximum size limitation so they are in fact affordable, and inclusionary zoning that requires new developments over 8000 sq.ft. to be zoned affordable per AMT.	No Change	Size of the units is not necessarily indicative of price. Other programs to guarantee long term affordability could be considered by the City outside of Title 21	4/5	Comment Form	Annette	Bellamy	
16		Affordable Housing	I hope you consider planning for the future with inclusion for affordability, environmental protection and continued quality of life in Kachemak Bay, Homer, Alaska.	TBD	See above comment regarding affordability. Environmental issues to be discussed at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	4/5	Comment Form	Annette	Bellamy	
17		Affordable Housing	Homer needs to emphasize and encourage development of more multi-unit dwellings, e.g. townhouses in the urban area especially. In zoning districts where townhouses may be conditionally permitted, a conditional use permit for a townhouse may be approved by the Commission if certain requirements are met. Increase flexibility of these by allowing them to be permitted in most zoning districts, e.g. GC1, CBD, and other.	No Change	Townhouses are a permitted use in NF, UR, M, RO, DMU, GBD, and LIMU	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission
18		Affordable Housing	The construction industry employs many people in town and we need more housing. I am concerned that these regulations may hurt both. For instance I have a neighbor building multiple tiny houses in the medical district and I'm concerned that under the new regulations we may not have buildings like this in the medical district. I also question the need for minimum lot sizes and building setbacks in this district as not much character would be harmed by more dense development.	No Change	No reduction in allowable uses, including housing types, is proposed in the M Medical district.	5/15	Comment Form	Jeremiah	Blake	
19	21.38.030(b)	Agriculture	It seems to be the intention in this draft to prohibit roosters anywhere within City limits. Is there support for this?	No Change	There was staff consensus to prohibit roosters. Could change based on Council direction	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
20	21.38.030(c)	Agriculture	This seems to prohibit an otherwise allowed use for home occupations allowed as an accessory use? How is a business sales office being defined?	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
21	21.38.020	Agriculture	29a. 21.38.020 You need to add pigs to this list. There's a house in the UR zone near West Elementary that has a pig in a Rural Residential District.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
22	21.38.020	Agriculture	29b. 21.38.020 You need to add High Tunnels, which are not included in the definition of "greenhouse".	No Change	A high tunnel is an accessory structure and not a "use"	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
23	21.38.020	Agriculture	29c. 21.38.020 Roosters should be allowed in RR districts. Their crowing is no worse than the sandhill cranes.	No Change	Best practice in a city is to prohibit roosters because of early morning noise issues.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
24		Building Code Adoption	I was looking forward to the City's adoption of a building code. Unfortunate that it couldn't happen.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	4/2	Email	Sava	White	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation		Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)						
25		Building Code Adoption	However, there is an opportunity here with the adoption of the Title 21 updates. An edit to the language in a few portions in this revision would allow for the development of horizontal and vertical construction to be consistent with time-tested and legally defensible building codes. There is language in these revisions that is conflicting within itself, and may potentially conflict with future code adoptions and implementations, as well as presenting significant legal and practical struggles for the City.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. Unsure what language is being referred to.	4/2	Email	Sava	White		
26		Building Height	Building Heights: 21.22.050, 21.23.050, 21.24.050, 21.25.050 My Comments: Changing the building heights in any area other than light industrial will negatively impact property values. The Homer view has value! The 35-foot height restriction works well and does not need changing. This is an important issue with the public. Residents do not see the need to build taller buildings as this will have a financial loss to the property owners. In the light industrial zone, there is a proven need (public input was used in this decision) for a 75-foot height restriction to allow marine trades to do business. This is good for the City financially. The Planning Commission voted for these changes.	Partial Change	Keep max. height in the DMU at 40 ft. Change max. height in the Gateway Business (GBD) to 35 ft. Change max. height in the LIMU to 40 ft. (retain exception for boat building)	4/1	Comment Form	Caroline	Venuti	City Council	
27		Building Height	Dimensions - Height: at this point, I don't support outright allowing heights greater than 40 feet anywhere, and absolutely not administrative flexibility for 75' in LIMU	Partial Change	Keep max. height in the DMU at 40 ft. Change max. height in the Gateway Business (GBD) to 35 ft. Change max. height in the LIMU to 40 ft. (retain exception for boat building)	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor	
28		Building Height	Building Heights 21.22.050 c Maximum Building Height is 40 feet 21.23.050 c Maximum Building Height is 40 feet 21.24.050 c Maximum Building Height is 50 feet 21.25.050 c Maximum Building Height is 55 feet WITH THE EXCEPTION OF BUILDINGS UP TO 75 FEET TALL IN THE LIGHT INDUSTRIAL MIXED USE ZONE FOR BOAT STORAGE OR BOAT CONSTRUCTION, I DO NOT AGREE THAT BUILDING HEIGHTS IN THE CITY SHOULD EXCEED 35 FEET. IN SCENIC HOMER, THE VIEW IS A VALUABLE ASSET ON ANY BUILDING SITE AND IS OFTEN AN IMPORTANT FACTOR IN ANY REAL ESTATE APPRAISAL AND OR PURCHASE. RAISING BUILDING HEIGHTS HAS THE POTENTIAL TO NEGATIVLY IMPACT PROPERTY VALUES BY BLOCKING VIEWS. HOMER DOES NOT NEED TO GROW VERTICALLY WHEN IT HAS THE POTENTIAL TO GROW HORIZONTALLY BY ANNEXATION.	Partial Change	Keep max. height in the DMU at 40 ft. Change max. height in the Gateway Business (GBD) to 35 ft. Change max. height in the LIMU to 40 ft. (retain exception for boat building)	4/1	Comment Form	Franco	Venuti	Planning Commission	
29		Building Height	I do not like increasing building height to 130'. If allowed by the permitted uses maybe should be broken in areas that do not impair peoples viewsheds or establishment of solar or wind generation.	Partial Change	Keep max. height in the DMU at 40 ft. Change max. height in the Gateway Business (GBD) to 35 ft. Change max. height in the LIMU to 40 ft. (retain exception for boat building)	5/15	Comment Form	Ole	Andersson		

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
30		Building Height	We appreciate that there is a gateway district but wish that the height restriction was lower. Homer is a tourist and marine trades town. Tourists do not come to Homer to see a place that reminds them of the cities they came from. A large building related to marine trades such as boat building might need to be tall, but not in the gateway district.	Change	Reduce maximum height in the Gateway Business District to 35 feet.	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	
31		Building Height	I am requesting that the height limit stay at 35' and go thur a permit process, when wanting to go higher. We actually have subdivisions in the Homer City Limits that have height limits, one at 19.9'. View!	Partial Change	Keep max. height in the DMU at 40 ft. Change max. height in the Gateway Business (GBD) to 35 ft. Change max. height in the LIMU to 40 ft. (retain exception for boat building)	5/15	Email	Scott	Adams	
32		Building Height	Homer is different than any other place, on the Kenai. Served by a small road system, to a large area to explore. Whether it be the Caribou Hill or Kachemak Bay and beyond. Some are asking Homer to change for money, or that's how we did it, from where I came. Homer isn't like any place we came from, so please stop trying. To make it there. We all arrived in Homer and fell in love with the small town and beauty of the area. That is Homer's draw, destroy it, and it's gone forever.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Scott	Adams	
33		Building Height	I also want to comment that I am against the higher heights allowed on buildings. Homer needs to keep the 35 ft height to preserve the nature of our town.	Partial Change	Keep max. height in the DMU at 40 ft. Change max. height in the Gateway Business (GBD) to 35 ft. Change max. height in the LIMU to 40 ft. (retain exception for boat building)	5/15	Email	Sara	Faulkner	
34		Building Height	The new standards for the DMU and GBD will completely alter the character of the city with buildings up to 5 stories tall and 80 % lot occupation. I do not agree with this modification.	Change	Reduce maximum height in the Gateway Business District to 35 feet and in DMU to 40 feet. Reduce building coverage maximum to 50ft	5/15	Comment Form	Liliana	Sotomayor	
35	21.24.050	Building Height	HCC 21.24.050 c. Reduce building height on the south side of the Sterling Highway to 50 35 feet. Let's protect Homer's view! Reason: High-traffic uses and excessive height directly conflict with the "Gateway" character and block the iconic panoramic view that define our community.	Change		5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
36	21.24.050	Building Height	21b. 21.24.050(c) Decrease Maximum Building Height to 35 feet. One of the goals of the Gateway Business District is to present a "positive first impression" of Homer. A 50-foot tall building would severely restrict one of Homer's biggest assets – its views.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
37		Building Height	5) Gateway District 50 foot height allowance baffles me completely. This is the prized view shed corridor for locals and visitors to enjoy as they come into town. Structures really should be even lower than the current 35 foot limit, so that our phenomenal open view remains in sight.	Change		5/15	Comment Form	Angie	Newby	
38		Community Design Manual	Where is the Community Design Manual authorized in code? It is approved by the Council (as noted in the definitions), but does it have a review timeline?	No Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
39	21.10.040	Conditional Use Permits	HCC 21.10.040 please clarify the reduced setbacks are not allowed from drainages, wetlands or steep slopes.	Partial Change	There are no required setbacks from wetlands.	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
40	21.09	Conditional Use Permits	7a. 21.09.030(f) This states that CUPs can be issued only if the proposal "will not be unduly detrimental to the health, safety, or welfare of the surrounding area or the City as a whole." This is one reason why the definition of "person aggrieved" needs to be broader than what it is. For example, under the current definition, a "person aggrieved" must be someone who has an interest in the proposed CUP that is different than the general public. With this definition, there is no eligible person/entity to represent "the City as a whole" when appealing a CUP on the basis that the proposed development will be detrimental to the "City as a whole". Please correct this.	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
41	21.09.040	Conditional Use Permits	7c. Chapter 21.09.040(b). Please add the following to the list of conditions that may be imposed on a Conditional Use Permit: i. Buffers for natural or constructed drainage ways ii. Buffers for high value wetlands iii. Slope setbacks iv. Easements for non-motorized transportation	TBD	Wetland, watercourse, and slope issues to be discussed at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session. Generally, it is not recommended that the City impose additional setbacks than what is required in the code.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
42	21.71.070	Conditional Use Permits	The CUP process should be left as-is, with possible addition of review criteria by COH Staff before going to HPC in order to streamline review. The HPC has an important role to play in reviewing COH development activity, plans, and other functions. As a public body, composed of Homer residents, it provides an insight to proposed developments that staff may not see. Additionally, the HPC is a public forum, open to the public. 'Administrative adjustments' allows for too much authority and review by COH Staff, versus allowing the HPC to review and have stronger decision making authority. Administrative Adjustments should not be used to expand legal nonconforming uses.	No Change	Only one administrative adjustment, to allow up to a 2-foot reduction in a setback, remains in the PRD. Maintain removal of the CUP requirement for buidlings over 8,000 Sf.	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission
43	21.09.040	Conditional Use Permits	HCC 21.09.040 b.12. Drainage buffers, wetlands, slopes and their setbacks, and easements.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
44	21.09.020	Conditional Use Permits	7b. Chapter 21.09.020(a). Please add the following to the list of required information that shall be provided on an application for a Conditional Use Permit: i. Location of natural or constructed drainage ways ii. Location and classification of wetlands iii. Location of slopes iv. Location of any easements, existing or proposed	Partial Change	Add location of slopes and easements. There are no required setbacks from wetlands or drainage ways.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
45	21.10.050	Conditional Use Permits	HCC 21.10.050 b. Financial hardship or inconvenience shall not be the sole reason for granting a variance. Reason: A variance shall not be granted for financial hardship or inconvenience regardless of the variance request is sole or part.	No Change	Comment does not indicate a change to the ordinance.	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
46	21.71.070	Conditional Use Permits	21.71.070 Permits, Plans and Reviews: Modify code to allow for development of review criteria that can streamline HPC CUP reviews. Site plans as in 21.73.030 should be a strict requirement for CUPs and constructed for understandable review by the HPC. 21.71.030: The existing criteria as listed should be revised such that HPC CUP reviews can be more streamlined.	Partial Change	Stricter requirements for site plan submissions so that plans are complete and legible for review. No change to CUP approval criteria are proposed.	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission
47		Conditional Use Permits	I think these should be subject to CUP: Schools and Educational signs in DMU; Boat Storage in Marine Commercial; Heavy Equipment Storage in LIMU.	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/12	Email	David	Schneider	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
48	21.09.050	Conditional Use Permits	The Conditional Use Permit process generally provides a reasonable process to review proposals that deviate from zoning limitations. However, we do not believe the process as currently defined in 21.09.0509(a), (b), and (c) works for large or complex projects. The 45-day period for city in (a) to (c) may be adequate for most small to moderate sized projects, but not for larger or more complex projects.	Change	Create an extension option for large or complex projects	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	
49	21.09.050	Conditional Use Permits	A recent, real-life case in point of a large project was the proposed Doyon Hotel and condo project at the base of Homer Spit. Realistically, as was the case with Doyon, the staff review and analysis for a large project takes a long time and is not released and made available to public until just before the public hearing, leaving little or no time for the public review and comment on their analysis. On the Doyon project, the public had less than a week to review the staff analysis.	Change	Create an extension option for large or complex projects	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	
50	21.09.050	Conditional Use Permits	We maintain that large and complex projects require more time for public and Commission review. We recommend a provision be included to allow for longer review timeframes for such projects. Perhaps a new section (f) could be added to allow the Planning Director or Planning Commission to extend review processes for up to 30 days longer for larger or more complex projects. This should include criteria or guidelines for such decisions in code to inform applicants and guide the Planning Director or Commission for making decisions on such extensions.	Change	Create an extension option for large or complex projects	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	
51	21.05.010	Decision Making Authorities	City organization has changed, and planning is a function of the Department of Community Development, not Administration.	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
52		Conditional Use Permits	Retain current language in Title 21 that requires conditional use permits for buildings with more than 8,000 square feet.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/14	Email	Landa	Baily	
53	21.09.020(b)	CUPs	Is there a time expectation for the Planner here?	No Change	No specific timeline required	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
54	21.09.050(b)	CUPs	What does “promptly” mean?	No Change	Policy has been consent agenda for next PC meeting. Address in policies and procedures if need be.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
55	21.09.060	CUPs	Is there a very clear process for revocation? This speaks to notice to permittee, public hearing, extension of time. What about recourse for no extension of time, and revocation? Penalties?	No Change	This is a violation of a permit. Revocation is possible in enforcement process.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
56	21.02	Definitions	1a. In the definition "Bed and Breakfast", the word "if" in the second line should read "where"; that is, the term "Bed and Breakfast" should be confined to owner-occupied residences. Please correct this.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
57	21.02.040	Definitions	HCC 21.02.040 Tiny House. The City doesn't need to define Tiny House nor declare that they are Accessory Structures as in HCC 21.37.030. Reason: A residential structure under 400sf could be the primary structure and over time there may be additions to the structure.	No Change	Consensus	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
58	21.02	Definitions	1c. The definition of "City Engineer", as a registered professional engineer, is in responsible charge of the City's technical engineering matters, much the same way the Fire Chief is in responsible charge of the City's fire safety/response matters. As such, the City Engineer should be appointed by the City Manager. Please correct this.	TBD	Need staff direction	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
59	21.02	Definitions	1b. The terms "Buffer, runoff" and "Buffer, stream" are defined as top of bank to top of bank. The "top of bank" is generally defined as the point along a streambank where an abrupt change in slope is evident. Sometimes, buffers need to include flood areas that go beyond top of bank. Please provide a correct definition for "top of bank" and "buffer".	Partial Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
60	21.02.040	Definitions	1n. The definition of "Person Aggrieved" is too limiting. Should delete the second sentence. For example, the Planning Commission, when reviewing CUPs, has the authority to impose "conditions necessary to protect the interests of the community and surrounding area". But who would represent the community and surrounding area if a member of the general public is excluded as an aggrieved person? You also see this issue arise in the matter of variances, which have as a criterion, "granting the variance...will not be detrimental to the public's health, safety, or welfare." Please correct this.	TBD	Pending legal review	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
61	21.02.040	Definitions	HCC 21.02.040 Greenhouse and High tunnels should not imply that items offered are for sale.	No Change	In this case, the definition corresponds with a specific retail use listed in the use table. It does not apply to the common definition of a "greenhouse".	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
62	21.02	Definitions	1e. RE: Definition of "gardening, personal use". Does this definition include a personal high tunnel? If so, please specify because High Tunnels aren't talked about anywhere else.	Partial Change	In this context, the definition refers to a use, not a particular structure. Structures like high tunnels would be considered under the definition of Accessory Structure. Recommend listing high tunnels and other similar structures in the Accessory Structure definition.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
63	21.02	Definitions	1f-i. Definition of "greenhouse" should include High Tunnels, which are not always "controlled temperature and humidity environments".	Partial Change	In this context, the definition refers to a use, not a particular structure. Structures like high tunnels would be considered under the definition of Accessory Structure. Recommend listing high tunnels and other similar structures in the Accessory Structure definition.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
64	21.02	Definitions	1d. Definition of "Comp Plan" needs to mention the term "land use". Please correct this.	No Change	The current definition includes "physical" development, which is inclusive of land use.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
65	21.02	Definitions	1f-ii. High tunnels are not always used to sell plants.	Partial Change	In this context, the definition refers to a use, not a particular structure. Structures like high tunnels would be considered under the definition of Accessory Structure. Recommend listing high tunnels and other similar structures in the Accessory Struct	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	

Code					Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
66	21.02	Definitions	1f-iii. OR – have a definition for High Tunnels.	Partial Change	In this context, the definition refers to a use, not a particular structure. Structures like high tunnels would be considered under the definition of Accessory Structure. Recommend listing high tunnels and other similar structures in the Accessory Struct	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
67	21.02	Definitions	1g. Definition of "Guest Room" needs to include Short Term Rentals. Please correct this.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
68	21.02	Definitions	1q. Definition of "School" needs to exclude home schooling.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
69	21.02	Definitions	1r. Definition of "sediment" needs to include material not necessarily caused by erosion; for example, it should include material triggered by road sanding, cleaning storm drains or gutters, and construction activities.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
70	21.02	Definitions	1h. Definition of "Home Occupation" should include BnBs and Short-Term Rentals because they are businesses. Please correct this.	No Change	STRs and BnBs were purposely left out of this definition because they are addressed in a specific chapter (Chapter 21.50). The issue of STRs will be discussed at the 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
71	21.02	Definitions	1j. Manufactured Home – why is there a cutoff of June 15, 1976?	No Change	This is the date that the Home Construction and Safety Standards (often called the HUD Code) that established standards for manufactured homes went into effect.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
72	21.02	Definitions	1k. Mobile Homes – why is there a cutoff of June 15, 1976?	No Change	This is the date that the Home Construction and Safety Standards (often called the HUD Code) that established standards for manufactured homes went into effect.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
73	21.02	Definitions	1l. Why do definitions of "Motels" and "Hotels" exclude hostels and BnB?	No Change	Hostels and Bed and Breakfasts are defined separately	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
74	21.02	Definitions	1m. Definition of "Open Space" has conflicting language. It includes picnic areas and playgrounds but not "outdoor recreation facilities". Please correct this.	No Change	Outdoor recreation facilities ("Recreation facility, outdoor") is defined separately and generally includes larger sports facilities.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
75	21.02	Definitions	1o. The definition of "Pollution" here is different than the definition in HCC 13.04.	No Change	Definitions in Title 21 include "pollutant", "pollution, nonpoint source", and "pollution, point source". The definition in 13.04 is appropriate within the context of that chapter.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
76	21.02	Definitions	1p. Why are BnB's excluded from the definition of "rooming house"?	No Change	Rooming houses do not require owner occupancy, whereas BnBs do.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
77	21.02	Definitions	1s. Definition of "Stormwater management" needs to include changes to the land from natural causes.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
78	21.02	Definitions	1t. Should have a definition for Solid Waste and it should include "junk".	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
79	21.02	Definitions	1u. Remove the word "Transient" from the definition of Worker Housing; that is, employers should be allowed to provide permanent worker housing, whether the employees are seasonable or year-round.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
80	21.61.040	Definitions	Sediment': needs to include material not necessarily caused by erosion; for example, it should include material generated by road sanding, cleaning storm drains or gutters, and construction activities. 'Slope': Include in addition the following: Slope can be calculated in GIS and expressed in terms of percent slope or degree slope. GIS generated slope maps can assist in planning and permitting review. 'Stormwater management' needs to include changes to the land from natural causes.	Change		5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
81	21.61.040	Definitions	'Wetlands' Need to include the following definition: Wetlands are ecosystems where water covers the soil—or is present at/near the surface—all year or for varying periods, including during the growing season. Wetlands are transitional areas between dry land and water bodies (like lakes or rivers), characterized by water-saturated soils (hydric soils) and plants adapted to low-oxygen environments, and serve important environmental functions in a community.	Partial Change	Update the definition of wetland, but not to include entire ecosystems.	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
82		Definitions	On the permitted uses, what do the letters stand for?	No Change	Allowed/permitted (P), Allowed Accessory (A), Conditional (C), and Not Allowed (blank)	4/1	Email	Marianne	Schlegelmilch	
83	21.61.040	Definitions	'geohazards.' Include this in definitions. This is a term that has been in the discussions with HPC for the last two years at least, and includes bluff slope stability, landslide risk, tsunami, and other geologically related hazards; and commonly used in planning with reference to these subjects. 'GIS': geographic information systems. 'Helipad': A helipad is a designated, often small and flat, landing area used by helicopters, powered lift, and vertical take-off and landing (VTOL) aircraft to take off and land safely. These hard surfaces are typically marked with a large 'H,' often located on rooftops, at hospitals, on ships, or at a private site.	No Change	The words "geohazard" and "GIS" are not currently used in the zoning code. There is a definition of helipad in the proposed code.	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
84	21.61.040	Definitions	'Hydrograph': A GIS database containing detailed stream mapping based on LiDAR elevation data, which includes stream orders from small to large, and provides a tool for assessing response of drainages to flooding and other discharge. Key uses of hydrograph are flood prediction and management; modeling how urban development affects runoff; and identifying peak flood times; stormwater system design for example calculating flow rates to design safe capacity for stormwater and sewer networks; and watershed analysis, for example determining the impact of topography and land use on streamflow.	No Change	The word "hydrograph" is not currently used in the proposed code.	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	

#	Code Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation (If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
85	21.61.040	Definitions	'land use' or 'land use plan': Include definition as follows: Municipal land use is the planned allocation, regulation, and management of land within city limits by local governments. It directs urban growth by designating specific areas for residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational purposes, ensuring efficient infrastructure, public safety, and managed development to prevent haphazard growth. 'Open space': The following should be added to the definition: greenways, conservation areas. Open space provides environmental, recreational, and cultural functions for a city.	No Change	In the context of the zoning code, the land use plan specifically refers to the adopted Comprehensive Plan's future land use plan.	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
86	21.61.040	Definitions	'peatlands' Need to include with the following or similar definition: Peatlands are a type of wetland ecosystem characterized by waterlogged conditions that prevent plant material from fully decomposing, leading to the accumulation of organic matter called peat. They act as vital, long-term carbon sinks, covering roughly 3% of the Earth's surface while storing approximately 30% of its terrestrial soil carbon. Major types include bogs (fed by rain, acidic) and fens (fed by groundwater, nutrient-rich). Vegetation is often dominated by Sphagnum mosses, sedges, and shrubs in cooler climates. Peatlands support specialized flora and fauna, serving as important habitats.	No Change	The word "peatlands" is not used in the proposed code.	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
87	21.61.040	Definitions	'Sediment': needs to include material not necessarily caused by erosion; for example, it should include material generated by road sanding, cleaning storm drains or gutters, and construction activities. 'Slope': Include in addition the following: Slope can be calculated in GIS and expressed in terms of percent slope or degree slope. GIS generated slope maps can assist in planning and permitting review. 'Stormwater management' needs to include changes to the land from natural causes. 'Wetlands': Wetlands are ecosystems where water covers the soil—or is present at/near the surface—all year or for varying periods, including during the growing season. Wetlands are transitional areas between dry land and water bodies, characterized by water-saturated soils (hydric soils) and plants adapted to low-oxygen environments, and serve important environmental functions in a community.	No Change		5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission
88		Definitions	I also suggest the City consider clearer language for "detached dwelling." I understand the term may be common in zoning, but it can sound unnecessarily technical or relational. "Standalone dwelling" or "freestanding dwelling" is easier for ordinary property owners to understand. At minimum, the definition should clarify that a detached dwelling means a freestanding residential structure, such as a house or cabin, and not only something detached from an existing primary building.	Change		5/15	Email	Whitney	Cushing	
89	21.61.040	Definitions	'geohazards.' Include this in definitions. This is a term that has been in the discussions with HPC for the last two years at least, and includes bluff slope stability, landslide risk, tsunami, and other geologically related hazards; and commonly used in planning with reference to these subjects. 'GIS': geographic information systems. 'Hydrograph': A GIS database containing detailed stream mapping including stream orders from small to large, and providing a tool for assessing response of drainages to flooding and other discharge. Key uses of hydrograph are flood prediction and management: Modeling how urban development affects runoff and identifying peak flood times; Stormwater System Design: Calculating flow rates to design safe capacity for stormwater and sewer networks; Watershed Analysis: Determining the impact of topography and land use on streamflow.	No Change	The words "geohazard" and "GIS" are not currently used in the zoning code. There is a definition of helipad in the proposed code.	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation (If no change or TBD)		Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment								
90	21.61.040	Definitions	'land use' or 'land use plan': Include definition as follows: Municipal land use is the planned allocation, regulation, and management of land within city limits by local governments. It directs urban growth by designating specific areas for residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational purposes, ensuring efficient infrastructure, public safety, and managed development to prevent haphazard growth. 'Open space': The following should be added to the definition: greenways, conservation areas. Open space provides environmental, recreational, and cultural functions for a city.	No Change	In the context of the zoning code, the land use plan specifically refers to the adopted Comprehensive Plan's future land use plan.	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission	
91	21.61.040	Definitions	'peatlands' Need to include with the following or similar definition: Peatlands are a type of wetland ecosystem characterized by waterlogged conditions that prevent plant material from fully decomposing, leading to the accumulation of organic matter called peat. They act as vital, long-term carbon sinks, covering roughly 3% of the Earth's surface while storing approximately 30% of its terrestrial soil carbon. Major types include bogs (fed by rain, acidic) and fens (fed by groundwater, nutrient-rich). Vegetation is often dominated by Sphagnum mosses, sedges, and shrubs in cooler climates. Peatlands support specialized flora and fauna, serving as important habitats.	No Change	The word "peatlands" is not used in the proposed code.	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission	
92	21.02.040	Definitions	“Agricultural activity” - check Christmas tree plantation against the “Timber growing, harvesting and forest crops” definition later on. I think there’s confusing overlap here	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor	
93		Definitions	The draft also raises a concern by treating "Tiny Home" as a separate land use. If a detached dwelling is allowed, then a smaller detached dwelling should also be allowed unless there is a specific health, safety, utility, or building-code issue. The code should not create an indirect minimum house size by allowing detached dwellings but excluding tiny homes. If the concern is tiny homes on wheels, RV-style units, or temporary occupancy, those issues should be addressed directly without limiting permanent small homes or cabins.	No Change	Intent is to allow Tiny Homes wherever Detached Dwellings are allowed.	5/15	Email	Whitney	Cushing		
94		Definitions	This is not just a theoretical issue. With the rising cost of materials, labor, and time, the difference between building a 200-square-foot home and a 400-square-foot home can easily exceed \$50,000, especially if the larger project can no longer be completed without substantial contractor involvement. Those costs are ultimately reflected in rent. Larger homes are important for families, but Homer also needs more attainable options for one and two-person households, especially where city services are available or can reasonably be extended. Larger, more expensive projects are more likely to require debt, delay completion, and make housing production less financially realistic in what is already a tenuous proposition.	No Change	Intent is to allow Tiny Homes wherever Detached Dwellings are allowed.	5/15	Email	Whitney	Cushing		
95	21.02.040	Definitions	“Bed and breakfast” - state directly in the definition that a bed and breakfast is by definition a type of short term rental (as defined in this section).	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor	
96	21.03.040	Definitions	21.03.040 Definitions - Proposed new and modified buffer/road/drainage definitions: "Area road buffer" means a certain percentage of open space left in its natural or landscaped state to provide a permeable surface between the impervious road surfaces from parking lot or sidewalk surfaces except rights of ways. "Buffer, road" means a certain percentage of open space left in its natural or landscaped state to provide a permeable surface between the impervious road surfaces from parking lot or sidewalk surfaces except rights of ways. "Street buffer" means a strip of green space needed between the road and the property especially if parking is in the front of the lot.	No Change	These terms are not yet used in the ordinance. If changes are made to impervious surface regulations, appropriate definitions will be added.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand		

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
97	21.03.040	Definitions	"Clearing, selective" means the careful strategic removal of trees and brush from the land, to consider repercussions to adjoining neighbours to avoid conflict from dust, wind, light trespass, privacy, view. "Development, new" means development on a site that was previously unimproved undisturbed or unaltered or that has had previously existing buildings demolished. "Direct discharge" means the concentrated release of stormwater to tidal waters or vegetated tidal wetlands from new development or redevelopment projects in critical habitat areas that considers adverse effects of discharge into unsuspecting ecosystems or food webs. "Improve" is an archaic obsolete term when describing the natural world. Man can not "improve" the natural world he alters it. A man-made structure however can be improved.	No Change	These terms are not yet used in the ordinance. If changes are made to impervious surface regulations, appropriate definitions will be added.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
98	21.03.040	Definitions	"Ecosystem Services" means the direct and indirect benefits that healthy natural environments provide to human well-being and survival. These essential contributions—which include air filtration and carbon storage by forests, water purification and flood prevention by wetlands, using drip lines and drainage areas for nonpotable water use, climate regulation, rye grass, willow growth and permeable surfaces to prevent erosion and natural disaster mitigation critical for sustaining life and the economy. "Green Infrastructure" mimics natural processes to manage water, reduce urban heat, and enhance resilience by using vegetation, soils, and natural systems. Key types include green roofs, permeable pavements, rain gardens, and urban tree canopies. These engineered solutions mitigate flooding, improve air quality, and provide habitat, creating healthier communities.	No Change	These terms are not yet used in the ordinance. If changes are made to impervious surface regulations, appropriate definitions will be added.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
99	21.03.040	Definitions	"Urban Forest" means is a dynamic ecosystem of trees, shrubs, and green spaces within cities and suburbs—spanning street trees, parks, and private gardens. Covering roughly 35% of U.S. urban areas, these forests serve as vital green infrastructure, mitigating heat, providing shade, improving air quality, and boosting community well-being. "Urban Wilderness" means informal green spaces and forests within urban areas distant enough from urbanized areas so that human activities cannot be registered. "Native vegetation" means native plant communities that are undisturbed or mimicked. "Permeable, continuous living ground cover" means landscaping surfaces made up of living plant materials as a green infrastructure to absorb, transpire and drain water to reduce erosion from less run off.	No Change	These terms are not yet used in the ordinance. If changes are made to impervious surface regulations, appropriate definitions will be added.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
100	21.03.040	Definitions	"Gardening, Community" means centralized vegetable gardens supported and operated by the city, local gardeners, or schools, as a city accessory to promote cooperative food security. "Open space" means an area reserved or developed for recreational uses or preserved for its natural amenities. Open space may include squares, parks, bicycle and pedestrian paths, refuges, campgrounds, picnic areas, playgrounds, bird habitat and gardens. "Open space" does not include outdoor recreation facilities. "Site plan" means a plan, to scale, showing the proposed use and development of a site. The plan generally includes lot lines, streets, points of vehicular access to the site, building sites, reserved open space, wildlife, bird or fish presence, existing buildings, major landscape features (both natural and manmade), and the locations of utility lines.	No Change	These terms are not yet used in the ordinance. If changes are made to impervious surface regulations, appropriate definitions will be added.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
101	21.03.040	Definitions	"Wetland, constructed" means engineered, human-made systems designed to treat wastewater, stormwater runoff, or graywater by mimicking the natural filtering functions of wetlands. They use plants, soils, and microorganisms to purify water, offering a sustainable, cost-effective alternative for pollution control, habitat creation, and flood control acting as a buffer, retaining stormwater to reduce peak runoff volumes. "Stormwater management, off-site" means the design and construction of a facility or green infrastructure, necessary to control stormwater from more than one development. "Stormwater management, on-site" means the design and construction of systems or green infrastructure, necessary to control stormwater within an immediate development site. "Stream" means any body of flowing water, including a river, creek, tributary, or other watercourse containing physical, chemical and biological ecosystem properties.	No Change	These terms are not yet used in the ordinance. If changes are made to impervious surface regulations, appropriate definitions will be added.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
102	21.02.040	Definitions	"Large Format Development" - why only defined as retail or wholesale business use? Would an office building complex not be considered a large format development?	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
103	21.02.040	Definitions	Suggest having a definitions of "steep slope", "floodplain"	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
104		Large Format Development	Dimensions - Building coverage vs. square footage maximum: I appreciate the move to percentage building coverage, however I don't support the removal of a square footage maximum. One reason is that Very Large Buildings are difficult to repurpose. You can drive through other communities and see closed, empty buildings taking up a LOT of real estate. I also don't believe the Comprehensive Plan supports this direction	Change	Revert to previous 15,000 sf. threshold.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
105	21.23.020	Downtown Mixed Use	21.23.020 a. Permitted Uses/Structures: Exclude mobile homes in DTMU especially along Pioneer Avenue, Lake Street and the Sterling Highway.	Change		5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
106	21.04.030	Definitions	Additionally, there are sentences and definitions that are taken directly from the various publications of the International Code Council that, although applicable, have no basis without a reference to the spiderweb of circular references of those publications, and do not relate to the local minutia and instead rely on the broader aspect of encompassing numerous and various conditions (i.e., 21.04.030 and building heights, alterations, impervious coverage, ADU).	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. Unsure what sentences are being referred to.	4/2	Email	Sava	White	
107	21.23.070	Downtown Mixed Use	HCC 21.23.070 d,e,f Replace the word encourage with mandatory language regarding the Community Design Manual.	Change		5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
108	21.23.060	Downtown Mixed Use	20e. 21.23.060(b) and (c) All developments in this district should be required to have a Level 2 drainage and erosion control plan. It is too confusing to have some developments require a Level 1 plan and others require a Level 2 plan in the same district. This is the Downtown Mixed Use District where drainage is (i) already a problem and (ii) important to the viability of parking lots, driveways, etc. Plus, development should not be allowed to adversely impact surrounding properties. Please address this.	Partial Change	Recommend adding the prohibition on impacts to other properties to Level 1 standards.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
109	21.23.070	Downtown Mixed Use	HCC 21.23.070 d. Buildings of less than 8,000 square feet are exempt from the siding and trim and color sections of the manual. Reason: Small-scale development impacts community character too, so visual appeal should be the standard regardless of square footage.	No Change	Removing this exemption would be an overly onerous requirement for small businesses / structures.	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
110	21.23.070	Downtown Mixed Use	20g. 21.23.070(c) Architecture for franchises should be required to conform to the Community Design Manual, not just "encouraged".	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
111	21.23.040	Downtown Mixed Use	20a. 21.23.40(c) Auto repair should not be allowed in Downtown Mixed Use, if it involves on-site storage of vehicles waiting to be repaired. This is unsightly and easily becomes a junk yard.	No Change	As a conditional use, appropriate conditions can be added for these uses to prevent the issues raised.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
112	21.23.040	Downtown Mixed Use	20b. 21.23.040(h) The need for a Traffic Impact Analysis should be triggered by probable impact, not merely by projected vehicle trips.	No Change	There needs to be objective criteria for the trigger. Probable impact is a subjective judgement by staff.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
113	21.23.050	Downtown Mixed Use	20c. 21.23.050 There should be a view protection clause that requires new developments to preserve the view corridors of existing buildings.	No Change	Requires that view corridors be defined, which is difficult, and impacts on property owners could be significant. This also gives owners of existing buildings significant power over development on property that could be far from their building.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
114	21.23.060	Downtown Mixed Use	20d. 21.23.060 Means for non-motorized transportation should be required, such as connection to existing sidewalks or trails.	No Change	This is addressed in 21.23.070(a)	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
115	21.23.070	Downtown Mixed Use	20h. 21.23.070(e) and (f) Artwork and high-quality materials should be required, not just "encouraged".	Partial Change	Require materials consistent with the Community Design Manual. Do not require artwork.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
116	21.23.070	Downtown Mixed Use	20f. 21.23.070(d) delete this sentence which exempts buildings of less than 8,000 from siding, trim and color sections of the Community Design Manual. Why should smaller buildings be allowed to be ugly?	No Change	Removing this exemption would be an overly onerous requirement for small businesses / structures.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
117		Downtown Mixed Use	I think we should exclude from Downtown Mixed Use: Mobile Homes; Marijuana cultivation.	Partial Change	Remove mobile homes from DMU, retain marijuana facilities.	5/12	Email	David	Schneider	
118		Downtown Mixed Use	1) Hotels and motels should definitely be a permitted use in the Downtown MU district. They are in this district already and there are still a few large undeveloped commercial parcels that are great sites for hotel/motel projects. 2) Offices for "tourism" should also be allowed in DMU. There are several year round tourism related service providers who may want a location in town vs on the Spit.	Change		5/15	Comment Form	Angie	Newby	
119	21.23	Downtown Mixed Use	20i. 21.23 There should be some qualitative standards for when a Traffic Impact Analysis is required.	No Change	There needs to be objective criteria for the trigger. Probable impact is a subjective judgement by staff.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
120	21.53.010	Drainage & Erosion Control	Consider adding a prohibition for the vacation of drainage easements without assessment of the drainage way not conveying water during peak flood times in spring and fall, and alternative drainage established	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
121		Downtown Mixed Use	The neighborhood bounded by Heath street to the east, the Poopdeck Trail to the west, Hazel Avenue to the south and Klondike Avenue to the north, is incompatible with Downtown Mixed Use (DMU), a more appropriate with the Urban Residential (UR) zoning district. From where I live on Klondike Avenue, I look out the front window and see the Bay Realty, the Homer Book Store, Cyclogical bike shop, The Star Wash car wash, The Grog Shop and Vida's Thai Food. When I look out the back window, I see no businesses, just a residential neighborhood. The differences are stark; the designation of zoning for this area requires finesse, not a broad-brush stroke.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Email	Ed	Gross	City of Homer, personal comment

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
122		Downtown Mixed Use	The proposed DMU code appears to be ideal for commercial uses that can be mixed with a residential component, such as businesses on lower floors and residences on upper floors. The neighborhood that I'm commenting on is residential, with small 6,000 square foot lots, and only a few businesses located near the edges of the neighborhood; Forget Me Not Flowers & Gifts, Preventive Dental Services.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Email	Ed	Gross	City of Homer, personal comment
123		Downtown Mixed Use	As indicated in the allowed uses table: Uses compatible with DMU not allowed in UR include: 1. Mixed-use buildings containing both residential and commercial uses (not including Home Occupations); 2. Conditional permit for Auto fueling stations; 3. Conditional permit for Auto, marine, and RV sales, rental, repair and storage; 4. Drive through establishments; 5. Entertainment establishments; 6. Farmer's market; 7. Garden supply and greenhouses; 8. Itinerant or transient merchants; 9. Marijuana cultivation facilities, manufacturing facilities, retail facilities and testing facilities; 10. Plumbing, heating, and appliance services; 11. Printing, publishing and bookbinding; 12. Retail businesses; 13. Retail and wholesale sales of building supplies and materials; 14. Self-service laundries; 15. Mobile food services; 16. Restaurants and clubs; 17. Financial institutions; 18. Medical clinics; 19. Offices; 20. Personal services; 21. Studios; 22. Libraries and similar institutions; 23. Museums; 24. Parking garages; 25. Parking lots; 26. Private exterior storage of occupant's personal noncommercial equipment; 27. Conditional permit for Light or custom manufacturing, fabricating and assembly.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Email	Ed	Gross	City of Homer, personal comment
124		Downtown Mixed Use	Most of the uses listed above are incompatible with a residential neighborhood. These uses would negatively affect this neighborhood's character and safety, with increased traffic, noise and odors. This neighborhood is essentially a residential island surrounded by businesses and institutions. Pioneer Avenue to the north, the east side of Heath Street, the Sterling Highway to the south, the present Town Center and Mainstreet to the west. This neighborhood is well situated for pedestrians to walk from to visit and support businesses located on these arterials.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Email	Ed	Gross	City of Homer, personal comment
125		Downtown Mixed Use	With the lack of housing in Homer, changing the prevailing nature of this neighborhood from residential to commercial, would further reduce housing options for the residents of Homer. At this time the neighborhood is in the Central Business District but this designation is inappropriate, as it has remained a neighborhood. The code rewrite is an opportunity to correct this mis-zoning. DMU should be related to commercial corridors where commercial uses exist or are appropriate; Pioneer Avenue, Sterling Highway, Main Street, Lake Street, Bunnell Avenue and Ohlson Lane.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Email	Ed	Gross	City of Homer, personal comment
126		Downtown Mixed Use	My name is Ed Gross and while I work for the City of Homer in the Planning Department, my comment is as a resident of Homer. The neighborhood bounded by Heath street to the east, the Poopdeck Trail to the west, Hazel Avenue to the south and Klondike Avenue to the north, is incompatible with Downtown Mixed Use (DMU), a more appropriate with the Urban Residential (UR) zoning district.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Email	Ed	Gross	City of Homer, personal comment

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
127		Downtown Mixed Use	From where I live on Klondike Avenue, I look out the front window and see the Bay Realty, the Homer Book Store, Cyclogical bike shop, The Star Wash car wash, The Grog Shop and Vida's Thai Food. When I look out the back window, I see no businesses, just a residential neighborhood. The differences are stark; the designation of zoning for this area requires finesse, not a broad-brush stroke.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Email	Ed	Gross	City of Homer, personal comment
128		Downtown Mixed Use	The proposed DMU code appears to ideal for commercial uses that can be mixed with a residential component, such as businesses on lower floors and residences on upper floors. The neighborhood that I'm commenting on is residential, with small 6,000 square foot lots, and only a few businesses located near the edges of the neighborhood; Forget Me Not Flowers & Gifts, Preventive Dental Services.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Email	Ed	Gross	City of Homer, personal comment
129		Downtown Mixed Use	As indicated in the allowed uses table, uses compatible with DMU not allowed in UR include: Mixed-use buildings containing both residential and commercial uses (not including Home Occupations); Conditional permit for Auto fueling stations; Conditional permit for Auto, marine, and RV sales, rental, repair and storage; Drive through establishments; Entertainment establishments; Farmer's market; Garden supply and greenhouses; Itinerant or transient merchants; Marijuana cultivation facilities, manufacturing facilities, retail facilities and testing facilities; Plumbing, heating, and appliance services; Printing, publishing and bookbinding; Retail businesses; Retail and wholesale sales of building supplies and materials; Self-service laundries; Mobile food services; Restaurants and clubs; Financial institutions; Medical clinics; Offices; Personal services; Studios; Libraries and similar institutions; Museums; Parking garages; Parking lots; Private exterior storage of occupant's personal noncommercial equipment; Conditional permit for Light or custom manufacturing, fabricating and assembly.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Email	Ed	Gross	City of Homer, personal comment
130		Downtown Mixed Use	Most of the uses listed above are incompatible with a residential neighborhood. These uses would negatively affect this neighborhood's character and safety, with increased traffic, noise and odors. This neighborhood is essentially a residential island surrounded by businesses and institutions. Pioneer Avenue to the north, the east side of Heath Street, the Sterling Highway to the south, the present Town Center and Mainstreet to the west. This neighborhood is well situated for pedestrians to walk from to visit and support businesses located on these arterials.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Email	Ed	Gross	City of Homer, personal comment
131		Downtown Mixed Use	With the lack of housing in Homer, changing the prevailing nature of this neighborhood from residential to commercial, would further reduce housing options for the residents of Homer. At this time the neighborhood is in the Central Business District but this designation is inappropriate, as it has remained a neighborhood. The code rewrite in an opportunity to correct this mis-zoning. DMU should be related to commercial corridors where commercial uses exist or are appropriate; Pioneer Avenue, Sterling Highway, Main Street, Lake Street, Bunnell Avenue and Ohlson Lane.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Email	Ed	Gross	City of Homer, personal comment

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
132	21.23	Downtown Mixed Use	The proposed classification of an area bordered by Poopdeck to Heath and Klondike to Grubstake is what I would like to address here. Referring to Chapter 21.23 on page 80, which proposes the purpose of this area to be classified as Downtown Urban Mixed Use, is less consistent with the current use of this land than Chapter 21.21 on page 74, Urban Residential District, which is far more consistent with the current use case of this neighborhood.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/14	Email	Amanda Rowan	Mulvey	
133	21.23	Downtown Mixed Use	When reading the purpose statement heading each of the indicated chapters it is immediately apparent that preserving the current neighborhood characteristics is not a primary vision or a stated priority for this proposed urban mixed use, whereas the purpose statement for the urban residential classification speaks immediately to the residential emphasis. It is primarily a residential neighborhood, that is how it was constructed, it is the current use, and the construction of the roads, intersections, utility grid and access points reflect this.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/14	Email	Amanda Rowan	Mulvey	
134	21.23	Downtown Mixed Use	If downtown mixed use classification were to be the future for this area, numerous changes would need to be made to the infrastructure in order to accommodate this. The lot sizes alone identify the area as being most appropriate for residential use. If downtown mixed use classification is implemented for this area, incongruent, unforeseen and unintended uses could stress and change this neighborhood which would then impact the larger area bordering it as well. The current residents, owners and users could experience changes that will alter the characteristics of the area that are not well suited to the current use of this land. There are other nearby and adjacent areas better suited for downtown mixed use classification and development.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/14	Email	Amanda Rowan	Mulvey	
135	21.23	Downtown Mixed Use	The lot sizes do not provide for the intensity of use indicated in the downtown mixed use proposal. The road and intersection widths would not accommodate an increase in large commercial vehicle use, snow removal and water runoff management changes, parking availability or significant increases in traffic volume. Fire and EMS response changes may also need to be implemented for this area if/when the proposed downtown mixed use changes occur. Impacts of noise, crowding, visibility, sight lines, and various fumes, odors, smoke, and exhaust may not be able to be well addressed by the downtown mixed use classification due to the small lot sizes and already established uses in place.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/14	Email	Amanda Rowan	Mulvey	
136	21.53.020(a)	Drainage & Erosion Control	I don't see any specification as to where that drainage is actually going. If someone creates an open-ditch construction, there should be some clear expectation that they aren't just dumping water onto downstream properties.	Change	Standard practice is: Any development that diverts stormwater must return the water to the same watercourse it originally flowed to. Add a statement that says water running off from subject property (due to the development) cannot cause a flooding problem for the downstream property.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor

#	Code			Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
137	21.53.030	Drainage & Erosion Control	Drainage and erosion level two: I would start by saying everything in Level one, PLUS additional. Same with Level three. It's redundant, and ordered differently across these three levels. Also, level three drainage and erosion control standards seem to be pretty much the bare minimum? Not much seems different between the three levels, aside from what triggers a SWP.	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
138	21.24.040	Gateway Business District	21a. 21.24.040 Delete these conditional uses because they are not compatible with the stated goals of the Gateway Business District: i. Auto, marine, and RV sales, rental and repair ii. Light or custom manufacturing, fabricating and assembly iii. Large format development iv. Uses that generate more than 100 trips per day	Partial Change	Delete auto rental and repair and manufacturing. Other uses can be evaluated appropriately (and conditions imposed that mitigate negative impacts) through the CUP process.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
139	21.53.020(b)(4)	Drainage & Erosion Control	I'm not sure Drainage is the correct word. Disturbed soil stabilization seems more appropriate	No Change	"Erosion control" refers to the soil stabilization issue.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
140	21.24.050	Gateway Business District	21d. 21.24.050(e) reduce maximum impervious coverage to account for the fact that much of the land in this district is on steep slopes, prone to erosion and landslides. Increasing impervious coverage exacerbates these risks.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
141	21.53.030	Drainage & Erosion Control	Have our fill standards always included a slope not to exceed 50%? Seems like a lot...	No Change	This fill standard has been in the code since 2011.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
142	21.58	Fences	I'm not sure why we have an entire chapter dedicated to fences.	No Change	Chapters are included for various standards that apply to all zoning districts, for ease of organization.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
143	21.58	Fences	(b) - four feet is not tall enough to keep out a moose, and this is not reasonable throughout much of our residential zoning districts.	No Change	Front yard fences are require to be lower than fences in the side or rear yards to maintain visibility from roads.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
144	21.58	Fences	(c) - This is presumably true of any obstruction, including fences, trees/shrubs, etc. See the following chapter and visibility at intersections section (21.59.050 (b). I believe this fences chapter is redundant and unnecessary.	No Change	Retain the chapter to facilitate any additional fence standards that may be added in the future.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
145	21.24.050	Gateway Business District	21c. 21.24.050(d) Reduce maximum building coverage to 8,000 SF or 30%, again to preserve the position first impression of view and open space.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
146	21.24	Gateway Business District	Gateway Business District. Thank you for putting this section back in code.	No Change	Comment does not indicate a change to the ordinance	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
147	21.24.040	Gateway Business District	HCC 21.24.040 a. iv Delete traffic in excess of 100 trips per hour/500 per day should be excluded from the GBD. Reason: Lots of traffic does not meet the purpose of the GBD.	No Change	This trigger for a CUP is included in nearly all zoning districts so that the Planning Commission has additional scrutiny (and can impose appropriate conditions) on such uses.	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
148	21.24.080	Gateway Business District	21e. 21.24.080(d) Franchise architecture should be required, not just encouraged, to conform to the Community Design Manual.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
149	21.24.090	Gateway Business District	21f. 21.24.090(a) Driveway access to Sterling Highway should be required to be consolidated, not just encouraged.	No Change	Requiring this in an area where there are scattered vacant sites mixed in with existing development may be extremely difficult. Could consider minimum driveway spacing standards/maximum number of driveways in some areas.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
150		General	Check and fix internal reference citations to HCC. Many of them are incorrect	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
151		General	Grammatical edits - extra periods, incorrect numbering, spacing, indentation, the occasional exclamation point, etc	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
152		Gateway Business District	I think we should extend the Gateway District further west, perhaps to Bidarki Creek. As it stands the Land Use Map has different anticipations for the corner lots at the bottom of West Hill.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/12	Email	David	Schneider	
153		Gateway Business District	I think we should exclude from Gateway: Plumbing and heating stores; Building Supply Stores; Laundries; Large Format Development.	No Change	Planning Commission expressed support for these uses as proposed district during the ____ meeting.	5/12	Email	David	Schneider	
154		General	Planning isn't technically a "department" ... division? Staff?	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
155		General	Ensure all acronyms are stated/defined (i.e. 21.44.030(g)(1)	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
156	21.41.030	Home Occupations	30a. 21.41.030 Storage of heavy equipment should not be allowed in residential, downtown mixed use, or flex districts as well as in other districts where heavy equipment storage is out of character with the intended use of the districts.	Partial Change	Clarify this is only for personal use, or clarify the type of equipment allowed.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
157	21.51.030	Landscaping	retains a section on landscaping, the large scale development chapter does not. Unless this is a specific requirement to places of assembly, remove. Review across districts & ensure consistency.	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
158	21.56.040	Landscaping	I would not provide administrative flexibility on this without more clear boundaries on how "the public interest is better served" and the degree to which the Planner would be allowed to permit variation from the regulations.	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
159		Hotels	Requesting an actual code that deals with hotels being constructed. As Homer's code didn't have one in place with the Doyon project, and should have paused, to come up with one. Instead of opening the door for at least one that pushed the height limit. Yet other hotel businesses were held to the 35' limit. Special treatment was given.	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/15	Email	Scott	Adams	

Code					Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
160		Landscaping	How are there Level 2 and Level 3 site plans but not level 1? Level three has the same buffer requirement, but allows planters/bike racks/etc. And has no parking lot requirements (except as in the general applicability). It seems like just a different, more “generous” allowance for what’s considered “landscaping” and doesn’t really actually seem to be clarifying what needs to be in a site plan. Instead of calling out DMU, SBHO, and LFD zones, why not have those outlined as level two and three landscape site plans required (note it in the zoning district section, where at least right now landscaping isn’t mentioned in large format development), and then better and more clearly define levels of site plan requirements.	Change	Change to Level One and Level Two	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
161	21.56.070(a)(4)	Landscaping	Why are we defining gardens here?	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
162	21.56.060(a)	Landscaping	Five percent is overly prescriptive. “At least” or “no less than” should be added.	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
163	21.56.070	Landscaping	Intro paragraph is redundant with the purpose statement for this chapter. See suggestion of making this the highest level landscape site plan, and referencing that requirement in the LFD section of code	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
164	21.56.040	Landscaping	III. The PRD would Give unchecked discretion to the Planning Director. Section 56.040 of the PRD - Administrative Flexibility states "Special consideration will be given to site design, topography, unique relationships to adjacent properties and existing utilities in enforcing screening requirements. If the applicant can demonstrate that the public interest is better served through alternative landscape design, the City Planner may permit variation from these regulations." This seemingly innocuous provision would grant the Planning Director unchecked power to allow nonconforming uses and significant undermining of basic zoning structure without going through any public process. Nor has this change been requested by the Planning Commission, City Council or members of the public.	Partial Change	Updated language to better connect with chapter purpose, and put limits on the amount of flexibility permitted.	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
165		Large Format Development	I do NOT want to see the 8000 sq. ft. trigger for CUPs removed.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	4/5	Comment Form	Annette	Bellamy	
166	21.02	Large Format Development	1i. Large Format Development – should be triggered by 15,000 SF, not 30,000 SF.	Change	Revert to previous 15,000 sf. threshold.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
167		Large Format Development	Large scale development is not for our town.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	4/5	Comment Form	Annette	Bellamy	
168	21.09	Large Format Development	8,000 sq. ft. buildings in any zone should trigger a CUP. I am opposed to buildings of this size being allowed without a public review.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	4/28	Email	Karen	Murdock	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
169		Large Format Development	The switch to the percentage of lot method will result in giant buildings with no landscaping and no open space. The CUP (Conditional Use Permit) process should be retained - as the planning commission has requested. I would like to see the CUP process expanded to include buildings over 8000 square feet instead of the current 15,000 square feet. This is our chance to make Homer a livable and walkable community that supports small businesses, not another Alaskan town littered with big box stores and franchise chains.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/14	Email	Jenny	Stroyeck	
170		Large Format Development	6. Retain current language in Title 21 that requires conditional use permits for buildings with more than 8,000 square feet. Buildings with a larger foot print will go through the Planning Commission for a Conditional Use Permit. This ensures that the community will have a voice and input into large building projects. In order to maintain the current ambience of Homer, which is a factor in the tourism industry and was overwhelmingly supported in the Comprehensive Plan, the community should have information and public input to large projects. Without these conditions, any manner of building can be constructed without consideration of the Homer community and the ensuing impact.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/14	Email	Deborah	Oudiz	
171		Large Format Development	I can't find where the this change is but have been told that there is a proposal to change the code to allow 30,000SF buildings without any permitting or public comment - this is unthinkable it a town that has fought long and hard to keep big box stores out and to support local small businesses! It is important that the Planning Commission and the Public reviews any large buildings. The City should continue to require Conditional Use Permits for any building over 8,000SF. If there is a need for a larger building then use the Planned Unit Development permit (PUD) but make sure that the building is essential infrastructure for the good of the community like a hospital, school, recreation center, etc.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/14	Email	Karin	Holser	
172		Large Format Development	This proposed change is against the recommendations of the public and the Planning Commission. I believe that the City should continue to require a Conditional Use Permit for buildings over 8,000 square ft. in the Downtown Mixed Use Zone and Gateway Business Zone; if there are other code updates that would achieve a similar outcome of rigorous, site-specific review for large buildings that you feel are better than a CUP, I welcome them.	No Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	
173		Large Format Development	The requirement for a conditional use permit for buildings over 8,000 sf in the downtown and gateway business zone should be continued. Again, maintaining the uniqueness of Homer is paramount to a thriving community here and maintaining the requirements to review any new development will ensure that developments are at least reviewed and brought to the public's attention.	No Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Jim	Levine	
174		Large Format Development	[Open Space Petition, cont.] "It is important for the Planning Commission to review large buildings to ensure site suitability, parking, lighting, connectivity, etc. Yet the City is proposing to get rid of this requirement and replace it with a percentage-of-lot standard. The City should continue to require a Conditional Use Permit for buildings over 8,000 sq. ft. in the Downtown Mixed Use Zone and Gateway Business Zone."	No Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
175		Large Format Development	The proposed code transfers a lot of power to the City Planner from the Planning Commission. Currently people have to apply for conditional uses and exceptions, and then there is a hearing to allow public comment and to flush out differences and work out an acceptable plan. Now with the expanded height, and other more lenient codes, the City Planner can approve development without the public process. While this might make development happen faster, I am not convinced this is in Homer's best interests.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf. Some building heights reduced as well. Only administrative adjustment remaining is up to 2 feet setback.	5/15	Email	Sara	Faulkner	
176		Large Format Development	It is important for the Planning Commission to review large buildings to ensure site-suitability, parking, lighting, connectivity, which can be best achieved through a Conditional Use Permit. Yet the proposed Title 21 Update gets rid of this requirement and replaces it with percentage-of-lot standard. I oppose this change, and am concerned that it could lead in the future to buildings that are very inappropriate for the specifics of their location and environment.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	
177	21.24; 21.25	Large Format Development	I am writing specifically about concerns with the drastic change in building size for large format development. Chapters 21.24 and 21.25: Gateway Business District and also Light Industrial Mixed Use. What I don't see addressed anywhere in the info I read is any priority given to the long term businesses of Homer. A number of us have been here +/- 50 years and have increased and grown with the town. When the size cap was decided in the early 2000's, the city and the planners did acknowledge the importance of our local businesses and all the importance they have had over the years.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Sue	Post	
178	21.42.010	Large Format Development	31a. 21.42.010 The trigger has been increased from 15,000 SF to 30,000 SF. Please take it back to 15,000 SF.	Change	Revert to previous 15,000 sf. threshold.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
179		Large Format Development	Finally, I just want to express that allowing huge buildings greater than 30,000 square feet or larger will have a huge impact on the community. Big box stores in a small, unique community like Homer detracts from our uniqueness. We slowly will become like Anywhere USA. History has shown that small towns lose big time when big box stores move in, forcing the small business owners out of the market. A large AI center would be a bad choice as well. AI centers are energy hogs and water guzzlers. Homer does not have a huge supply of drinking water for our current population. We should not encourage businesses that will be a net detriment to the town. They can also cause a lot of pollution depending on the type of electricity they use. Likely, our electric rates would soar, just as they have in other communities in the Lower 48. We need to carefully consider what types of construction and how large we are encouraging so that we do not destroy the businesses of those who are currently part of the community.	Change	Revert to previous 15,000 sf. threshold.	5/1	Email	Nina	Faust	
180		Large Format Development	In all decisions for larger developments, the people of the community should have the opportunity to comment on the proposed building, particularly if it is in a residential area. We have choices as to what we do and don't allow in this town. I would say once again—No to Big Box Stores, and now No to AI facilities or large prison facilities. Let's not make choices that detract from our unique, beautiful community.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/1	Email	Nina	Faust	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
181		Large Format Development	Maximum Building Size: My Comments: The surveys you used revealed that the majority of citizens want to support small, local businesses. One way to do this is to retain the cap of 8,000 square feet in size to all areas but the Medical Mixed Use and Light Industrial Mixed-Use Districts. I believe we need to have that maximum size of business buildings.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	4/1	Comment Form	Caroline	Venuti	City Council
182		Large Format Development	MAXIMUM BUILDING SIZE With the exception of the Medical Mixed Use District and the Light Industrial Mixed-Use District, I DO NOT AGREE THAT BUILDINGS IN THE CITY OF HOMER SHOULD EXCEED 8000 SQ. FT. IN SIZE. SURVEYS HAVE SHOWN THAT A MAJORITY OF THE PUBLIC WANTS MODERATE TO MINIMAL GROWTH.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	4/1	Comment Form	Franco	Venuti	Planning Commission
183	21.41.010(a)	Large Format Development	this doubles the current definition of 15,000 square feet. I don't support this doubling, and would like to understand the team's rationale here.	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
184	21.42.080	Large Format Development	31b. 21.42.080 There was a requirement for two public participation meetings, but now there's only one. Please take it back to two because there could have been substantial change made and the public has a right to see the final version.	No Change	The public has a chance to see revisions during the public hearing for the CUP.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
185		Large Format Development	Please incorporate my comments into the public testimony regarding Title 21 update. First of all, I found the format of this document challenging to navigate. Therefore, I am not referencing the specific code number in each concern. Please link my comments to the specific categories.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. All comments will be entered into the public record for the Title 21 update.	4/28	Email	Karen	Murdock	
186		Large Format Development	I support our local businesses and fear for the effect of big box stores upon their businesses. Again, I strongly oppose the consideration of allowing 75,000+ sq.ft buildings in the Light Industrial Mixed Use Zone and in the Gateway Business District.	Partial Change	No change is proposed to the existing language in these districts. Building size is also governed by the Large Format threshold (currently 30,000 sf., but recommend changing back to 15,000 sf.) and building coverage maximums.	4/28	Email	Karen	Murdock	
187		Large Format Development	Our local businesses contribute to the our sense of community, providing likelihood for those owners who reside in our community. I am always impressed when I am in one of our shops and learn of folks from up the peninsula who travel to patronize these unique Homer businesses.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. July 7, 2025 Planning Commission meeting discussed the importance of retaining Homer's unique character when updating Title 21.	4/28	Email	Karen	Murdock	
188		Large Format Development	While I don't live in Homer, and therefore not a registered voter in the community, I do have property across the bay in Sadie Cove, and from that vantage point the character of Homer is very important to me and my family. We have been visiting Homer since 1978. I am opposed to big box stores, data centers in sensitive dwindling habitat, and excessive short-term rentals that price out locals. The economy doesn't need those developments, the real risk is the loss of quality of life.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/1	Email	Dolly	Peach	
189		Large Format Development	Additionally, I am opposed to permitting any building larger than 8000 sf no matter the zone or lot size. I feel the public will strongly desire providing input.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/12	Email	David	Schneider	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation (If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment							
190		Large Format Development	I oppose allowing 38,000 sq. ft. buildings to be built without public comment or permit. Why should we not be able to speak to these issues. Suppose two or preferably more meetings for comment. I do not support 75,000 sq. ft. buildings without a CUP as is required for 60,000 sq. ft. buildings. The 12,000 sq. ft. expansion language that will guide CUPs to include protections that are major environmental concerns such as wetland protections, waterways buffers, etc. and to give mitigation of hazards like gas flooding, erosion, stormwater, etc. A.R.C. City code 21.71.040.	Partial Change	Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf. No change is proposed to the existing language regarding 75,000 sf. maximum in some areas of LIMU and Gateway Business districts. Building size is also governed by the Large Format threshold and building coverage maximums.	5/15	Comment Form	Ole	Andersson	
191	21.57.020	Large Format Development	I also overheard at a city counsel meeting that Big Box Stores could gain clearance in Homer? Where can I find this in Title 21? I think there is NO place in Homer for any more large corporate stores.	Partial Change	No change is proposed to the existing language regarding the 75,000 sf. maximum buidling size in GBD and LIMU districts. Building size is also governed by the Large Format threshold (currently 30,000 sf., but recommend changing back to 15,000 sf.) and building coverage maximums.	5/14	Comment Form	Katherine	Brennan	
192		Large Format Development	In the current zoning plan, it is limited by total size. The new plan seems to allow it to be limited by a percentage of a total lot size. This would allow a company to combine together lots and build a massive building. I do not feel that this is appropriate at this time within the city limits for a variety of reasons. First, large box stores historically put small locally owned businesses out of business. It is the small stores scattered throughout town that make Homer unique from the bookstores, to clothing stores to gift shops. Many of them would not make it with the competition.	Partial Change	Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf. No change is proposed to the existing language regarding 75,000 sf. maximum in some areas of LIMU and Gateway Business districts. Building size is also governed by the Large Format threshold and building coverage maximums.	5/14	Email	Janet	Fink	
193		Large Format Development	Secondly, all recent surveys have shown that the local population appreciates open space within Homer and the surrounding community. We would be losing a lot of land with massive size development. A lot of this development could take place in the peatlands of Homer. These lands are essential for wildlife and for natural water storage. Lastly, I think all buildings, especially larger ones need to go through a permitting process.	Partial Change	Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf. No change is proposed to the existing language regarding 75,000 sf. maximum in some areas of LIMU and Gateway Business districts. Building size is also governed by the Large Format threshold and building coverage maximums.	5/14	Email	Janet	Fink	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
194		Large Format Development	I can't find where the this change is but have been told that there is a proposal to change the code to allow 30,000SF buildings without any permitting or public comment - this is unthinkable in a town that has fought long and hard to keep big box stores out and to support local small businesses! It is important that the Planning Commission and the Public reviews any large buildings. The City should continue to require Conditional Use Permits for any building over 8,000SF. If there is a need for a larger building then use the Planned Unit Development permit (PUD) but make sure that the building is essential infrastructure for the good of the community like a hospital, school, recreation center, etc.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/14	Email	Karin	Holser	
195		Large Format Development	Input from meetings and the community survey show 77% of respondents would like to protect open space within the Homer community. Two thirds support "moderate development" and walkability. I am unable to see how those priorities align with allowing 30,000 square foot buildings with very little oversight as to environmental conditions and infrastructure.	Partial Change	Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf. No change is proposed to the existing language regarding 75,000 sf. maximum in some areas of LIMU and Gateway Business districts. Building size is also governed by the Large Format threshold and building coverage maximums.	5/15	Email	Jenny	Stroyeck	
196		Large Format Development	Homer established a gateway district many years ago with the intent of preserving the beauty of the entrance into town. Suddenly, we're willing to put 30,000 square foot buildings there? I do not get the support of unchecked development from within the planning commission or the current city council. Is all this drive coming from city staff and the consulting firm? Endless growth and expansion is a dated philosophy that disregards the environmental health and quality of life in a community.	Partial Change	Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf. No change is proposed to the existing language regarding 75,000 sf. maximum in some areas of LIMU and Gateway Business districts.	5/14	Email	Jenny	Stroyeck	
197		Large Format Development	We have concerns that the proposed code does not address a maximum size limit for buildings other than as a percentage of the lot size. An entity with deep pockets could purchase a large amount of land, or land abutting non-buildable land, which would still be counted when the percentages were figured. Any store in the business district >30,000 is going to overwhelm the area. We would like to not allow large format buildings there without vetting and seeking neighborhood and public input.	Partial Change	Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf. No change is proposed to the existing language regarding 75,000 sf. maximum in some areas of LIMU and Gateway Business districts. Building size is also governed by the Large Format threshold and building coverage maximums.	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	
198		Large Format Development	As I understand it, proposed changes to a Title 21 include allowing buildings to take up 50%-70% of the total lot and building height to be 50-75 ft without a conditional use permit. This opens the door for big box stores to take over our small businesses and creates environmental concerns and even more parking challenges.	Partial Change	Recommend reducing maximum building coverage in the LIMU from 50% to 30% and in the DMU from 70% to 50%.	5/14	Email	Metis	Riley	
199		Large Format Development	Larger buildings, lot size vs building size proposal is too large. Even Soldotna has stricter regulations in place with height & building size on lots. I would hope that the small town feel, is what we are trying to keep, and not just building for revenue. I would like to see our town being built with the thought of smaller buildings that have green space and parking.	Partial Change	Recommend reducing maximum building coverage in the LIMU from 50% to 30% and in the DMU from 70% to 50%.	5/15	Email	Scott	Adams	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
200		Large Format Development	If Homer allows larger sq ft business buildings and limited parking. Just drive Pioneer Ave, very limited parking, seems if you plan for more larger buildings on lots, you give up parking. That might be an argument for height, and maybe that's the city's argument. Not enough room for both, well then it's a smaller building and parking. At the city's own admission, that they don't have the infrastructure for growth, and can't afford it. Putting it on the lot owners, who say no to the added cost of purchasing a lot and building.	Partial Change	Recommend reducing maximum building coverage in the LIMU from 50% to 30% and in the DMU from 70% to 50%.	5/15	Email	Scott	Adams	
201		Large Format Development	Separately, I urge the City not to reduce public review for very large commercial buildings or large-format development. My concern about small residential structures is separate from how Homer reviews 30,000-, 50,000-, or 75,000-square-foot buildings. The code can make it easier to add small-scale housing without weakening review for projects that may have major traffic, drainage, visual, parking, or neighborhood impacts.	Partial Change	Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf. No change is proposed to the existing language regarding 75,000 sf. maximum in some areas of LIMU and Gateway Business districts. Building size is also governed by the Large Format threshold and building coverage maximums.	5/15	Email	Whitney	Cushing	
202		Large Format Development	I absolutely oppose changing code to allow large format development, including buildings over 8,000 sf. Homer does not want box stores or similar-sized businesses. Those establishments are readily available in the greater southcentral area; we have no need of them in our community and prohibited them years ago through the Retail and Wholesale rule (15,000 sf limit). Homer does not want anything like 75,000 sq ft buildings, whether they be businesses, large apartment complexes, large hotels, etc. We must ensure that any larger development fits the community need.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	
203		Large Format Development	For instance, we do not want anything like a data center, a prison, or a cruise ship facility. Homer is a small town viably populated with small and medium-sized businesses. When we do need a larger building, like HHS or SPH that benefits the community as a whole, we must be assured that the development will be held to and follow our building guidelines and not receive exceptions through a PUD permit or any such thing. Homer does not want sprawl. We do not want anything like a data center, a prison or a cruise ship facility.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. Chapter 21.42 recognizes the potential detriments of large format development and seeks to prevent as much as possible using traffic impact analyses, public participation meetings, parking, loading, and delivery requirements, screening requirements, and building and aesthetics requirements, among other tools.	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	
204		Large Format Development	Building size: I was very disappointed with the recommendation to lift the cap on building size and height. Leave the cap of 8,000 sf and height of 35 ft. If something larger is requested then request a CUP or Planned Unit / Development Permit, and public hearings should be required. Large developments should require a public process, not automatically give a developer the go ahead.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Sandra	Garity	
205		Large Format Development	The Title 21 Update would redefine "large format developments" as buildings over 30,000 square feet, rather than the current limit of 15,000+ square feet (about the size of the Aspen Suites Hotel). I oppose this. Permits should be required for buildings over 15,000 square feet. I think this aligns with the expressed desire for "moderate development," density, and walkability that came through in the Comprehensive Plan.	Change		5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	

Code					Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
206		Large Format Development	I also oppose decreasing the number of public meetings for "large format developments" from two meetings (current code) to only one meeting (proposed code). There should be ample opportunities for public engagement when large format developments are proposed.	No Change	This change reflects the need for public input in the event of large format development while not disincentivizing developments that may greatly contribute to Homer and its residents.	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	
207		Large Format Development	I also oppose the allowance for 75,000+ square-foot buildings in the Light Industrial Mixed Use Zone and in the Gateway Business District. I recognize that there is some confusion as to whether this refers to the building footprint or multiple stories. Even with multiple stories involved, 75,000 square feet of retail space is huge. I do not think a change such as this should be made through a small change to a very long code document; instead, this proposal deserves more specific opportunities for public input and guidance and should not move forward with the Title 21 Update without a more intentional process.	Partial Change	No change is proposed to the existing language regarding the 75,000 sf. maximum building size in GBD and LIMU districts. Building size is also governed by the Large Format threshold (currently 30,000 sf., but recommend changing back to 15,000 sf.) and building coverage maximums.	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	
208		Large Format Development	I do not agree with redefining large format developments to be increased to 30,000 sf buildings. The current limit of 15,000 sf seems like a reasonable requirement for a community the size of Homer.	Change		5/15	Email	Jim	Levine	
209		Large Format Development	I do not agree with the proposal to allow 75,000 sf buildings to be built within the Homer City Limits. The current requirement was a hard fought compromise that involved several years of discussion and a vote by the city residents in the late 90's. This requirement allows the small businesses in Homer to thrive and provide a livable scale to Homer. I think the unique characteristics of the current businesses contributes to the small town feel and the charm that the visitors like seeing when they visit here. Being at the end of a long supply chain, we will never have prices as low as Anchorage or even Soldotna so our uniqueness is what drives our economy.	Partial Change	No change is proposed to the existing language regarding the 75,000 sf. maximum building size in GBD and LIMU districts. Building size is also governed by the Large Format threshold (currently 30,000 sf., but recommend changing back to 15,000 sf.) and building coverage maximums.	5/15	Email	Jim	Levine	
210		Large Format Development	3) Also large format developments-what are they and shouldn't they be in the DMU? We have to keep in mind there are over 30 acres of undeveloped or underutilized prime commercial properties in the DMU.	Change		5/15	Comment Form	Angie	Newby	
211		Large Format Development	Going from a size cap of 8000 (which may be outdated and time to increase) to 30,000 or 75,000 square feet is completely outrageous. One point I really want to make here is: NO ONE MOVED TO HOMER EXPECTING TO HAVE A GIANT FURNITURE STORE OR GROCERY STORE WITH DISCOUNTED PRICES!!! It is not like we had a large store that has closed and left a void. People have moved to Homer because they like the small town charm and the lack of big businesses like what every city USA has.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Sue	Post	
212		Large Format Development	Having worked at a small business in Homer since 1978, I hear over and over again about what charm Homer has and why it is such an appeal to people from not only Alaskan cities (Kenai, Soldotna, Anchorage, Wasilla, Palmer, etc) but to so many tourists who visit from the Lower 48, or even internationally. I guess what all this is coming to is the big question of "do we want Homer to continue to be a tourist town and a destination place, or do we want to suddenly transform into any town usa and be just another duplicate of so many other places?"	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. July 7, 2025 Planning Commission meeting discussed the importance of retaining Homer's unique character when developing Title 21.	5/15	Email	Sue	Post	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
213		Large Format Development	The recently created Comprehensive Plan for Homer had much public input and desire for protecting open spaces from development, moderate growth, walkability, recreational access, protection from hazards like flooding and landslides and affordable housing. These values are all important, and critical to keep this thriving community as it is. I don't see much mentioned in this Draft Code Revision about that. Yes, I see you require x number of feet in front of a building or whatever, but that doesn't create a walkable, recreation area.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. The Title 21 Update highlights the importance of pedestrian access. For example, section 21.42.070 of the Large Format Development chapter discusses the need for this type of development to be accessible, safe, and convenient for pedestrians.	5/15	Email	Sue	Post	
214		Large Format Development	I am a bit perplexed as to where and who is driving this current code? Who really wants to see a 30,000 square foot building (much less a 75,000 SF one!?) Nothing I have observed in my everyday life in Homer shows any of this is of importance or value. Again, I question where the pressure is coming from if you who are putting this comprehensive plan out there see that need? We currently have one elementary school that is slated to possibly close in a year- a tragedy in my mind. We are seeing threats of closure to the local swimming pool and theater at the high school. These are the things I want Homer to continue to excel in. Not who can build the largest and ugliest building in town and see what they can do to force out existing businesses.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. Section 21.42.020 describes the intent of the Large Format Development Chapter. It recognizes the potential impacts on the surrounding community and that the Chapter seeks to minimize negative effects.	5/15	Email	Sue	Post	
215		Large Format Development	I just want to remind you that Homer has NOT lost any large shopping centers. NO ONE moved to Homer or the surrounding area thinking they could get cheap furniture or cheap clothes or expecting any other amenities that these large scale buildings would bring. Nothing has been lost but so much will be lost if these large scale developments are allowed to happen. It is not the locals who are driving this proposal, so who is it? I do hope you will consider going back to the drawing board on building size limits. When I see size caps of 75,000 that is a huge red flag that perhaps there is consideration for something that does not need to be in Homer such as a prison or a data center or a large warehouse business of some sort.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. Planning commission members have expressed concern for maintaining community character and the intent statement for Chapter 21.42 Large Format Development clarifies how the Code Update will deal with this type of development.	5/15	Email	Sue	Post	
216	21.42.010(b); 21.57.040; 21.57.060	Large Format Development	II. The PRD would allow Construction of Big Box Retail in Sensitive Areas. The current Code requires a permit for developments over 8,000 sf, a clear public interest/ traffic analysis etc. for buildings over 15,000 sf (size of Aspen Suites Hotel). The PRD however, proposes to pave the way for currently restrictions on big box retail, prisons, hotels, or any other large building like a hotel in Homer under the amendments to section 21.42.010(b) – Large Format Development by eliminating 15,000 square foot size restrictions for such buildings and changing it to 30,000. The PRD would also pave they way for such development by eliminating the requirement under 21.57.040 that the property owner apply for a conditional use permit for and the requirement that the CUP include a community and economic impact analysis under section 21.57.060.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
217		Large Format Development	Worse these streamlined big box buildings would be allowable in two Zoning Districts: "Light Industrial Mixed Use" – Under Chapter 21.25 which includes the highly sensitive Beluga Wetlands along Kachemak Drive and at the top of Baycrest hill and in the "Gateway Business District," – under Chapter 21.24 which includes the area where Pioneer Street meets the Stirling Highway.	Partial Change	No change is proposed to the existing language regarding the 75,000 sf. maximum building size in GBD and LIMU districts. Building size is also governed by the Large Format threshold (currently 30,000 sf., but recommend changing back to 15,000 sf.) and building coverage maximums.	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
218		Large Format Development	I unequivocally oppose changing code to allow large-format development, including buildings over 8,000 square feet (sf) and above. Homer does not want box stores or similar-sized businesses. Those establishments are readily available in the greater Southcentral area; we have no need of them in our community, and in fact, prohibited through the Retail and Wholesale rule (15,000 sf limit). It follows that Homer does not want anything like 75,000 sf buildings whether they be businesses, apartment complexes, hotels, data centers, prisons, etc. Homer is a small town that "runs on" small and medium-sized businesses.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Leslie	Slater	
219		Large Format Development	Of course, larger buildings like Homer High School and South Peninsula Hospital exist within Homer. Notably however, those buildings hold institutions that benefit the community as a whole and are not commercial enterprises. We must be assured that codes follow our building guidelines and will not receive exceptions through a PUD permit or other code-evading process.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. The Planning Commission has expressed concern for protection of the surrounding community.	5/15	Email	Leslie	Slater	
220		Large Format Development	I would like to see tighter restrictions on Large Format Development, not looser. The triggers for conditional use permits should not be removed. The great majority of people in Homer favor no growth to moderate growth and zoning requirements should reflect the preferences of the community. Code requiring a public process and conditional use permit for buildings over 8000 square feet should remain in effect. There should also be two or more public meetings pertaining to large format development so there is ample opportunity for the people of Homer to ensure that development conforms to community needs. Changes in code should not conflict with the vision expressed in community surveys and laid out in the comprehensive plan.	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Comment Form	John	Whittier	
221		Large Format Development	[Open Space Petition; est. ~680 signatories per submitter (~600 unique visible in submitted documents). Verbatim petition language:] "The city's proposal would redefine 'large format developments' as buildings over 30,000 square feet, rather than the current limit of 15,000+ square feet. We oppose this. Permits should be required for buildings over 15,000 square feet. We also oppose decreasing the number of public meetings for 'large format developments' from two meetings (current code) to only one meeting (proposed code)."	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
222		Large Format Development	[Open Space Petition, cont.] "The City is proposing to allow 75,000+ square-foot buildings in the Light Industrial Mixed Use Zone and in the Gateway Business District. Retail and Wholesale buildings of this scale are currently prohibited throughout Homer, based on a rule designed to keep box stores out of Homer and keep small and mid-size businesses thriving. We should keep a hard prohibition on box stores everywhere in town, and we should extend the limitation to include hospitality."	Partial Change	No change is proposed to the existing language regarding the 75,000 sf. maximum building size in GBD and LIMU districts. Building size is also governed by the Large Format threshold (currently 30,000 sf., but recommend changing back to 15,000 sf.) and building coverage maximums.	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society
223	21.42.010(b)	Large Format Development	why are we restating definitions here that are identical to the definitions at the beginning of the title? Reduce unnecessary redundancy. Still don't understand the limiting definition of retail or wholesale business?	Change	Direction was to revert to the original language in this chapter.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
224	21.42.050 & 21.42.090	Large Format Development	I'm not sure that the zoning districts are fully outlining when a traffic impact analysis and/or a stormwater management plan is required. For a large development as outlined here, I would just outright say these things are required (similar to the snow storage plan). Landscaping should also be stated as required here.	Partial Change	Stormwater requirements are laid out in the zoning districts. Traffic impact analysis is required for large format development. Added landscaping with the level one site plan requirement	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
225		Large Format Development	I have a business on Pioneer Avenue, which is (or was) the main street in town for most of Homer's existence. For the past 2 summers, I have heard from 3 or 4 family groups who stopped in and said "we have been on the Spit for 3 days and we didn't even realize there was more to Homer. We thought all the businesses and restaurants were out there." I shudder to think if the Gateway Business District were to have a large shopping complex up there, would any visitors to Homer see anything beyond that shopping mall and then the Spit?	Partial Change	Maintain the removal of the 8,000 sf. trigger for CUP. Reduce the threshold for Large Retail and Wholesale CUP back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Sue	Post	
226		Large Format Development	I also have concerns about situations where new businesses may open but the roads are not developed to keep traffic moving safely. In areas such as East End Road where it is a two lane road with no middle turn lane. There are many, many more residents out East End then there were 40 years ago and now many more businesses in those first 3 miles or so with traffic turning across the other lane. When will that road become updated and safer? What consideration is taken if the land beyond Kachemak Drive continues to develop and what happens if a large fire breaks out on East End and there is not a alternative road to escape on? And speaking of fires, if building sizes of up to 30,000 or the ludicrous size of 75,000 sf were to be accepted, will our fire department also grow and be funded as fully as they will need to be to support a disaster in such a large building?	No Change	No change to the ordinance is suggested by this comment. Threshold for large format development proposed to be reduced back to 15,000 sf.	5/15	Email	Sue	Post	
227		Large Format Development	I have attended several Planning Commission meetings and work sessions and am appalled at the result of the sessions now represented in the proposed tables of allowable dimensions and intensity standards when it was made very clear in the initial public comment that Homer residents want to maintain the sense of small town character with open spaces, low building density and preservation of access to views by keeping the buildings at 35 ft tall and current setbacks.	Partial Change	Reduce threshold for large format development back to 15,000 sf; reduce building height maximum in GBD to 35 feet.	5/15	Comment Form	Liliana	Sotomayor	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
228		Large Format Development	In many of the sessions I heard several commissionees express their preoccupation witht the removal of the CPU process and expansion of lot occupation. An lo and behold the proposed limits are presented anyways ignoring public comment and commissioner concerns.	Partial Change	Reduce threshold for large format development back to 15,000 sf; reduce building height maximum in GBD to 35 feet.	5/15	Comment Form	Liliana	Sotomayor	
229		Large Format Development	I am adamantly opposed to large format or light industrial mixed use development in the Gateway District or ranging up Baycrest Hill, especially around the scenic overlook at the top, including between there and Bluff Point.	Partial Change	Reduce height maximum in GBD to 35 feet. No industrial uses are permitted in the GBD.	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	
230		Large Format Development	My primary concerns relate to changes in Title 21 that open Homer up for larger buildings, and also that, from what I can tell, not much has been added that would better ensure proactive planning for sustainable development to maintain the environmental/ecosystem services that keep us safe and happy.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	
231	21.25.050	Light Industrial Mixed Use	22e-ii. Buildings in the Scenic Gateway district should be limited to 30% and 8,000 SF.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
232	21.25.040	Light Industrial Mixed Use	HCC 21.25.040 I,j. Extractive enterprises and junkyards should not be allowed along, nor in the area of, Ocean Drive.	Partial Change	Consider a different zoning district or overlay for Ocean Drive area.	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
233	21.25.070	Light Industrial Mixed Use	HCC 21.25.070 a. Add the requirement to provide year round sight-obscuring screening along Ocean Drive. Reason: Ocean Drive is a visitor corridor to the Spit and maintaining attractiveness is important for tourism.	Partial Change	Consider a different zoning district or overlay for Ocean Drive area.	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
234	21.25.040	Light Industrial Mixed Use	22a. 21.25.040(i) Extractive Enterprises should not be allowed in Light Industrial.	No Change	This is the most appropriate district for this use.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
235	21.25.040	Light Industrial Mixed Use	22b. 21.25.040(l) There should be a qualitative trigger for when a Traffic Impact Analysis is required.	No Change	There needs to be objective criteria for the trigger. Probable impact is a subjective judgement by staff.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
236	21.25.050	Light Industrial Mixed Use	22c. 21.25.050(c) There should be view protection for neighboring residential uses.	No Change	Requires that view corridors be defined, which is difficult, and impacts on property owners could be significant. This also gives owners of existing buildings significant power over development on property that could be far from their building.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
237	21.25.060	Light Industrial Mixed Use	22d. 21.25.060 There should be means for connection to sidewalks or trails that are existing or planned.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
238	21.25.050	Light Industrial Mixed Use	22e-i. 21.25.050(f) Some of these land use zones/designations, Ocean Drive LIMU, East End Road LIMU and Scenic Gateway LIMU no longer exist under the current proposed Title 21 language so this whole section needs to be revised.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
239		Light Industrial Mixed Use	The land behind Beluga Lake is zoned LIMU, this land is winter moose habitat and wetlands, it would seem like a better place for conservation, or open area. Open space and environmental protection is also one of priorities of the comprehensive plan.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
240		Lighting	Chapter 21.55 Lighting - I am very impressed with the changes on this lighting code. As a life member of the International Dark Sky Association, I would like to take these standards to this organization to see if the City of Homer qualifies as one of the tiers of reasonable lower light compliance as a Dark Sky City. We are slowly working our way to bring Kachemak Bay State Park as a dark sky Park also and have this in the Management Plan.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
241		Lighting	It may be the cities desire to become a Dark Sky Community like the beautiful cities of Flagstaff, Sedona, Arizona and many other beautiful cities. If you have not consulted with them, please compare needed codes at their website to strengthen this section of Title 21 for health environment and welfare if need be. I will help in any way possible.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
242		Lighting	ADD: 3. Lights during bird migrations. We are a designated Western Hemispheric shorebird corridor as well as a migration route of many bird species. During migration I have witnessed on multiple occasions the harbor lights affecting birds who get disoriented and have collisions with these light masts. There are many LIGHTS OUT initiatives that we may want to add into code or at very least acknowledge as a problem.	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
243	21.26.020	Marine Commercial District	23a. 21.26.020 Mixed use and in particular, worker housing, should be allowed.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
244	21.26.020	Marine Commercial District	23b. 21.26.020 Auto related businesses should not be allowed in the Marine Commercial District. It should be preserved for marine-related uses.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
245	21.26.030	Marine Commercial District	23c. 21.26.030(b) It should be possible to build an accessory building before the primary building is built.	No Change	No consensus on making this change from Planning Commission or staff.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
246	21.26.040	Marine Commercial District	23d. 21.26.040 There should be some qualitative standards for when a Traffic Impact Analysis is required.	No Change	There needs to be objective criteria for the trigger. Probable impact is a subjective judgement by staff.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
247	21.26.050	Marine Commercial District	23e. 21.26.050 The building dimensions in what was paragraph (d) and (e) have been deleted and should be restored.	Partial Change	Maximum size of retail and wholesale businesses of 25,000 sf. can be readded, but do not recommend readding the 8,000 sf. CUP trigger	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
248	21.26	Marine Commercial District	The economic support the businesses in the Marine Commercial District bring to the City is critical for funding City operations. I encourage Council members to not decrease current allowable uses.	No Change	No decrease in allowable uses in the MC district is proposed.	5/15	Email	Debbie & Mark	Speakman	
249		Marine Commercial District	All of our businesses are incorporated and licensed through the State and we collect and submit Borough & City sales tax. The City should encourage investment and support businesses not create additional hurdles.	No Change	No reduction in allowable uses is proposed in the MC district	5/15	Email	Debbie & Mark	Speakman	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
250		Marine Commercial District	I have owned and operated my business in Homer, Alaska for the past 13 years. During that time, our studio and gift shop have contributed to the local economy by attracting tourism and supporting surrounding businesses throughout the community. We specialize in mariner-themed tattoos and Alaska-inspired artwork that draw visitors specifically seeking an authentic Homer experience. Many of our clients travel seasonally to Homer and spend money not only at our business, but also at local restaurants, lodging, retail shops, fishing charters, and other small businesses in the area.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Rachel	Gonzalez	
251		Marine Commercial District	The proposed changes eliminating housing options such as short-term vacation rentals, worker housing, onsite housing, temporary housing, and dormitory housing within the Marine Commercial zone would create significant hardship for existing businesses that rely on seasonal tourism and workforce flexibility to operate successfully.	Partial Change	No changes to the existing types of housing allowed in the Marine Commercial district are proposed. Make clear that housing above businesses (mixed use buildings) are permitted.	5/15	Email	Rachel	Gonzalez	
252		Marine Commercial District	Additionally, the language limiting retail uses to "the sale of seafood products, sporting goods, curios, and arts and crafts" does not reflect the current diversity of businesses that contribute to Homer's economy today. Homer has evolved into a destination known for arts, tourism, culture, and small independent businesses that attract visitors from around the world. Existing and future business opportunities should be supported rather than restricted by outdated zoning language.	No Change	Direction from the Planning Commission has been to reserve limited space on Homer Spit to uses that require this location.	5/15	Email	Rachel	Gonzalez	
253		Marine Commercial District	I encourage the City to more thoroughly review the allowable uses within the Marine Commercial zone and consider the long-standing businesses already operating successfully in this area. Supporting mixed-use flexibility and seasonal housing opportunities is essential for maintaining economic growth, tourism, and the unique character of Homer.	No Change	Direction from the Planning Commission has been to reserve limited space on Homer Spit to uses that require this location.	5/15	Email	Rachel	Gonzalez	
254		Marine Commercial District	We have MANY businesses in the proposed Marine Commercial zone on the Homer Spit. The proposed changes would limit our current uses of accessory housing above our retail businesses that we currently enjoy (as do our tenants who all run multiple spit businesses). This proposal creates a diversion from housing and uses that we Already have and have built our businesses around. The ability to house staff, live on-site as owners subordinate to commercial and retail activity AND to earn additional income from nightly rentals is a significant income generator for the community and has not posed additional challenges.	Partial Change	No changes to the existing types of housing allowed in the Marine Commercial district are proposed. Make clear that housing above businesses (mixed use buildings) are permitted.	5/15	Comment Form	Crisi	Matthews	
255		Marine Commercial District	This use instead has provided for seasonal worker support and onsite security at night. We have been asked for housing for seasonal staff at the City as well in this location. It seems now overly regulated in the paired down uses. Even sitting on the Port Commission, we heard time and again this being a desperate need for the Spit services and to limit that with code updates will also be a hindrance to any Harbor Expansion needs there as well. Housing is short and this is a vital part of our community.	Partial Change	No changes to the existing types of housing allowed in the Marine Commercial district are proposed. Make clear that housing above businesses (mixed use buildings) are permitted.	5/15	Comment Form	Crisi	Matthews	
256		Marine Commercial District	Not allowing boat storage on most of the Spit also seems shortsighted. We are private property owners and support 9 working vessels in addition to the companies we support with customer referrals. To not be able to use our own property to park/store, charge up, stage for launching and gear repairs on our own property is also taking away a vital use and cluttering up the road way and City areas for the same use. Parking is VERY constrained out on the Homer Spit, to now remove some of these uses we had when we bought this land 12 years ago is also short sighted.	Change		5/15	Comment Form	Crisi	Matthews	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
257		Marine Commercial District	Although our hotels on Pioneer fall into the DMU proposed Zone, I'm unclear why "Retail businesses" is a permitted use but "Retail businesses limited to the sale of seafood products, sporting goods, curios, and arts and crafts" is not. Why also is the latter is allowable in the Marine Commercial but the other is not? My neighbors in all 3 zones do both as well so I am not the anomaly and it feels as though this update doesn't consider the actual operating businesses of Homer's current uses. Perhaps some more clarification on the two distinctions is needed as they seem to overlap and we sell all retail types listed in all three zones that I mentioned as they were existing uses to the businesses bought within those zones.	No Change	Intent is to specifically reserve space on the Spit for businesses that rely on the coastal location.	5/15	Comment Form	Crisi	Matthews	
258		Marine Commercial District	Where the code intended to create a healthy growth plan it seems to redefine the existing zones with preference but not with practical understanding of what income is already being generated to the City's benefit within them.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Comment Form	Crisi	Matthews	
259		Marine Commercial District	4) Float plane tie ups, both personal and commercial, should be allowable on the north side of Beluga Lake. There is a large undeveloped 8 acre commercial property next to Ben Walters Park, Lot 1A-3 lakeside Village park Addition and also AA Mattox 1959 Addition Tract C, which is a privately held 9 acre lake parcel. This is the second largest undeveloped commercial parcel in town and definitely lends itself to the possibility of tourist or floatplane aviation activities.	Change		5/15	Comment Form	Angie	Newby	
260		Marine Commercial District	This is our 13th year of operation in this Marine Commercial Zone. We run the gallery and live on the premises during the season. We would like to continue the pre-existing uses of our gallery including both retail and housing. During the 2025 season, we saw approximately 35,000 visitors in our gallery and we believe that continuing to operate in this manner will provide significant benefits to the City of Homer.	No Change	Existing uses are allowed to continue in the MC district as legal nonconforming uses.	5/6	Email	Olga	Amaral	Diamond Ridge Gallery & Gifts
261		Marine Commercial District	Should the pre-existing zoning regulations be changed to prohibit current usage, we would experience serious hardships. We hope that you will consider all current and future use possibilities for growth in this zone and support the established businesses by reviewing more thoroughly allowable uses (P) in this zone that already exist and are an opportunity for revenue to the City.	No Change	Existing uses are allowed to continue in the MC district as legal nonconforming uses.	5/6	Email	Olga	Amaral	Diamond Ridge Gallery & Gifts
262	21.24.060, 21.24.080, 21.24.090	Marine Commercial District	There are edits in the language of 21.24.060, 21.24.080, and 21.24.090 that could be made to not explicitly prohibit developments such as a hypothetical hotel with accompanying housing and lighthouse, and not expose the City to conflicts if such developments are permitted to occur.	No Change	Chapter 21.24 is the Gateway Business District and does not apply on the Homer Spit.	4/2	Email	Sava	White	
263	21.27.020	Marine Industrial District	24a. 21.27.020 Mixed use and in particular, worker housing, should be allowed.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
264	21.27.020	Marine Industrial District	24b. 21.27.020 Auto related businesses should not be allowed in the Marine Industrial District. It should be preserved for marine-related uses.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
265	21.27.050	Marine Industrial District	24c. 21.27.050 There should be view protection for neighboring residential or commercial uses, which are view dependent.	No Change	Requires that view corridors be defined, which is difficult, and impacts on property owners could be significant.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
266	21.27.060	Marine Industrial District	24d. 21.27.060 There should be means for connection to sidewalks or trails that are existing or planned.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
267		Medical	I am writing as a property owner in the Medical Mixed Use district. I appreciate the City's work to update Title 21 and make the code clearer. My concern is that the current draft may leave Medical Mixed Use owners with fewer practical residential options than owners in other districts where housing is also allowed.	Partial Change	Add Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as an accessory use and Tiny Homes as a permitted use in the M Medical District	5/15	Email	Whitney	Cushing	
268		Medical	I bought my properties with housing in mind. I have been working toward adding useful, attainable places to live that fit the land and the realities of building in Homer. While I intend to build larger structures when I can afford to, some portions of my property are better suited to a smaller cabin, tiny home, or independent residential structure than to a larger building. That approach can preserve trees, open space, drainage patterns, and watershed areas while still adding needed housing. Smaller more environmentally friendly units can also help renters keep utility bills low and manage their environmental footprint.	Partial Change	Add Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as an accessory use and Tiny Homes as a permitted use in the M Medical District	5/15	Email	Whitney	Cushing	
269		Medical	Medical Mixed Use should not be treated as though residential flexibility is secondary or accidental. The district is described as supporting a variety of housing types and a mix of residential and nonresidential uses. It also allows detached dwellings, duplexes, townhouses, rooming houses, bed and breakfasts, hostels, and more than one building containing a permitted principal use on a lot. That is a district where housing is expected, not an area reserved only for medical or institutional development.	Partial Change	Add Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as an accessory use and Tiny Homes as a permitted use in the M Medical District	5/15	Email	Whitney	Cushing	
270		Medical	For that reason, Medical Mixed Use should have access to the same reasonable housing tools being made available in comparable residential and mixed-use districts. Other districts appear to receive express ADU rights, and Neighborhood Flex expressly includes both ADUs and tiny homes. Medical Mixed Use should not be left out of those options without a clear explanation.	Partial Change	Add Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as an accessory use and Tiny Homes as a permitted use in the M Medical District	5/15	Email	Whitney	Cushing	
271		Medical	I also do not think the ability to have "more than one building containing a permitted principal use on a lot" should be treated as a replacement for ADU rights. Those are different tools. Multiple principal buildings address one type of development pattern. An ADU is a separate, subordinate housing option that can help owners add flexible, lower-cost housing in a controlled way. If ADUs are appropriate in other districts that allow housing, they should also be expressly allowed in Medical Mixed Use where a primary dwelling exists.	Partial Change	Add Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as an accessory use and Tiny Homes as a permitted use in the M Medical District	5/15	Email	Whitney	Cushing	
272		Mixed Use Medical	We have also heard the city is planning to rezone the lots along Bartlett Street to be commercial medical zone. Our lots are zoned residential. We have concerns about how this will impact our home, our borough taxes, and our privacy if a medical or commercial building is built next to our home and Woodard Creek. We would like to be notified about proposed changes in writing prior to changes. We will continue to read and try to follow city proposals regarding these changes also.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Comment Form	Marilyn	Shroyer	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
273		Mixed Use Medical	In short, I support a clearer and more flexible code, but that flexibility should be fair and consistent. Medical Mixed Use property owners who bought or already own property for residential purposes should not have fewer practical housing options than similarly situated owners in other districts. If Homer wants more housing and better use of served or partially served land, Medical Mixed Use should be part of that solution.	Partial Change	Add Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as an accessory use and Tiny Homes as a permitted use in the M Medical District	5/15	Email	Whitney	Cushing	
274		Mixed Use Medical	I own property in the Medical Mixed Use district that I purchased a couple of years ago with residential use in mind. My property does not currently have city services, so flexibility is especially important. A modest cabin, small home, or other affordable housing option may be the most realistic and appropriate way to use the property. My dream is just for a small scale summer retreat space for my daughters and I, and a cozy option for a winter resident. I ask that the City make sure Medical Mixed Use property owners have the same reasonable residential options available in other residential or mixed-use districts where housing is allowed.	Partial Change	Add Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as an accessory use and Tiny Homes as a permitted use in the M Medical District	5/15	Email	Zakary	Cushing	
275		MJ Use	I am writing to express support for amending the zoning code to allow marijuana retail facilities as a permitted use within the Marine Commercial District on the Homer Spit.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	Port and Harbor Advisory Commission
276		MJ Use	The Spit is one of the most commercially active and economically important areas in Homer. It is already characterized by a diverse mix of marine-dependent businesses, tourism-driven retail, food service, lodging, and seasonal operations. Allowing marijuana retail in this district would be consistent with the existing commercial character and would represent a logical extension of uses already serving visitors and residents.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	Port and Harbor Advisory Commission
277		MJ Use	1. Economic activity and local revenue: Marijuana retail is a regulated, taxable industry that generates measurable local revenue. Allowing these businesses on the Spit would increase sales tax generation in one of the city's highest-traffic areas, particularly during peak summer months when visitor volume is highest. This supports city services without requiring additional infrastructure expansion.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	Port and Harbor Advisory Commission
278		MJ Use	2. Consistency with existing commercial uses: The Marine Commercial District already accommodates retail sales, food and beverage service, and tourism-oriented businesses. Marijuana retail functions as a storefront retail use comparable in scale and operation to other permitted businesses. It is also similar in nature to liquor stores, which are already allowed within the district, reinforcing that this type of regulated retail is compatible with the area.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	Port and Harbor Advisory Commission
279		MJ Use	3. Visitor demand and market reality: Visitors to Homer—particularly those traveling from other parts of Alaska and out of state—expect access to legal retail marijuana in convenient, commercial locations. Prohibiting these businesses on the Spit effectively redirects that demand elsewhere, rather than eliminating it. Allowing it locally keeps economic benefit within the district.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	Port and Harbor Advisory Commission
280		MJ Use	4. Manageable regulatory framework: Marijuana retail is already tightly regulated at the state and local levels, including licensing, security, hours of operation, and setbacks. The City retains authority to impose reasonable conditions to address any site-specific concerns, ensuring compatibility with surrounding uses.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	Port and Harbor Advisory Commission

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
281		MJ Use	5. Equity among commercial districts: Currently, marijuana retail is permitted in other commercial zones but excluded from one of the most commercially viable areas in the city. This creates an uneven regulatory environment and limits fair business opportunity. Aligning the Marine Commercial District with other commercial zones promotes consistency in land use policy.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	Port and Harbor Advisory Commission
282		MJ Use	6. No demonstrated adverse impact to harbor operations: Retail marijuana is a low-impact use in terms of noise, traffic generation, and infrastructure demand. It does not interfere with marine operations or harbor functions. Its inclusion would not displace marine-dependent uses, but rather complement existing commercial services.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	Port and Harbor Advisory Commission
283		MJ Use	This proposal is not about introducing a new or untested use. Marijuana retail is already established, regulated, and operating successfully in other parts of Homer and throughout Alaska. The question is whether the Marine Commercial District should participate in that same regulated marketplace.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	Port and Harbor Advisory Commission
284		MJ Use	Allowing marijuana retail as a permitted use would reflect the current economic reality of the community, support local business growth, and maintain consistency with the district's commercial purpose.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	Port and Harbor Advisory Commission
285	21.20.050	Neighborhood Flex District	HCC 21.20.050 Dimensional requirements. Thank you for the changes which open possibilities for zero-lot line construction and townhouses. With a finite amount of land with public utilities these provisions may make housing more affordable.	No Change	Comment does not indicate a change to the ordinance.	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
286	21.20.030	Neighborhood Flex District	17a. 21.20.030(g) Storage of heavy equipment seems out of character for the Intended Land Use of the Neighborhood Flex district. Please delete this.	Partial Change	Clarify this is only for personal use, or clarify the type of equipment allowed.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
287	21.20.030	Neighborhood Flex District	17b. 21.20.030(h) It should be possible to get a permit to build/occupy a garage or other accessory building before the primary structure is built.	No Change	No consensus on making this change from Planning Commission or staff.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
288	21.20.050	Neighborhood Flex District	17c. 21.20.050 There should be a view protection clause that requires new developments to preserve the view corridors of existing buildings.	No Change	Requires that view corridors be defined, which is difficult, and impacts on property owners could be significant. This also gives owners of existing buildings significant power over development on property that could be far from their building.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
289	21.20.050	Neighborhood Flex District	17d. 21.20.050 Means of non-motorized transportation, such as connecting to existing sidewalks or trails, should be required.	No Change	Not appropriate for a primarily residential district.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
290		Neighborhood Flex District	There are both similarities and important differences between the RR and NF districts guidelines: most notable is the density of development allowed and use of "Planned Unit Developments" (PUDs). A RR designation provides greater certainty that this land will retain its predominant residential character. No PUDs are allowed in the RR district, yet they are allowed in NF district (for non-industrial uses). As we learned through the PUD process as applied in Doyon Development, this allows the Planning Director to approve deviations from any and all ordinance standards, including those that are designed to protect slope stability.	No Change	Changes are in accordance with the adopted Future Land Use map in the Comprehensive Plan. No changes to uses, including smaller lot sizes, are allowed without the availability of public water and sewer service.	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
291		Neighborhood Flex District	The north side of Bay Avenue is very different, or more fitting for a NF designation. This area is clearly a mix of commercial and residential properties, as well as higher density private residences. A mix of uses includes a car maintenance shop, a shipping company, the office and shop for Alaska Department of Fish and Game Homer office, a shop and work area for the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge, a shop/work area for the Kachemak Bay Research Reserve, and eight houses on small lots. This kind of mix seems appropriate for NF District.	No Change	Changes are in accordance with the adopted Future Land Use map in the Comprehensive Plan. No changes to uses, including smaller lot sizes, are allowed without the availability of public water and sewer service.	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	
292		Neighborhood Flex District	The new zoning districts offer considerably more opportunities and clarity. I personally appreciate the Neighborhood Flex which acknowledges the realities of current development. Also deleting the Town Center district and rolling it into the new Downtown Mixed use district will encourage development of this crucial parcel in the future. I also applaud the inclusion of Townhouses in most districts as a permitted use, as well as the new lot sizes across various districts, based on the availability of public water and sewer.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Comment Form	Angie	Newby	
293		Nonconforming Uses	I feel compelled to mention this KBWC comment - "The Planning Team is pursuing a code framework that would grant the Planning Director unchecked power to allow nonconforming uses, when no survey indicates the public's desire for such a broad and significant undermining of basic zoning structure, and the Planning Commission as a body said that they thought this was a terrible idea." Any Planning Director or other employees should not be given carte blanche to make decisions. Rather, Planning Department employees are hired to represent the community's interests and needs. Recent actions by the incumbent have resulted in the opposite... independent of express direction from the public, City Council, and the Homer Planning Commission, he has refused to work on current code changes as requested by those entities.	No Change	No change to nonconforming uses language related to this topic is proposed. By law, legal nonconforming uses must be allowed to remain so long as they are not expanded.	5/15	Email	Leslie	Slater	
294	21.15.050	Nonconformities	12a. 21.15.050 Please add the following language: 21.15.050(e) Nonconforming uses shall not be allowed to extend into public rights of way or easements.	No Change	This is already covered in the prohibition on expansion of a nonconforming use in subsection a.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
295	21.15.070	Nonconformities	12b. 21.15.070 Nonconforming uses should not be allowed to be transferred to new property owners, including transfers upon death. Non-conforming uses that constitute nuisances should not be allowed. Please address this.	No Change	Planning best practice suggests that nonconforming status runs with the land, not with the owner. Nuisances (whether associated with a nonconformity or not) are addressed in Chapter 21.16	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
296	21.15	Nonconformities	12c. Nonconforming uses that constitute nuisances should not be allowed.	No Change	Nuisances (whether associated with a nonconformity or not) are addressed in Chapter 21.16	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
297	21.16.010	Nuisances	13a. 21.16.010. Please add the following to the list of nuisances: "(h) accumulations of junk or solid waste that cover a majority of a lot are nuisances"	No Change	No consensus on making this change from Planning Commission or staff.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
298	21.16	Nuisances	13b. We need a definition of "solid waste" and it should include materials that are not necessarily hazardous or toxic, such as heaps of debris, 55-gallon drums of mystery fluids, junk cars, etc.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
299	21.16	Nuisances	13c. There should be a process for dealing with nuisances – giving notice, clean up requirements, enforcement requirements, etc.	No Change	Public nuisance abatement is covered in Chapter 5.16 of Homer City Code.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation		Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)						
300	21.16	Nuisances	13d. Release of invasive flora and fauna should be classified as a nuisance.	No Change	No consensus on making this change from Planning Commission or staff.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser		
301	21.16	Nuisances	13e. Homer needs an Anti-Blight Policy/Program. Let's start with a defensible definition of a "blighted building/property" and an enforcement mechanism. Homer cannot afford to let real estate remain in a blighted condition in perpetuity. We need to get the properties cleaned up and back into productive use. Please address this.	No Change	Requires policy direction from Planning Commission or City Council, as well as staff review for feasibility.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser		
302	21.16	Nuisances	13f. There needs to be a process for mitigating nuisances.	No Change	Public nuisance abatement is covered in Chapter 5.16 of Homer City Code.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser		
303		Nuisances	BEAR AWARE WITH GARBAGE ISSUES: The city must help ADFG to alert the residents and visitors of the need to keep garbage, food, birdseed, compost in an orderly condition that does not attract bears.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand		
304	21.28.040	Open Space / Conservation	Ch. 21.28 Open Space Recreational District: 21.28.040 The requirements of Level 2 drainage and erosion control should apply to any dirt-moving activity or structures.	No Change	Requires policy direction from Planning Commission or City Council, as well as staff review for feasibility.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser		
305	21.28	Open Space / Conservation	Ch. 21.28 Please add the following new language: The City shall develop an Open Space Lands Policy and Strategy that maps lands currently held for Open Space Recreation as well as a fund for the acquisition of such lands.	No Change	This is a larger policy discussion that requires direction from City Council.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser		
306	21.29.060	Open Space / Conservation	Ch. 21.29 Conservation District: 21.29.060 The requirements of Level 2 drainage and erosion control should apply any dirt-moving activity or structures.	No Change	Requires policy direction from Planning Commission or City Council, as well as staff review for feasibility.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser		
307	21.29	Open Space / Conservation	Ch. 21.29 Please add the following new language: The City shall develop a Conservation Lands Policy and Strategy that maps lands currently held for conservation as well as a fund for the acquisition of such lands.	No Change	This is a larger policy discussion that requires direction from City Council.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser		
308		Open Space / Conservation	I am opposed to a park in direct proximity to my house or within two blocks of my house. Personal note: The people of Homer have consistently voiced these same concerns, yet you seem determined to put them there anyway.	No Change	The proposed code and zoning map do not intend to create new parks or public open spaces where they do not exist already.	4/1	Email	Marianne	Schlegelmilch		
309		Open Space / Conservation	When I looked at the permitted uses of the medical zone I noted that no trails or parks were permitted. Is that a typo? That would include a great deal of Woodard creek. There are already trails in this zone and in the future there are proposed more trails and a park "Woodard Creek Park" which frontages Spruceview Ave.	Change		4/19	Comment Form	Lou	Stewart		
310		Open Space / Conservation	I noticed on all zone areas there are no allowances for parks , trails and viewing platforms. Is that a typo also? What is in place for amended future development.	Change		4/19	Comment Form	Lou	Stewart		
311	21.28.010	Open Space / Conservation	Modify 21.28.010 to add: 'The purposes of the Open Space – Recreation District are primarily to promote public recreational opportunities while protecting and preserving the natural and scenic resources, and environmental aspects, of the area and public access to tidelands. Generally, pedestrian uses are given priority over motorized uses. [Ord. 08-29, 2008].'	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong		

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation (If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment							
312		Open Space / Conservation	My wife and I bought our house in Homer in the fall of 1979. It was on old house trailer on a city lot on Soundview Ave. The lot was West of Bartlett. At the time, Soundview wasn't paved, and there were 3 developed lots to the West. The South side of Soundview Ave had 3 modest homes and a few more mobile homes. Woodard Creek was channeled under Soundview Ave. using 3 x 24" in culvert stacked in a diamond formation to protect the road. The lot East of our contained a sprawling creek named Woodard Creek. We purchased the lot after the trailer was moved by the tenants.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/11	Email	Robert	Shroyer	
313		Open Space / Conservation	My Children and I used to play down by the creek. Coal seams were discovered in the banks and we used to collect large chunks from the bed. It wasn't clean like the beach coal, and smelld bad when burned. There were many Devil's Club plants and runners in the area and caution was needed to protect hands and skin from the barbs. Cow Parsnip was thick in the area also and was hard to avoid. The juice from the leaves can cause skin burns. The Creek itself has been behaving well since the flood. We have viewed Black bears coming down the creek from above Horniday Park. It is also used by Porcupines, moose, and occasional foxes and coyotes. Pheasants family's have grow up, and rabbits come and go. I have watched Eagles catching ground squirrels.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/11/2026	Email	Robert	Shroyer	
314		Open Space / Conservation	As far as my concerns the creek should be left alone. I personally do not want strangers traversing the creek or walking through my yard. We have had things stolen from our yard including propane tanks, and hi-lift jacks. It is somewhat startling to see strangers strolling bye close to the house. Not all of the campers are nice people I think Woodard Creek can take care of itself. I applaud the work that has gone into this enterprise, and the dreams of land stewardship. But for me, it's private property, and I'd like to keep it that way.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/11/2026	Email	Robert	Shroyer	
315		Open Space / Conservation	The growth I would like to see here would include more walkable districts and planning for green spaces. We live in such a unique place; please don't turn Homer into Wasilla just for a few big business. Tourists come here for Homer's beauty and small town charm, not to shop at Walmart. Protecting the fragile landscape of our wetlands and hills and supporting locals is the best investment for the future of Homer.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/14	Email	Metis	Riley	
316		Open Space / Conservation	I support and echo here all the excellently researched, well-considered, and highly detailed comments submitted by the Kachemak Bay Conservation Society and the Kachemak Bay Watershed Council. It is imperative that the Update approach be strongly inclusive of wetland, watershed and open space protection for fish and wildlife habitat, which will also serve to protect water quality and prevent the natural hazards from development in these areas.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	
317		Open Space / Conservation	Critical green infrastructure helps manage flooding, landslides, bluff-erosion, ice and water on the roads, overflowing culverts, and septic system failure. Protecting these habitats and open space will not restrict growth but instead direct it to appropriate areas. Taking an ecologically-based approach to planning is imperative to future economic sustainability as we go forward.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
318		Open Space / Conservation	The Homer community has made it abundantly clear that we want slow, sustainable, environmentally-supportive growth over a multi-decade time frame. The importance and value of Homer and the Kachemak Bay area is derived directly from its incredible natural environment. Protecting that is of utmost importance for the local community to thrive. We do not want or anticipate large population increase. The vast majority of residents seek to protect natural and open spaces within the city from development and to increase access to recreational opportunities.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	
319		Open Space / Conservation	As spelled out in the recent Comprehensive Plan update process, the community overwhelmingly prioritized protecting open spaces from development, minimum to moderate growth, walkability, recreational access, protection from flooding and landslides, and affordable housing. These values straight out need to be placed into code.	No Change	No specific ordinance change is suggested by this comment. No direction from Planning Commission or City Council to increase area zoned for Open Space or Conservation. Wetlands to be discussed at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session.	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	
320		Open Space / Conservation	My main concern is with landscaping, natural open space areas and green infrastructure and green viewsheds near businesses proven to help with healthy mental clarity and peace of mind. Please do not dilute these sections but make them stronger with priority focused on the year-round residents and businesses of Homer area.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
321		Open Space / Conservation	When I read these standards, I see you are trying to keep from being redundant in some places so have removed some critical aspects such as native vegetation and diluting serious aspects of code that will lessen aesthetics to the Homer Area. Buffers need to remain at least at 15%. Keep the landscaping standards strong don't lose ground going backwards on this for the city. Certainly, we do not want to cover this City in asphalt without the continuous theme of native landscaping?	No Change	Native landscaping requirements are retained. Change to landscaping area to 5% in DMU due to small lot sizes.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
322		Open Space / Conservation	People simply do not read. This is a fact, and even though when read by your experienced eyes you see redundancy, to not be redundant means applicants will miss your intent and applicability unless you remind them in other sections of the direction of creating a beautiful planned city that is spared from evolving into an ugly dusty concrete jungle that is not in the public interest but in the interest of the automobile.	No Change	Native landscaping requirements are retained. Change to landscaping area to 5% in DMU due to small lot sizes.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
323		Open Space / Conservation	We have volcanic ash that can be mitigated through the addition of green infrastructure within green space and green buffers. Also, in the summer, Homer have very little shade around parking areas for when passengers or dogs are left in cars during what appears to be increasing heat of summer. Let's accommodate helping with some of these natural phenomena of volcanic ash and needed shade wherever and whenever possible.	No Change	Native landscaping requirements are retained. Change to landscaping area to 5% in DMU due to small lot sizes.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
324		Open Space / Conservation	The Draft Update clearly shows that officials in the above-mentioned offices and contracted consultants are not heeding the stated opinions and wishes of the majority of community members. Instead the tack they've taken promotes unfettered land development, thereby setting the stage for a destructive and unwanted development plan in Homer. I support and echo the well-researched and detailed comments submitted by the Kachemak Bay Conservation Society (KBCS) and the Kachemak Bay Watershed Council (KBWC).	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. The Title 21 update takes into account voices that are concerned about a variety of issues Homer is facing, including economic development and environmental concerns.	5/15	Email	Leslie	Slater	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
325		Open Space / Conservation	The Homer community has made it quite clear that we want sustainable, environmentally-sound growth over a multi-decade time-frame. Homer and the Kachemak Bay area are noted by residents and visitors alike for the incredible natural environment, and protecting that is of utmost importance for the local community to thrive. As spelled out in the recent Comprehensive Plan update process, the community overwhelmingly prioritized: protecting open spaces from development, minimal to moderate growth, walkability, recreational access, protection from flooding and landslides, and affordable housing. These values must be included into code.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Leslie	Slater	
326		Open Space / Conservation	[Open Space Petition, cont.] "Larger developments should be required to create park space and connectivity/walkability with other parts of the city. The public appreciates places where they can walk and see wildlife: parks raise property values, mitigate flooding, and improve quality of life. If developments go in adjacent to trails or bike paths, they should ensure connectivity."	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society
327	21.45.010	Outdoor Storage	32a. 21.45.010 There should be a distinction between outdoor storage and an accumulation of junk.	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
328	21.55	Parking and Loading	This seems to largely be the same as existing code? What modernizing, or consideration thereof, has happened in this chapter?	No Change	Reductions in number of off-street spaces required for dwellings, retail and office uses, modernization in terminology; 25% reduction in parking required in the DMU.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
329		Permitted Uses	I would be hopeful that Dance Studio's would be included in all of the zoning districts, except for special exception for residential. Please let me know if that is what is proposed or if Ballet schools and Studios would not be allowable in residential office specifically.	No Change	Dance studios are included in the definition of "Studio", which are permitted in RO, DMU, GBD and LIMU.	5/15	Email	Breezy	Berryman	
330		Pioneer Ave - Commercial Uses	I'd like to comment that no more businesses on Pioneer should be services, only retail, restaurants, or entertainment. I feel it is unfortunate that we now have another bank on Pioneer. Or maybe specifically the blocks between Kachemak Way & Main Street.	No Change	Removing service uses from the district will create many non-conformities for existing businesses.	4/26	Email	Laurie	Deakins	
331	21.23	Pioneer Ave - Commercial Uses	In addition to these considerations, I would like to point out that there are Downtown Mixed Use areas that could benefit from a more well developed corridor for commercial activities. I think that a plan which fosters and maximizes support and development along Pioneer Avenue which will improve exposure and access for businesses is a choice that could improve outcomes for these adjacent areas. The same could be said for other areas (bypass, Main Street, Lake Street, East End Rd etc.) which already have considerable commercial development. For the reasons mentioned above and others that I am sure I have not considered, I propose that the area demarked by Poopdeck to Heath and Klondike to Grubstake be classified as urban residential instead of downtown mixed use.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/14	Email	Amanda Rowan	Mulvey	
332	21.36	Planned Unit Development	HCC 21.36 PUD. Delete this section. I can't believe that Planned Unit Development is still in T21. The purpose statement notes "flexibility and variation in the many of the traditional controls as related to....." I gather that the main reason the PUD section is still in T21 is the need for of construction timelines and phased construction.	No Change	There was no consensus (or significant support) expressed for this during Planning Commission discussions.	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
333	21.36	Planned Unit Development	Suggestion. Move PUD 21.36.030 a. 3 & 4 to the CUP section. Reason: The current PUD language creates "flexibility, loopholes, a back door, a work around" that opens the City for legal challenges.	No Change	No consensus on making this change from Planning Commission or staff.	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
334	21.36	Planned Unit Development	27. Chapter 21.36 Planned Unit Developments. This section should go away. Homer does not have enough physical space to allow these kinds of developments.	No Change	Planning Commission and staff do not agree with this major change.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
335	21.36	Planned Unit Development	In many of the zoning districts, the idea of a PUD is listed as an option for conditional use. I am opposed to the idea of PUD's. This designation is over-scaled for the size of this City. No PUD's.	Partial Change	No Planning Commission or staff direction to remove PUDs. Add language about community benefits required for PUD approval.	5/10	Email	Rika	Mouw	
336		Planned Unit Development	The PUD (Planned Use Development) designation should be limited to those projects benefiting the community in the future. A recreation center, for example, or a community auditorium/theater, or multi dwelling affordable housing like a townhouse complex. Not hotels and data centers. Consideration needs to be given to existing infrastructure and how it can support the proposed project. For example, we do not currently have either the electrical or water infrastructure to support a large data center. Review and analysis of current effects of data centers in the lower 48 are leading to moratoriums in many communities and 10+ states.	Partial Change	Add language about community benefits required for PUD approval. Building size limits via building coverage maximums and large retail/wholesale development standards govern building size.	5/14	Email	Jenny	Stroyeck	
337		Planned Unit Development	The basis for allowing PUD is a reasonable one, but we would like to request that they be required to follow environmental rules and regulations – not ignore them. For example, the Doyon Hotel and Condos were recommended approval by the city planner, even though there was no setback from the salt marsh, and indeed parts of it overhung the marsh. Our comprehensive plan places a priority on promoting sound, environmentally responsible development.	No Change	The current code includes the following language requiring concurrence with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan: If the Commission determines that the PUD development plan does not satisfy the conditional use permit standards and requirements or is not consistent with good design, efficient use of the site, or community standards, the Commission shall deny the application.	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	
338		Planned Unit Development	Eliminate PUD or define when it can be used. As it is, it lifts the lid on all development restrictions like height and footprint anywhere and should not be used for projects like the Doyon Hotel. Specify that it is for hospitals, schools and recreation centers.	Partial Change	No Planning Commission or staff direction to remove PUDs. Add language about community benefits required for PUD approval.	5/15	Email	Sandra	Garity	
339		Planned Unit Development	I recognize that sometimes we need larger buildings, like the high school or hospital. But I worry that the PUD permit that allows for these larger buildings is vague and confusing. It concerns me to think that this could potentially be used as a loophole in the future to lift the lid on development guidelines, like height and footprint, anywhere. It opens the door for unequal application of the law.	No Change	The current code includes the following language requiring concurrence with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan: If the Commission determines that the PUD development plan does not satisfy the conditional use permit standards and requirements or is not consistent with good design, efficient use of the site, or community standards vision based on the Comprehensive Plan, the Commission shall deny the application.	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	

Code						Project Team Recommendation				
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
340		Planned Unit Development	Proposed updated code reads "A PUD is different from a variance in that a PUD grants flexibility from ordinance standards in exchange for some community benefit pursuant to the review criteria herein. PUD designs and project elements shall align with the comprehensive plan in terms of community vision, land use compatibility, housing variety (as applicable), and environmental conservation." While this sounds good, it leaves lots of room for interpretation.	No Change	The current code includes the following language requiring concurrence with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan: If the Commission determines that the PUD development plan does not satisfy the conditional use permit standards and requirements or is not consistent with good design, efficient use of the site, or community standardsvision based on the Comprehensive Plan, the Commission shall deny the application.	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	
341		Planned Unit Development	For more fair, consistent, and reasonable PUD permitting, I believe that code should specify that PUDs are only for projects that will directly benefit the community, like schools, rec. centers, hospitals and essential infrastructure. Structures such as a large hotel, box store, data center, prison, or cruise ship facility should not be considered for a PUD but could theoretically be viewed as providing "some community benefit" under the current language. Code should be clarified to prevent this.	Change	Add language about community benefits required for PUD approval.	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	
342		Planned Unit Development	[Open Space Petition, cont.] "Code should specify that PUDs are only for projects that will benefit the community, like schools, rec. centers, hospitals and essential infrastructure. Structures such as a large hotel, box store, data center, prison, or cruise ship facility should not be considered for a PUD."	Change	Add language about community benefits required for PUD approval.	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society
343	21.05.010	Review Process / Admin	3a. 21.05.010 Should this be changed to Community Development Department since that Department is actually the supervisor of the Planning Division?	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
344	21.05.020	Review Process / Admin	3b. 21.05.020(a). My understanding is that the Director of Community Development is the immediate supervisor of the City Planner. Do we still want to say that the 'City Manager may appoint a City Planner'?	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
345	21.10	Review Process / Admin	8b. If you must have this, please add the following restriction: "Except that an Administrative Adjustment may not be used to reduce buffers/setbacks from natural or constructed drainageways, drainage easements steep slopes, or high value wetlands"	TBD	The code currently does not specify setbacks from wetlands. Final direction to be provided by the Planning Commission and City Council.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
346	21.13.030	Review Process / Admin	11a. 21.13.030(a)(2) Government officials, agencies or units should have standing whether or not their enabling statutes specifically empower them to engage in legal actions. This is because the law on this matter is opaque, which causes the parties to go down a legal rabbit hole that has nothing to do with the land use issue at hand and costs the tax payers thousands of dollars in legal fees, only to address this administrative detail. It would be more transparent, equitable and less costly for everyone to give government bodies the right to question land use issues that are (i) within their purview and subject matter expertise and (ii) where they have actively and substantively participated in the proceedings before the Commission.	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
347	21.17.050	Review Process / Admin	14b. 21.17.050 There should be a way of notifying the property owner by personal or substituted delivery, mail or publication, if other means of notice are not effective, similar to service of a summons.	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
348	21.04	Review Process / Admin	2a. 21.04.01.20(g). Should include other types of easements, including drainage easements and trail easements.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
349	21.05	Review Process / Admin	3c. The Hearing Officer is hired by and paid by the City, which sets up a conflict of interest. How can we be assured the Hearing Officer will make decisions in an impartial manner?	No Change	Comment does not indicate a change to the ordinance. Section 21.05.040 requires that hearing officers have had experience as an administrative law judge/administrative hearing officer (positions requiring impartiality). Not the final arbiter and parties can appeal.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
350	21.05.050	Review Process / Admin	3d. 21.05.050(a) What is the "Land Use Plan"? This term is not defined.	Change	Change to Comprehensive Plan	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
351	21.05.030	Review Process / Admin	3e. 21.05.030(b)(2) There is no definition of the term "Land Use Plan". Is this the Future Land Use Plan?	Change	Change to Comprehensive Plan	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
352	21.06.020	Review Process / Admin	4a. 21.06.020 Again, there is reference to a Land Use Plan, which is an undefined term. What is this?	Change	Change to Comprehensive Plan	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
353	21.06	Review Process / Admin	4b. I do not like the concept of Administrative Adjustments. If you must have them, the Planning Commission should be the appellate authority.	No Change	The City requests that the Hearing Officer be the primary appellate authority.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
354	21.06	Review Process / Admin	4c. The review of Enforcement Orders should be the Planning Commission.	No Change	The City requests that the Hearing Officer be the primary appellate authority.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
355	21.07.010	Review Process / Admin	5a. 21.07.010(b)(1). Isn't the correct name of the new Comp Plan the "2045 Comprehensive Plan"?	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
356	21.07.010	Review Process / Admin	5b. 21.07.010(c) Again, there's a reference to an undefined "land use plan".	Change	Change to Comprehensive Plan	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
357	21.07.020	Review Process / Admin	5c. 21.07.020(a) Again, there's a reference to an undefined "land use plan".	Change	Change to Comprehensive Plan	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
358	21.07.020	Review Process / Admin	5d. 21.07.020(b) Again, there's a reference to an undefined "land use plan".	Change	Change to Comprehensive Plan	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	

#	Code			Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
359	21.07.010	Review Process / Admin	5e. 21.07.010(b)(2) The Homer Master Roads and Streets Plan (1986) is obsolete and should not be part of the new Comp Plan.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
360	21.07.010	Review Process / Admin	5f. 21.07.010(b)(4) The Homer Town Center Development Plan was deleted from this list, per Ord 25-64.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
361	21.07.010	Review Process / Admin	5g. 21.07.010(b)(5) The Homer Spit Plan (2010) was deleted from this list per Ord 25-64.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
362	21.08.050	Review Process / Admin	6a. 21.08.050 The process of requesting, or reviewing a request for, a zoning amendment seems to suggest that (i) such requests are made, and reviewed, on a site specific basis and (ii) in accordance with the "Future Land Use Map" in the new Comp Plan. The problem is that the Future Land Use Map does not show property boundaries. This makes it very difficult for the process, as described herein, to be administered consistently.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
363	21.10	Review Process / Admin	8c. There needs to be some definition or guidelines for the term "practical difficulty".	No Change	This is a legal term required nationwide for variances.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
364	21.17.040	Review Process / Admin	14a. 21.17.040 Orders for addressing and remediating nuisances and never-ending non-conforming uses should be specifically listed in this section.	No Change	Public nuisance abatement is covered in Chapter 5.16 of Homer City Code. Nonconforming uses are addressed in Chapter 21.15. Legally, nonconforming uses are allowed to remain as long as they meet the criteria in 21.15.050	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
365	21.17	Review Process / Admin	14c. There is some misnumbering in this chapter.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
366	21.18.020	Review Process / Admin	15a. 21.18.020(b) The following Overlay Districts should be listed: i. The Environmental Constraints Overlay. ii. Gateway Business District Overlay	No Change	There is no longer an Environmental Constraints Overlay as originally proposed. The Gateway Business District is not an overlay district.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
367		Review Process / Admin	Please do not limit public input or comment. Many people considering and voicing their opinions needs to be the decisions in the long run. Thank you for your work and for listening.	No Change	No changes to the public hearing process are proposed.	5/15	Comment Form	Ole	Andersson	
368	21.22.010	Review Process / Admin	Modify 21.22.010 to add the following: 'The purpose of the Medical District is to provide an area near the South Peninsula Hospital to support medical facilities, professional offices, assisted living facilities, and a variety of housing types. Housing for hospital and medical facility personnel is a key concern, and housing developments in the district should be encouraged. The district is meant to accommodate a mixture of residential and nonresidential uses. Pedestrian-friendly designs and amenities are encouraged. Proximity to parks (e.g. Hornaday Park) and trails is an advantage in this area providing wellness opportunities for hospital patients and customers and the general public [Ord. 20-59(A) § 1, 2020].'	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
369	21.23.040	Review Process / Admin	Delete the following line from 21.23.040 as this energy type isn't pertinent in the medical district: g. One small wind energy system having a rated capacity exceeding 10 kilowatts; provided, that it is the only wind energy system of any capacity on the lot.	No Change	These systems are listed as accessory uses in all districts that allow residential uses.	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
370	21.08.050	Review Process / Admin	A well written section that addresses the current inconsistencies between The Zoning Map, a product of the Title 21 Update, and the FLUM, a product of the 2045 City of Homer Comp Plan. These two maps need to be consistent and reflect public survey input from the 2025 Comp Plan survey. Given that the maps are key guides for Homer planning for the next 20 years, it's important to get these right before finalizing Title 21. Best example of consistency issues: conservation land use designation and environmental constraints overlays with 'industrial' and GC1 in the airport - Beluga Lake area. Industrial designation is not appropriate for these sensitive, environmentally important areas, nor is GC1. This needs more discussion in public forums, e.g. Council and HPC meetings.	No Change	The City has taken the stance of not proactively rezoning property to match the FLUM. Future rezonings of those properties where there are inconsistencies will be guided by the FLUM, but for now the existing uses can remain.	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
371		Review Process / Admin	Currently there are inconsistencies between the Zoning Map and the FLUM. The Zoning Map is a product of the Title 21 Update, and the FLUM is a product of the 2045 City of Homer Comp Plan. These two maps need to be consistent and accurate as they serve as key guides for Homer planning for the next 20 years. Best example of consistency issues: conservation land use designation and environmental constraints overlays with 'industrial' and GC1 in the airport - Beluga Lake area. Industrial designation is not appropriate for these sensitive, environmentally important areas, nor is GC1.	No Change	The City has taken the stance of not proactively rezoning property to match the FLUM. Future rezonings of those properties where there are inconsistencies will be guided by the FLUM, but for now the existing uses can remain.	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission
372	21.57.020	Review Process / Admin	I think that Homer should consider becoming a Dark Sky Compliant City. We currently have lighting that covers the spectrum in terms of light temperature, intensity and timing. Becoming Dark Sky Compliant would potentially help save on natural resources, protect wildlife, and help us all be better neighbors.	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/14	Comment Form	Katherine	Brennan	
373	21.57.020	Review Process / Admin	Some good examples of city code that already exists through Cupertino Municipal Code include: CUPERTINO MUNICIPAL CODE 19.102.030 Bird-safe Development Requirements and CUPERTINO MUNICIPAL CODE 19.102.040 Outdoor Lighting Requirements. I am happy to forward links to these codes via email.	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/14	Comment Form	Katherine	Brennan	
374	21.57.020	Review Process / Admin	I would also encourage looking at www.darksksociety.org and their Dark Sky Societies Lighting Plan Guidelines. 'The American Medical Association (AMA) endorses dark-sky friendly lighting at or below 3000 Kelvin to reduce hazardous glare and excessive light trespass which has many implications for human health conditions including the correlation between melatonin suppression with the growth of cancerous tumors.' I would include a proposal to have outdoor light at NO GREATER THAN 3000 kelvin.	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/14	Comment Form	Katherine	Brennan	
375		Review Process / Admin	It is impossible to go through a 200 plus page document that is often written in legal terms and understand it. It really needs to be presented to the public in a summarized form that is possible to comprehend. It is hard to respond otherwise to a huge document that is challenging to understand. I feel you need to issue a summary that highlights the key changes and extend the comment period to allow time to review.	No Change	No change to the ordinance is suggested by this comment	5/14	Email	Janet	Fink	
376		Review Process / Admin	Thank you for the hard work on the updating of Title 21 for Homer. I am hoping to see some direction on two issues: annexation and ADA compliance.	No Change	Annexation is not covered by Title 21. ADA is a federal law and compliance is required for new uses and public infrastructure regardless of zoning district.	5/15	Comment Form	Caroline	Venuti	resident

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
377		Review Process / Admin	It is short sighted to not even mention acquiring more land as a way to increase growth in Homer. Annexation would be handled through city ordinances, land use studies, and zoning. To go out further in The East End Road area makes sense as there is land available without water and sewer. Also, we would have more residents that can become voters in city elections and serve on city commissions. Not sure where this would fit but it does need to be mentioned.	No Change	Annexation is not covered by Title 21.	5/15	Comment Form	Caroline	Venuti	resident
378		Review Process / Admin	The Title 21 also does not have the topic of ADA access to new buildings. This law isn't just for customers but also for employees. In the area of public accommodations and commercial facilities that needs some guidelines that can be given by the Planning Department. There will moderate growth in these two areas and we need to be ready with the information regarding the American with Disabilities Act of 1990.	No Change	ADA is a federal law and compliance is required for new uses and public infrastructure regardless of zoning district.	5/15	Comment Form	Caroline	Venuti	resident
379		Review Process / Admin	The parameters of ADA in Title 21 documents would include parking spaces, sidewalk widths and any future public transit routes.	No Change	ADA is a federal law and compliance is required for new uses and public infrastructure regardless of zoning district (including off-street parking standards)	5/15	Comment Form	Caroline	Venuti	resident
380	21.555 .90	Review Process / Admin	A significant issue that arose in review of a large and complex project like the Doyon Hotel was the lack of sufficient guidelines/requirements for off-street parking. Doyon formally indicated that they had met City code for parking, which they probably did. After a closer look at the City Code, it was clear that the current code did not include sufficient standards to address a large, multi-use, complex facility like this. The City approved a major project with deficient parking and no real plan to adequately meet parking needs for the facility without impacting neighborhoods or impacting nearby dedicated parking.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	
381	21.555 .90	Review Process / Admin	For a hotel, the parking space requirement is for "One per guest room." There is no requirement for hotel staff: room cleaning staff, building maintenance, office reception or other staff? For a restaurant, the proposed requirement is "one space per 200 square feet of gross floor area." The proposed requirements also lack standards for special situations like conference facilities. The Doyon project includes a hotel, restaurant, and conference rooms. The conference room – which will hold a few hundred people -- will certainly generate more need for parking. The draft code includes a whole new section on ways to reduce required off-street parking (21.555.100). Should it also include a standard to increase off-street parking for special situations like conference rooms or other special facilities?	No Change	Off street parking requirements for hotels reflect current best practices. Parking requirements can be increased if necessary during the PUD process for unique uses.	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	
382		Review Process / Admin	One of the changes we would like to see in the proposed Title 21 update is better notice of Planning Commission agenda and upcoming public hearings. The way that we read it, it looks as though only publishing in a paper of general circulation in Homer is required. Currently Homer has 1 paper that is greatly diminished since the controversy last fall. Readership is down. There is a new online paper: is that included in this option, so that it must be published in both papers, even though one is only online?	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation (If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
	Sec.2	Topic								
383	21.14.030	Review Process / Admin	Finally, we have a comment on existing code with respect noticing affective landowners for changes in zoning as noted section (b) below. Why not notify affected landowners – within 300 feet of "zoning code text change or a major district boundary change"? A mailed notice is certainly more effective way notifying adjacent landowners of a proposed change of major change in zoning that could affect them in multiple ways. We believe that all landowners of adjacent properties must be notified of major changes in zoning that could effect their community and lead to major changes in land use and property value.	No Change	Section 21.14.030 states, in part, "a copy of the aforementioned newspaper notification or notice containing at least the same information shall be mailed to owners of record on the Borough Assessor's records of real property within a 300-foot periphery of the site that is the subject of the proposed action."	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	
384		Review Process / Admin	Unfortunately, I am highly disappointed in the Draft Update. I think you have not listened to the community and instead are all rather development-minded, creating a blueprint for a destructive and unwanted development plan in Homer.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. Public input is a valued contribution to the development of the Title 21 update.	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	
385		Review Process / Admin	Again, please consider all the specific points and suggestions made by KBCS and KBWC to be repeated here. I believe you have a very great deal of revision work to be made to this Draft Update before submitting it to the City Council for their consideration.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. Public input is a valued contribution to the development of the Title 21 update.	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	
386		Review Process / Admin	My understanding is a planning commissioner cannot make a site visit on large-scale projects or projects in sensitive/technical areas. A planning commissioner should be required to do a site visit on these projects. Utilize the GIS mapping expertise that is at Homer Public Works.	No Change	No change proposed to the review process.	5/15	Email	Sandra	Garity	
387		Review Process / Admin	I also hope there can be a good and fair balance between the public and developers. Twenty years is a long time for the next Comprehensive Plan. It would benefit the community if these issues could be written in a code and are enforced.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. Public input is a valued contribution to the development of the Title 21 update.	5/15	Email	Sandra	Garity	
388		Review Process / Admin	My first request is that, if the process does not already include this, you please build in additional time for public comment after some of these comments are incorporated into another round of proposed changes.	No Change	The public hearing draft (PHD) will provide additional time for the public to provide formal input on the draft.	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	
389	21.01.030	Review Process / Admin	21.01.030 Purpose - Proposed additions (underlined in bold in original submission): add 'clean environment' to public health/safety/welfare language; add 'shade' and 'erosion' to open space provisions; add 'while promoting foot powered transportation' to vehicular congestion section; add section i: 'Preserve and enhance the aesthetic natural environment of the community'; add 'clean environment' to general welfare promotion.	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
390		Review Process / Admin	Homer City residents have paid for this process and public input and they deserve to be heard.Ignoring public comment in this case is an improper use of city funds.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. Public input is a valued contribution to the development of the Title 21 update.	5/15	Comment Form	Liliana	Sotomayor	
391		Review Process / Admin	"These petitions are in support of the significant majority of public comment that was given through the Comp Plan process, as well as comments and recommendations made by the Planning Commission and the public at the Planning Commission Worksessions this past winter. Given all of this, staff should at a minimum draft code along the lines proposed. It will then be up to the City Council to refine, consider, and ultimately vote."	No Change	Comment does not suggest a specific change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
392		Review Process / Admin	"We have not counted up all the signatures precisely, but we approximate 680 signatures on our Open Space Petition and 490 signatures on the STR Petition. We hope you will read and respond to all the individual comments that folks have included." [Note: submitted documents contain approx. 600 unique signatories (Open Space) and 360 unique signatories (STR); discrepancy may reflect additional sheets not included in submission.]	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society
393	21.19.050	Rural Residential District	HCC 21.19.050 a.2.i. Dimensional requirements. Clarify if the City accepts DEC approved wells and haul water.	TBD	Need confirmation from staff	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
394	21.19	Rural Residential District	16a. 21.19 This section needs to be reconciled with the adopted version of the 2045 Comp Plan, where some of the zoning designations were changed.	No Change	The comprehensive plan does not change any zoning districts. It is not intended that the zoning districts exactly map the future land use designations in the plan.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
395	21.19.020	Rural Residential District	16b. 21.19.020(l) This definition of "temporary...roadside stands" should be expanded to include other cottage industries such as: egg sales, garage sales, lemonade stands...	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
396	21.19.020	Rural Residential District	16c. 21.19.020 The keeping of RVs and small boats should be a permitted use.	Change	Add to list of accessory uses.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
397	21.19.030	Rural Residential District	16d. 21.19.030 "Home occupations" are a permitted use. The definition of "Home occupation" does not include Air Bnbs, even though they are businesses, creating a conflict. Please reconcile this.	No Change	Bed and Breakfasts are also listed as a permitted use.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
398	21.19.030	Rural Residential District	16e. 21.19.030 It should be possible to get a permit to build/occupy a garage or other accessory building before the house is built. It's a useful strategy to build the garage first and live in it while you're building the house. There could be a time limit on it.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
399	21.19.040	Rural Residential District	16f. 21.19.040 Commercial greenhouses should be a conditional use. They certainly have less impact than a kennel or some of the other conditional uses.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
400	21.19.050	Rural Residential District	16g. 21.19.050 There should be a view protection clause that requires new developments to preserve the view corridors of existing buildings.	No Change	Requires that view corridors be defined, which is difficult, and impacts on property owners could be significant. This also gives owners of existing buildings significant power over development on property that could be far from their building.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
401	21.19.050	Rural Residential District	16h. 21.19.050 Means of non-motorized transportation, such as connecting to existing sidewalks or trails, should be required.	No Change	Not necessary within a primarily residential district.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
402	21.38.030	Rural Residential District	Hoping that we can get keeping of livestock and fowl added as an allowed use in Rural Residential :)	No Change	Agricultural activity, including the keeping of livestock, is a permitted use in the RR district	4/13	Email	Amy	Woodruff	City of Homer

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
403		Rural Residential District	It is proposed that all properties on Bay Avenue be rezoned from "Rural Residential District" (RR) to "Neighborhood Flex District" (NF). We urge the City retain the Rural Residential Status for the properties south of Bay Avenue. We own residential property in this area. Like our neighbors, we purchased this special place and home with the understanding that it was zoned RR, and would remain that way. Every single property on south side of Bay Avenue – that portion bordering and including part of salt marsh land in Mariner Park Lagoon – is fully developed for residential use. It seems both unfair and highly inappropriate that the City is proposing to change this status.	No Change	Changes are in accordance with the adopted Future Land Use map in the Comprehensive Plan. No changes to uses, including smaller lot sizes, are allowed without the availability of public water and sewer service.	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	
404		Rural Residential District	The density of development is also different between the two designations: Maximum building coverage: RR, 30%; NF, 50%. Maximum impervious coverage: RR, 50%; NF 70%. Given that the south Bay Avenue lots are very deep and narrow, nearly half of their acreage is on slope down to marsh and the vegetated salt marsh below (i.e., undevelopable), it is conceivable that re-development could completely cover the upland/useable property with building and pavement. Moreover, it could greatly impact the use, value, and quality of adjoining properties. In the case of drainage, the runoff from rain would drain onto adjoining properties and in some conditions flood adjoining properties.	No Change	Changes are in accordance with the adopted Future Land Use map in the Comprehensive Plan. No changes to uses, including smaller lot sizes, are allowed without the availability of public water and sewer service.	5/15	Email	Glenn & Bette	Seaman	
405		Rural Residential District	We also have two properties in the Rural Residential zone of Baycrest area that under the new recommendation would be obsolete for Motel, Worker Housing, Retail Uses and Offices all of which exist at Baycrest as necessary parts of the operations and proposed overlay zoning removes the ability to continue existing uses. Nurseries, Fueling Stations, RV Campgrounds, Refuse facilities and large machine rentals ALL exist as our neighbors here and also are not a Permitted Use by the new proposed zoning. It seems a mixed use is more appropriate for that Upper Baycrest area as it is very much commercial including the State's gravel exchange operations and Borough Landfill.	TBD	Discuss site specific issue with staff to determine if RR is the most appropriate zoning designation for the property.	5/15	Comment Form	Crisi	Matthews	
406		Rural Residential District	In the future, we hoped to add a venue space on this land that already supports and has been used for over 15 years as nightly rental cabins and the proposed code doesn't have a provision for this to even be applied for. With the cry for a meeting center and gathering area to attract off season business to Homer this also seems very shortsighted after my time serving on the HERC Commission and the Chamber of Commerce who both heard requests for such facilities to improve healthy and targeted growth in Homer.	TBD	Discuss site specific issue with staff to determine if RR is the most appropriate zoning designation for the property.	5/15	Comment Form	Crisi	Matthews	
407	21.31.060	Scenic Gateway Corridor	25a. 21.31.060 Please add some restrictions to lot coverage, require conformance with the Community Design Manual and require that driveway access to the Sterling Highway be consolidated and minimized.	No Change	Regarding access: requiring this in an area where there are scattered vacant sites mixed in with existing development may be extremely difficult. Could consider minimum driveway spacing standards/maximum number of driveways in some areas.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
408		Scenic Gateway Corridor	Furthermore, zoning should keep like activities together (i.e., follow the purpose of zoning). I adamantly oppose large format or light industrial mixed-use development in the Gateway District or ranging along Baycrest Hill. At the latter location, such activity along a sloped 4-lane highway seems a recipe for disaster from a traffic safety standpoint. Concentrations of light industrial businesses already exist throughout the community.	Partial Change	Reduce height maximum in GBD to 35 feet. No industrial uses are permitted in the GBD.	5/15	Email	Leslie	Slater	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation		Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)						
409		Short Term Rentals	I am writing in opposition to the proposed zoning changes affecting short-term seasonal housing and mixed-use housing opportunities within the Marine Commercial zone in Homer.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Rachel	Gonzalez		
410		Short-Term Rentals	The proposed Short-Term Rental (STR) section in Chapter 21.50 should be removed from Title 21 in its entirety.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Charles	Anderson		
411		Short-Term Rentals	This section represents a clear departure from how the rest of the zoning code is structured and applied. Title 21 regulates land use based on use and measurable impacts—things like size, density, traffic, and compatibility—not on the duration of occupancy. The stated purpose of the zoning code is to enhance the public health, safety and welfare through land use regulations, including to regulate and restrict the location and use of buildings, structures and land and to address impacts such as congestion and density (Homer City Code 21.01.030).	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Charles	Anderson		
412		Short-Term Rentals	By contrast, Chapter 21.50 states that its purpose is to establish rules, regulations, and limitations on short-term rentals. This is a fundamentally different approach. It targets a specific activity for limitation rather than identifying and regulating a land use impact.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Charles	Anderson		
413		Short-Term Rentals	A dwelling unit is defined as a structure with independent living facilities including provisions for sleeping, cooking and sanitation (Homer City Code 21.02). That definition does not change based on whether someone stays 30 days or 31 days. In practical terms, the use is identical—people enter the home, prepare meals, bathe, and sleep. There is no meaningful land use distinction created by a one-day difference in duration of stay.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Charles	Anderson		
414		Short-Term Rentals	The STR provisions therefore regulate what is already a lawful residential use—occupancy—without identifying a distinct or measurable impact that justifies separate treatment. Nowhere else in Title 21 is a residential use singled out and regulated in this manner. Where the code does regulate specific uses, it does so to mitigate clearly identified impacts—for example, drive-through standards are intended to reduce the negative impacts they may create (Homer City Code 21.40.010). That is not the case here.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Charles	Anderson		

Code					Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
415		Short-Term Rentals	If short-term rentals create impacts, those impacts should be clearly identified and supported with measurable evidence. Title 21 already contains tools to address real issues—noise, traffic, nuisance, and site design—and those standards apply to any property creating a problem, regardless of who occupies it or for how long. Regulation should follow demonstrated impacts, not assumptions tied to duration of stay.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Charles	Anderson	
416		Short-Term Rentals	In addition, the STR section introduces further inconsistency into an already fragmented set of lodging-related definitions. Uses such as rooming houses and bed and breakfasts are defined separately (Homer City Code 21.02), but are not clearly integrated with one another. Adding a distinct STR category increases ambiguity, creates overlapping classifications, and invites inconsistent interpretation and enforcement.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Charles	Anderson	
417		Short-Term Rentals	Finally, adoption of STR regulations within Title 21 at this time is premature. The City Council has already directed the Economic Development Committee to study short-term rentals and provide recommendations. Advancing regulatory language in the zoning code prior to completion of that work bypasses that process and introduces policy without the benefit of analysis.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Charles	Anderson	
418		Short-Term Rentals	Title 21 is built around regulating land use impacts—not limiting lawful activities based on how they are perceived. Chapter 21.50 departs from that foundation by targeting a specific form of residential occupancy based solely on duration of stay, without demonstrated justification.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Charles	Anderson	
419		Short-Term Rentals	If regulation is to be considered, it should be done deliberately, transparently, and based on evidence—not introduced indirectly through a structural change to the zoning code.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Charles	Anderson	
420		Short-Term Rentals	For these reasons, Chapter 21.50 should be removed and addressed, if necessary, following completion of the current study process.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Charles	Anderson	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
421		Short-Term Rentals	My name is Kristen and I live outside of Homer city limits off Diamond Ridge, so this issue doesn't really pertain to me, but I have an opinoin as a landlady. I am e-mailing in regards to the airbnb issue that is being discussed.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Kristen	Bell	
422		Short-Term Rentals	I own 2 airbnbs and SIX long term (from summer to 6 month to 1 year) rentals all on one property, so 8 rentals in total.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Kristen	Bell	
423		Short-Term Rentals	I have to charge between \$1000-1200 a month for my long term tenants to make the bills. That includes ALL utilities. I always have space available in my long term rentals and people complaining about the price....of \$1000 in Homer. I rely heavily on my airbnbs so I can ONLY charge 1000-1200 for my local tenants which in my opinion is dirt cheap considering my electric bll is between 650 - 800. Water is \$250 a month. Internet \$150. Trash \$110. Heat \$400. Let's not forget all the wear and tear, insurance, lack of privacy for myself....I can keep going.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Kristen	Bell	
424		Short-Term Rentals	This isn't a no rental available for people issue. Homer is ridiculously expensive and people just can't afford it. People aren't renting \$1000-1200. That's apparently too much and yet that's only a portion of my mortgage.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Kristen	Bell	
425		Short-Term Rentals	My airbnbs are only half rented this summer and if that were to be taken away, I'd just sell the entire property and leave Homer and its' stupid rules. I am already disgusted by the overreach of the city into peoples lives. You (the city of Homer) can't tell me what to do with my property which is why I moved to Alaska in the first place. Want to take it away? Ok, I'll take my long term rentals, the money I pour into the city, and all the rescue work I do for the community and go find somewhere else that won't try to tell land owners what they can and cannot do. Which honestly, is a violation of my rights, but that's a whole other e-mail. Good luck!	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Kristen	Bell	
426		Short-Term Rentals	I have been the owner and on-site host of a STR, Homer Roundhouse, for fifteen years. I am licensed with the state of Alaska and have paid thousands of dollars in borough taxes as well as federal tax each and every year. I have been a city property and home owner since 1984. I purchased the lots adjacent to my home about twenty-five years ago and built my yurt/guest cottage around 2011.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Comment Form	John	Bushell	

Code					Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
427		Short-Term Rentals	I agree that STR regulation is appropriate for our small, tourist destination community.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Comment Form	John	Bushell	
428		Short-Term Rentals	1- Taxes/fees on owner/hosts should not be imposed as the borough already collects them. I could go along with a yearly small registration fee for administrative costs. Remember, I said 'small.'	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Comment Form	John	Bushell	
429		Short-Term Rentals	2- It is crucial for the city to devise a system insuring that all STRs operating within city limits are licensed by the state and pay their borough tax.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Comment Form	John	Bushell	
430		Short-Term Rentals	3- It is also important for the neighborhoods that the STRs have the owner/host on site during each guest stay. These hosts must be permanent residents.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Comment Form	John	Bushell	
431		Short-Term Rentals	4- I strongly believe that the actual accommodation for the guests are a. within the owner home b. in a guest house located on the hosts property c. on the adjacent lot of hosts property.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Comment Form	John	Bushell	
432		Short-Term Rentals	I have not seen 4c mentioned anywhere in the city's proposed regulations. Here is my reasoning: When the owner/host is present at all hours on-site, in the house or directly next door, he/she is responsible when things go wrong. An on-site host has immediate, personal skin in the game: noise, parties, trash, and bad guests affect their home too. Self-interest creates the enforcement mechanism that regulations are designed to impose externally.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Comment Form	John	Bushell	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
433		Short-Term Rentals	With absentee ownership - no one is responsible when things go wrong. A next-door owner flips that entirely. When the owner lives next door, they are the neighbor. They'll screen guests more carefully, respond to problems faster than any hotline, and have strong social and financial incentives to keep the peace.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Comment Form	John	Bushell	
434		Short-Term Rentals	The Homer STR regulations must be designed to solve problems such as absentee landlords, corporate investors and neighborhood disruption — that a present, invested, next-door owner largely doesn't create.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Comment Form	John	Bushell	
435		Short-Term Rentals	My name is Sky Cady. I'm the owner of several small businesses in Homer and have been here for 5 years working and living. I've got kids in the local schools and am involved in various community organizations. I want Homer to flourish.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Comment Form	Sky	Cady	
436		Short-Term Rentals	I own several short term rentals, have managed the airbnb's for them, and have transitioned them into longer term over the years (primarily because of the spoken needs of our community). Both short and long term rentals are needed. Over the last couple years here's what I have noticed, have heard in conversation with other land/home owners & businesses, and have become more convinced of.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Comment Form	Sky	Cady	
437		Short-Term Rentals	Tenants who say they want longer term really mean that WHEN they say it, but the reality is that Alaska has natural turnover for many reasons. Most who say they want to stay, actually leave or find another place after 3-6 months. People move, jobs change, expectations are reconsidered, weather hits, income changes. Especially coming into summer when they find a better opportunity.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Comment Form	Sky	Cady	
438		Short-Term Rentals	STR already pay a tax. Why pay more?	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Comment Form	Sky	Cady	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation						
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org	
439		Short-Term Rentals	The Airbnb rentals have come to somewhat of a saturation point in Homer where some are sitting unrented for longer periods of time than the owners would like, especially before memorial day, after August 15th and even during the summer season.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Comment Form	Sky	Cady		
440		Short-Term Rentals	LET THE MARKET of landlords naturally make the move to long term when they see the changes and needs. If they're not making money – they'll find a way to make it. That's how people survive in Homer.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Comment Form	Sky	Cady		
441		Short-Term Rentals	A LARGE PERCENTAG of STR are not capable of having someone there long term, and if you say they can only be long term – then you won't have either. For example... 1. a mother-in-law basement suite that has little sound insulation – so the landlord can be quiet for a day or two for guests, but can't maintain quiet for a year. 2. Or, a septic system that can't handle two full time families, but can handle it for a couple days. 3. Or a space that cannot be converted to a full functioning kitchen – but only has room for a coffee pot, burner & minifridge, and little insulation for warmth during the winter.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Comment Form	Sky	Cady		
442		Short-Term Rentals	Changing economic conditions in our country and state have forced many of us to be creative with leveraging what we have to provide income for our families. By regulating, over taxing, putting limits & bureaucracy on this sector, you will severely limit peoples ability to make a living in Homer and thus disable some from being able to afford to live here. A large majority if not MOST of landlords who live here have multiple jobs. They're trying to make it just like everyone else. Why make it harder for short term rental owners to thrive when they contribute to the community?	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Comment Form	Sky	Cady		
443		Short-Term Rentals	The Hotel industry is not enough to provide for summer tourists. Cap or overregulate/tax and you make it less affordable for tourists to come here.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Comment Form	Sky	Cady		
444		Short-Term Rentals	In short – regulation and overtaxation are a big part of the reason why people have left California, New York, Washington & Oregon. Let's not do that. It's hard enough just to get people here.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Comment Form	Sky	Cady		

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation						
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org	
445		Short-Term Rentals	The short term rental community provides jobs for a huge amount of cleaners. Put a cap on that or tax that and those cleaners wages will stagnate or go down.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Comment Form	Sky	Cady		
446		Short-Term Rentals	When the new development is finished below West Homer Elementary I believe there will be 24(?) [comment text cut off at bottom of page]	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Comment Form	Sky	Cady		
447		Short-Term Rentals	In each phase of the public processes for the comprehensive plan and zoning code rewrites there has been a growing outcry by Homer residents to stop absentee-landlord short-term rentals (STRs) from infiltrating our neighborhoods. "Absentee-landlord STRs" are dwelling units that are rented for less than 30 days on properties that are not the primary residential premises of the operator. Instead of housing for neighbors, these dwelling units are profit-makers for investors.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/12	Email	Kathryn	Carssow		
448		Short-Term Rentals	Over a decade ago, city leaders foresaw this issue and addressed it in the comprehensive plan and the zoning code, Title 21. At that time the term for what we now refer to as "short-term rentals (STRs)" was "bed and breakfasts (B&Bs)." B&Bs are only allowed on the premises of the operator's primary residence. Even though these two terms continue to be used interchangeably by the hospitality industry, e.g. AirBnB Inc., and the State of Alaska (18AAC 30.400), terminology has been given as the reason why absentee-landlord STR entrepreneurs have been allowed to buy up property in our neighborhoods. Further, in our current Title 21, other short-term accommodation uses are inadequately defined and cannot be clearly distinguished from one another or from STRs: "dormitory," "hostel," and "rooming house." Confusion over these has also been an argument for allowing absentee-landlord STRs in residential neighborhoods under the current zoning code.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/12	Email	Kathryn	Carssow		
449		Short-Term Rentals	The Title 21 Public Review Draft ignores the intent behind our current zoning code as well as the foreseen socioeconomic burdens absentee-landlord STRs now impose on our neighborhoods and community. Simply put, if you have an absentee-landlord STR next door, you have the hospitality industry, not an individual or a family, for a neighbor. Without neighbors, you are no longer living in a neighborhood; you are living in a "hospitality-industry/residential mixed-use zone." Neighborhoods are essential to the quality of our lives in Homer. Neighborhoods integrate us across generations, races, political persuasions, sexual orientations and religions. The close proximity of our homes to one another binds us in a way that is unique in building and strengthening enduring relationships. That is what is meant by a fundamental community planning principle: neighborhoods are the building blocks of community.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/12	Email	Kathryn	Carssow		

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation						
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)			Date	Format	First Name	Last Name
450		Short-Term Rentals	Creating a new permitting system does not fit Homer's city government resources and capabilities. A new permit system will be administratively unwieldy and costly for a city with little in the way of zoning enforcement capacity. It is a bureaucratic process slapped onto the tail-end of the draft code; STRs, unlike all other allowed uses, are not integrated into the text of draft code under the relevant zoning districts.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/12	Email	Kathryn	Carssow		
451		Short-Term Rentals	A new permitting system does nothing to protect the integrity of our neighborhoods and does not yield a timely solution to our affordable housing crisis -- another immediate public concern. Individual investors and corporations, who can pay more, but have no vested interest in us as neighbors, will continue to successfully compete for the houses next door to us to use as profit-making public accommodations. People whom we would value as neighbors, including returning adult children, families, down-sizing seniors, and those hoping to fill our job openings, will continue to be pushed out of our housing market – to the detriment of the social and economic health of our community.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/12	Email	Kathryn	Carssow		
452		Short-Term Rentals	Replace the term "bed and breakfast" with the term "short term rental" throughout the code and make the distinction between absentee-landlord STRs and STRs located on the premises of the operator's primary residence.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/12	Email	Kathryn	Carssow		
453		Short-Term Rentals	Allow STRs in Residential Districts only on the premises of the operator's primary residence.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/12	Email	Kathryn	Carssow		
454		Short-Term Rentals	Allow STRs, regardless of operator's residence status, in all other zones and in other than residential structures, e.g., on the second floors of commercial buildings along Pioneer Avenue and on the Spit.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/12	Email	Kathryn	Carssow		
455		Short-Term Rentals	Grant nontransferable "grandfather rights" to existing absentee-landlord STRs in Residential Districts that terminate upon sale of the property.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/12	Email	Kathryn	Carssow		

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
456		Short-Term Rentals	Define "dormitory," "hostel," and "rooming house" so as to be clearly distinct from STRs in terms of length of stay, number of guest rooms and guests, property ownership, etc., and only allowed in Residential Districts as Conditional Uses.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/12	Email	Kathryn	Carssow	
457		Short-Term Rentals	Require STRs to comply with State of Alaska Requirements for Bed and Breakfasts, including state plan approval regulations for "not owner occupied" bed and breakfasts, which are referred to in our state regulations as "public accommodations."	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/12	Email	Kathryn	Carssow	
458		Short-Term Rentals	Do not establish a new permitting system.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/12	Email	Kathryn	Carssow	
459		Short-Term Rentals	First, thank you to the City Council, committee members, consultants, and City staff for the hard work over the past several months (years?) on the Comprehensive Plan and Title 21 rewrite. In the meetings and open houses I attended, it was clear how much effort went into balancing a wide range of views.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan	
460		Short-Term Rentals	As someone who manages rental housing both inside and outside Homer city limits, I am primarily advocating for flexibility in how I manage my business and fairness in how Homer businesses are regulated. The current draft of Section 21.50 creates a situation where local businesses could be eliminated simply by Council resolution (21.50.30b), which is unique among uses identified in the code. It also creates arbitrary and unclear standards for rentals under 30 days that are not applied to other businesses or lodging types. In fact, the proposals are not even applied consistently among rentals under 30 days.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan	
461		Short-Term Rentals	Each type of housing serves a different niche, and the market already responds to changing needs in Homer. In my view, the ongoing focus on short-term rentals is largely misdirected. The City should not be laying the groundwork for future restrictions unless there are proven negative impacts of that use, and I do not believe we are even in the ballpark there. Instead, these proposed rules would loom over established short-term rental owners, and those that may want or need to utilize their property in different ways now or years in the future to suit their own goals, desires, and needs.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan	

Code					Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
462		Short-Term Rentals	Please see below my comments specific to the proposed short-term rental section. I believe Chapter 21.50 should be removed from Title 21.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan	
463		Short-Term Rentals	1. Duration of stay does not create a different use; business permitting doesn't fit in Title 21: A dwelling unit functions the same whether occupied for 10 days or 100 days. Residents sleep, cook, park, create noise, generate waste, and consume resources in essentially the same way. The proposed regulations rely on duration of stay as the determining factor for whether a rental business must register with the City, without identifying any impact that justifies separate treatment under the zoning code.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan	
464		Short-Term Rentals	If the Council's goal is to better understand housing uses and impacts in Homer, why single out one category of housing rather than requiring permits for all housing units, or even all businesses, regardless of occupancy duration? While I understand there has been vocal and persistent pressure to "do something" regarding short-term rentals, business registration requirements are beyond the scope of Title 21 and should be addressed separately in the appropriate section of code, and only if necessary.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan	
465		Short-Term Rentals	2. Regulation should be based on actual impacts, not assumptions: If short-term rentals are associated with impacts such as noise, traffic, or nuisances, those impacts should be clearly identified and supported by evidence. In 2024, the Council investigated these concerns and found that short-term rentals did not cause increased incidents in these areas. Also, Title 21 already contains provisions to address nuisance-related issues for any type of land use.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan	
466		Short-Term Rentals	Past discussions also focused on ensuring proper sales tax compliance. Since then, information shared with the City by the Borough has shown that the vast majority of operators were compliant, and remaining stragglers were being actively being brought into compliance.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan	
467		Short-Term Rentals	Recent anti-short-term rental efforts have pivoted to housing availability and affordability talking points. While those concerns are understandable, a shortage of cheap housing should not automatically be attributed to short-term rentals or assumed to be solved through their restriction or elimination. Regulation should address real impacts rather than assumptions, especially when proposing eliminating businesses and restricting otherwise lawful residential uses.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan	

Code					Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation							
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org		
468		Short-Term Rentals	3. Adds confusion to already inconsistent lodging definitions: The addition of a separate short-term rental category adds complexity to an already fragmented set of lodging-related definitions throughout Title 21. Existing categories such as "bed and breakfasts", "dormitories", "hostels", "rooming houses", and "worker housing" are not clearly integrated with one another, and now "bunkhouses", "inns", and "rental cabins" are mentioned here and there as separate housing types without clear definitions.		No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan			
469		Short-Term Rentals	For example, the definition of "hostel" references dormitory-style accommodations, raising questions about how those uses differ from actual "dormitories" or "bunkhouses". Is a "rooming house" rented weekly also considered a "short-term rental"? Why is a "rental cabin" exempt from the proposed rules, but a non-cabin looking building needs to be permitted? Does it really matter whether a bed is occupied by a tourist, student, seasonal worker, or backpacker? Why does the City think it should be the one to micromanage that?		No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan			
470		Short-Term Rentals	Adding another overlapping classification with separate permitting requirements is arbitrary and would lead to inconsistent interpretation and enforcement.		No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan			
471		Short-Term Rentals	4. Premature given ongoing EDC study and housing discussions; unnecessary just for data collection: The City Council has already directed the Economic Development Committee to study short-term rentals and provide recommendations. Advancing zoning regulations before that process is complete is premature and bypasses the review already underway.		No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan			
472		Short-Term Rentals	At the same time, housing initiatives continue to move forward through non-governmental efforts, including an upcoming housing summit on May 14 sponsored by the Rasmuson Foundation and a MAPP-facilitated workgroup exploring practical housing solutions.		No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan			
473		Short-Term Rentals	The staff time required to develop, administer, and enforce a short-term rental permitting program could be better spent analyzing data that is already available. In many cases, that work has already been done by others such as the recent report by the Kachemak Board of Realtors.		No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan			

Code						Project Team Recommendation				
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
474		Short-Term Rentals	Creating a permitting or registration system primarily to gather already available information is duplicative and inconsistent with the stated purpose of discussing short-term rentals at this time, which was to "better understand the short-term rental market in Homer and inform future policy changes". I urge the Council to remove Section 21.50 from the Title 21 rewrite.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Dorothy	Duncan	
475	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Chapter 21.50 should be removed from Title 21.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Angie	Elordi	
476	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Title 21 is designed to regulate land use based on measurable impacts—density, traffic, noise, and compatibility. It is not written to regulate how long someone stays in a home. Chapter 21.50 departs from that framework by targeting short-term rentals based solely on duration of occupancy, not on any clearly defined land use impact.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Angie	Elordi	
477	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	A dwelling unit functions the same whether it is occupied for 30 days or 31. The use does not change, and no meaningful land use distinction is created by length of stay. Regulating duration is not the same as regulating impact.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Angie	Elordi	
478	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	If there are real impacts associated with short-term rentals, they should be clearly identified and supported with evidence. Title 21 already includes tools to address noise, traffic, nuisance, and site issues—regardless of who occupies a property or for how long. Regulation should follow demonstrated impacts, not assumptions.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Angie	Elordi	
479	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	This proposal also adds confusion to an already inconsistent set of lodging definitions, increasing the risk of unclear interpretation and uneven enforcement.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Angie	Elordi	

Code				Project Team Recommendation						
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
480	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Finally, this action is premature. The City Council has already directed further study of short-term rentals. Moving forward now bypasses that process and introduces policy without adequate analysis.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Angie	Elordi	
481	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Title 21 should remain focused on land use impacts—not regulating lawful residential occupancy based on duration.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Angie	Elordi	
482	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	For these reasons, Chapter 21.50 should be removed.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/29	Comment Form	Angie	Elordi	
483	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	RESIDENTIAL IS RESIDENTIAL NOT A MIXED USE, OR BUSINESS ZONE.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Email	Kate	Finn	
484	21.51.100	Short-Term Rentals	PLEASE UPDATE HCC TITLE 21.51.100 FROM "BED AND BREAKFAST" TO INCLUDE OR BE REPLACED BY THE TERM "SHORT TERM RENTAL" TO BE SURE PEOPLE ARE OPERATING THE BUSINESS FROM THEIR PRIMARY RESIDENCE.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Email	Kate	Finn	
485		Short-Term Rentals	NO TO NEIGHBORHOOD FLEX DISTRICTS IF THEY ARE GOING TO INCLUDE NON-OWNER-OCCUPIED STRS	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Email	Kate	Finn	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
486		Short-Term Rentals	ALL STRs MUST BE RENTALS OF LESS THAN 30 DAYS, AND THE PERSONS OPERATING THE BUSINESS NEED TO BE DOING SO FROM THEIR PRIMARY RESIDENCE.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Email	Kate	Finn	
487		Short-Term Rentals	ONE DOESN'T BUY INTO A RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD TO BE LIVING NEXT DOOR TO THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY, WITH THE CONSTANT TURNOVER OF TRAVELERS WHO HAVE NO VESTED INTEREST IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD, AND ARE ACCOUNTABLE TO NO ONE LOCALLY.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Email	Kate	Finn	
488		Short-Term Rentals	Below is an e-mail sent from Kathy Carssow to the EDC on May 4th, enclosed with permission, as a more precise and detailed background summary of the issue. (See Carssow comments for full text of enclosed letter.)	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Email	Kate	Finn	
489	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Of course mine revolves around the short term rental items. I have young (20-30 year old) nieces and nephews who are Homer residents who would love to actually build or purchase a STR in the future as it's a great way to be part of the community and allow maximum flexibility to their purchase. (Actually a great way to be able to remain in homer!! - hence the reason for my comments!)	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Email	Marc	Freund	
490	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	1) Bottom line is that regulation of STRs does not help lower income housing availability or supply. Data actually points to quite the opposite. You will notice that any successes of policies even in Alaska do not reference facts or any studies. This is due to the fact that the data tells the opposite story. Regulation of STRs does not improve affordability and only decreases tourism and increases hotel prices. (see references below)	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Email	Marc	Freund	
491	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	2) Regulation is highly unpopular in Homer. I ran an AI agent to analyze all homer resident public 1000+ comments in past 3 years across all platforms such as facebook, reddit, nextdoor and homer news polls and peninsula forums. Here are the results based on actual users: • Oppose STR regulation: 70%-73% of users • Support STR regulation: 20%-22% of users • Neutral: 7%-13% of users (Feel free to run an AI agent analysis as well to support these facts)	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Email	Marc	Freund	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation (If no change or TBD)		Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment								
492	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Happy to discuss further! (I do support a bed tax to help out some of our budget shortfalls but not support regulation on who or which properties can be STRs)	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Email	Marc	Freund		
493	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Here are some actual studies on the impacts and not political statements of "oh regulation worked great!" NASTRA 2026 Policy Study — "Short-Term Rental Regulations: Principles, Pitfalls and Practical Reforms" Key finding: After reviewing a decade of data, the study concludes that STRs are not a meaningful driver of housing unaffordability. New York City Case Study — 80-90% Reduction in STRs, No Housing Relief: After NYC's strict 2023-2024 STR crackdown: Legal STR listings fell 80-90%. Vacancy rates did not improve. Rents continued rising year-over-year. Hotel prices spiked, harming tourism competitiveness. "STR bans don't free up housing — they just hurt tourism." Harvard Business Review (2024) "What Does Banning Short-Term Rentals Really Accomplish?" Housing costs are driven far more by building restrictions, zoning, and supply constraints. Bans are a poor solution to housing affordability.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Email	Marc	Freund		
494	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Of course what drives housing prices is mostly market building prices, fuel, cost of labor and supply of land, etc. (ask any builder what drives their pricing and none would say "because out of state investors snapping them up and making them to STRs"). It's a fun scenario but it isn't the cause. So obviously from a facts perspective- the data shows that regulation in a place like Homer does not improve market conditions for lower income housing availability.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Email	Marc	Freund		
495	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	I would suggest changes to 21.50.030 (short term rentals)	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Jessica	Hadley		
496	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	Subsection B allows for too broad of powers via resolution of city council without guidance of standards, justifications or data.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Jessica	Hadley		

#	Code Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation (If no change or TBD)					
					Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org	
497	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	If the objective of the code is to ensure transparency, this section should not be included at this time. Across nearly all peer cities - it is not typical to leave broad future authority to changing or establishing caps without objective standards.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Jessica	Hadley	
498	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	Code standards like this are ment to provide solid permitted uses and objective criteria. However this language is vague and creates unpredictable property rights (the exact reason for building codes). Essentially layering in a "gotcha" for a specific type of property usage.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Jessica	Hadley	
499	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	Does the council have rights to establish caps on all other property types via resolution as well? This ability circumvents all code language and decreases the value of a building code in general.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Jessica	Hadley	
500	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	Thanks and let's please consider following the standard of other Alaska communities and first focus on collecting data, registration and enabling understanding impacts rather than broad authority of the council.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Jessica	Hadley	
501	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	I wanted reach out regarding the proposed short term rental regulation.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Email	Joe	Hoanin	
502	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	I don't have a vested interest in the short term rental market but I am unclear on the purpose of creating a permitting process for these rentals.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Email	Joe	Hoanin	

Code					Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
503	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	At this time I'd be inclined to vote no on Title 21.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Email	Joe	Hoanin	
504	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	I appreciate the effort the City is putting into updating Title 21 and addressing housing concerns. This is an important issue for our community.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/30	Comment Form	David	Mastolier	
505	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	As both a long-term and short-term rental owner and a local real estate investor, I would like to offer a practical perspective from someone actively operating within this market.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/30	Comment Form	David	Mastolier	
506	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	I would ask that the City carefully consider how short-term rentals are treated within the Table of Allowed Uses by Zoning District and within residential zones such as RR (21.19), NF (21.20), and UR (21.21).	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/30	Comment Form	David	Mastolier	
507	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	There is a common assumption that STRs are a primary driver of housing affordability challenges. However, available data and local experience suggest that Homer's housing market is influenced by broader economic factors, not solely STR activity.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/30	Comment Form	David	Mastolier	
508	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	I would also encourage caution in placing STRs into a Conditional Use Permit framework (21.09), as this can create uncertainty and additional cost for local property owners without clearly addressing housing supply.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/30	Comment Form	David	Mastolier	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
509	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	In a seasonal economy like Homer, STRs are one of the tools that allow residents to remain financially viable. Many local residents rely on this flexibility to make property ownership work.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/30	Comment Form	David	Mastolier	
510	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Homer residents are resilient and creative, and STRs are part of that reality. Limiting or overburdening them risks removing an important income tool without clearly solving the underlying issue.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/30	Comment Form	David	Mastolier	
511	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	I would encourage the City to focus on solutions that increase overall housing supply—such as allowing flexibility in development standards and supporting additional housing types—rather than placing disproportionate restrictions on STRs within residential zones.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/30	Comment Form	David	Mastolier	
512	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	My name is Maranatha McCarter, and I'm a Homer resident, mom, small business owner, and the owner of Host Alaska Vacation Rental Management. I wanted to share some thoughts regarding the discussion around regulating short-term rentals in Homer.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
513	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	First, I completely understand that housing concerns in Homer are real and emotional. We all want Homer to remain a place where local families can live, work, and thrive. Homer matters deeply to me because this is where my family is raising our children and building our life.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
514	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	That being said, after listening to the recent planning meeting discussions, I was honestly surprised by what felt like a major misunderstanding of how the short-term rental market in Homer actually works.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
515	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	There seemed to be a perception that large corporations or outside investors are coming into Homer and buying up neighborhoods strictly for vacation rentals. From my experience working directly in this industry every day, that really is not the reality for most short-term rentals here.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
516	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	If the City took time to speak directly with the local property managers already operating in Homer, I think they would find that the majority of these homes are owned either by locals or by people who have a real connection to Homer — people who grew up here, have family here, spend summers here, or hope to eventually move or retire here themselves.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
517	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	A lot of these owners keep these homes because they personally want to continue coming back to Homer. Most would not simply turn them into long-term rentals if more STR restrictions were put into place, because that would completely defeat the reason they own the property in the first place.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
518	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	It also feels like some of the frustration directed toward short-term rentals is really tied to the huge housing pressure that happens every summer when our town suddenly fills up with seasonal workers and people desperately looking for 3-4 month housing all over social media and our local Facebook groups. But realistically, many of the homes currently being used as vacation rentals would never have been available as year-round workforce housing to begin with.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
519	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Another thing that stood out to me during the meeting was the concern that short-term rentals are unmonitored or that neighborhood problems are not being handled. I really don't think there was much understanding of how dependent this business is on guest reviews and responsiveness.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
520	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Most short-term rentals are booked almost entirely through platforms like Airbnb and VRBO, where reviews are everything. One bad review can seriously hurt a listing and impact future bookings. Because of that, owners and managers have a huge incentive to respond quickly to problems, keep properties maintained, and make sure guests are respectful neighbors.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation (If no change or TBD)						
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org		
521	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	The reality is that vacation rentals cannot successfully operate without someone actively involved and available. Whether it's the owner, a property manager, a cleaner, or a local contact person, there has to be someone responding to issues quickly or the business simply won't survive.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter		
522	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Every community should have standards, I support the nightly lodging tax and am not totally opposed to permitting itself. However in listening to the City Planning meeting it sounded very personally biased and not data driven. One of the members even talked in disdain about the tourists and wishing he could put them all out into a building on the Spit. He also mentioned tiny homes being unlivable. It seems his opinions are overriding factual data and are personal bias. I hope the City approaches this issue with accurate local information and a better understanding of how Homer's short-term rental community actually operates, rather than comparing us to large cities or even places like Hawaii where people come visit year round, and people WANT to live year round.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter		
523	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	In Homer, it takes a special person to live here through the winter all year round and we want to have a say in how we manage our own property since we tough it out and choose to invest in this community.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter		
524	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Differently than the current narrative, most of us involved in this industry truly care about Homer and want to be good neighbors and positive contributors to the community. We hire excellent local cleaners, maintenance workers, window washers, managers, tour guides, all to show the rest of the world how magical Homer can be.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter		
525	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	I left a previous email for public comment. I would also like to add a narrative below of who my property owners actually are. I have more that I can add to this list and none of them are meeting the criteria that is driving the charge to regulate in hopes of cheaper housing/rents.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter		

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
526	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	My name is Maranatha, and I'm the owner of Host Alaska, a locally owned vacation rental management company based in Homer. I'm also a mom of five young kids, all under the age of 11.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
527	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Managing vacation homes in Homer has given me the unique opportunity to build a business that aligns with the natural rhythm of our seasons. Because much of our work is concentrated during the busy summer months, I've been able to be present with my family in meaningful ways—including homeschooling my kids for a few years before recently transitioning them into public school.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
528	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	I truly love what I do. I have the opportunity to help guests plan their trips to Homer—often once-in-a-lifetime or bucket-list vacations—and to play a small part in creating meaningful family experiences and lasting memories. Sharing the beauty of Homer with those seeing it for the first time is something that never gets old.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
529	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	In Homer, short-term rentals are not primarily owned by large outside corporations or investors buying up land. In most cases, they are owned by local residents—families who live here, work here, and are part of this community. These are people who are trying to responsibly use their properties to supplement their income, especially in a seasonal economy like ours.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
530	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	For many, short-term rentals help cover mortgages, offset the high cost of living, and allow them to continue living in Homer long-term. In some cases, they make it possible for families to stay here rather than relocate.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
531	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Additionally, these rentals directly support our local economy. Guests who stay in these homes are visiting our restaurants, booking fishing charters, shopping locally, and experiencing everything Homer has to offer. This creates a ripple effect that benefits many small businesses across town.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
532	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	And importantly, all of the owners I work with are properly registered with the borough. They collect and pay lodging taxes and fees on every single nightly rental, contributing meaningful revenue back into our local community.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
533	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	I'd also like to share real examples of who short-term rental owners are in our community.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
534	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	One of the homeowners I work with is a single grandmother who lives here in Homer full-time and works at our local hospital. Her two daughters also live here in town, and her goal is to be able to retire early so she can help raise her grandchildren and be present in their lives.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
535	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	During the summer months, she temporarily moves in with her daughters. This allows her to both support her family and make her home available as a short-term rental during the peak visitor season. The income she earns during that time helps supplement her earnings and move her closer to being able to retire and remain here in Homer long-term.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
536	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Another example is a family who has operated a successful local business in Homer for over 20 years. They are deeply rooted in this community and contribute significantly to our local economy.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
537	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	They own a small cottage near their business, which they use throughout much of the year to support their operations. Each season, their parents return to Homer and spend countless hours helping prepare for the busy summer months—especially in a business centered around outdoor supplies, gardening, and plants. That cottage provides a place for their parents to stay while they contribute to getting the business ready for the influx of visitors.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
538	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Because of this ongoing use, the home isn't suitable as a traditional long-term rental. It plays an important role in supporting both their family and their business.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
539	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	During the summer, when their needs shift, they make that same cottage available as a short-term rental. This allows them to supplement their income while also offering visitors a unique, locally connected experience.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
540	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	A third example is a well-known local couple who both hold important positions at South Peninsula Hospital. They have seven children and have spent years building their life here in Homer.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
541	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	After their youngest child left home, they decided to downsize and placed their larger home on the market. They initially tried to find long-term renters, but due to the size and cost of the home, they were unable to do so. For the past three years, while the home has remained on the market, they have used it as a short-term rental during the summer months to help cover the mortgage and maintain the property.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
542	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	That home has been listed this entire time and has not yet sold. The ability to offset their mortgage through short-term rental income has allowed them to hold onto that investment and remain financially stable during that transition.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
543	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	They have no intention of leaving Homer. Most of their children still live here, and they are deeply invested in this community.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation						
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org	
544	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Another owner I work with was born and raised in Homer, and his family's roots here go back generations, including grandparents who homesteaded in this area. Due to his work, he is often required to live outside of Homer, but he returns regularly to be with his family and stay connected to the community.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter		
545	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	He invested in a home here so he would always have a place to return to. He rents one unit as a long-term rental, contributing to housing in that way, and uses the other unit as a short-term rental. This flexibility allows him to manage around his work schedule while still being able to come home and use the space when he is in town. This enables him to maintain his connection to Homer and continue investing in the community despite having to work elsewhere.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter		
546	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	I also work with a couple of families who first came to Homer as visitors years ago and have long hoped to make it their full-time home. Because of current family and job commitments, they aren't able to relocate permanently yet.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter		
547	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Instead, they return year after year—often multiple times a year—and have chosen to invest in homes here so they have a place to stay and a long-term connection to the community. They consider Homer a true gem and are deeply invested in its future. Short-term rentals allow them to offset the cost of ownership while they work toward the possibility of eventually living here full-time. In many ways, these are future residents—people who are already investing in Homer, supporting the local economy, and building meaningful ties to this community.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter		
548	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Lastly, I work with a couple who have been coming to Homer for years, bringing friends and family to experience what they believe is some of the most beautiful scenery in the world. They purchased a home here with the intention of visiting regularly and sharing that experience with others.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter		
549	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Unexpectedly, their primary residence in Texas was lost to a fire. As a result, their Homer home has temporarily become their primary residence, even though their jobs, family commitments, and daily lives remain in Texas.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter		

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
550	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Short-term rentals have given them the ability to offset the financial burden of rebuilding their home, while still holding onto their long-term dream of eventually living in Homer. It also allows them to continue sharing their home with others who want to experience Alaska, just as they have for years.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Maranatha	McCarter	
551	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	Seems to be lots of confusion out there but wanted to make sure I request a specific redline change to section 21.50.030	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Tom	Miller	
552	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	Subsection (B) contains too broad of language. This language allows for sweetheart deals and introduces ambiguity into the code rather than specific reasons or benchmarks on how this code should be applied.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Tom	Miller	
553	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	Action suggested: redline: 21.50.030 (B) "where the city may establish or modify a limit...." I would suggest replacement of: "the city may establish a registration process for purposes of taxation and tracking short term rentals"	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Tom	Miller	
554	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	In the future, if issues arise, these can be addressed via study to establish limits and processes to determine what best benchmarks, metrics or standards would be used to determine limits to be included this into the actual code.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Tom	Miller	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
555	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	Here are some reasons this section (B) should be redlined: • The proposed STR permitting, occupancy, parking, and nuisance rules already give the City strong tools to regulate impacts objectively. • A future STR cap is arbitrary because it is not directly tied to measurable impacts such as parking, fire safety, noise, infrastructure, or density. • Best-practice land use regulation focuses on objective operational standards and enforcement, not allowing small governing bodies wide latitude for policy changes by establishing arbitrary limits without a formal data driven process which is indicated in the code. • Allowing future caps "by resolution" creates uncertainty for homeowners, lenders, and future home owners because the rules could change without a formal code amendment process. • Caps often favor existing operators while preventing future local home buyers with the same opportunity. • If future restrictions are ever considered necessary, they should require clear data, formal findings, and a full public ordinance process — not discretionary future caps set by the whims of a few folks.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Tom	Miller	
556	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	Thanks again for the opportunity. I'm not against taxation of STRs but this current code item is too broad in my opinion and grants too much latitude. (Which really distracts from the effectiveness and rigor of the code)	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Tom	Miller	
557	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Short term rentals (Chapter 21.50): update the language in current Title 21 from "bed and breakfast" to include the term "short term rental". This will insure that "bed and breakfast/short term rental" are being operated on the premises of the owner/operator's primary residence.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/28	Email	Karen	Murdock	
558	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Short term rentals/b&bs that operate in urban residential, rural residential or neighborhood flex zones occur only in residences that the owner or operator declares as their primary residence. Primary residence as defined by Permanent Fund Dividend eligibility.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/28	Email	Karen	Murdock	

Code					Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
559	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Define short term rentals/b&bs as rentals are those that are less than 30 days.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/28	Email	Karen	Murdock	
560	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Existing short term rentals/b&bs that are owned by absentee landlords/landladies are grandfathered in; however, this STR grandfathered rights are not transferrable.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/28	Email	Karen	Murdock	
561	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Neighborhoods build community. STRs and their transient hotel business do not offer stability to a neighborhood. The community response to the Comprehensive Plan survey question "what three things do you value most about living in Homer" was the community, small town feel, family and friends. These attributes are components of a neighborhood. STRs do not enhance neighborhoods.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/28	Email	Karen	Murdock	
562	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	One of the identified challenges in the Comprehensive Plan was lack of affordable housing. Again, STRs greatly impact the availability and cost of long term rentals.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/28	Email	Karen	Murdock	
563	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Just wanted to make a comment to express full objection to regulations of short term rentals. I don't have any but these are not driving up housing costs in our community and there is actually zero evidence that those two are related.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Email	Ben	Newton	
564	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Feel free to tax em along with hotels but we shouldnt tell people how many days they can rent their property - 3 or 30 days or 3 years! (And certainly not which properties are grandfathered in or sweetheart deals of who's get approved, etc)	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Email	Ben	Newton	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
565	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	I understand peoples frustration with housing costs but that isn't the answer. By the way - I live down the street to a Airbnb and it's fine! Would much rather have that than my full time neighbor with a barking dog!	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/10	Email	Ben	Newton	
566	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	I am opposed to big box stores, data centers in sensitive dwindling habitat, and excessive short-term rentals that price out locals.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/1	Email	Dolly	Peach	
567	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	The proposed Short-Term Rental (STR) section in Chapter 21.50 should be removed from Title 21 in its entirety.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/1	Comment Form	Brian	Reid	
568	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	This section represents a clear departure from how the rest of the zoning code is structured and applied. Title 21 regulates land use based on use and measurable impacts—things like size, density, traffic, and compatibility—not on the duration of occupancy. The stated purpose of the zoning code is to enhance the public health, safety and welfare through land use regulations, including to regulate and restrict the location and use of buildings, structures and land and to address impacts such as congestion and density (Homer City Code 21.01.030).	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/1	Comment Form	Brian	Reid	
569	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	By contrast, Chapter 21.50 states that its purpose is to establish rules, regulations, and limitations on short-term rentals. This is a fundamentally different approach. It targets a specific activity for limitation rather than identifying and regulating a land use impact.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/1	Comment Form	Brian	Reid	
570	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	A dwelling unit is defined as a structure with independent living facilities including provisions for sleeping, cooking and sanitation (Homer City Code 21.02). That definition does not change based on whether someone stays 30 days or 31 days. In practical terms, the use is identical—people enter the home, prepare meals, bathe, and sleep. There is no meaningful land use distinction created by a one-day difference in duration of stay.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/1	Comment Form	Brian	Reid	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
571	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	The STR provisions therefore regulate what is already a lawful residential use—occupancy—without identifying a distinct or measurable impact that justifies separate treatment. Nowhere else in Title 21 is a residential use singled out and regulated in this manner. Where the code does regulate specific uses, it does so to mitigate clearly identified impacts—for example, drive-through standards are intended to reduce the negative impacts they may create (Homer City Code 21.40.010). That is not the case here.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/1	Comment Form	Brian	Reid	
572	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	If short-term rentals create impacts, those impacts should be clearly identified and supported with measurable evidence. Title 21 already contains tools to address real issues—noise, traffic, nuisance, and site design—and those standards apply to any property creating a problem, regardless of who occupies it or for how long. Regulation should follow demonstrated impacts, not assumptions tied to duration of stay.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/1	Comment Form	Brian	Reid	
573	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	In addition, the STR section introduces further inconsistency into an already fragmented set of lodging-related definitions. Uses such as rooming houses and bed and breakfasts are defined separately (Homer City Code 21.02), but are not clearly integrated with one another. Adding a distinct STR category increases ambiguity, creates overlapping classifications, and invites inconsistent interpretation and enforcement.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/1	Comment Form	Brian	Reid	
574	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Finally, adoption of STR regulations within Title 21 at this time is premature. The City Council has already directed the Economic Development Committee to study short-term rentals and provide recommendations. Advancing regulatory language in the zoning code prior to completion of that work bypasses that process and introduces policy without the benefit of analysis.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/1	Comment Form	Brian	Reid	
575	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	Title 21 is built around regulating land use impacts—not limiting lawful activities based on how they are perceived. Chapter 21.50 departs from that foundation by targeting a specific form of residential occupancy based solely on duration of stay, without demonstrated justification.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/1	Comment Form	Brian	Reid	
576	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	If regulation is to be considered, it should be done deliberately, transparently, and based on evidence—not introduced indirectly through a structural change to the zoning code.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/1	Comment Form	Brian	Reid	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
577	21.50	Short-Term Rentals	For these reasons, Chapter 21.50 should be removed and addressed, if necessary, following completion of the current study process.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/1	Comment Form	Brian	Reid	
578		Short-Term Rentals	Public Comment – Title 21 (Short-Term Rentals) The proposed Short-Term Rental (STR) section in Chapter 21.50 should be removed from Title 21 in its entirety. This section represents a clear departure from how the rest of the zoning code is structured and applied. Title 21 regulates land use based on use and measurable impacts—things like size, density, traffic, and compatibility—not on the duration of occupancy. The stated purpose of the zoning code is to “ enhance the public health, safety and welfare through land use regulations,” including to “ regulate and restrict the location and use of buildings, structures and land” and to address impacts such as congestion and density (Homer City Code 21.01.030).	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/1	Comment Form	Miyun	Stogsdill	
579		Short-Term Rentals	By contrast, Chapter 21.50 states that its purpose is to “ establish rules, regulations, and limitations” on short-term rentals. This is a fundamentally different approach. It targets a specific activity for limitation rather than identifying and regulating a land use impact. A “ dwelling unit” is defined as a structure with “ independent living facilities including provisions for sleeping, cooking and sanitation” (Homer City Code 21.02). That definition does not change based on whether someone stays 30 days or 31 days. In practical terms, the use is identical—people enter the home, prepare meals, bathe, and sleep. There is no meaningful land use distinction created by a one-day difference in duration of stay.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/1	Comment Form	Miyun	Stogsdill	
580		Short-Term Rentals	The STR provisions therefore regulate what is already a lawful residential use—occupancy—without identifying a distinct or measurable impact that justifies separate treatment. Nowhere else in Title 21 is a residential use singled out and regulated in this manner. Where the code does regulate specific uses, it does so to mitigate clearly identified impacts—for example, drive-through standards are intended to “ reduce the negative impacts they may create” (Homer City Code 21.40.010). That is not the case here. If short-term rentals create impacts, those impacts should be clearly identified and supported with measurable evidence. Title 21 already contains tools to address real issues—noise, traffic, nuisance, and site design—and those standards apply to any property creating a problem, regardless of who occupies it or for how long. Regulation should follow demonstrated impacts, not assumptions tied to duration of stay.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/1	Comment Form	Miyun	Stogsdill	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
581		Short-Term Rentals	In addition, the STR section introduces further inconsistency into an already fragmented set of lodging-related definitions. Uses such as rooming houses and bed and breakfasts are defined separately (Homer City Code 21.02), but are not clearly integrated with one another. Adding a distinct STR category increases ambiguity, creates overlapping classifications, and invites inconsistent interpretation and enforcement.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/1	Comment Form	Miyun	Stogsdill	
582		Short-Term Rentals	Finally, adoption of STR regulations within Title 21 at this time is premature. The City Council has already directed the Economic Development Committee to study short-term rentals and provide recommendations. Advancing regulatory language in the zoning code prior to completion of that work bypasses that process and introduces policy without the benefit of analysis. Title 21 is built around regulating land use impacts—not limiting lawful activities based on how they are perceived. Chapter 21.50 departs from that foundation by targeting a specific form of residential occupancy based solely on duration of stay, without demonstrated justification.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/1	Comment Form	Miyun	Stogsdill	
583		Short-Term Rentals	If regulation is to be considered, it should be done deliberately, transparently, and based on evidence—not introduced indirectly through a structural change to the zoning code. For these reasons, Chapter 21.50 should be removed and addressed, if necessary, following completion of the current study process.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/1	Comment Form	Miyun	Stogsdill	
584		Short-Term Rentals	I am a resident of Anchorage, and I own residential property within the City of Homer. I submit these comments, as I do not believe that restricting homeowner autonomy is an effective or appropriate response to Alaska's short-term rental challenges. The housing shortage is not driven solely by short-term rentals, it is also driven by the fact that the average home is no longer attainable. Home sizes have increased significantly over the past several decades, while the construction of modest, affordable housing has not kept pace. The City's focus should not be on regulating homeowners, but rather on encouraging the development of smaller, more attainable housing options that meet the needs of everyday residents.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Stacey	Stone	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation (If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment							
585		Short-Term Rentals	The proposed approach moves in the opposite direction. Imposing additional licensing requirements, annual renewals, inspections, and potential caps on use will only expand bureaucracy, increase costs, and create unnecessary barriers for homeowners. These measures do little to address the root causes of housing shortages and instead shift the burden onto individuals who are not the source of the problem. A more effective and sustainable approach would be to develop economic incentives and innovative solutions, such as those that encourage employers to help provide or secure housing for their workforce. The definition of “short-term rental” as drafted is particularly concerning. It is overly broad and conflates fundamentally different types of activity, from occasional home sharing to full-scale commercial lodging, treating them as though they warrant the same level of regulation. This is clear government overreach. Rather than targeting actual impacts, the proposal creates a sweeping regulatory framework that captures nearly all forms of short-term use, regardless of scale, frequency, or effect on the housing market.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Stacey	Stone	
586		Short-Term Rentals	Compounding this concern is the absence of any meaningful distinction between owner-occupied and investor-operated properties, as well as the failure to account for long-standing Alaskan practices such as seasonal or “snowbird” use. I am also interested to know whether the City has conducted any analysis to determine how many short-term rental properties would realistically enter the long-term rental market if restricted. Without that data, it is difficult to conclude that regulating short-term rentals will meaningfully increase housing supply. This particularly given the fact long-term rentals come with significantly greater obligations and risks for property owners, including maintenance responsibilities, tenant-related issues, and the potential for costly and time-consuming legal processes such as eviction. Short-term rentals, by contrast, are typically more flexible and involve fewer long-term complications.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Stacey	Stone	
587		Short-Term Rentals	In my own situation, my husband resides in Homer and I reside in Anchorage. We maintain a home in Homer that is currently used by friends and family while we are away. If in the future we were to engage in occasional short-term rental use while we are not present, this action does not remove housing from the long-term market, it simply makes more efficient use of an existing home and adds to available housing. Policies that fail to recognize these realities risk discouraging reasonable, low-impact uses while missing the larger structural issues.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Stacey	Stone	
588		Short-Term Rentals	It is encouraging that the City is exploring more meaningful housing solutions, such as expanding zoning flexibility and incorporating innovative options like tiny homes. These efforts directly address housing supply and should be the priority. However, creating an entirely new regulatory regime for short-term rentals, complete with permitting, inspections, and ongoing administrative oversight, adds cost and complexity without proven benefit. This approach risks burdening both homeowners and taxpayers while attempting to regulate a problem in an untested, overly broad, and inefficient manner.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/11	Email	Stacey	Stone	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
589		Short-Term Rentals	I saw a "Hosts of Homer" post about the STR rules. I'm in favor of these changes. They posed a few questions, and here are my responses: How could these regulations impact property owners, their livelihoods, their cleaners, managers, businesses reliant on their guest's business, overall affects to tourism, loss of sales tax revenue, jobs, workforce flexibility, housing investment when there's uncertainty on how the city may regulate moving forward ? response: The regulations will probably not effect those owners very much, and sales tax revenue won't change much either. There is uncertainty whether residents will be able to afford to live here at all, which is a much more important concern. Invest in residents, not visitors. I note "Hosts of Homer" only asked questions, without making any claims to know any answers. Sounds like paranoia instead of reasoned policy claims.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/1	Comment Form	Paul	Vela	
590		Short-Term Rentals	Should major STR regulations move forward before the economic and social impacts are fully studied and presented publicly? response: Yes, we know enough to move forward. Proposing impossible studies is just a tactic to avoid some simple regulations. If they don't work, rules can always change later.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/1	Comment Form	Paul	Vela	
591		Short-Term Rentals	Key Proposed Changes: STR defined as stays under 30 days? GREAT Mandatory city permit required ? FANTASTIC Annual permit renewals required ? YES PLEASE City gains authority to cap total STR permits ? LOVE IT “ Use it or lose it” renewal requirement ? BRING IT ON Local caretaker/property manager registration required ? WHOOHOO STRs formally separated into their own regulated category ? MADE MY DAY	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	4/1	Comment Form	Paul	Vela	
592		Short-Term Rentals	Please do not pass this. We are taxed so High, as it is, here in Homer. My husband and I are trying to make a living in order to stay in this beautiful town. By increasing more regulations and higher taxes it will undoubtedly start making people wonder if it's even worth it to live in Homer.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/9	Email	Tamara	Whitney	
593		Short-Term Rentals	Please remove the STR section from Title 21. Regulate impacts like noise and traffic but <u>not</u> length of stay. Wait for the EDC to finish its work analysis of them. Restricting or banning STRs will impact Homer socially and economically. STRs have made it possible for my family to own a home in Homer.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/13	Comment Form	Earl	Bowersox	

Code						Project Team Recommendation				
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment	Recommended Action	(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
594		Short-Term Rentals	Please remove the STR section from Title 21. Please wait for the Economic Development Committee to finish its work analysis of how restricting or banning STRs will impact Homer socially and economically.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/13	Comment Form	Erin	Bowersox	
595		Short-Term Rentals	I am writing as a Homer resident and concerned citizen for those of our neighbors that invest locally, but plainly, share my concerns about the renewed push for STR-specific taxes, registration fees, and regulations. My concerns are not simply philosophical. After reviewing the City's own 198-page proposed revision to Title 21 of the Homer City Code - the document that would govern these very regulations - I believe this policy direction is premature, internally inconsistent, and ultimately punitive to the Homer residents it claims to protect.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Matthew	Bullard	
596		Short-Term Rentals	While I understand that taxes can be a useful tool to incentivize certain behaviors, we should ask ourselves: Why are we deciding to punish local investors, our friends and colleagues, rather than empower them to provide more supply? Instead of adding burdens on property owners who have already committed their well-earned capital to this community, the Council should direct that same energy toward supporting local builders and investors to create additional housing supply. A carrot works much better than a stick, and Homer's housing challenges are better solved by growing the pie rather than by penalizing those who are already invested in this town's future.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Matthew	Bullard	
597	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	SHORT-TERM RENTALS ARE NOT LISTED IN ANY ZONING DISTRICT. Section 21.50.030(a) states that STRs 'may be located in any zoning district where dwelling units are a permitted or conditional use,' yet STRs appear in none of the individual district use tables (Chapters 21.19-21.29). Every comparable use - bed and breakfasts, rooming houses, hotels, motels, hostels - is explicitly enumerated district by district. STRs are not. Any fee or tax ordinance attached to a use that lacks proper district-level zoning authorization is legally vulnerable from the start.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Matthew	Bullard	
598	21.02; 21.42	Short-Term Rentals	THE STR DEFINITION CREATES DOUBLE REGULATION FOR BED AND BREAKFASTS. The definition of 'Short-term rental' (§21.02) explicitly includes bed and breakfast establishments, yet B&Bs are separately regulated as home occupations under §21.42 with their own permit standards. Layering a new STR fee regime on top of the existing B&B framework subjects those operators to double regulation - a burden the code itself creates, not resolves.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Matthew	Bullard	
599	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	THE CODE ALREADY GIVES THE COUNCIL POWER TO CAP STRS WITHOUT NEW TAXES. Section 21.50.030(b) states that 'the city may establish or modify a limit on the number of short-term rental permits it allows within the municipal limits, as established by resolution of the city council.' If the goal is reducing STR pressure on housing stock, this provision accomplishes it directly - without a single new dollar of fees or taxes. Using both a permit cap and new taxes would penalize operators twice.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Matthew	Bullard	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
600	21.50.020	Short-Term Rentals	A MAJOR LOOPHOLE GOES UNADDRESSED. Section 21.50.020 explicitly exempts 'rental cabins' from the STR chapter entirely. Yet 'rental cabin' is nowhere defined in the definitions chapter (§21.02). Any operator can characterize their property as a rental cabin and sidestep the entire STR framework - including any new taxes or fees. The rules would fall hardest on compliant local owners while non-compliant operators walk away unaffected.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Matthew	Bullard	
601	21.55.090	Short-Term Rentals	NO PARKING STANDARD EXISTS FOR STRS. The parking table in §21.55.090 assigns specific requirements for: bed and breakfast (2 + 1 per 2 guest rooms), rooming house (graduated by guest rooms), hotel/motel (1 per guest room), dormitory (1 per 2 beds), hostel (2 + 1 per 2 guest rooms). Short-term rentals are not listed. If the City cannot demonstrate a concrete infrastructure impact metric, a fee designed to recover infrastructure costs lacks the factual basis needed to withstand scrutiny.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Matthew	Bullard	
602		Short-Term Rentals	Two significant market developments are about to reshape Homer's lodging and housing landscape: First, the Doyon Lighthouse Village hotel. The Planning Commission approved Doyon, Limited's conditional use permit (CUP 23-08) for the Lighthouse Village development on November 6, 2024. The project includes a 70-room hotel with a restaurant and conference space, plus condo units - a substantial addition of professionally managed lodging inventory aimed directly at the same visitor base that currently sustains Homer's STR market. With an estimated 326 STR units in Homer today, adding 70 dedicated hotel rooms to a relatively small market will measurably reduce per-unit STR occupancy and revenue.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Matthew	Bullard	
603		Short-Term Rentals	Second, South Peninsula Hospital is releasing long-term leases back into the local rental pool. SPH is the area's largest employer, with over 500 local employees, and has historically held a number of long-term residential leases for staff housing. As those leases wind down, a meaningful volume of housing supply will return to the long-term rental market - directly addressing the affordability and availability concerns that have driven much of the STR regulation conversation since Ordinance 23-61 (S). Together, these two changes do exactly what regulation is being asked to do: reduce pressure on the long-term housing market and rebalance Homer's lodging mix - without a single new ordinance.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Matthew	Bullard	
604		Short-Term Rentals	Sitka offers the clearest cautionary tale. After its 2022 ordinance imposed a 180-day owner-occupancy requirement, a 6% dedicated bed tax on top of existing sales taxes, a permit sunset on sale, and a \$100 annual fee with full host-side tax remittance, the burden fell hardest on residents using STRs for supplemental income - exactly the group the policy claimed to protect. The Alaska Department of Labor continued to list Sitka as having the state's highest long-term rental vacancy rate, suggesting STR conversion was not the primary driver of the housing problem the regulation was designed to solve.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Matthew	Bullard	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
605		Short-Term Rentals	Anchorage's 12% room tax and Juneau's mandatory registration regime have similarly increased compliance costs for small operators without producing the housing relief promised at adoption. The pattern is consistent: rules and fees framed as targeting investors disproportionately hit retirees renting out a guesthouse, working families using an ADU for supplemental income, and homeowners using a portion of their property to offset Homer's high cost of living. Large hotel operators - like the incoming Doyon property - absorb compliance costs easily. A retired teacher renting a one-bedroom apartment over her garage cannot.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Matthew	Bullard	
606		Short-Term Rentals	With respect, I ask the Council and Planning Commission to: Delay adoption of any new STR-specific taxes, registration fees, or owner-occupancy requirements for at least 18-24 months after the Doyon hotel opens and SPH has released all of its long-term rentals, so the Council can measure actual market impact on STR demand and long-term rental supply rather than legislate on projections. Distinguish in any future ordinance between owner-occupied/resident-operated STRs and non-resident investor-owned properties - but base that distinction on data collected after the Doyon and SPH changes work through the market. Engage directly with local STR owners, the Homer Chamber, and the Homer Bed and Breakfast Association before drafting new code.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Email	Matthew	Bullard	
607	21.02; 21.42	Short-Term Rentals	1. The STR Definition Absorbs Bed & Breakfasts — Creating Double Regulation. The STR definition explicitly states that STRs 'may include, but are not limited to... bed and breakfast establishments.' However, B&Bs are already separately regulated as home occupations under §21.42 (Home Occupations, p. ~143), with their own specific standards — operator must reside on-premises, maximum 5 bedrooms, food service rules. If the City then layers STR-specific taxes and fees on top of the STR permit, B&B operators would be subject to both the home occupation requirements and the new STR fee/permit regime. The code creates no exemption or clear hierarchy between the two. This double-regulation is legally vulnerable and inequitable.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Comment Form	Matthew	Bullard	
608	21.50.030	Short-Term Rentals	2. The Council Can Already Cap STR Numbers by Resolution — No New Tax Needed. §21.50.030(b), p. 156: 'The city may establish or modify a limit on the number of short-term rental permits it allows within the municipal limits, as established by resolution of the city council.' This is arguably the most powerful tool in the code — the Council can directly cap STR supply by simple resolution, without creating new taxes or fees at all. If the stated goal is reducing STR pressure on housing stock, this provision already accomplishes it. Adding taxes on top of a permit cap punishes operators twice: once by restricting supply, and again financially.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Comment Form	Matthew	Bullard	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
609	21.19; 21.29	Short-Term Rentals	3. STRs Are Not Listed as Permitted or Conditional Uses in Any Individual Zoning District. Chapters 21.19 through 21.29 (all district use tables, pp. 68-100); §21.50.030(a), p. 156. The STR chapter says STRs 'may be located in any zoning district where dwelling units are a permitted or conditional use.' But STRs are not explicitly listed in any individual district's permitted or conditional use table. Meanwhile, rooming houses, bed and breakfasts, hotels, motels, and hostels are individually enumerated in each relevant district. This omission creates a regulatory gap — STRs exist in a kind of zoning limbo governed only by Chapter 21.50, not by district-level rules. Any new STR-specific fee or tax ordinance imposed at the district level would have no clear hook to attach to, and could be challenged as applied to a use that lacks proper zoning authorization in the underlying district.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Comment Form	Matthew	Bullard	
610	21.55.090	Short-Term Rentals	4. No Dedicated Parking Standard Exists for STRs — But One Exists for Every Comparable Use. §21.55.090 Parking Table, p. ~172. The parking table assigns specific requirements for: bed and breakfast (2 + 1 per 2 guest rooms), rooming house (graduated by guest rooms), hotel/motel (1 per guest room), dormitory (1 per 2 beds), hostel (2 + 1 per 2 guest rooms). STRs are not listed. This means the City has no parking standard for STRs, which undermines any argument that STRs impose disproportionate infrastructure burdens justifying new fees. If the Council cannot demonstrate a concrete impact metric, a fee designed to recover infrastructure costs is legally harder to defend.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/12	Comment Form	Matthew	Bullard	
611		Short-Term Rentals	Rentals for full time residents are expensive and competitive in spring because so many small homes are used as short term rentals. I am a landlord; I rent my units full time rental only. I have tenants for years, giving them stable, affordable homes. I think the 'airbnb' rentals are part of the problem. Please consider constraining the number of summer only rentals.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Laurene	DeVita	
612		Short-Term Rentals	It is very challenging to understand the changes to the zoning of areas between housing, light industrial etc. I think it is apparent to everyone that it is challenging to find any housing in Homer year-round. This is only complicated by the many units that become seasonal short-term rentals. I think housing areas need to remain zoned housing. That short-term rentals in these areas need to be run by people living on the site. I think the zoning codes need to cover limitations on absent owners investing in short-term rentals and B&B's removing housing from the market and changing the feelings of neighborhoods.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Janet	Fink	
613		Short-Term Rentals	I have lived in Homer nearly 45 years and I want to first off thank the folks that work hard to keep Homer's small town charms and quaint artsy feel. As a fifth generation Alaskan who grew up in Homer, I am a small business owner who struggles to live here with our high prices while we all want steady, healthy growth and opportunity for all, I strongly oppose excessive regulation and policing of short term rentals (STRs) in Homer. In Homer, the overwhelming number of STR owners are not large corporations or wealthy investors. They are local families, retirees, and small business owners who are simply trying to survive in an increasingly difficult economy.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Comment Form	Elizabeth	G.	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation						
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org	
614		Short-Term Rentals	Additional restrictions place an unfair burden on ordinary residents who are already struggling with rising costs, inflation, insurance, utilities, maintenance, and seasonal income fluctuations. Many families rely on STR income to help pay mortgages, property taxes, medical bills, and basic living expenses.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Comment Form	Elizabeth	G.		
615		Short-Term Rentals	I also believe the current discussion lacks sufficient accurate data to justify sweeping restrictions. Before implementing policies that could deeply impact livelihoods, the city should ensure it has transparent, comprehensive, and objective information regarding actual housing impacts, tourism economics, occupancy rates, and community effects.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Comment Form	Elizabeth	G.		
616		Short-Term Rentals	Overregulation of STRs risks shutting down small local businesses and creating an environment where only large hotels and outside investors can survive. This ultimately removes opportunity from local residents and transfers economic power away from Homer families into the hands of larger commercial entities.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Comment Form	Elizabeth	G.		
617		Short-Term Rentals	STRs also contribute significantly to the unique character and charm of Homer. Visitors often choose Homer specifically because they can stay in locally owned cabins, cottages, guesthouses, dry cabins, apartments, and family operated rentals that reflect the authentic culture and hospitality of our community. Replacing these experiences with standardized hotel expansion would fundamentally change the spirit of Homer.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Comment Form	Elizabeth	G.		
618		Short-Term Rentals	Many STR owners take great pride in maintaining beautiful properties, welcoming guests, supporting tourism, and contributing to the local economy through taxes, maintenance jobs, cleaning services, restaurants, fishing charters, shops, and other local businesses.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Comment Form	Elizabeth	G.		
619		Short-Term Rentals	I encourage the city to pursue balanced and reasonable solutions expanding the job market creating more opportunity for healthy economic growth and expanding affordable housing rather than burdensome regulation that harms local residents, discourages entrepreneurship, and weakens the independent spirit that makes Homer special. Thank you for your consideration.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Comment Form	Elizabeth	G.		

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
620	21.51.100	Short-Term Rentals	I would like to propose that the language in HCC Title 21.51.100 be changed from 'bed and breakfast' to be 'short term rental' and that the City adopt what Seward has done to regulate these short term rentals (rentals less than 30 days). These really are businesses and need to be in area zoned for business or a special use permit obtained to ensure that someone is on site and not an absentee landlord where parties are likely to disturb neighbors.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Karin	Holser	
621		Short-Term Rentals	To the Members of the Homer Planning Commission and City Council, I am writing to share my public comment regarding the potential short-term rental (STR) regulations currently under consideration in the Title 21 zoning updates. I am currently purchasing my childhood home 2183 Skyline Dr (Parcel No. 171-391-02)—a log house built by my father almost 40 years ago. My goal is to preserve this property, which holds immense personal and sentimental value. However, the home currently requires substantial repairs, modernizations, and ongoing maintenance to remain viable. To fund these extensive renovations without sacrificing my family's personal use, my approach relies on being able to operate it as a short-term rental during the peak summer months.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Kendra	Busch	
622		Short-Term Rentals	Forcing a transition to a long-term framework introduces severe financial and operational roadblocks: Financial Strain: This regulation would essentially eliminate the property's ability to be self-sustaining and destroys the entire strategy that is allowing me to retain my childhood home. Phased Repairs: Short-term renting allows me to generate the necessary revenue to fund updates while keeping the home vacant between guest stays. I can freely complete major renovations in stages without a disruption in renters a long-term rental would create. Long-Term Renting: If restrictive STR regulations force me into a long-term rental model I will be forced to choose between desperately needed repairs or a renter. I cannot safely or ethically execute large-scale, structural repairs with a full-time resident in the home.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Kendra	Busch	
623		Short-Term Rentals	Preserving Personal Use: A STR model allows my family to retain personal use of the home. A long-term lease would eliminate this entirely. It would create a hardship in the ease of visiting, maintaining my home roots and force me to pay for accommodation when I do visit. Most friends and families I know, cannot comfortably accommodate a family of four with two small children and a dog. In addition, research compiled in the 2026 Homer Housing Report by the Kachemak Board of REALTORS confirms that targeting STRs will fail to solve municipal affordability issues while deeply hurting local property owners (pp. 1, 15): Negligible Market Improvements: Market impact modeling proves that even a complete total ban on STRs would only yield a minor 2.5% decrease in rentals costs and a minor 2% drop in home prices. In a moderate or partial regulatory scenario, the report explicitly states that the impacts on the housing market would be completely negligible (p. 13).	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Kendra	Busch	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
624		Short-Term Rentals	Broader Economic Realities: The data explicitly notes that Homer's real housing constraints stem from building costs and inflation, rather than a lack of supply driven by STRs (p. 15). Homer actually produces more new housing starts per capita than any other community in Alaska (p. 1). For me, the STR model is not a commercial enterprise driven by profit. It's a critical tool that allows me to balance retaining a sentimental family home, providing a service the community needs, funding property maintenance and ensuring family retention and use of local real estate. I urge the Planning Commission to craft a balanced policy. Please focus on clear operational standards and life-safety measures that elevate property standards rather than zoning prohibitions or caps. Thank you for your time, consideration and dedication to protecting both the people and the unique character of Homer.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Kendra	Busch	
625		Short-Term Rentals	I am happy to see some changes to promote affordable housing in the city. I'd support more aggressive efforts to limit short-term rentals and encourage condo or town house developments to benefit both young couples and seniors looking to downsize (thereby freeing up larger houses for families).	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Jenny	Stroyeck	
626	21.26	Short-Term Rentals	In the proposed code updates the overnight lodging allowed would be hotels & motels and campgrounds. Short term rentals and worker housing should be included. Having a short term rental above our shop currently conforms to code because over 50% of the building is used as retail. Current code is sufficient allowing businesses to operate and grow and encourages investment.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Debbie & Mark	Speakman	
627	21.50.038	Short-Term Rentals	Targeting a single business sector with licensing and fees sets the City up for growing into a regulatory body with minimal enforcement ability. Requiring a registration so that local law enforcement can contact the owner/manager is a good step. STR are an economic driver in our community the City's money would be better spent enforcing current code.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Debbie & Mark	Speakman	
628		Short-Term Rentals	Please prohibit absentee landlord short-term rentals in residential zones and require that short-term rentals in residential zones be on the operator's property as their primary residence.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Sue	Rennolds	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
629	21.51.100	Short-Term Rentals	1. Replace the term 'bed and breakfast' with the term 'short-term rental' (STR) throughout Title 21. 2. Allow STR's in all residentially zoned districts only on the premises of the operator's primary residence, defined as the operator's permanent abode where the operator lives for at least 185 days per year and remove the language in draft code placing restrictions on the numbers of STR's. 3. Allow STR's, regardless of operator's residence status, in other zones not zoned for residential uses.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Deborah	Oudiz	
630		Short-Term Rentals	4. If permits are required, permits should not be transferrable between or among properties and should not be transferred upon the sale of a property. 5. Require STRS to comply with all "State of Alaska Requirements for Bed and Breakfasts" including state plan approval regulations for properties 'not owner occupied', referred to in Alaska regulations as 'public accommodations.'	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Deborah	Oudiz	
631		Short-Term Rentals	The above provisions may help to ensure a vital, strong STR economy in Homer while at the same time protect neighborhoods and encourage private small business development by owner occupied STRS on residential property. People buy homes in neighborhoods to insulate themselves and their families from commercial operations. Owner/operator occupied STRs in residential zones protects neighborhoods by ensuring the residence is occupied by the operator, and ensures the income is circulated within Homer promoting strong economics.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Deborah	Oudiz	
632		Short-Term Rentals	Requiring residency occupancy in neighborhood zones helps increase safety to all other neighborhood residents from noise and any criminal activities and ensures rapid first responder response in the event of fire or other public safety events. Also, the residency requirement for neighborhood zones ensures families can generate income and their participation in a robust STR economy that promotes and protects their individual family needs. Allowing non residency / absentee owner STR's in neighborhoods effectively grants random and spontaneous nonreviewed rezoning of properties within residential zones into defacto commercial properties without community review or consent. This unreviewed commercial use of residential zoned property effectively guts many provisions of Title 21, rendering as useless the code and the time, effort and considerable expense to formulate the code, decreases the many inherent value and benefits of neighborhoods, and decreases the confidence and predictability necessary and essential for strong communities.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Deborah	Oudiz	
633		Short-Term Rentals	I am writing in opposition to the proposed Title 21 ordinance regarding short-term rentals. I believe there is a major difference between local residents operating a short-term rental to support their income and outside investors purchasing properties solely for commercial gain. Local homeowners should not bear the burden of regulations aimed at problems created by non-resident operators or large-scale investment groups.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Chantrelle	Major	

Code					Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation							
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org		
634		Short-Term Rentals	As a local property owner and short term rental owner, I pay taxes, contribute to the community, support local businesses, and care about my neighborhood. Income from short-term rentals helps residents afford rising costs and remain financially stable. Restricting local owners who are simply trying to make a living unfairly punishes the very people who live and work here.		No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Chantrelle	Major			
635		Short-Term Rentals	If the municipality believes regulation is necessary, priority should be placed on addressing absentee ownership, large commercial operators, and out-of-state investors before imposing burdensome permits and restrictions on local residents. Responsible local owners should not be treated the same as corporations or non-residents operating multiple investment properties. A one-size-fits-all ordinance is not fair and does not recognize the difference between community members and outside commercial interests. I ask the municipality to reconsider this proposal and focus on protecting local residents, property rights, and responsible homeownership.		No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Chantrelle	Major			
636	21.51.100	Short-Term Rentals	I would like to propose that the language in HCC Title 21.51.100 be changed from "bed and breakfast" to be "short term rental" and that the City adopt what Seward has done to regulate these short term rentals (rentals less then 30 days). These really are businesses and need to be in area zoned for business or a special use permit obtain to ensue that someone is on site and not a absentee landlord where parties are likely to disturb neighbors.		No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Karin	Holser			
637		Short-Term Rentals	The proposed STR section in Ch. 21.50 should be removed from Title 21 in its totality. The "problem" this effort is gnised to remedy hasn't been defined and the laws/rules/regs already in place to address any issues w/ bed landlords or renters already exist. Any further regulation of STRs will only serve to further burden the city and additional admin has needed for governance and enforcement, and will also burden the community because, frankly, the additional income is needed.		No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Daniel	Klein			
638		Short-Term Rentals	We need the Economic Development Committee and City Hall to stop trying to control or suppress the community's ability to make money. Things are tough enough as they stand. Focus on bringing in manufacturing jobs, consulting jobs (remote/virtual work), and other industries such as aviation, shipwrights, and government agency offices (NOAA, USFWS, etc.). Focus on added tourism in the fall, winter, and spring. Invest in a co-working business center and follow federal requirements for contracts for Homer. Help us make more money, not make it harder than it has to be.		No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Daniel	Klein			
639		Short-Term Rentals	I'd like to see STR's continue as a part of a clean economics, part of Homer. They have been providing a service here in Homer for 20-30 years, whether a BnB or a house. When someone visits Homer and would like a slower or more private pace than a hotel, STR's have provided that niche. The revenue that STR's bring into our small town is unmatched, if you get rid of some of the STR's, they don't just turn into LTR's.		No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Scott	Adams			

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
640		Short-Term Rentals	Some are one bedroom in a home or a summertime yurt, dry cabin or travel trailer. So you lose revenue and don't gain a LTR. Any service that provides a need and provides local jobs and taxes is a win, for Homer. Homer doesn't have or need large scale hotels, it has mom & pop BnB's, homes. Many not on the city's infrastructure, so it's a cost for them vs the city.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Scott	Adams	
641		Short-Term Rentals	As someone that has seen other great places, be over built for the benefit of a city or town in revenue. To only destroy the small town feel, something you can't get back. Once you destroy Paradise, you can't get it back. Folks from all over the world visit Homer for the small town feel and beauty, not mismanaged growth.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Scott	Adams	
642		Short-Term Rentals	I fully support limiting short-term or nightly rentals to owner-occupied residences in our residential neighborhoods. We need to ensure our neighborhoods remain as such by preventing investors from purchasing housing for the express purpose of populating it with a continual rotation of transient visitors who have no investment in the neighborhood and serve only to make money as a business.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	
643		Short-Term Rentals	Residential zoning must be unconditionally distinct from mixed use or business zoning. We have a housing shortage in the Homer area and it is a clear disservice to our community to allow neighborhood homes to be turned into disinterested, short-term lodging businesses.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Laurie	Daniel	
644		Short-Term Rentals	I have been concerned about the impact of STR's on Homer's neighborhoods for a long time. As a small town, Homer is known for people helping each other. This all starts in the small communities in which we live, our neighborhood. STR's are commercial businesses being run in residential neighborhoods, and as such City zoning code should not allow them, or at least limit areas where they are allowed so those of us buying homes don't end up with the house next door being an STR with different guests cycling through every couple of days. This has a huge impact on our quiet enjoyment of our own property.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Sara	Faulkner	
645		Short-Term Rentals	Not only do some STR's not pay any taxes, the transient nature of their guests destroys the fabric of our residential community. Hotels are the designed venue for overnight guests, not residential homes. Hotels keep the transient guests and their traffic all in one area, away from our homes and neighborhoods where our children play. Hotels have inspected and certified fire alarm systems, fire escapes, handicap access, adequate parking, noise controls and security, government oversight of payroll, staffing, and taxes, etc. STR's are currently not bound by these regulations.How many of them even have worker's comp insurance?	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Sara	Faulkner	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
646		Short-Term Rentals	With a hotel, the city has one location to inspect and monitor, vs hundreds of STR's spread across the city. Because of the impact on our residential neighborhoods- traffic, noise, lack of neighborhood relationships, safety issues from transients in our residential neighborhoods, limited safety regulations for and inspections of STR's, payroll/taxes/insurance and other tax collection challenges, I urge the planning department and commission to better manage and control STR's. My preference would be to not allow them at all in our residential neighborhoods. This should have been done 10 years ago but it is better to regulate them out of operation in our residential areas late than never.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Sara	Faulkner	
647		Short-Term Rentals	Attainable housing/STRs: I suggest that rentals under 30 days be defined as STRs and be listed under the B&B code. The property that the STR is on is the primary residence of the owner. The STR is grandfathered in and cannot be sold as a STR. STRs are registered/permitted for tax purposes and limiting of STRs.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Sandra	Garity	
648		Short-Term Rentals	There should be a cap on STRs, a specific percentage of available housing. To code this is important, so that action could be taken for non-compliance. Protect neighborhoods as that, and not business STRs in neighborhoods, that eliminate the neighborhood environment.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Sandra	Garity	
649		Short-Term Rentals	I generally support some common-sense regulations related to STRs, especially regulations that put them on equal footing with Bed & Breakfasts and other business uses in residential areas. I also think that this is a topic that deserves more time for community engagement and careful discussion, and I see a lot of misinformation and strong opinions circulating. I strongly encourage you all to dig into this topic more, and include a variety of ways for public input as you decide if regulation of STRs through a Title 21 Update is the most appropriate next step or if more data are needed to make a wise decision.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	
650		Short-Term Rentals	Overtourism occurs when a destination receives too many visitors, exceeding its physical, ecological, or social capacity and causing a decline in the quality of life for residents and the experience for tourists. It happens when the negative impacts of tourism, such as overcrowding, strain on infrastructure, and environmental damage, outweigh its economic benefits.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
651		Short-Term Rentals	Key Aspects of Overtourism: Declining Local Quality of Life: Residents experience displacement, rising living costs, loss of housing to short-term rentals, and overcrowding of public infrastructure. Reduced Visitor Experience: Landmarks become crowded, making them hard to enjoy, and the authentic atmosphere of a location is lost. Environmental Degradation: Natural sites and ecosystems are overwhelmed by high volumes of people. Management Failure: Overtourism is often seen as a failure to properly manage tourist flows and development rather than just high numbers of people. Overtourism is considered the opposite of "Responsible Tourism," which focuses on making better places for people to live and visit.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
652		Short-Term Rentals	The answer to this is not grappling with how to accommodate or control this but by slowing down on the marketing and advertising. This may be something the Chamber of Commerce needs to attend to and become aware of before we foul our own nest scurrying around spending money that can never be recouped. Prioritize the year-round residents and year-round business owners who live here instead of catering to the transients who take the money and leave.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
653		Short-Term Rentals	I understand a draft for changes relating to Short Term Rentals in Homer is in the works and I wanted to take a moment to express my full SUPPORT for this to be finalized and approved. I want to make certain its clearly stated and documented within any re-write of regulations/ordinance for Short Term Rentals, that properties which are located within neighborhoods with CCR's and/or HOA's will NOT be allowed to apply for and/or be approved for Licensing/Permit to operate if the CCR's and/or HOA's prohibit Short Term Rentals, Bed & Breakfast, Businesses of any kind to operate within these neighborhoods.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Kimberly	Junior	
654		Short-Term Rentals	Our neighborhood CCR's which were written/recorded in the 90's, specifically state no bed and breakfast (aka short term rentals) or businesses can operate in the neighborhood. Our family along with many others intentionally purchased within these neighborhoods due to the neighborhood having CCR's and/or HOA's for the pure enjoyment and protection of not having to deal with the negative impact businesses and operations such as bed and breakfast/short term rentals can bring to a neighborhood.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Kimberly	Junior	
655		Short-Term Rentals	With all the natural beauty and wonderful things Homer has to offer, more and more people from lower 48 and elsewhere have been drawn to purchase property in Homer. Sadly, not all have respect for rules, guidelines, ordinances, or their fellow Homer residents, and they put their greed and making money as their first priority with full disregard for rules and their neighbors. Unfortunately, this leads to neighbors who do follow the rules having to defend the CCR's through the only means currently available which is the very costly legal system.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Kimberly	Junior	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
656		Short-Term Rentals	By the City establishing strict and very clearly written rules, guidelines and not allow for any loopholes for those within CCR and/or HOA areas to find a work around, would be essential in this re-write. Without clearly written details relating to CCR and/or HOA neighborhoods, these current rule breakers will only continue to find a work around. This can become very detrimental to owners personally, emotionally and financially, if guidelines, rules, ordinance, and regulations are not put into place within City of Homer. Please be clear within any re-write as to permitting, licensing NOT being approved for properties within areas which are already restricted from having these short term and similar type rentals and businesses.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Kimberly	Junior	
657		Short-Term Rentals	I ask, if it is not already clear in the re-write documents, that it be clearly noted permitting/licensing will not be allowed or approved for any property where CCR's and/or HOA's do not allow for short term rental businesses of any kind. Equally important is to specifically note what the penalty will be if any Short-Term Rental anywhere within the City is found to be operating against the ordinance, rules, guidelines. As an extra side note: it's easy to use the reference of AirBnB, VRBO, etc., however, it's critical to not specify these names only and rather utilize "all types of short term rentals" as Bed & Breakfast are short term rentals, and online rental bookings through Zillow, Bookings.com, etc. Only trying to help avoid any loopholes for the rule breakers to find.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Kimberly	Junior	
658		Short-Term Rentals	Homer exists off of revune from Tourism. We have no noteable commercial fishery or cannery to support it, we have no logging, no minning, no oil or gas production, no manufactring. Homer has no way to maintain and/or grow its economy other than tourism. If you regulate STRs in Homer you will be doing irreversible short and long term damage to Homer's economy. Limitnig STRs direcfly limits the number of tourists that will visit homer in the short term and over a long enough time Homer will cease to be a tourist desitination because people will see it as too difficult to travel here.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Andre	Lovett	
659		Short-Term Rentals	When that happens it will be too late to go back and fix these mistakes becuase other towns and cities on the Kenai Penninsula and in Alaska will have stepped in to fill the void that we would be creating. Homer cannot afford for that to happen. By limiting the number of people that can and will visit Homer you are directly impacting every business in Homer and the surrounding area in a negative way. As well as effecting every citizen in and around Homer.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Andre	Lovett	
660		Short-Term Rentals	If you want more housing promote development instead of further regualting what is already here. You can not regulate yourself into properity, it simply does not work. Winston Churchill shared the same sentiment when he said "You can not tax your way to prosperity" His statement has never been more true and applies directly to this discussion, we would be foolish to not listen.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Andre	Lovett	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
661	21.51.100	Short-Term Rentals	IV. The PRD lacks regulation of short-term-rentals. The PRD fails to address a growing need for regulations addressing short term rentals regardless of the fact that the public, the Council and the Planning Commission have requested such provisions. Short Term Rentals in Residential Zones should only be allowed at the residence of the owner in the City of Homer. This is already the status quo for B&Bs and all other businesses. It would not apply in areas zoned for business, like Homer Spit or Pioneer Ave.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
662	21.51.100	Short-Term Rentals	The intent of this change is to: Prevent investors from taking up too much of the available housing stock, inflating property values, and incentivizing sprawl. Ensure neighborhoods continue to feel like neighborhoods. Reinforce the basic definition of residential zoning as distinct from "mixed use" or "business." Update language in current HCC Title 21.51.100 from "bed and breakfast" to include or be replaced by the term "short term rental" to ensure folks are operating the business from their residence. Define "short term rental" as rentals of less than 30 days. Apply the rule in areas zoned Urban Residential, Rural Residential or Neighborhood Flex. Grant nontransferable "grandfather rights" to existing absentee-landlord STRs that terminate upon sale of the property.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
663		Short-Term Rentals	On a different topic, I fully support limiting short-term or nightly rentals to owner-occupied residences in our residential neighborhoods. We need to maintain the integrity of our neighborhoods by preventing non-resident investors from exploiting our community purely to make money and giving little in return to the community. Residential zoning must be unconditionally distinct from mixed use or business zoning. Again, please incorporate all the specific points and suggestions made by KBCS and KBWC before submitting the revised Update to the City Council for their consideration.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Leslie	Slater	
664		Short-Term Rentals	My wife and I own a short term rental (STR) on the Homer Spit above our business. Reading through the draft Title 21, it does not appear us that we will be allowed to continue to use this space for an STR. Additionally, we would not be allowed to house seasonal workers or even live in the space ourselves. How do such restrictions benefit Homer? Historically, Spit businesses have used space above their shops for seasonal housing or rentals. Like many STRs on the Spit, ours is cutoff from water and sewer during the winter and can only be heated through the use of electric space heaters. Most Spit STRs are not suitable for year round residency.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Mark	Speakman	
665		Short-Term Rentals	On a broader note, what problem is the city trying to solve by restricting STRs? Is it to provide more affordable housing? At best, the housing market would see a slight, one time increase in housing inventory if ALL of these properties were put up for sale. Is it to provide more housing for seasonal workers? Then why restrict STRs on the Spit where most seasonal workers find employment. What are the property owners supposed to do for the other 6 months of the year when the seasonal workers are not here. In my opinion, restricting STRs in Homer is a solution in search of a problem. The only winners will be the STR owners outside of city limits (Kachemak City, Anchor Point, etc.) who would not be required to comply with these restrictions.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	Mark	Speakman	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
666		Short-Term Rentals	In terms of economics, the cost of living, and available housing - the Air BnB trend has made it harder for working people to live in Homer, including myself. Ownership of short term rentals should be restricted to residents who live on the property. Investors who buy up multiple houses for the purpose of short term rentals should be prohibited from doing so. The lack of available housing has STIFLED opportunity for many people who live and work here year round.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Comment Form	John	Whittier	
667		Short-Term Rentals	Homer should be careful before adopting broad zoning rules or permit caps for short-term rentals. The City has real concerns to consider, including housing, noise, parking, trash, safety, tax compliance, and absentee management. However, those concerns should be addressed with local facts, not assumptions.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jay	Young	
668		Short-Term Rentals	The best first step is a simple registration system, not permit limits. Registration would help the City understand how many short-term rentals exist, where they are located, what types of units they are, whether they are owner-occupied, and whether they are actually causing neighborhood problems. Without that information, a permit cap could be arbitrary and unfair. It could hurt responsible local owners without solving the specific issues the City is trying to address.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jay	Young	
669		Short-Term Rentals	Short-term rentals are also not all the same. A bedroom in someone's home, a seasonal cabin, an owner-occupied duplex, and a full-time vacation rental can have very different impacts. Any future rules should recognize those differences. If the problem is noise, parking, trash, safety, or tax compliance, the City should focus on those specific issues through registration, complaint tracking, local contact requirements, and clear enforcement. A permit cap does not automatically fix those problems.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jay	Young	
670		Short-Term Rentals	Homer has its own seasonal economy, housing pressures, visitor patterns, and neighborhood concerns. A registration-first approach would give the City useful information, improve accountability, and avoid rushing into rules that may create unintended consequences. For these reasons, I respectfully ask that the Planning Commission/Zoning Board not move forward with broad Title 21 restrictions or permit caps at this time. If short-term rental language must be added now, it should be limited to simple registration only.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jay	Young	
671		Short-Term Rentals	I am frustrated that the City is even considering broad new restrictions before proving there is a clear problem that needs this level of government control. Property owners should not have to keep defending their right to use their own property responsibly. Homer has always depended on independent people, small businesses, seasonal work, tourism, and private property owners finding ways to make things work.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jonathon	Young	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
672		Short-Term Rentals	Short-term rentals are part of the free market. Visitors need places to stay, and property owners are meeting that need. If guests do not want to rent a certain place, they will not. If owners do a bad job, the market will punish them. If neighbors have real issues like noise, trash, parking, or safety, then enforce those issues directly. Do not use those concerns as an excuse to create broad permit caps or zoning restrictions on everyone.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jonathon	Young	
673		Short-Term Rentals	A permit cap is especially concerning. Once the government starts deciding how many people are allowed to operate, it creates winners and losers. Existing permit holders could gain special value, while future owners may be locked out. That is not fair, and it is not how a healthy local economy should work. The City also does not appear to have enough local data to justify these restrictions. Before creating new limits, the City should at least know how many short-term rentals exist, where they are located, what types of units they are, and whether they are actually causing documented problems. Acting first and gathering facts later is bad policy.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jonathon	Young	
674		Short-Term Rentals	Short-term rentals are not all the same. A room in someone's home, a family cabin, an owner-occupied duplex, and a full-time vacation rental all have different impacts. Treating them the same through broad zoning rules is not reasonable. Homer's economy is seasonal. Many people rely on summer income to survive the rest of the year. Short-term rentals help bring visitors into town, and those visitors spend money at restaurants, shops, charters, gas stations, grocery stores, and other local businesses. Restricting lodging without understanding the economic impact could hurt more than just property owners.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jonathon	Young	
675		Short-Term Rentals	If the City insists on doing something now, it should be limited to a basic registration system only. Registration would give the City contact information and basic facts without jumping straight into unnecessary government control. After one to three years of real local data, the City could decide whether any further action is actually needed. I respectfully ask that the Planning Commission/Zoning Board reject broad Title 21 restrictions and permit caps at this time. Enforce real problems directly, collect facts first, and let responsible property owners and the free market continue to work.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jonathon	Young	
676		Short-Term Rentals	I recognize that Homer has legitimate issues to consider regarding housing availability, neighborhood impacts, visitor lodging, safety, tax compliance, parking, noise, and absentee management. Those concerns deserve to be taken seriously. I also believe the City should have a clear way to identify and contact short-term rental operators and ensure that basic standards are being met. However, I do not believe Title 21 should be used at this time to impose broad short-term rental restrictions, permit caps, or zoning-based limits before Homer has better local data and before the broader short-term rental ordinance process has been completed.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jonathon	Young	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
677		Short-Term Rentals	The more reasonable path is to begin with a simple registration system, collect reliable local information for one to three years, and then decide whether additional regulation is actually needed. A registration-first approach would allow the City to answer basic questions before adopting more restrictive rules: How many short-term rentals are currently operating in Homer? Where are they located? How many are owner-occupied versus non-owner-occupied? How many are rooms, cabins, duplex units, accessory units, seasonal homes, or full-time vacation rentals? How many generate actual neighborhood complaints? Are the main problems related to housing supply, noise, parking, trash, safety, tax compliance, or something else?	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jonathon	Young	
678		Short-Term Rentals	Without that information, any permit cap or broad zoning restriction risks being arbitrary. A limit set before the City has a reliable baseline could be difficult to justify and could unintentionally harm responsible local operators without solving the specific problems the City is trying to address. I am also concerned that the current proposal appears to treat very different types of short-term rentals too similarly. A room in someone's home, a seasonal cabin, an owner-occupied duplex unit, and a full-time investor-owned vacation rental do not have the same impact. If the City eventually chooses to regulate short-term rentals more heavily, those categories should be clearly separated before broad restrictions or limits are considered.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jonathon	Young	
679		Short-Term Rentals	There are also practical concerns with creating a permit system before the City has defined the problem clearly. Good regulation should start by identifying the specific issue being addressed. If the concern is nuisance behavior, then complaint tracking, local contact requirements, parking standards, trash rules, and enforcement may be the right tools. If the concern is safety, then safety acknowledgments or inspections may be appropriate. If the concern is tax compliance, then registration and reporting may be the correct first step. A permit cap does not automatically solve those problems.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jonathon	Young	
680		Short-Term Rentals	I am especially concerned that allowing the City to establish or modify permit limits later by resolution could create uncertainty and unfairness. If caps are eventually adopted, existing permitted properties may gain special value while future operators are locked out. Transferable permits could also create winners and losers before the City has enough evidence to justify that kind of system. The renewal requirement also deserves more careful review. If renewal depends on proving that a short-term rental was actively advertised and used during the prior permit period, owners may feel pressured to keep operating as short-term rentals simply to preserve their permits. That could discourage an owner from pausing operations, renovating, using the property personally, or even converting it to long-term rental use.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jonathon	Young	
681		Short-Term Rentals	Homer's economy is seasonal and tourism-based. Short-term rentals are part of the visitor lodging supply, and many local owners use that income to pay mortgages, maintain property, support local businesses, and remain financially stable in a seasonal economy. Before the City adopts restrictions that could reduce lodging supply or affect local property owners, it should first understand the likely housing, neighborhood, and economic impacts.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jonathon	Young	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
682		Short-Term Rentals	For these reasons, I respectfully ask that the Planning Commission/Zoning Board not move forward with broad Title 21 restrictions or permit caps for short-term rentals at this time. If short-term rental language must be included in Title 21 now, I ask that it be limited to a simple registration requirement only. That registration could include owner contact information, a local emergency contact, unit type, number of bedrooms, maximum occupancy, parking information, tax compliance confirmation, safety acknowledgment, and whether the unit is owner-occupied. Please allow the EDC and City Council short-term rental ordinance process to continue before adopting zoning changes that could have long-term unintended consequences.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Jonathon	Young	
683	21.51.100	Short-Term Rentals	[STR Petition; est. ~490 signatories per submitter (~360 unique visible in submitted documents). Verbatim petition language:] "Short Term Rentals should only be allowed at the residence of the owner in Residential Zones the City of Homer. This is already the status quo for B&Bs and all other businesses. It would not apply in areas zoned for business, like Homer Spit or Pioneer Ave."	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society
684	21.51.100	Short-Term Rentals	[STR Petition, cont. Proposed code changes:] (1) "Update language in current HCC Title 21.51.100 from 'bed and breakfast' to include or be replaced by the term 'short term rental' to ensure folks are operating the business from their residence." (2) "Define 'short term rental' as rentals of less than 30 days." (3) "Apply the rule in areas zoned Urban Residential, Rural Residential or Neighborhood Flex." (4) "Grant nontransferable 'grandfather rights' to existing absentee-landlord STRs that terminate upon sale of the property."	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society
685	21.41.030(f)(1)	Short-Term Rentals	this should be for STRs, and maybe be pulled out of this section entirely to go into the section on STRs. The definitions include BnBs as a type of STR, and including this here is confusing. It is redundant to restate the definition of a bed and breakfast here, and to restate the requirement to follow signage code.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
686		Short-Term Rentals	Replace the term 'bed and breakfast' with the term 'short-term rental' (STR) throughout Title 21.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Landa	Baily	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
687		Short-Term Rentals	Allow STR's in all residentially zoned districts only on the premises of the operator's primary residence, defined as the operator's permanent abode where the operator lives for at least 185 days per year and remove the language in draft code placing restrictions on the numbers of STR's. In other words, this language: "Short term rentals means a dwelling in residential zones in which an individual or family resides for at least 185 days per year, and rents no more than five bedrooms in the dwelling to overnight guests, if the short term rental use is accessory to the principal use of the dwelling as the primary residence of the operator."	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Landa	Baily	
688		Short-Term Rentals	Allow STR's, regardless of operator's residence status, in other zones not zoned for residential uses.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Landa	Baily	
689		Short-Term Rentals	If permits are required, permits should not be transferrable between or among properties and should not be transferred upon the sale of a property.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Landa	Baily	
690		Short-Term Rentals	Require STRS to comply with all "State of Alaska Requirements for Bed and Breakfasts" including state plan approval regulations for properties 'not owner occupied', referred to in Alaska regulations as 'public accommodations.'	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Landa	Baily	
691		Short-Term Rentals	The above provisions may help to ensure a vital, strong STR economy in Homer while at the same time protect neighborhoods and encourage private small business development by owner occupied STRS on residential property. People buy homes in neighborhoods to insulate themselves and their families from commercial operations. Owner/operator occupied STRs in residential zones protects neighborhoods by ensuring the residence is occupied by the operator, and ensures the income is circulated within Homer promoting strong economics.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Landa	Baily	
692		Short-Term Rentals	Requiring residency occupancy in neighborhood zones helps increase safety to all other neighborhood residents from noise and any criminal activities and ensures rapid first responder response in the event of fire or other public safety events. Also, the residency requirement for neighborhood zones ensures families can generate income and their participation in a robust STR economy that promotes and protects their individual family needs. Allowing non residency / absentee owner STR's in neighborhoods effectively grants random and spontaneous nonreviewed rezoning of properties within residential zones into defacto commercial properties without community review or consent.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Landa	Baily	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
693		Short-Term Rentals	This unreviewed commercial use of residential zoned property effectively guts many provisions of Title 21, rendering as useless the code and the time, effort and considerable expense to formulate the code, decreases the many inherent value and benefits of neighborhoods, and decreases the confidence and predictability necessary and essential for strong communities.	TBD	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/14	Email	Landa	Baily	
694		Short-Term Rentals	STR should not regulate length of stay. Please allow the economic development committee to finish its work analysis on the impact this would have on our community and the economy of Homer.	No Change	Per the 6/22 2026 joint PC/CC work session, proposed registration language shall remain at this time. The STR topic is pending the results of the EDAC study, and will be workshopped with staff, PC, and CC over the coming months.	5/8	Email	Ann	Reed	
695	21.61	Signs	Generally I will support efforts to simplify the sign code as much as possible. I haven't spent time digging into this chapter recently.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
696	21.11.030	Site Plans	9a. 21.11.030(d) Please add the following to the list of information that needs to be included on a Level One Site Plan – the classification of any wetlands.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
697	21.11.050	Site Plans	9b. 21.11.050 The requirements for site plans should have stronger language about legibility. Site plans should not look like they have been scrawled by a 4th grader using a crayon. Some of the site plans we've received are very crude and you can hardly discern what is existing or proposed. Please address this.	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
698	21.74.010	Site Plans	21.74.010 Development Activity Plan (DAP): A DAP is a critical part of a proposed development because it shows and describes in detail what the development is composed of, and potential impacts. A DAP should be required for any development as part of a CUP that affects drainage, stormwater management, slope stability risk, and trails. Review of the DAP should reference a checklist that COH Staff first reviews, then the HPC reviews. Need to add as a review criteria that speaks to the COH Non-Motorized Transportation Plan and trail connectivity. The DAP should address trail connectivity and compatibility with proposed trail connections in the NMTP.	No Change	The DAP is proposed to be changed to "Drainage and Erosion Control Plan", so it's focus is narrow.	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission
699		Site Plans	Parking on the Homer Spit is finite. To devote any more parking by damaging the critical green infrastructure of the rye grass holding the spit together, and uglifying the aesthetics with ever more distasteful plastic cones needs to be seriously considered. The "parking problem" manifests for only one month out of the year. The largest perpetrators of causing the parking problems on the Homer Spit are we, the vendors and the captains of the charters themselves. We the businesses supposedly to serve the public, feel entitled and are lazy ...taking up parking spaces of our own customers accommodate us rather than we the businesses walking the short way to accommodate our customers. More two-hour minimums on the Spit Road near areas such as our Coal Point lots would help bring solution to this problem of employees and captains parking for over 8 hour shifts.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
700		Site Plans	On the Homer Spit the parking areas not only had green buffers in the parking areas but also a log and chain infrastructure that added a remarkable aesthetic addition to the flavour of the nautical Homer Spit. These were all ripped out by the city themselves and replaced with ugly plastic cones, the lush ever green native grass buffers now trampled to dirt. It is interesting to walk the spit and see tufts of this green infrastructure poking up where there is a sign preventing trampling. These green buffers are what is holding the spit together and needs to be created as a system of infrastructure on the spit with a no net loss policy that if some is removed here it is planted there. It grows readily with the only requirement is it cannot be trampled so zero cost to the city if simply acknowledged.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
701		Site Plans	Please add the words back that remind applicants and the city of the requirement of native landscaping and buffers as well as readily available natural piling and old used chain used as dividers so you won't have to continually have to remind them.	No Change	Detailed landscaping requirements for all new development are included in Chapter 21.56, including the requirement for native vegetation to the maximum extent possible.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
702		Site Plans	21.54.010 Purpose - Proposed addition: 'Where required, A landscaping plan shall provide for landscaping that minimizes visual, sound, volcanic ash, dust and other negative impacts, from the development, as well as create shade and positive benefits.'	Partial Change	Add shade and buffering benefits to the purpose statement.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
703		Site Plans	21.54.020 Applicability - Proposed language: 'b. New or expanded parking lots with 10 or more spaces, including paving of unpaved parking lots: buffers, parking lot landscaping, or street trees are required (excellent).'	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
704		Site Plans	21.54.030 General - RETAIN: 'a. Landscaping shall include the retention of native vegetation to the maximum extent possible.' Proposed addition to section c: 'Native species seeding without invasives.' Recommendation: The city may want to create a list of approved native seed to help contractors understand and choose which seeds are native and which are not or may contain invasives. This can be placed in the application and in Plans submitted.	No Change	This language is retained in the public review draft, section21.56.030(a)	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
705		Landscaping	21.54.040 Administrative Flexibility - Recommendation: please define "public interest" in definitions.	Change	Remove administrative flexibility from this section.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
706		Site Plans	21.54.050 Level 2 Site Plans - Recommendation: If the Purpose, Applicability and General sections are to be taken seriously Landscaping Requirement and Buffers more than any other item set the stage for beautifying the aesthetics of Homer. Please don't dilute these standards. Those who decide to live or build in Homer as snowbirds, need to understand we are serious on creating our own path to a well-planned beautiful City that must be recognized has limited finite space so can accommodate only limited finite number of people, especially if many of the people are transient. We need to recognize there are year-round citizens who must be accommodated instead of catering to summer time only visitors damaging our esthetics for one month flurry of activity.	No Change	Landscaping requirements in the public review draft have been improved or increased in several zoning districts.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
707		Site Plans	21.54.050 Level 2 Site Plans - ADD BACK: 'Landscaping Requirements. All development shall conform to the following landscaping requirements: Landscaping shall include the retention of native vegetation to the maximum extent possible and shall include, but is not limited to, the following:' a. Buffers. A buffer of three five feet minimum width along all lot lines where setbacks permit; except where a single use is contiguous across common lot lines, such as, but not limited to, shared driveways and parking areas. Whenever such contiguous uses cease the required buffers shall be installed. ADD BACK TO REMIND: ii. A buffer of 15 feet minimum width from the top of the bank of any defined drainage channel or stream.	No Change	This language is retained in the public review draft, section21.56.030(a)	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
708		Site Plans	21.54.050 Level 2 Site Plans - b. Parking Lots: Parking lots with a minimum of 24 spaces or more shall provide a minimum of 10 percent landscaped area in dividers, islands or buffers or any combination thereof. REMOVE: 'adjacent or within the parking area'. Recommendation: REMOVE these six words as applicants will take the path of least resistance and choose 'adjacent' rather than beautifying the parking area with aesthetic dividers islands or buffers. Or keep the original language: 'A minimum of 10 percent of the area of parking lots with 24 spaces or more shall be landscaped in islands, dividers, or a combination of the two.'	No Change	This flexibility (for adjacency) is provided to be sensitive to snow removal and snow storage issues in Homer.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
709		Site Plans	21.54.060 Level 3 Site Plans - RETAIN: 'Landscaping shall include the retention of native vegetation to the maximum extent possible and shall include, but is not limited to, the following.' RETAIN and repeat: reminder of the applicability, purpose and general landscaping requirements. a. A buffer of five feet minimum.	No Change	This clause was removed because the native vegetation requirement is stated at the beginning of the chapter (and is required for all landscaping).	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
710		Site Plans	21.54.070 Downtown Mixed Use District - RETAIN 15%: 'Not less than 15 percent of the area of the lot(s) shall be landscaped.' Do not go backwards on this even if people are not fully complying. RETAIN: 1. Buffers along lot lines shall be not less than five feet in width. Use of landscaping to buffer the public view of the backs of buildings and loading areas is encouraged. 4. RETAIN: garden shall be not less than 10 feet. RETAIN: 'Use of grass, woodchips, or natural surfaces is preferred over areas paved with asphalt or concrete.' ADD: Community Gardens for food security. 5. RETAIN SHALL, NOT MAY: 'Parking lots shall include landscaping.' Recommendation: define Small Boat Harbor Overlay; this is confusing as sometimes it mentions platforms and sometimes not.	No Change	On small downtown lots, 15% minimum landscaping paired with off-street parking requirements, can be a significant constraint to development.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
711		Site Plans	21.54.060 Landscaping, Small Boat Harbor Overlay - RETAIN THE WORD landscaping. Keep the green infrastructure of buffers as large as possible to protect from erosion. Proposed changes: a. 'Five Ten percent of the area of an overslope platform must be landscaped with native grasses that protect the banks from erosion.' c. 'The Commission City Planner may permit the substitution of durable outdoor art, or amenities for public use such as bike racks, benches, trash receptacles and information kiosks, for part of the required landscaping on an overslope platform as long as this does not interfere with the green infrastructure holding the banks of the spit intact minimizing erosion.'	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
712		Site Plans	21.54.070 Landscaping for Large Format Development - Proposed changes: b. 'Landscaping shall not be less than 15 20 percent of the total lot area of the site and shall include the retention of existing native vegetation to the maximum extent possible.' 40.2. In parking lots: i. A minimum of 15 percent of the parking area of parking lots with 24 spaces or more shall be landscaped. ii. Parking lots with 24 spaces or more will have a minimum 15-foot landscaped buffer adjacent to road rights-of-way. The Commission City Planner shall require buffers, including berms, fences, trees and shrubs, to avoid conflict and minimize impacts to adjacent property. A landscaped buffer or combination of landscaping and berms of no less than 15 feet in width will be required where the development adjoins residential zones.	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
713	21.11	Site Plans	I would consider requiring stormwater/drainage/erosion plans early in the decision-making process.	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
714	21.35.010	Slopes / Coastal Development	26a. 21.35.010 This paragraph references a Steep Slopes Overlay District. Where is this? It should be linked to the City's GIS maps of steep slopes.	Change	Correct reference from overlay district to Chapter 21.35	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
715	21.35.030	Slopes / Coastal Development	26b. 21.35.030 This would be a good place to insert a requirement for a Fill & Grade permit.	TBD		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
716	21.35.040	Slopes / Coastal Development	26c. 21.35.040 This would be a good place to insert a requirement that the City must inspect and approve construction.	TBD	Stormwater permitting process is under staff review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
717	21.35.060	Slopes / Coastal Development	26d. 21.35.060(c)(3) These sections limit review of adverse impact to "adjacent" properties. This needs to be broadened to encompass a larger area, including all downstream impacts within the subject watershed, as shown in the City's GIS maps for drainage ways and watersheds. Please add the following language: "shall not cause an adverse effect on land or drainage patterns adjacent to, or downstream from, the development activity."	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
718	21.53	Slopes / Coastal Development	HCC 21.53 Lower the threshold for required engineering to 30% grade (natural grade), for new impervious area, for additional fill (especially when drainage is altered), and clearing. Reason: Require height to be measured from natural grade rather than a filled/finished grade. This prevents artificially elevating structures to capture views at the expense of neighboring properties.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
719	21.22.060	Slopes / Coastal Development	Add to 21.22.060: d. Proposed developments on the north side of South Peninsula Hospital should be reviewed with special attention to bluff stability and require the review of geotechnical engineers. A single review by a geotechnical engineer needs to be supplemented by an additional peer review or reviews by qualified geotechnical professionals to assure that the initial geotechnical review is valid. e. Proposed developments in the medical district should be reviewed with special attention to drainage because of the downslope aspect of this area.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
720	21.35.020	Slopes / Coastal Development	Add to 21.35.020: d. Areas over 15 percent grade in areas considered to be potentially landslide prone by authoritative geologists and geotechnical engineers.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
721	21.35.070	Slopes / Coastal Development	Modify 21.35.070 to add slope stability analysis requirements including: i. Summary of all subsurface exploration data, including subsurface soil profile, exploration logs, laboratory or in situ test results, and groundwater information; ii. Interpretation and analysis of the subsurface data; iii. Summary of seismic concerns and recommended mitigation; iv. Specific engineering recommendations for design; v. Discussion of conditions for solution of anticipated problems; vi. Review by a licensed geotechnical engineer and recommended geotechnical special provisions.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
722	21.35.060	Slopes / Coastal Development	Title 21 code relative to geohazards should be modeled on code that has been developed for other states and local governments. In particular, the State of Washington municipal and state code. Homer has many similarities to Washington in terms of landslide risk, and Washington has had many landslide events in the past 10 years (e.g. a recent landslide closing I5 highway north of Seattle). These landslide events have been driving code revisions. It is important to distinguish landslide prone areas from just 'slopes.' Landslide prone areas in the COH area are based on a combination of soils, slope, drainage characteristics. These areas should be recognized as such by the COH and code developed for them.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
723	21.35.060	Slopes / Coastal Development	An option is to create an overlay district or environmental constraint layer developed specifically for landslide risk including debris flow risk in the COH area. Within this district or overlay, a set of specific review criteria and regulatory code should apply (see Washington DNR examples). The State of Alaska DNR DGGS, in conjunction with the COH, and funded by FEMA, has published studies including maps identifying clearly where these sensitive areas/environmental constraint overlays should be designated. GIS could be used as a tool by COH Staff and the public to easily determine if a particular development falls within the district, overlay, or sensitive area.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
724	21.35.060	Slopes / Coastal Development	Another option for management and regulation of geohazards is to create a Chapter 21.XX Landslide Prone Areas (similar for example to Flood Hazard Areas). This chapter would contain the various sections such as permitting standards and others to regulate development in landslide prone areas.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
725	21.35	Slopes / Coastal Development	Code should be modeled on code that has been developed for other states and local governments. In particular, the State of Washington municipal and state code. Homer has many similarities to Washington in terms of landslide risk, and Washington has had many landslide events in the past 10 years (e.g. a recent landslide closing I5 highway north of Seattle). These landslide events have been driving code revisions. It is important to distinguish landslide prone areas from just 'slopes.' Landslide prone areas in the COH area are based on a combination of soils, slope, drainage characteristics. These areas should be recognized as such by the COH and code developed for them.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
726	21.35	Slopes / Coastal Development	An option is to create an overlay district or environmental constraint layer developed specifically for landslide risk including debris flow risk in the COH area. Within this district or overlay, a set of specific review criteria and regulatory code should apply (see Washington DNR examples). The State of Alaska DNR DGGs, in conjunction with the COH, and funded by FEMA, has published studies including maps identifying clearly where these sensitive areas/environmental constraint overlays should be designated. GIS could be used as a tool by COH Staff and the public to easily determine if a particular development falls within the district, overlay, or sensitive area. Another option is to create a Chapter 21.XX Landslide Prone Areas (similar to Flood Hazard Areas) containing permitting standards and others to regulate development in landslide prone areas.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission
727	21.35.040	Slopes / Coastal Development	VI. Steep Slopes. Under 21.35.040 Drainage and erosion control. All development on a site affected by a slope of 15 percent or more, bluff, coastal edge or ravine, as described in HCC 21.35.020, shall be subject to level two drainage and erosion control standards in HCC 21.53150.030 in addition to the requirements of this section. Consider lowering the threshold for required engineering from 45% to 30% grade. Require Clear, Fill and Grade Permits for development in sensitive sites like steeper slopes, high-value wetlands, or areas with large amounts of water moving through them. For a good model, take a look at King County, Washington.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
728		Slopes / Coastal Development	Require fill and grade permits to prevent and mitigate landslide, flooding and/or low water quality.	TBD	Requires staff direction.	5/14	Email	Landa	Baily	
729	21.46	Snow Storage	Do snow storage requirements only apply to “new developments”, as stated in the purpose?	No Change	Yes, we cannot apply requirements retroactively on existing sites.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
730	21.35.050	Steep Slopes	I. The PRD ignores the unambiguous direction of the Mayor, the City Council, the public, and the Planning Commission to create an improved framework for managing stormwater. Specifically, to use a data-based mapping framework for managing development in wet areas. Under 21.35.050 Stormwater management. All development on a site affected by a slope of 15 percent or more, bluff, coastal edge or ravine, as described in HCC 21.35.020, shall be subject to a stormwater management plan in addition to the requirements of this section.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
731	21.09	Stormwater / Drainage	I would ask that Title 21 expand the language of Conditional Use Permits to include measures maintaining waterways, soil stability, woodlands, vegetation, wetland protection and water quality. Witnessing the current issues with flooding and erosion over the last several years, Conditional Use Permits would help people remain safe from harm caused by other people's actions.	No Change	No additional CUPs recommended, but the issue of wetland and watercourse protection to be discussed at the 6/22 joint PC/CC work session.	4/28	Email	Karen	Murdock	
732	21.12.010	Stormwater / Drainage	10a. 21.12.010(a) or (c) These would be good places to require a Fill & Grade permit. Ryan Foster drafted language for such a permit and permit review process. Please include this material.	No Change	Drafted language not appropriate in Title 21 in the absence of a building permit.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
733	21.12.060	Stormwater / Drainage	10b. 21.12.060 I am opposed to Administrative Adjustments of any kind.	No Change	Recommend keeping the one administrative adjustment in the public hearing draft: setbacks up to 2 feet.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
734	21.12.070	Stormwater / Drainage	10c. 21.12.070 This section should specify consequences of proceeding with work without a permit or if work continues when the permit has been revoked.	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
735	21.53.010	Stormwater / Drainage	34a. 21.53.010 This section should specify that on-site nature-based systems for managing drainage and stormwater shall be used where possible for all Levels of development.	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
736	21.53.020	Stormwater / Drainage	34b. 21.53.020(c) Site Development Standards – Level One. Storm Water Management Plans should be required where (i) more than 1000 SF of new impervious surface area is created; (ii) where more than 30 CY of material are moved; (iii) where the movement of material will alter a natural or constructed drainage way; or (iv) clearing more than 25% of the property. Stormwater Management Plans for Level One developments should be approved by the City Engineer and should be exempt from Chapter 21.54.030 regarding Financial Responsibility.	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
737	21.53.030	Stormwater / Drainage	34c. 21.53.030 Site Development Standards – Level Two. A fill and grade permit should be required before cutting trees, doing any excavation, or depositing fill. Storm Water Management Plans should be required where (i) more than 1000 SF of new impervious surface area is created; (ii) where more than 30 CY of material are moved; (iii) where the movement of material will alter a natural or constructed drainage way or (iv) clearing more than 25% of the property. Stormwater Management Plans for Level Two development should be prepared by a registered Professional Civil Engineer.	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
738	21.53.040	Stormwater / Drainage	34d. 21.53.040 Site Development Standards – Level Three. A fill and grade permit should be required before cutting trees, doing any excavation, or depositing fill. Storm Water Management Plans should be required where (i) more than 1000 SF of new impervious surface area is created; (ii) where more than 30 CY of material are moved; (iii) where the movement of material will alter a natural or constructed drainage way; or (iv) clearing more than 25% of the property. 21.53.050 A Fill and Grade Permit should be required for (i) any movement of more than 30 CY of material; (ii) where the movement of material will alter a natural or constructed drainage way; (iii) the movement will adversely affect private water sources or (iv) clearing more than 25% of the property.	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
739	21.54	Stormwater / Drainage	35a. Level One developments should be required to submit Stormwater Management Plans to be approved by the City Engineer and should be exempt from Chapter 21.54.030 regarding Financial Responsibility.	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
740	21.54	Stormwater / Drainage	35b. Stormwater Management Plans for Level Two developments should be prepared by a registered Professional Civil Engineer.	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
741	21.54.010	Stormwater / Drainage	35c. 21.54.010 This section should require that: Stormwater shall be managed to prevent adverse impact to existing drainage ways or properties within the subject watershed, as depicted on the City's GIS watershed maps. Nature-based systems shall be used in all districts where possible.	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
742	21.54.020	Stormwater / Drainage	35d. 21.54.020(l) This should say that dewatering activities must not adversely impact any existing drainage way or downstream properties within the same watershed of the subject property, as depicted on the City's GIS watershed map.	TBD	Requires further staff/legal review.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
743	21.35.050	Stormwater / Drainage	The current code update needs to clearly reference a COH Stormwater Management Plan, which, by the way, is in serious need of updating. The 'Stormwater Manual' dates back to 2007. Drainage related code should reference the newly updated COH Hydrograph GIS layers and DGGs/COH LiDAR data (e.g. topo hillshade). Drainage 'districts' should be updated using current GIS and engineering (e.g. the COH Low Impact Development study of 2021).	Partial Change	Reference Stormwater Manual and updated GIS layers.	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
744	21.515 3.030	Stormwater / Drainage	Development shall not adversely impact other properties by causing damaging alteration of surface water drainage, existing stream courses as mapped in the COH GIS Hydrograph, surface water ponding, slope failure, erosion, siltation, or root damage to neighboring trees, or other adverse effects. Development shall provide a drainage system that takes into account the drainage network as mapped in the COH GIS Hydrograph, as approved by the City Engineer, that is designed to deposit all runoff into either an engineered drainage system or into a natural drainage.	TBD	Stormwater permitting process is under staff review.	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
745	21.53; 21.54	Stormwater / Drainage	The current code update needs to clearly reference a COH Stormwater Management Plan, which by the way, is in serious need of updating. The 'Stormwater Manual' dates back to 2007. Drainage related code should reference the newly updated COH Hydrograph GIS layers and DGGs/COH LiDAR data (e.g. topo hillshade). Drainage 'districts' should be updated using current GIS and engineering (e.g. the COH Low Impact Development study of 2021).	Partial Change	Reference Stormwater Manual and updated GIS layers.	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission
746		Stormwater / Drainage	As luck would have it Soundview Ave. was improved by the City of Homer, and a large culvert was installed to handle the creek. Main street was being improved at the same time and I volunteered the lot to received the old road beds from Main Street and Soundview Ave. This fill brought the surface elevation of the Lot up several feet making the lot high and dry and channeling Woodard Creek due South into a new culvert. Everything was fine until a new road was punched in going North above Karen Horniday Park. That fall heavy rains flooded Woodard Creek and the new road failed sending mud and debris down the Creek. The Creek was moving lots of water down to the Bay, and it carved into our new yard and removed a large portion of the lot to the West. We contacted FEMA and arraigned a loan to rebuild our lot and straighten out the Creek again.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/11/2026	Email	Robert	Shroyer	
747		Stormwater / Drainage	Clear, fill and grade permit should be required for any removal of trees or vegetation and/or grading critical areas. Poor drainage management comes at a cost to downstream property owners and the city.	TBD	Stormwater permitting process is under staff review.	5/15	Email	Sandra	Garity	
748	21.71.040	Stormwater / Drainage	Please expand the language describing the kinds of conditions that can be placed on Conditional Use Permits (Homer City Code, 21.71.040) to include measures maintaining riparian waterways, soil stability, woodlands, vegetation, wetland protection, and water quality. These considerations are supported by language throughout the Comprehensive Plan indicating the need to manage hazards associated with stormwater, such as flooding and erosion, and it aligns with the basic legal principle that governments have the power to protect people from harm caused by other people.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	
749		Stormwater / Drainage	Please also require Clear, Fill and Grade Permits for development in sensitive sites like steeper slopes, high-value wetlands, or areas with large amounts of water moving through them. Mismanaged stormwater is a problem all over Homer and can lead to flooding, ice, clogged drainages, septic system failures, and more. We have to be careful with cutting and rerouting water in these areas to protect folks downstream.	TBD	Stormwater permitting process is under staff review.	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
750	21.73.020(i); 21.73.030(a)	Stormwater / Drainage	Strategy #2: Require Grading and Drainage plans for all developments. Status Quo: Owners of Level One and Level Two developments are already required to submit a "grading and drainage plan," showing "all cuts, fills, and areas of disturbance..." in compliance with HCC 21.73.020(i) and HCC 21.73.030(a). This applies to all zoning districts except Marine Commercial and Marine Industrial, which are Level Three developments. Recommendation: Require grading and drainage plans for all development where 100 cy of material will be moved. Benefit: Provide greater oversight on fills and excavations on private properties.	TBD	Stormwater permitting process is under staff review.	5/15	Email	Chris	Rainwater	Homer Soil & Water Conservation District
751	21.50.020(c)(1); 21.50.030(a)(1); 21.50.040(a)(1)	Stormwater / Drainage	Strategy #3: Require all developers to avoid adverse, off-site impacts. Status Quo: Owners of all developments are already required to avoid: "adversely impacting other properties by causing damaging alteration of surface water drainage, surface water ponding, slope failure, erosion, siltation, or road damage to neighboring trees, or other adverse effects." HCC 21.50.020 (c)(1), HCC 21.50.030(a)(1), and HCC 21.50.040(a)(1). Recommendation: Amend the above-cited sections to specify that property owners shall not adversely impact wetlands, ranked as Moderate or High on the 2005 Homer Wetlands Map. Benefit: This would help protect the functional value of Homer's higher quality wetlands by giving the City a regulatory vehicle for influencing developments affecting such wetlands, without creating conflicts with the U.S. Corps of Engineers.	TBD	Stormwater permitting process is under staff review. Wetlands to be discussed at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session.	5/15	Email	Chris	Rainwater	Homer Soil & Water Conservation District
752	21.74	Stormwater / Drainage	Strategy #4: Require Development Activity Plans for all developments. Status Quo: Owners of some Level Two developments are already required to submit Development Activity Plans in compliance with the standards set forth HCC 21.74 Development Activity Plan. These plans must address how erosion will be prevented, how adjacent properties will be protected from sediment deposition, how off-site erosion will be prevented, how slopes will be stabilized, and more. Recommendation: Require Development Activity Plans for all developments and include in the list of potential adverse impacts, adverse impacts to high value wetlands and require such plans to be approved by the City Engineer. Benefit: This would make development standards consistent and allow staff to be better informed about potential adverse impacts to off-site properties or wetlands.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Chris	Rainwater	Homer Soil & Water Conservation District
753	21.75	Stormwater / Drainage	Strategy #5: Require Stormwater Management Plans ("SWP") for all developments. Status Quo: Owners of some Level One and Level Two developments are already required to submit Stormwater Management Plans, prepared by a registered professional engineer, in compliance with the standards set forth HCC 21.75, Stormwater Plan. These plans must address how stormwater discharges as well as water quality, such as how total suspended solids and other pollutants will be controlled. Provisions must be made for conducting and documenting on-going monitoring and maintenance. Recommendation: Require SWPs for all developments. SWPs for Level One developments need not be prepared by a registered professional engineer but must be approved by the City Engineer.	TBD	Stormwater permitting process is under staff review.	5/15	Email	Chris	Rainwater	Homer Soil & Water Conservation District
754		Stormwater / Drainage	Establish vegetated buffers around creeks and wetlands designated as "medium-" and "high-priority" by the Kenai Peninsula Borough. Mismanaged stormwater is a problem all over Homer that leads to flooding, dangerous roadway icing, clogged drainages, septic system failures, increasing costs and hazards for the city and the public. The EPA has a model ordinance for instituting local buffers. The Kenai Peninsula Borough already has buffers around all anadromous salmon waters; the Bridge Creek Watershed already has buffers around creeks - all of which could be used as models to establish relevant code.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
755		Stormwater / Drainage	[Open Space Petition, cont.] "Require Clear, Fill and Grade Permits for development in sensitive sites like steeper slopes, high-value wetlands, or areas with large amounts of water moving through them. Mismanaged stormwater is a problem all over Homer and can lead to flooding, ice, clogged drainages, septic system failures, and more. We have to be careful with cutting and rerouting water in these areas to protect folks downstream."	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society
756	21.16.010(c)	Stormwater / Drainage	There's also an opportunity here to insert language to head off potential future claims against construction vibrations, earth movement, etc for future developments. Third party claims against the City for utility work serving developments by private contractors may be made easier by a single sentence, for example, setting peak particle velocity. Without which, City utility work may be handicapped. Pile driving for harbor expansions, water and sewer pipe replacement, civil projects, etc. can either be prevented or made easier. For example, as written, 21.16.010(c) may be interpreted to prevent any of these activities, if they occur close enough to the lot line.	No Change	This language would be extremely difficult to enforce / monitor during construction.	4/2	Email	Sava	White	
757		Stormwater / Drainage	I'm a forensic civil/structural engineer, I've been deposed as an expert witness too many times by too many lawyers in too many jurisdictions around the country. I'd like to avoid the potential of the City having to defend itself from subrogation by insurance companies who wield enormous legal resources in which forced settlements render the city incapable of providing anything except essential services for the foreseeable future.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	4/2	Email	Sava	White	
758	21.54.020	Stormwater Management	I would like to see this apply to not only during “construction and all other phases of development activity” but to be clearly intended to protect the surrounding landscape and neighboring/downstream properties during development and in the long-term to ensure continued integrity and protection of public and private infrastructure during and following development. This does not apply only to the construction process, but to the final product in perpetuity (although some of the subsections clearly are only applicable during active construction).	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
759	21.54.020	Stormwater Management	To that end, this section should possibly be a requirement to have established prior to permitting for certain areas if it isn’t already	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
760	21.48.010(a)	Temporary Storage	Why does the lime limit of one-year only apply to residential structures? What is the time limit on a commercial structure?	No Change	Time period applies to residential structures because construction projects are particularly disruptive in a residential neighborhood. Construction projects may reasonably extend more than a year (requiring storage of equipment) for non-residential projects.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
761		Traffic Impacts	Traffic impacts - ensure seasonality and peak time impacts are understood and taken into consideration for what triggers a traffic assessment/CUP/mitigation/response.	No Change	Traffic engineers account for this in several ways in a TIA. They'll take current traffic counts, which may correspond with the summer season and the highest volumes of traffic. If not, they can use DOT traffic counts which are conducted on a regular basis.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
762	21.60.030	Traffic Impacts	How is seasonality assessed for the LOS during a traffic impact analysis? The focus throughout the chapter is on the “opening date and in the design year” - how does that take into account the public’s reasonably low tolerance for making traffic worse in July, or during school pickup/dropoff hours during the school year (for example)? Ensure those peak periods are meaningfully assessed and there are clear paths afforded the City for requiring mitigation around.	No Change	Traffic engineers account for this in several ways in a TIA. They'll take current traffic counts, which may correspond with the summer season and the highest volumes of traffic. If not, they can use DOT traffic counts which are conducted on a regular basis.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
763	21.60.080(b)	Traffic Impacts	how is “unacceptable LOS” defined? Who gets to define it?	No Change	Unacceptable LOS is a professional judgement by a traffic engineer, potentially DOT, City Planner, Public Works and the developer. It is very location-specific.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
764	21.21.030	Urban Residential District	18a. 21.21.030(h) Storage of heavy equipment seems out of character for the Intended Land Use of the UR district. Please delete this.	Partial Change	Clarify this is only for personal use, or clarify the type of equipment allowed.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
765	21.21.030	Urban Residential District	18b. 21.21.030(i) It should be possible to get a permit to build/occupy a garage or other accessory building before the primary structure is built.	TBD	Discuss feasibility with staff	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
766	21.21.040	Urban Residential District	18c. 21.21.040(d) Storage of heavy equipment seems out of character for the Intended Land Use of the UR district. Please delete this.	Partial Change	Clarify this is only for personal use, or clarify the type of equipment allowed.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
767	21.21.050	Urban Residential District	18d. 21.21.050 There should be a view protection clause that requires new developments to preserve the view corridors of existing buildings.	No Change	Requires that view corridors be defined, which is difficult, and impacts on property owners could be significant. This also gives owners of existing buildings significant power over development on property that could be far from their building.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
768	21.21	Urban Residential District	18e. Page 117 There is a typo – 21.14.50 should read 21.20.050	Change		5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
769	21.21	Urban Residential District	18f. 21.21 Means of non-motorized transportation, such as connecting to existing sidewalks or trails, should be required.	No Change	Not necessary within a primarily residential district.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
770	21.22.020	Urban Residential District	19a. 21.22.020 Mixed use buildings, containing both residential and commercial uses, should be allowed as a permitted use. [Note: filed under Medical Mixed Use District in code]	No Change	Mixed Use Buildings not recommended in primarily residential districts	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
771	21.22.050	Urban Residential District	19b. 21.22.050 Means of non-motorized transportation, such as connecting to existing sidewalks or trails, should be required. [Note: filed under Medical Mixed Use District in code]	No Change	Not necessary within a primarily residential district.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
772		Urban Residential District	I am firmly opposed to detached dwelling if it is for renting to tourists or increasing density. Ditto for tiny houses, prefab main housing in UR zone. Ditto 2 for rooming house and B & B—all of which are back window way to increase density, increase traffic and disruption and not what I moved to Homer for.	No Change	Planning Commission expressed support for these uses in the UR district during meetings ____.	4/1	Email	Marianne	Schlegelmilch	
773		Urban Residential District	I am firmly opposed to day care in UR area without express consent of property owners withing half mile radius.	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	4/1	Email	Marianne	Schlegelmilch	
774		Urban Residential District	I am firmly opposed to wind energy units on lots, indoor and outdoor recreation facilities in neighborhoods and any and all things that take away from solitude and peace of my neighborhood.	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	4/1	Email	Marianne	Schlegelmilch	
775		Urban Residential District	Lot size for UR way too small!! We did not move to Homer to live in Anchorage congestion!! Lot sizes across the board are way to small for Homer life. 5 Foot setback is way too close. Again with the density.	No Change	Direction from Planning Commission was supportive of proposed lot sizes (meeting ____)	4/1	Email	Marianne	Schlegelmilch	
776	21.17	Violation and Enforcement	“upon written notice” - is there a timeline on this?	No Change	There is no specific timeline; the notice must be received by certified mail or hand delivery and there is a 30 day appeal period.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
777	21.17	Violation and Enforcement	Overall, ensure that the team has taken into serious consideration recent enforcement challenges and is providing recommendations to improve enforcement pathways.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor
778		Wetlands	The Update should include wetland, watershed, and open space protections for fish and wildlife habitats as outlined by these organizations' professionals. If included, water quality will be protected, and the effects of natural events such as flooding, landslides, bluff-erosion will be mitigated in areas that would otherwise be developed. Critical green infrastructure also helps manage ice and water on the roads, overflowing culverts, and septic system failure. Protecting functioning habitats and open space will not restrict growth but instead direct it to appropriate areas. Taking an ecologically-based approach to planning is imperative to future economic sustainability.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Leslie	Slater	
779		Wetlands	The Kachemak Bay Watershed Council is very concerned about the pro-development language in the Public Review Draft of the Code (PRD) and the lack of even the simplest, low cost and low resource use amendments that could apply existing resources to begin the process for protecting wetlands, watersheds and open space. Rather than proposing such regulations, the PRD would pave the way for large scale development in sensitive wetlands representing the worst fears of KBWC and others who have been commenting on the draft sense last fall.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
780	21.25.060	Wetlands	Add to 21.25.060: d. All development in this area shall not impact wetlands or conservation areas considered environmentally sensitive or in environmental overlay zones.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
781		Wetlands / Environmental	[Open Space Petition, cont.] "Expand the language describing the kinds of conditions that can be placed on Conditional Use Permits (Homer City Code, 21.71.040) to include measures maintaining riparian waterways, soil stability, woodlands, vegetation, wetland protection, and water quality. These considerations are supported by language throughout the Comprehensive Plan indicating the need to manage hazards associated with stormwater, such as flooding and erosion."	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
782		Wetlands / Environmental	I want to see wetlands protected utilizing GIS data [Anchorage does this]. I oppose administrative adjustments.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	4/29	Comment Form	Annette	Bellamy	
783		Wetlands / Environmental	Comparing the Proposed Zoning Map and the Homer Wetlands map, I am dismayed to see that, despite all the new information we have about the importance of protecting high value wetlands, the decision makers have put a blanket zoning designation of Light Industrial Mixed Use (LIMU) on this sensitive area. I know it is currently General Commercial 2. I expecting movement in the direction of protecting these areas since open space protection is valued by Homer residents.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/1	Email	Nina	Faust	
784		Wetlands / Environmental	Over the years, much new information has been discussed about the need to protect high value wetlands because of the important ecological services they perform. For Homer, the wetlands above Beluga Lake act as filtration for water moving into Kachemak Bay, absorbing chemicals that would otherwise go into the Bay. In big rain events or rapid snow melt, excessive runoff is absorbed into the spongy mass of wetlands performing stormwater control that would be expensive if we had to construct other ways to control flooding waters or had to deal with the destructive force of heavy flooding from the canyon waterways coming off the ridge. Nature performs these services better than anything we could construct.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/1	Email	Nina	Faust	
785		Wetlands / Environmental	With Climate Change more atmospheric rivers are hitting different parts of the country with damaging results. Homer would be in trouble without this very large sponge to mitigate stormwaters. The wetlands with their ancient peatlands are a significant carbon sink. Perhaps there is a way to use this valuable land to create "mitigation credits" where developers elsewhere who need to offset their developments invest in purchasing these lands for protection under City Conservation zoning and then pay ongoing fees to help the City of Homer manage the natural area. This money could be used to pay owners for their land and then protect this valuable area for the future. Many cities elsewhere have ignored the value of wetlands and allowed controversial developments that ended up costing a lot to mitigate when huge storms hit. We know better now, but too few communities heed the need to protect these valuable, dwindling wetlands.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/1	Email	Nina	Faust	
786		Wetlands / Environmental	Wetlands are also biodiverse areas, hosting a variety of species, from waterfowl to moose. The whole wetland complex is important as a wintering area for local moose. Habitat loss on the lower bench is making it harder for moose to find safe wintering areas with plentiful food. This area is ideal for moose and necessary for our local moose to thrive.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/1	Email	Nina	Faust	
787		Wetlands / Environmental	Ground water is important to the Homer area as drinking water is often difficult to locate and City water is not readily available throughout the community. Wetlands absorb water and help recharge underground aquifers. If we let this area be developed, over time there will be impacts to local aquifers.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/1	Email	Nina	Faust	
788		Wetlands / Environmental	All the potential uses that would be allowed in the LIMU would result in a tremendous amount of fill for building foundations and parking areas. Filling in high and moderate value wetlands will impact hydrology and absorption. Over time, we will not have any sort of functioning wetlands complex, a tragic loss of the ecological services the complex provides for the community.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/1	Email	Nina	Faust	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
789		Wetlands / Environmental	Aside from all these intrinsic values, these high value wetlands have specialized economic values that contribute to our recreational and tourism economies. If the land can be preserved, in addition to all the ecological services they provide, they can also enhance our recreation opportunities with carefully placed wildlife viewing platforms, wetland study sites for outdoor education, and potentially a trail designed with minimal impact in mind. Working to protect these wetlands through a carbon credit system will keep intact an area that will work for us in this era of unpredictable mega storms so we are not overwhelmed with floods and erosion that could happen if this area is mostly developed.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/1	Email	Nina	Faust	
790	21.53	Wetlands / Environmental	Wetlands Buffers are needed. Reason: Mapping will always improve but we can implement buffers with the existing mapping.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/11	Email	Dotti	Harness	Planning Commission
791		Wetlands / Environmental	36. Wetlands. Please add a chapter regarding Wetlands that does the following: a. Adopts Homer's wetland classification map prepared in 2005. b. Requires proposed plats and Level Two Developments to show, not only the presence of wetlands, but also, the category of the wetlands. c. Requires buffers for wetlands classified as high value to be shown on the proposed plat and Level Two Developments. d. Restricts development in high and medium value wetlands in a similar manner that development in the Bridge Creek Reservoir is restricted.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
792		Wetlands / Environmental	Keiser2 - Strategy #1: Show the presence and quality of wetlands on proposed plats. Status Quo: Surveyors are already required to include information about the existence of wetlands on proposed plats. Information about where wetlands are located within the City already exists. Further, qualitative information about such wetlands already exists in the form of the 2005 Homer Wetlands Map.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
793		Wetlands / Environmental	Keiser2 - Recommendation #1: Require surveyors to provide qualitative information about wetlands on proposed plats; that is, whether the wetlands are ranked as Low, Moderate, or High on the 2005 Homer Wetlands Map. Benefit: This would give the Planning Commission the additional information it needs to make knowledgeable decisions.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
794		Wetlands / Environmental	Keiser2 - Recommendation #2: Require buffers around Moderate and High wetlands. Benefit: This would help protect the functional value of Homer's higher quality wetlands.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
795		Wetlands / Environmental	Keiser2 - Strategy #2: Require Grading and Drainage plans for all developments. Status Quo: Owners of Level One and Level Two developments are already required to submit a "grading and drainage plan," showing "all cuts, fills, and areas of disturbance..." in compliance with HCC 21.73.020(i) and HCC 21.73.030(a). This applies to all zoning districts except Marine Commercial and Marine Industrial, which are Level Three developments.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
796		Wetlands / Environmental	Keiser2 - Strategy #3: Require all developers to avoid adverse, off-site impacts. Status Quo: Owners of all developments are already required to avoid "adversely impacting other properties by causing damaging alteration of surface water drainage, surface water ponding, slope failure, erosion, siltation, or rood damage to neighboring trees, or other adverse effects." HCC 21.50.020(c)(1), HCC 21.50.030(a)(1), and HCC 21.50.040(a)(1).	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
797		Wetlands / Environmental	Keiser2 - Recommendation: Amend the above-cited sections to specify that property owners shall not adversely impact wetlands, ranked as Moderate or High on the 2005 Homer Wetlands Map. Benefit: This would help protect the functional value of Homer's higher quality wetlands by giving the City a regulatory vehicle for influencing developments affecting such wetlands, without creating conflicts with the U.S. Corps of Engineers.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
798		Wetlands / Environmental	Keiser2 - Strategy #4: Require Development Activity Plans for all developments. Status Quo: Owners of some Level Two developments are already required to submit Development Activity Plans in compliance with the standards set forth HCC 21.74 Development Activity Plan. These plans must address how erosion will be prevented, how adjacent properties will be protected from sediment deposition, how off-site erosion will be prevented, how slopes will be stabilized, and more.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
799		Wetlands / Environmental	Keiser2 - Recommendation: Require Development Activity Plans for all developments and include in the list of potential adverse impacts, adverse impacts to high value wetlands and require such plans to be approved by the City Engineer. Benefit: This would make development standards consistent and allow staff to be better informed about potential adverse impacts to off-site properties or wetlands.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
800		Wetlands / Environmental	Keiser2 - Strategy #5: Require Stormwater Management Plans ("SWP") for all developments. Status Quo: Owners of some Level One and Level Two developments are already required to submit Stormwater Management Plans, prepared by a registered professional engineer, in compliance with the standards set forth HCC 21.75, Stormwater Plan. These plans must address how stormwater discharges as well as water quality, such as how total suspended solids and other pollutants will be controlled. Provisions must be made for conducting and documenting on-going monitoring and maintenance.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
801		Wetlands / Environmental	Keiser2 - Recommendation: Require SWPs for all developments. SWPs for Level One developments need not be prepared by a registered professional engineer but must be approved by the City Engineer. Benefit: This would make development standards consistent and allow staff to be better informed about potential adverse impacts to off-site properties or wetlands.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
802		Wetlands / Environmental	As a resident of the Homer Community since 1979, I am quite concerned about preserving our wetlands. I would ask that Title 21 expand the language of Conditional Use Permits to include measures maintaining waterways, soil stability, woodlands, vegetation, wetland protection and water quality. Witnessing the current issues with flooding and erosion over the last several years, Conditional Use Permits would help people remain safe from harm caused by other people's actions.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	4/28	Email	Karen	Murdock	
803		Wetlands / Environmental	My main concerns are around wetlands, water ways, watershed, steep slopes and coastal lands.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/10	Email	Rika	Mouw	
804		Wetlands / Environmental	I am dismayed to see that there is still no wording in the zoning ordinance or districts that clearly state 50 foot buffer zones along waterways and at least 50 ft. setbacks from wetlands.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/10	Email	Rika	Mouw	
805		Wetlands / Environmental	Wording similar to what the zoning code articulates for the Bridge Creek Watershed Protection District are clear about that but not in any of the other districts.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/10	Email	Rika	Mouw	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
806		Wetlands / Environmental	The City claims it relies on the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) to establish and protect wetlands but this is not sufficient. The ACOE does not manage or determine wetlands that do not drain into, or are not directly adjacent to navigable waters. The City MUST take responsibility in establishing buffer zones for wetlands and waterways, especially since much of the industrial zoning is in and adjacent to wetlands. The City must designate and determine wetland protections.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/10	Email	Rika	Mouw	
807		Wetlands / Environmental	As an example of no language for waterway buffer zones, a plat for a subdivision off of East End Road, adjacent to Paul Banks on Cantrell Creek, was approved with no language for stream buffer set backs. The City learned a lot from that mistake. Recently, a very similar situation happened again nearby just north of the subdivision. There is STILL no language in the code for waterway and wetlands buffer protection.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/10	Email	Rika	Mouw	
808		Wetlands / Environmental	I feel very strong about the protection of the our natural waterways and watersheds to keep the natural infrastructure intact in our surroundings. With that very basic awareness we lose the integrity of this landscape and to our quality of life.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/10	Email	Rika	Mouw	
809		Wetlands / Environmental	WETLANDS I DO NOT AGREE THAT ADEQUATE ATTENTION IS GIVEN TO THE ISSUE OF WETLANDS IN THIS VERSION OF TITLE 21.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	4/1	Comment Form	Franco	Venuti	Planning Commission
810		Wetlands / Environmental	The planning commission delegates environmental concerns of wetlands, streams, buffers, stormwater, etc. to the Army Corps of Engineers. The commission should use mapping data that it already has to address these types of environmental concerns and to have guidelines that can be developed by Title 21 language. They can be of any development permit that arises to apply to any development permit.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Comment Form	Ole	Andersson	
811		Wetlands / Environmental	I think the management of water and wetlands is a major issue considering how much there is and how steep our slopes are. Please build consideration for them into the new Title 21.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Comment Form	Ole	Andersson	
812	21.33.050	Wetlands / Environmental	Modify 21.33.050 Permits (7) to read: 'Disturbance of ground cover within the required setback or buffer of any stream or reservoir as mapped in the COH GIS Hydrograph.' Modify (15) to read: 'Diversion of a stream course as mapped in the COH GIS Hydrograph.' [Ord. 08-29, 2008].	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
813	21.33.090	Wetlands / Environmental	Modify 21.33.090(g) Stream buffers to read: 'A Stream buffer as mapped in COH GIS must be preserved and maintained along all perennial and intermittent streams in the BCWP district. The stream buffer must be at least 50 feet on each side of the stream measured from the top of the stream bank. Buildings and other features that require grading or construction must be set back at least 10 additional feet from the edge of the buffer. To avoid a decrease in the buffer's effectiveness in protecting the stream the buffer shall remain in natural and undisturbed vegetation.'	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
814	21.35.040	Wetlands / Environmental	The COH needs a wetlands management policy and code, largely because the federal Corps of Engineers is scaling back its role in managing wetlands in local areas, and also due to Homer area wetlands being important habitat as well as groundwater storage. The COH could model their own code and program based on working successful models, for example Municipality of Anchorage which has a wetlands management program in place over the last 35 years, and which fits well with Corps criteria. COH need not have exactly the same model as Anchorage, but at a minimum a simple classification of wetlands in the Homer area and what development level is appropriate for that class of wetland.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	

#	Code		Comment	Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
	Sec.2	Topic			(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
815	21.35.040	Wetlands / Environmental	We already have an excellent wetlands mapping and classification in place (the Kenai Watershed Forum (KWF)), it needs updating as it was last updated 10 years ago. We have the expertise in Homer to do this updating at reasonable cost, e.g. Kachemak Reserve, Dr. Michael Gracz, and others. The Corps of Engineers no longer provides the level of management and review as in the past due to cutbacks in their programs, for example the elimination of a Kenai Peninsula office; and the Corps is now charged with bigger projects in Alaska, with a lesser focus on small local areas (pers. Comm. USACE, March, 2026).	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Helen	Armstrong	
816		Wetlands / Environmental	The COH needs a wetlands management policy and code, largely because the federal Corps of Engineers is scaling back its role in managing wetlands in local areas, and also due to Homer area wetlands being important habitat as well as groundwater storage. The COH could model their own code and program based on working successful models, for example Municipality of Anchorage which has a wetlands management program in place over the last 35 years, and which fits well with Corps criteria. COH need not have exactly the same model as Anchorage, but at a minimum a simple classification of wetlands in the Homer area and what development level is appropriate for that class of wetland.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission
817		Wetlands / Environmental	We already have an excellent wetlands mapping and classification in place (the Kenai Watershed Forum (KWF)), it needs updating as it was last updated 10 years ago. We have the expertise in Homer to do this updating at reasonable cost, e.g. Kachemak Reserve, Dr. Michael Gracz, and others. The Corps of Engineers no longer provides the level of management and review as in the past due to cutbacks in their programs, for example the elimination of a Kenai Peninsula office; and the Corps is now charged with bigger projects in Alaska, with a lesser focus on small local areas (pers. Comm. USACE, March, 2026).	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission
818	21.33.050	Wetlands / Environmental	21.33.050 Permits (7): Modify to read 'Disturbance of ground cover within the required setback or buffer of any stream or reservoir as mapped in the COH GIS Hydrograph.' (15): Modify to read 'Diversion of a stream course as mapped in the COH GIS Hydrograph. [Ord. 08-29, 2008].' 21.33.090(g) Stream buffers: Modify to read: A Stream buffer as mapped in COH GIS must be preserved and maintained along all perennial and intermittent streams in the BCWP district. The stream buffer must be at least 50 feet on each side of the stream measured from the top of the stream bank. Buildings and other features that require grading or construction must be set back at least 10 additional feet from the edge of the buffer. To avoid a decrease in the buffer's effectiveness in protecting the stream the buffer shall remain in natural and undisturbed vegetation.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/13	Email	Charles	Barnwell	Planning Commission
819		Wetlands / Environmental	Why is there not a requirement for comprehensive mapping and integration of GIS information into the zooming plan? We have the technology and science that show exactly where wetlands need to be protected for the health of our environment and where steep slopes should not be developed for safety. To disregard this is short-sighted and will ultimately increase costs to the city in the long run.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/14	Email	Jenny	Stroyeck	
820		Wetlands / Environmental	Require buffers around creeks, wetlands and steep slopes, they are necessary for stormwater to permeate the soil, replenish the groundwater, decrease soil erosion and prevent stream-bank and steep slope collapse.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Sandra	Garity	
821		Wetlands / Environmental	I support additional code updates that better preserve creeks and wetlands and the crucial ecosystem services they provide, such as flooding mitigation and filtration of runoff.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation (If no change or TBD)		Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment								
822		Wetlands / Environmental	Establish vegetated buffers around creeks and wetlands designated as "medium-" and "high-priority" by the Kenai Peninsula Borough. Mismanaged stormwater is a problem all over Homer that leads to flooding, dangerous roadway icing, clogged drainages, septic system failures, increasing costs and hazards for the city and the public. The EPA has a model ordinance for instituting local buffers. The Kenai Peninsula Borough already has buffers around all anadromous salmon waters; the Bridge Creek Watershed already has buffers around creeks - all of which could be used as models to establish relevant code.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Katie	Gavenus		
823		Wetlands / Environmental	More attention should be paid to the geography and climate of the Homer area. The peat along Kachemak Drive should not have large developments allowed and the streams, creeks, and wetlands around town need to be better protected. This winter showed how flooding, ice and clogged drains can wreak havoc with the roads and buildings around town. As our weather gets more unpredictable, our building codes should get more rigorous.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Jim	Levine		
824		Wetlands / Environmental	I also feel your proposals really do not take into account the fragile peatlands that are as deep as 30 feet in places and critical in many ways. I lived on Kachemak Drive as a child and remember the vast number of moose that fed and lived in those peatlands during the winter when the snow was deep on the hillsides. I have seen multiple mudslides after heavy rain on East End road and I know those peatlands act as giant sponges- able to absorb a lot of that water. I know Kachemak Drive has had some big issues since the road was paved and the knowledge of how important the peatlands and how those would impact the road changes were not taken into consideration. I can not believe there is any reason to put more development in that area which is considered critical habitat.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Sue	Post		
825		Wetlands / Environmental	The District's mission, among other things, is to help protect soil, land, and waters from natural and man-made hazards such as landslides, erosion, and degradation of water quality. We support sensible regulations that effectively address erosion control, development on steep slopes, prevent landslides, manage stormwater, as well as protect high value wetlands and water quality. These issues represent some of the area's most pressing risks to the natural and the built environment.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Chris	Rainwater	Homer Soil & Water Conservation District	
826		Wetlands / Environmental	We noticed the proposed revisions do not address wetlands at all and do little to change the way stormwater is managed or erosion is controlled. This omission leaves the door open for more erosion, landslides, water quality degradation and flooding. We would like to see the City more proactively manage wetlands and drainages. We believe much can be done with the City's existing staff and resources. This is possible because the resources, and some of the underlying regulations, required to make this happen already exist. For example, the City has more technical staff now than it did a couple of years ago, the rate of development is still relatively low, and many of the regulations already exist in Title 21 in Chapter 21.33 Bridge Creek Watershed District.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Chris	Rainwater	Homer Soil & Water Conservation District	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
827		Wetlands / Environmental	Strategy #1: Show the presence and quality of wetlands on proposed plats. Status Quo: Surveyors are already required to include information about the existence of wetlands on proposed plats. Information about where wetlands are located within the City already exists. Further, qualitative information about such wetlands already exists in the form of the 2005 Homer Wetlands Map. Recommendation #1: Require surveyors to provide qualitative information about wetlands on proposed plats; that is, whether the wetlands are ranked as Low, Moderate, or High on the 2005 Homer Wetlands Map. Recommendation #2: Require buffers of at least 15 feet around Moderate and High wetlands. Benefit: This would help protect the functional value of Homer's higher quality wetlands.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Chris	Rainwater	Homer Soil & Water Conservation District
828		Wetlands / Environmental	V. The Planning Code needs to Step in to Protect Replace Declining Army Corp of Engineers Ability to Protect Wetlands and Watercourses. One of the issues with wetlands and water course protection in Homer is the fact that proposed wetland development and fill requests are currently analyzed and permitted exclusively by the Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps ability, however, to protect these waters from development is expected to be severely limited by the Trump Administration's proposal to weaken the Waters of the United States rule that would largely gut the application of Clean Water Act (CWA).	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
829		Wetlands / Environmental	The Proposed Rule would limit jurisdictional waters determinations to a two part definition: First, that the adjacent water body is a water of the United States, i.e., one that abuts a traditional navigable water through a relatively permanent, standing, or continuous flowing waterbody, and second, that any wetland in question has a continuous surface connection with that water at least during the wet season. According to USEPA and USACE: "Regulatory Impact Analysis indicates that, under the proposed WOTUS definition, only 19% of wetlands mapped in the National Wetlands Inventory would fall within Clean Water Act jurisdiction" and waters that will no longer be considered jurisdictional include many types of wetlands (geographically isolated, permafrost-dominated, and mosaic wetlands) and streams with intermittent or ephemeral flows.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
830		Wetlands / Environmental	Alaska's Home Rule framework allows the State's local governments to adopt their own wetlands and watershed-related regulations (e.g., setbacks, land-use zoning, habitat buffers, conservation programs) that can be stricter than federal/state requirements like the CWA. Homer is a home rule city, meaning Homer can legislate on any local matter unless a state or federal law explicitly prohibits it. Homer therefore may adopt zoning and land-use regulations including creation of watershed, habitat, and wetlands protections, development buffers, and setbacks beyond state minimums, and establish local permitting systems for land use, drainage, and shoreline development.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
831		Wetlands / Environmental	Homer's Zoning Code is largely devoid of regulations for development setbacks or areas where building is prohibited on or around wetlands or watercourses. The goals of the Anchorage Wetlands Management Plan include: protect wetlands that support important ecological and hydrological functions; ensure development in wetlands minimizes water quality degradation; provide a balance between protection of higher value sites and development of lower value areas; and prevent public liabilities associated with development of these areas. Anchorage has mapped their wetlands and classified them into 3 types: where A or B require permitting by the Corps while C is suitable for development without a Corps permit.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
832		Wetlands / Environmental	According to Janiette Keiser, who was the City Engineer for the City of Homer in the early 1980's and served as Homer's Public Works Director and City Engineer from 2020 - 2024, the AWMP is a means that municipalities can fill in the gaps provided by current federal law by focusing "on freshwater wetlands not associated with navigable waters." Keiser says the City of Homer has, or has access to, sufficient GIS mapping resources to identify the City's wetlands and sufficient resources, mapping and staffing, to classify wetlands using a system similar to the MOA. Plat applicants should be required to show buffers and setbacks on proposed plats.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
833	21.71.040	Wetlands / Environmental	VII. Minimum Standards for Wetlands and Watersheds. At minimum the Planning Code changes should Expand the language describing the kinds of conditions that can be placed on Conditional Use Permits (Homer City Code, 21.71.040) to include measures maintaining riparian waterways, soil stability, woodlands, vegetation, wetland protection, and water quality. These considerations are supported by language throughout the Comprehensive Plan indicating the need to manage hazards associated with stormwater, such as flooding and erosion, and it aligns with the basic legal principle that governments have the power to protect people from harm caused by other people.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
834		Wetlands / Environmental	Landscape Suitability Maps show Wetland Rankings, Stormwater Runoff Coefficients, Steep Slopes and more. The proposed changes to the City of Homer's zoning code presents a real opportunity to fill in the gaps left by the federal governments current backtracking on protection of watersheds and wetlands. Unfortunately, instead the PRD frames environmental constraints as administrative burdens rather than baseline planning inputs and the incorporation of such protections did not occur during the scoping phase. Instead of moving towards wetlands and watershed protections, the Public Review Draft represents a move in the opposite direction by proposing that sensitive wetlands be offered up not only to development but industrial and large retail structures.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
835		Wetlands / Environmental	Janette Keiser says in reference to the PRD, "iJn January 2026, I submitted over 9 pages of comments to the earlier version as well as multiple memoranda since January, with additional comments about specific topics, such as wetlands and stormwater management. When I compared the comments I made in January to my current set of comments, I found that almost nothing had changed. Very few of my earlier recommendations or observations of errors/inconsistencies had been addressed." As far as the claim by some members of the City Council that criticism of the planning code change process is too early, Keiser says "There are too many issues to address effectively if we try to take them all on. I can't imagine the Planning Commission or the City Council going through the proposed changes in the level of detail that will be needed to address all the issues. Plus, diving into the details requires more time and in some cases, specialized expertise."	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Hal	Shepherd	Kachemak Bay Watershed Council
836		Wetlands / Environmental	In general I think the quality of life in Homer has deteriorated in the 33 years I've lived here. The opportunities I had no longer exist for younger people here today. Environmentally, I would like to see greater protection for wetlands, development setbacks on creeks, and limits on clear cutting forested lots. Open spaces and natural areas should be incorporated into the planning process and supported in code. We have seen diminished abundance in fisheries and wildlife directly related to development.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Comment Form	John	Whittier	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
837		Wetlands / Environmental	[Open Space Petition, cont.] "Existing GIS mapping that shows low-, medium- and high-value wetlands, water flow, slope instability, and critical habitats should be used to guide what kinds of developments go where. This data is on-hand, easy to use, and will improve safety, property values, and quality of life. It will protect folks from the hazards of flooding, septic failure, etc. and it will also ensure that some of our highest-value wetlands (think deep peat) and habitats (think shorebird habitat in Mud Bay) only have low-impact development on them."	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society
838		Wetlands / Environmental	[Open Space Petition, cont.] "Establish vegetated buffers around creeks and wetlands designated as 'medium-' and 'high-priority' by the Kenai Peninsula Borough. Mismanaged stormwater is a problem all over Homer that leads to flooding, dangerous roadway icing, clogged drainages, septic system failures, increasing costs and hazards for the city and the public. The EPA has a model ordinance for instituting local buffers."	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/15	Email	Penelope	Haas	Kachemak Bay Conservation Society
839		Wetlands / Environmental	Require buffer zones around creeks and wetlands to alleviate stormwater associated problems and encourage natural groundwater flow to assist in sediment filtration, prevent erosion, prevent stream bank collapse and protect wildlife habitation. The recent Winter King Derby and the Kachemak Bay Shorebird Festival are just two of countless events with economic benefits to Homer businesses. The tourism business is to a very large extent, dependent upon strong environmental protections both for safety and for tourists' expectations.	TBD	Discuss at 6/22 joint PC/CC work session	5/14	Email	Landa	Baily	
840		Woodard Creek	My husband and I have owned our home along Woodard Creek for over 40 years. We are interested in any development or changes along Woodard Creek, as it could impact our home and yard. It sounds like this area has not been surveyed for over 10 years. If this area is included in any changes, it needs to be re-surveyed and all the Homer citizens along Woodard Creek need to be contacted prior to any developments. In 2002, the land above Karen Hornaday Park and Woodard Creek was impacted by heavy rains. A road that was not well established washed out and led to erosion below Fairview along the creek. A part of our backyard was damaged and we had to take out a FEMA loan to pay for groundwork, rocks, and repair.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/15	Comment Form	Marilyn	Shroyer	
841	21.37.010	Worker Housing	28a. 21.37.010 ADUs should be allowed to serve as Worker Housing, for permanent, year-round worker housing.	No Change	ADUs can be used as such without a change to the proposed code.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
842	21.49.010	Worker Housing	33a. 21.49.010 Worker housing should be allowed for permanent, full-time workers in all districts.	No Change	No direction from staff, Planning Commission or City Council has been provided to make this change.	5/5	Email	Janette	Keiser	
843		Worker Housing	Homer is already facing a severe shortage of affordable and available housing. Providing staff housing above our shop has been essential to operating our business successfully, especially during the busy seasonal months. Without the ability to provide onsite housing for employees, it would create an extreme hardship for our business due to the high cost of rentals and the limited availability of housing in Homer. Many small businesses simply cannot attract or retain reliable workers without offering housing accommodations.	No Change	No changes to the ordinance are proposed that would prohibit housing attached to businesses.	5/15	Email	Rachel	Gonzalez	
844		Worker Housing	We respectfully request that the City continue to allow the pre-existing uses of short-term vacation rentals, worker housing, onsite housing, temporary housing, and dormitory housing within the Marine Commercial zone. These uses have long supported local commerce, tourism, and economic sustainability in Homer.	No Change	No changes to the ordinance are proposed that would prohibit housing attached to businesses.	5/15	Email	Rachel	Gonzalez	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation						
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org	
845	21.49.020(a)	Worker Housing	I’m not clear why this section exists/what it is accomplishing? “Worker housing” is only allowed in the LIMU and MI zoning districts as drafted. 21.49.020(a) has a different list than what is defined at the beginning of the title. I’m unclear as to what (b) is referencing. If the underlying standards of development all apply to worker housing, then what makes it special and why should it have an entire chapter?	No Change	The term "worker housing" encompasses a variety of housing types, and is meant to allow/encourage housing specifically for workers of a certain business to be located on the same lot as an accessory use to the business. This is different than just allowing apartments or dormitories as a permitted use in these districts because we don't want industrially zoned property exclusively developed for housing.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor	
846	21.08.050(b)	Zoning Amendments	I’d like to better understand how the FLUM isn’t regulatory, but general in nature, and yet the findings require a zoning map amendment to be “consistent with” the FLUM. Should this say, “generally consistent” or something similar?	No Change	This criteria for a zoning amendment does not just refer to the FLUM, but also the goals and policies established in the Comprehensive Plan. A main purpose of the Comp Plan is to set direction for future zoning changes that can happen based on market timing and/or property owner wishes, which is why the FLUM sets a desired future state without being regulatory.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor	
847	21.08.070	Zoning Amendments	Is it possible to explore more clear expectations of findings for the Council? Or since it’s a legislative action state as such? The Planning Commission has guidance for approval “only if” a set of four criteria in 050. If the Council can deny for any reason, maybe this can be more clearly stated? Could the Council approve a proposal that Planning did not approve recommendation of?	Change		5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor	
848		Zoning Districts	Zoning Districts - All except the 3 residential districts need drainage and erosion control standards stated. See my comments in that section of code for needing more clarity and standards language for the different levels.	No Change	All districts contain direction on which level of drainage and erosion control standards apply.	5/18	Email	Rachel	Lord	Mayor	
849		Zoning Map - Marine Districts	I am writing regarding the proposed zoning map update that would reclassify the city-owned, leased parcel where my business operates from Marine Commercial to Marine Industrial. Parcel number: 18103118 Tax ID: T 6S R 13W SEC 35 SEWARD MERIDIAN HM 0940043 THE FISHIN HOLE SUB NO 2 TRACT 1-B	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood		
850		Zoning Map - Marine Districts	I want to be clear that I am generally supportive of the broader zoning code updates, including the effort to refine and better define Marine Commercial uses. The overall direction appears thoughtful and appropriate. However, this specific map change does not align with the actual, longstanding use of this site or the surrounding area.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood		
851		Zoning Map - Marine Districts	This location is actively used for retail and customer-facing commercial activity, consistent with Marine Commercial zoning. It serves both residents and visitors in a high-traffic area on the Homer Spit and functions as part of a cluster of similarly situated commercial uses.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood		

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
852		Zoning Map - Marine Districts	Reclassifying this parcel to Marine Industrial would create several issues: • Nonconforming use risk for existing businesses operating under a city lease, potentially limiting future investment, improvements, or continuity • Misalignment with actual use, as the site functions as a retail/commercial space rather than an industrial one • Inconsistency with surrounding properties, which are predominantly commercial and visitor-oriented • Unintended economic impact on small businesses that rely on commercial zoning for viability	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	
853		Zoning Map - Marine Districts	There does not appear to be a change in use or conditions that would justify this reclassification. As such, this seems likely to be an oversight in the mapping process rather than an intentional policy outcome.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	
854		Zoning Map - Marine Districts	Given that this is city-owned land leased for active commercial use, maintaining appropriate zoning is particularly important to ensure stability and clarity for current and future tenants. I respectfully request that the Planning Commission: 1. Remove this parcel (and any similarly situated leased commercial parcels) from the proposed Marine Industrial designation, and 2. Retain Marine Commercial zoning consistent with its actual use and function.	Change		5/5	Email	David	Atwood	
855		Zoning Map - Marine Districts	My house is on edge of RR vs UR and I would like it to be RR, which I believe it was when we bought it. I am on corner of Mtn View and K Way. I am opposed to any and all density increases in Mtn View area!!!!	No Change	The proposed code and zoning map do not intent to proactively rezone any property from RR to UR.	4/1	Email	Marianne	Schlegelmilch	
856		Zoning Map - Marine Districts	I think we should consider a zoning corridor that captures the properties fronting East End Rd from Lake Street to East Hill Rd. These lots should include uses that include greenhouses, studios, schools, small offices, personal services and recreational facilities.	No Change	No proactive zoning changes are being made at this time, except for district consolidations and renamings. Additional city-initiated rezonings could be considered in the future.	5/12	Email	David	Schneider	
857		Zoning Map - Marine Districts	I live in the sw corner of the proposed Medical district on Spruceview ave. First I question why this area was changed from office / residential to Medical. If you wish to change it then why does it have to extend further south than the SVT medical center. I feel that the Office/ residential was a was accurate description before. The area east of the medical zone you have that listed as office/residential. That looks out of place. Only two clinics are there at his time and the rest are residences. There is not a permitted use described in the zone schedule.	Change		4/19	Comment Form	Lou	Stewart	
858		Zoning Map - Marine Districts	Please consider looking at the zoning on the Homer Spit between OCR and CON. Possibly using piling chain infrastructure so sensitive bird areas can be designated to alert guests and residents of sensitive areas as well as pathways through these areas to guide people to the beach.	No Change	Comment does not suggest a change to the ordinance. Rezoning can occur in the futre.	5/15	Email	Nancy	Hillstrand	
859	21.02.040		Homer City Code 21.02.040 includes the following definition: “Person aggrieved” means a person who shows proof of the adverse effect an action or determination taken or made under the Homer Zoning Code has or could have on the use, enjoyment, or value of real property owned by that person. An interest that is no different from that of the general public is not sufficient to establish aggrievement.	TBD	Suggested change requires legal review.	4/22	Comment Form	Frank	Griswold	

Code				Recommended Action	Project Team Recommendation					
#	Sec.2	Topic	Comment		(If no change or TBD)	Date	Format	First Name	Last Name	Org
860	21.02.040		The second sentence of this provision constitutes “perverse public policy” and directly conflicts with multiple recent decisions by the Alaska Supreme Court, including Griswold v Homer Board of Adjustment, S-16267 (2019) which states in relevant part as follows: “HCC 21.03.040 defines “person aggrieved” as a person who shows proof of the adverse effect an action or determination taken or made under the Homer Zoning Code has or could have on the use, enjoyment, or value of real property owned by that person. An interest that is no different from that of the general public is not sufficient to establish aggrievement.[15] We held previously that Homer's standing ordinance for land use appeals is “not more restrictive than our interpretation of AS 29.40.060(a).”16 And the standing requirement in AS 29.40.050(a) — which requires municipal governments to provide appeals from administrative decisions — should be read to provide review to those “aggrieved” within the meaning of AS 29.40.060(a) — which provides for appeals to the superior court.	TBD	Suggested change requires legal review.	4/22	Comment Form	Frank	Griswold	
861	21.02.040		So interpreted, HCC 21.03.040 requires that a property owner make only a minimal showing to qualify as a “person aggrieved.” . . . The City argues that granting Griswold standing would provide standing to any property owner in the zoning district, rendering the City's standing requirement “futile.” But because reduced setbacks could potentially harm every property owner in the zoning district, every property owner in that zoning district does have standing to challenge their legality.23 As we explained in Kanuk ex rel. Kanuk v. State, Department of Natural Resources, “even federal law recognizes that denying injured persons standing on grounds that others are also injured — effectively preventing judicial redress for the most widespread injury solely because it is widespread — is perverse public policy.”24 An aggrieved property owner is no less aggrieved merely because the neighbors are aggrieved as well.25 “	TBD	Suggested change requires legal review.	4/22	Comment Form	Frank	Griswold	