

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Table of Contents by Subject Area:

General / Miscellaneous Comments (p. 2)
Commercial / Mixed-use Center Designations (p. 3)
Park and Natural Resource Use Designations (p. 4)
Transit / Transit Focus Areas (p. 6)
Area-specific Comments - Northeast Anchorage Bowl (p. 6)
Area-specific Comments - Northwest Anchorage Bowl (p. 10)
Area-specific Comments - Southwest Anchorage Bowl (p. 35)
Area-specific Comments - Southeast Anchorage Bowl (p. 37)

Index of Commentators:

Alaska Mental Health Trust (pp. 7-8, 37)
Alaska Railroad Corporation (pp. 33-35)
Anchorage Chamber of Commerce (p. 3)
Bolles, Dan (pp. 9, 35-37, 40)
Brock, Bob (pp. 4-5)
Brooks, J. Jay (pp. 20-23)
Cummings, Terry (pp. 2, 5, 9-10)

Index of Commentators (Cont'd):

Debenham, Shaun (pp. 11-12)
Fairview Community Council (pp. 13-20)
Hodges, Clinton (pp. 6, 9-10)
Kaeppele, Rudy (pp. 12-13)
Luksich, Anna (pp. 22-23)
Meyer, Justina (p. 13)
Mjos, Peter (p. 9)
Mole, Deborah (pp. 38-39)
Pexton, Scott (pp. 2-3, 5, 37-38,)
Rothwell, Greg (pp. 41-42)
Rabbit Creek Community Council (pp. 38-41)
Shepards, Jim (p. 41)
Stone, Dan (pp. 37-38)
Turnagain Community Council (pp. 4, 23-33)
University of Alaska (pp. 4-5, 6-7)
Warkentin, Nelda (pp. 10-11)
Wilber, Michelle (p. 2)
Misc. Public Meeting Participants (pp. 3, 4, 6, 11)

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<i>General / Miscellaneous Comments</i>		
<p>I urge you to support the <u>Anchorage 2020</u> goals and objectives. This plan, which involved many citizens of Anchorage, created goals which the people of Anchorage wanted to see implemented and it has for the most part been ignored since it was adopted. Specific comments relevant to the LUPM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Open space needs to be preserved; ▪ Roads should not be cut through our parks and open space, animal migration patterns need to be protected (not bisected by roads); ▪ There should be increased density in downtown, midtown and new town centers. 	<p>Terry Cummings / Debarr Vista Subdivision resident</p>	<p>The Land Use Plan Map is aligned with the policies of <u>Anchorage 2020</u>, while also reflecting new information available and recent developments that have occurred since <u>Anchorage 2020</u> was adopted in 2001. It does not attempt to implement <u>Anchorage 2020</u> fully. It provides a framework for Neighborhood and District Plans which can more fully implement <u>Anchorage 2020</u> over time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Open Space</u>. The <i>Land Use Plan Map</i> identifies and preserves existing designated or dedicated open spaces. It also identifies park use permit areas on airport or other non-municipal property.
<p>I am concerned that Anchorage become a livable, walkable, bike-able and bus-able city. I applaud higher density and mixed use districts.</p>	<p>Michelle Wilber, 9-1-05 public meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Roads</u>. The Land Use Plan Map is not the primary transportation planning tool by which the community identifies new roads or transportation routes. It reflects major transportation corridors of the recently adopted <i>Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)</i>. ▪ <u>Mixed-use / Density</u>. The Land Use Plan Map identifies the mixed-use centers as distinct areas on the map and takes some steps toward concentrating increased housing densities in certain adjacent areas.
<p>Please provide a copy of the 1982 Plan Map in the next Public Review Draft so that people can see how proposed land use designations differ from the 1982 Plan Map.</p>	<p>Scott Pexton</p>	<p>An illustrative re-creation of the 1982 Generalized Land Use Plan Map will appear in the coming <i>Technical Report</i>, and is available online on (a) the Land Use Plan Map project website and (b) the 1982 Plan document .pdf.</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>The narrative in the first section leads one to believe that the proposed “Land Use Plan Map” is a single map to be used as a tool when making decisions about future development. However, several maps were included in the Community Discussion Draft package. Will there be one single map replacing the 1982 Land Use Plan Map or multiple maps replacing it? Is the “Generalized Land Use Plan Map” the intended replacement map for the 1982 Plan Map? Please clarify.</p>	<p>Scott Pexton</p>	<p>Planning staff has revised the Plan Map narrative on page 3 to clarify what documents constitute the “Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map”.</p> <p>The purpose of multiple map layers is to simplify or break-out specific kinds of information for the benefit of the reader. <i>Map E: Composite Land Use Plan Map</i> contains all the information together on one Map. If the multiple map layers are confusing, then just Map E can be used.</p>
<p>No commercial office areas are depicted on the maps that would correspond to the proposed Office (O) use district in the draft Title 21.</p>	<p>Anchorage Chamber of Commerce</p>	<p>The draft <i>Office – Low Intensity</i> designation corresponds to the proposed <i>Title 21</i> Office use district. The draft Plan Map provides its general locations in the Bowl.</p>
<i>Commercial / Mixed-use Center Designations</i>		
<p>Consolidate one commercial / mixed-use center in the Dimond Center area, rather than one at Dimond and another at Abbott Town Center. Show more residential use in Abbott Town Center than commercial mixed-use. Dimond Center has the most potential for mixed-use redevelopment. Unless the Plan Map focuses the commercial center for that area of the Bowl in one location, neither location will develop to any intensity.</p>	<p>Participant at 6-28-05 public meeting</p>	<p>The draft Plan Map reflects the existence and continued growth of two commercial / mixed use centers in the east Dimond area. Each has a distinct function and is separated from the other by the freeway. The <i>Regional Commercial Center</i> at Dimond Center functions primarily as a regional retail center and is less focused on serving surrounding neighborhoods. Abbott Town Center is further away from the freeway, abuts surrounding residential areas, and is anchored by two grocery stores. It contains commercial activities which are not likely to disappear in the next 20 years or beyond.</p> <p>The Plan Map approach is to maximize redevelopment potential in both areas. Area-specific planning for the areas can further refine the land use designations. The Abbott Town Center is in <i>Anchorage 2020</i>. Both designations allow and encourage residential development.</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>The LUP should provide guidance as to prioritizing and phasing the development of mixed-use centers. It should prioritize one or several centers and provide direction so that other centers do not develop above a certain intensity until the first centers reach a certain threshold. Anchorage does not have enough growth resources to accommodate all designated centers in Anchorage 2020 at one time. Unless growth is focused and prioritized, none of the centers will be realized.</p>	<p>Participant at 6-28-05 public meeting</p>	<p>The Plan Map does show a greater number of commercial / mixed-use centers than are likely to redevelop into Town Centers envisioned in <i>Anchorage 2020</i>. Anchorage’s anticipated rate of growth for the next 20 years would not support complete redevelopment of all of the centers. Some are likely to progress toward the mixed-use town center vision, while others are likely to remain limited to primarily commercial uses at a low suburban density.</p> <p>Planning staff does not necessarily disagree in concept with a strategy of geographic phasing and prioritizing investment in high-priority centers. However, the main purpose of the Plan Map project is to merely identify the locations of all existing and future commercial / mixed-use centers throughout the Bowl. It is beyond the scope or resources of this project to develop a phasing plan which categorizes or prioritizes centers according to which should receive public and/or private reinvestment and in what order.</p>
<p><i>Park and Natural Resource Designations</i></p>		
<p>The draft LUPM depicts several areas as striped green (Park and Natural Resource Use) and blue (Major Transportation Facility) areas. Example is the area in and north of Kincaid Park near Little Campbell Lake.</p> <p>The LUPM do not explain these dual and contradictory designations.</p>	<p>Turnagain Community Council</p>	<p>Planning has added an explanation of these areas on page 10 of the Land Use Plan Map narrative, under “<i>Other Areas that Function as Park or Natural Resource</i>”. Further discussion about lands around the International Airport appears in this document below.</p>
<p>The narrative description of “<u>Other Area that Functions as Park, Recreation and Natural Resource</u>” implies that lands in this designation are public access recreation areas. However, the “preservation open space” classification in the U-Med Plan is not intended to mean public access parkland. The primary purpose in the U-Med Plan is to identify areas that are to be permanently protected areas through a conservation easement or similar instrument. It is to be natural open space but not necessarily publicly accessible park.</p>	<p>Meg Hayes, University of Alaska</p>	<p>(1) Planning has adjusted the name of this designation to “<i>Other Area that Functions as Park, Recreation <u>or</u> Natural Resource</i>” to be inclusive of any preservation open spaces that are <u>not</u> publicly accessible / public use areas.</p> <p>(2) Planning has revised the intent statement for this designation to no longer state that these are publicly</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>The area abutting Johns Park to the west, which is designated “Other areas that function as park, recreation and natural resources”, is privately owned. The definition of this designation includes public access. This looks like an appropriation of private land for public open space, as part of the Coastal Trail effort.</p>	<p>Bob Brock / resident property owner</p>	<p>accessible park areas.</p> <p>(3) Planning has revised the description of “<i>Other Area that Functions as Park, Recreation or Natural Resource</i>” to state that it includes state lands designated by an adopted plan as either (a) park or (b) natural resource areas unsuitable for development. It states that these natural resource areas are not necessarily intended to provide public recreation access.</p> <p>(4) Planning staff has reviewed and where necessary has corrected open space-related designation of properties throughout the Bowl. This review included areas along the south coast to ensure accuracy of designations in relation to private property and Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge. The classifications of areas below the bluff and in the coastal plain reflect the environmental constraints to development, and the likelihood that these areas will remain undeveloped.</p> <p>(5) Planning intends to conduct an additional quality check of the accuracy of the boundary of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge as depicted on the draft Plan Map.</p>
<p>The Park and Natural Resource Use Designation as described on page 13 of the narrative should also include all areas that are currently zoned for parks and recreation purposes (PLI-p) and any other similar or equivalent existing zoning categories intended by the Assembly for parks and/or recreation purposes.</p>	<p>Scott Pexton</p>	<p>Planning staff has attempted to identify all existing and planned park and natural resource areas that have been dedicated, designated or through formal agreement or severe environmental constraints will remain open spaces. If the draft Plan Map has missed any of such lands, Planning appreciates any information and comment.</p>
<p>We need to do more to protect habitat for wildlife as the Anchorage 2020 Comp Plan directs. We are still losing habitat at an alarming rate.</p>	<p>Terry Cummings, 8-17-05 public meeting</p>	<p>Planning appreciates any information and comment.</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<i>Transit Corridors / Transit Focus Areas</i>		
It should be clear that the point symbol for “Intermodal / Transit Focus Area” located in the U-MED District does not necessarily indicate a large transit station facility. There is no plan now for a large transit station facility.	Meg Hayes, University of Alaska	Planning has revised the description of <i>Intermodal / Transit Focus Area</i> to more clearly state that its map symbol does not necessarily represent a single facility—it often designates a wider area that has a high level of bus service. It specifies that areas designated <i>Major Institutional</i> may include this symbol to indicate a high level of transit service for the general area.
The LUPM does not propose to increase the density of residential development along the developing transit corridors in south anchorage, specifically O'Malley, Huffman, DeArmoun and Abbot Loop. These developing major corridors service city centers and employment centers. In accordance with the comprehensive plan, and consistent with the arguments planning uses in support of high density development along the transit corridors in north anchorage and Lake Otis, these main transit corridors in south anchorage should depict the same density levels.	Clinton R. Hodges / Debarr Vista Subdivision resident Written comments and verbal comments at 6-28- 05 public meeting	The <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> does not identify O'Malley, Huffman, DeArmoun or Abbott Loop roads as transit supportive development corridors. The designated corridors are identified on page 50 of the <i>Anchorage 2020 / Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan</i> . The draft LUPM proposes a practical and step-by-step approach to achieving <i>Anchorage 2020</i> . It does not recommend increasing density of every residential area within ¼ mile of a designated transit supportive development corridor. It must weigh a variety of locational criteria for where to increase density. Some areas are inappropriate for higher density, according to other locational criteria provided in the narrative.
<i>Area-specific Comments - Northeast Anchorage Bowl</i>		
<i>School and Community Institutional</i> designation for the Alaska Botanical Gardens appears to depict an inaccurate or outdated use area boundary with Far North / Bicentennial Park and Natural Resource area. The area southeast of the creek may not have been a part of the updated Botanical Gardens use permit area.	Participant at 6-28- 05 public meeting	Planning has changed the use designation boundary to reflect the existing Botanical Gardens use permit area.
Designate University of Alaska and other non-municipal “preservation open space” lands in the <i>Universities – Medical District Framework Master Plan</i> as “Other Area that Functions As Park...”. The “Park” designation should apply only to municipal	Meg Hayes, University of Alaska	Planning has changed the designation of non-municipal preservation open spaces to “ <i>Other Area...</i> ”. Only municipal lands, including Goose Lake Park and University Lake area, are now designated as “ <i>Park and Natural</i> ”

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
land and other public land designated for public park use.		<i>Resource Use</i> ". Planning has clarified the definition and locational criteria of " <i>Park and Natural Resource Use</i> " and the " <i>Other Areas that Function as Park...</i> " The second bulleted criteria for the " <i>Park...</i> " designation is changed to clarify that " <i>Park</i> " applies only to municipally owned land.
There are two parcels of land to the northeast of Northern Lights Boulevard around Pine Street is University owned land. The draft Land Use Plan Map designates them as "School and Community Institutional" rather than as "Major Institutional". This draft designation would seem inconsistent with the Land Use Plan Map designation of other UAA lands.	Meg Hayes, University of Alaska	The draft Plan Map does not recommend the classification of future use based on land ownership alone. The parcels in question are isolated from the rest of the University area, partially affected by wetlands, and may have poor access adjacent to Northern Lights other than through an adjacent low intensity residential area. These parcels are outside of the <u><i>Universities & Medical District Framework Master Plan</i></u> area. Such areas beyond the core campus area are considered less appropriate for the most intensive <i>Major Institutional</i> designation.
The University is concerned that the draft Land Use Plan Map classification of its parcels into "Major Institutional" and other, natural preservation-related land use designations could result in separate zoning districts for these two kinds of areas of University land. UAA wants assurance that all of its lands will remain in the PLI zone.	Meg Hayes, University of Alaska	The narrative report reads that PLI is the primary implementing zoning district for " <i>Major Institutional</i> " and the " <i>Other Areas that Function as Park, Recreation...</i> " designations. This is consistent with the <u><i>U-MED Plan</i></u> recommendation (page 38) that PLI zoning be retained, and adjusted as necessary to accommodate conservation easements and other preservation open space areas.
Lands on the northwest corner of Bragaw and Northern Lights belong to the Alaska Mental Health Trust. The land consists of 80 acres containing existing uses by non-profit organizations, and an undeveloped nine acre parcel east of Nichols Street next to the Bragaw/Northern Lights intersection. The draft designation "School and Community Institutional for these lands is too restrictive given the overall neighborhood. Trust land is managed similar to private land, and in this case the adjoining private lands to the north are designated	Alison L. Smith / Alaska Mental Health Trust	The parcel in question is outside of the <u><i>Universities & Medical District Framework Master Plan</i></u> area, and is presently designated and zoned for PLI activities, and is amidst school and community institutional activities. Therefore, it is designated as <i>Schools and Community Institutional</i> rather than <i>Major Institutional</i> in the draft Plan Map. Areas beyond the core U-Med District are considered less appropriate for the intensive <i>Major Institutional</i> use

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p><i>Commercial Office – Low Intensity.</i> The appropriate land use designation for the Trust’s land would contain two potential general uses: community facility and commercial/mixed-use center, with a more specific designation of neighborhood center. The LUPM should allow more flexibility in the development of the area through designation with both types of uses.</p> <p>Intends to provide office space to lease to some beneficiary groups such as nonprofits. Need flexibility for next 10-20 years for use of that land. The use of many nonprofits is really an office use and so Office – Low Intensity would be an appropriate designation.</p> <p>Old existing PLI district fails to acknowledge commercial nature of leases to non-profit administrative office uses (see 21.40.020.B.8).</p>		<p>designation.</p> <p>This area is considered to continue to be an important part of the community’s reserve of PLI community institutional lands. A commercial / mixed-use center designation does not appear appropriate for this area. The U-Med District is served by centers to the south, and the nearest residential neighborhoods are served by existing centers to the north and east. In general, the Planning Department believes there is an oversupply of commercial / mixed-use lands in most areas of the Bowl relative to other use classifications.</p> <p>Planning recommends that the area be reserved for non-profit and community service functions, and so a commercial <i>Office – Low Intensity</i> designation is less appropriate than <i>Community Institutional</i>. In any case, the <i>Office – Low Intensity</i> designation is intended as a lower intensity commercial alternative that buffers residential neighborhoods from more intense commercial activities. The area in question does not have a need for this kind of buffer.</p> <p>Planning recognizes the concern that the “<i>Community Institutional</i>” designation on the Plan Map, as implemented by the draft Title 21 PLI zone, appears not to allow for administrative offices of non-profit organizations. Planning Department staff will review the “<i>School and Community Institutional</i>” designation as drafted, as well as the table of allowable use types for the PLI zone in the draft Title 21, to ascertain whether the <i>Community Institutional</i> designation would allow for office development for the purpose of administrative functions of non-profit community service organizations. Upon review, Planning Department can recommend changes to the public hearing draft Plan Map and/or draft Title 21 to make necessary corrections.</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
Question the need for an industrial/commercial development at Muldoon and the Glenn Highway. This is at a visual gateway into the city. The area north of the Glenn Hwy. might better be used for residential and mixed use districts. Anchorage is running out of developable land to take prime acreage and convert it to industrial uses seems a departure from the growth pattern for this area of our community.	Dan Bolles	Planning Department has received information that a commercial / mixed-use center designation is more consistent with the property owner’s intended use for the site. Planning has therefore changed the draft land use designation for this property in order to indicate this possibility on the public hearing draft Plan Map.
Large areas within northeast Anchorage are shown as lower intensity residential use. Some of these areas are currently single family developments, existing trailer parks and some multi-family development. With the Comprehensive plan calling for increased density this may be counter productive. Each area should be weighed in view of its impact to existing and potential development.	Dan Bolles	<i>Anchorage 2020</i> should not be interpreted to promote increased density throughout the Bowl. Increased density is intended to be focused primarily near the major employment centers in the Northwest Subarea. A moderate population growth rate in the Bowl is predicted for the foreseeable long term future. Therefore, increases in density need only be focused in key policy areas.
Please address the need to preserve and enhance east Anchorage neighborhoods and restrict further traffic volumes.	Peter Mjos, Rogers Park resident, 9-1-05 public meeting	The Northeast Subarea under current zoning and development trends appears to exceed the planned residential growth called for in <i>Anchorage 2020</i> . Therefore, the Plan Map recommends that designated density should be reduced in certain areas of the Northeast Subarea that are distant from town centers or transit-supportive development corridors.
It would be more appropriate to designate the R-2M area west of Creekside TC on north side of Debarr as <u>Low Intensity Residential</u> . This area is developed at one and two-family density. The proposed land use designation for Debarr Vista Subdivision off of Turpin and Debarr Road would essentially be an increase in density accommodating 6 or 8 plex buildings. This would change the unique character of the neighborhood, which is an older, stable neighborhood with mostly single family homes and duplexes with a few triplexes. Making this neighborhood a higher density would change its character and	Terry Cummings / Debarr Vista Subdivision resident	The draft LUPM land use designation for the Debarr Vista Subdivision corresponds to existing zoning. The draft implementation zoning in Title 21 would not allow higher density multifamily than what R-2M already allows. The existing R-2M zoning already allows for 8-plex multifamily structures on larger lots. The lots in this subdivision are too small for 8-plex multifamily structures, and the neighborhood has built out without them. It is an older residential subdivision with

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>livability.</p> <p>Established neighborhoods should be protected from dense housing and commercial developments moving next door to them. Dense housing should not continue to be built in East Anchorage. It is creating a horrible traffic problem. Dense housing should be placed in Midtown and Downtown where the majority of jobs are.</p>		<p>typically 6000 square foot lots in a street grid. One and two family homes comprise the majority of existing housing stock. However, there are about 13 properties developed with 3, 4 or 5 unit multifamily. The neighborhood provides a mix of housing types and has not developed exclusively as a single or two family area. A low intensity designation that the commentators suggest would allow less than existing built density, and create substantial nonconformities.</p>
<p>The draft LUPM designates the Debarr Vista Subdivision as Low / Medium Intensity Residential (8-15 DUA), to be implemented by the [replacement for the R-2M] zoning district. The rewrite process is getting too far ahead too quickly. Each existing R-2M zoned neighborhood should be identified and categorized based on majority housing type, density, traffic and other local factors. Then, with concurrence of neighborhood residents, a decision as to the type of land use designation and zoning district could then be made. This will mean some R-2M districts will become R-1, R-2 or R-3.</p> <p>As for Debarr Vista Subdivision, assuming the community is willing to accept the creation of new non-conformities as part of the Title 21 Rewrite and LUPM process, the Debarr Vista Subdivision should be reduced in designated density to Residential Low Intensity, so that it can be eventually rezoned from R-2M to R-2. Given the size of the area, the number of one and two-family single structure dwellings, the number of potential non-conformities [i.e., triplex and larger structures] doesn't seem to be any higher, percentage wise, than in other parts of northeast Anchorage where this being considered. Additionally, an R-2 designation comports with the comprehensive plan in that it allows for higher density within 1/4 mile of a transit corridor. Maybe not as dense as some would like but it certainly is a good compromise. Not to mention that this seems to be the direction builders are going with redevelopment in the area.</p>	<p>Clinton R. Hodges / Debarr Vista Subdivision resident</p>	<p>The neighborhood abuts an <i>Anchorage 2020</i> transit supportive development corridor and a designated town center commercial core. A reduction in density to less than 8 DUA would be inconsistent with the transit supportive development corridor, conflict with the adopted policies for town center areas, and reduce the neighborhood's existing capacity to provide a mix of housing types. Adopted policy advises to at least avoid reducing designated density from existing zoning and development patterns in such areas.</p> <p>The commentator has indicated that different R-2M zoned areas around town vary in actual built density and character. Planning Department has introduced a new, lower density multifamily zoning district in Title 21 Public Review Draft #2. This RM-1 zone would continue to allow low density multifamily but not 5, 6 or 8-plexes. The RM-1 is listed as a potential implementation zone for the <i>Residential Low-Medium Intensity</i> land use designation.</p>
<p><i>Area-specific Comments - Northwest Anchorage Bowl</i></p>		
<p>Do not increase the designated residential density from what is already allowed in Bootleggers Cove below the bluff. Above the bluff, the soils are better and the rights of way are 60'. Below the bluff, the soils are poor and the rights of way are 50' or less. The area below the bluff cannot accommodate additional traffic. Some will say that people walk to work from the area below the bluff. This is true. But, most people</p>	<p>Nelda Warkentin</p>	<p>In consideration of the seismic hazard of the soils in the area Planning staff has decreased the recommended residential density for the Bootleggers Cove area north of 9th Avenue from <i>City Center Intensity</i> to <i>Medium Intensity Residential</i>. This is the most equivalent designation to</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
will drive and have 1-2 cars. Parking, maneuvering, etc. is already an issue.		current zoning for the area.
The LUPM should designate more Residential areas, at medium or high density in mid-block areas of Midtown off of the arterial roadways. More residential housing is needed near the major city centers of Midtown. The LUPM should not recommend perpetuation of all existing commercial or industrial use areas within the interior of Midtown superblocs. For example, show more housing areas bordering Midtown Park, or between Arctic and C Street in areas south of 36th Avenue.	Participant at 6-28-05 public meeting	<p>Planning Department recommends designating most of central Midtown as <i>Major City Center</i>. This is the most intense category of <i>Commercial / Mixed-use Center</i>. It is a commercial mixed-use designation however it encourages high-density mixed-use residential housing. Planning does not recommend using the Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map project for breaking out a lot of new residential areas from existing, viable commercial areas.</p> <p>The coming area-specific <i>Midtown District Plan</i> is anticipated to provide more customized land use guidance in Midtown. That plan will be a more comprehensive and appropriate process through which to identify additional residential enclaves that may be created from areas currently zoned commercial or industrial.</p>
<p>The draft LUPM should depict the lots on the southeast corner of Benson and Arctic, including the South Park Mobile Home Park, as <i>Commercial / Mixed-use Major City Center</i> rather than <i>Residential City Center Intensity</i>. This area is currently zoned B-3 and R-4. The reasons for this comment are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Part of the area in question is already zoned B-3. Changing zoning to residential takes value away from the property owners. ▪ Property fronting Benson and Arctic is not a desirable residential location. Frontage property is more conducive to commercial activity. ▪ This area is more likely than most other sites in Midtown to be able to transition to mixed-use, because it is more easily redevelopable. ▪ The site meets the Planning Department’s suggested Locational Criteria for commercial / mixed use better than it does for residential use. 	Shaun Debenham / Debenham Properties	<p>The Planning Department has changed the designation to “<i>Commercial Corridor</i>” for one block (approximately 300 feet) of depth along both Arctic and Benson Boulevards. This would result in an expansion of existing commercial zoning in this area, and a reduction in residential areas in Midtown from today’s zoning.</p> <p>A mixed-use zoning district would be the most likely zone to implement the <i>Commercial Corridor</i> land use designation in this area because Arctic Boulevard is identified in the <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> as a transit supportive development corridor. The draft CMU mixed-use zone is a medium density commercial-mixed use zone which would allow substantial commercial office / retail development.</p> <p>Planning does not consider this site to be an appropriate location for a <i>Major City Center</i> designation. It is a relatively narrow commercial corridor area isolated from</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		<p>the primary Midtown <i>Major City Center</i> area east of C Street. <i>Major City Center</i> should be reserved for the heart of Downtown and Midtown. Areas designated as part of a <i>Major City Center</i> should be connected to or continuous extension of the high-rise, highest-density centers of the city.</p> <p>On the interior of the site, which is within a neighborhood, Planning recommends maintaining the <i>Residential City Center Intensity</i> designation. This would be implemented by a new, high-density zoning district, the draft RM-4. This provides the property owner with the highest density residential designation possible, which should allow for the redevelopability of the lot while also maintaining the residential integrity of the neighborhood and preserving key residential lands for housing density.</p> <p>Further encroachment into the existing residential land base from the arterial frontages would conflict with <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> policies for neighborhood protection and preserving the residential land base. The Land Use Plan Map analysis shows a lack of residential development capacity in the Northwest Anchorage Bowl. More residential is needed to maximize the vitality of nearby city centers and to improve the geographic balance between the location of housing and the location of employment and urban services in the Bowl. The best way to ensure this capacity is through residential designations and zoning. <u>The mixed-use designations and draft mixed-use zones do not require or ensure that housing will be a part of a development project.</u></p>
The area abutting north side of 15 th Avenue between A and C streets, should be designated for, <i>City Center Residential</i> rather than <i>Office – Low Intensity</i> shown in	Rudi Kaeppele, property owner	Planning staff has reviewed and revised the application of the <i>Office – Low Intensity</i> in higher intensity areas.

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>the draft LUP Map. The City Center Residential designation, implemented by the proposed new high-density residential mixed-use zone would have a less restrictive height limitation and would allow a medium-rise development (possibly 5 or more levels) with residential units and some lower-floor commercial uses. Inspired by cities like Vancouver, BC, we are confident that a well designed condominium project in this area would be an asset to Anchorage.</p>		<p><i>City Center Residential</i> is a more appropriate designation for the properties along 15th Avenue between A and C Streets. It is more consistent with community objectives for increasing housing opportunities near the Downtown. It provides the flexibility for allowing some commercial use. The <i>Office-Low Intensity</i> designation exists in part to allow low-medium rise and relatively low-impact commercial use while buffering lower density residential areas from more intense commercial.</p>
<p>I am shocked to discover that the Freeway-to-Freeway connection was going to go right through my house, displacing us.</p>	<p>Justina Meyer, Fairview resident, 9-1-05 public meeting comment</p>	<p>The draft Land Use Plan Map depicts the approximate location of major street corridors that have been approved as part of <u><i>Anchorage's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)</i></u>. The Assembly and AMATS have approved the freeway-to-freeway connection and its general route as part of the most recent update to the <u><i>LRTP</i></u>. The purpose is to visually relate the city's land use plan to its planned transportation system, and illustrate the likely impacts of such planned transportation system on land use. The depiction of the freeway-to-freeway connection on the Land Use Plan Map is essential to understanding the future recommended land uses in the Fairview area.</p>
<p><i>[Following is a summary of the recommendations of the Fairview Land Use Map, submitted by Fairview Community Council, and of discussions with Fairview Community Council land use committee.]</i></p> <p>The Land Use Plan Map should depict the freeway-to-freeway connection right-of-way location in relation to the neighborhood, and the preferred pattern of land use and street connections surrounding such freeway project, in order to implement Comprehensive Plan policies and neighborhood objectives for the Fairview/east downtown area. The north-south alignment of the freeway should be between Ingra and Gambell, generally centered on Hyder Street, to avoid impacting existing residential neighborhoods east and west of the Gambell-Ingra corridor, and to allow Gambell and Ingra to become neighborhood-scale main streets.</p>	<p>Fairview Community Council</p>	<p>Planning Department has revised the Land Use Plan Map to designate a general freeway alignment. The depiction of the freeway-to-freeway connection on the Land Use Plan Map is essential to understanding the future recommended land use pattern in the Fairview area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It helps the community to visualize future land use impacts of and land use patterns around the planned freeway. ▪ It allows the community to communicate its intent for the location / configuration of the freeway from the

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>The cut-and-cover freeway-to-freeway connection has the potential to reconnect neighborhood areas within this traditional town site area, remove regional through-traffic from surface streets, and make neighborhood revitalization and redevelopment possible in Fairview and Downtown.</p>		<p>perspective of future land use and development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It enables the Land Use Plan Map to recommend long-term future land use patterns that relate to adopted transportation plans and projects. <p>The draft Plan Map generally depicts the alignment as suggested by the Fairview Land Use Map: centered east of Hyder Street centerline, between Gambell and Ingra (i.e., further east closer to Ingra than to Gambell). This maximizes the potential for Gambell to redevelop as a commercial/mixed-use residential main street with adequate room for redevelopment on both sides of the street. This meets <i>Anchorage 2020</i> objective for a commercial / mixed-use center at Gambell, and for mixed-use residential redevelopment near Downtown.</p> <p>The Fairview’s proposed land use map depicts a greenbelt buffer between Ingra and the depressed freeway. The public hearing draft Land Use Plan Map does not depict the buffer because the scale of the Plan map seemed too small to warrant depiction of a greenbelt buffer. The Plan Map should not be interpreted to mean that Ingra is intended to be merged into the freeway. It is only a generalized map and so the greenbelt buffer between the two was not added. However, if the community finds it necessary to show the buffer to clarify that there is a separation and intended buffer between the below-grade freeway and Ingra Street, this can be added.</p>
<p>Fairview areas west of the freeway alignment should be designated as <i>Residential City Center Intensity</i>, plus a neighborhood-scale commercial / mixed-use center along Gambell Street. The commercial / mixed-use Neighborhood Center along Gambell should extend on both sides of Gambell as a main street between 11th Avenue and Sullivan Arena. There is potential synergy between the public assembly activity at the sports facilities and a mixed-use main street area extending northward.</p>	<p>Fairview Community Council</p>	<p>Planning Department has changed the Plan Map to depict Gambell Street area as a combination of high density housing area and mixed-use main street, in agreement with Fairview Land Use Map concepts.</p> <p>Planning recommends concentrating the Commercial / Mixed-use Center south of 12th Avenue. Planning staff</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>Gambell is unlikely to continue to function as a Commercial Corridor or through traffic/truck route because through traffic will use the depressed freeway.</p>		<p>recommends that the Gambell corridor north of 12th be designated <i>Residential City Center</i>. This would allow for greater residential redevelopment and still allow local neighborhood scale businesses. This also helps geographically focus the commercial / mixed-use center along Gambell between 13th and 15th Avenues.</p> <p>Because the freeway is anticipated to remove regional traffic from Gambell, its northern end would in the long-term become less viable as a regional commercial corridor. It is recommended that this area redevelop in the long term as a primarily residential high-density neighborhood to support Downtown and other nearby commercial.</p>
<p>Fairview areas just south and east of Downtown should provide for high density / mixed-use housing.</p> <p>The concept of Downtown needs to geographically expand to match the growth of the overall Greater Anchorage Area. The grid system of streets established at the founding of the city represents the downtown area of Anchorage in the 21st Century. The land use pattern associated with a downtown and a winter city environment with the street grid of the traditional Anchorage town site must be reflected in the new Land Use Plan Map and implementing zoning. The cut-and-cover freeway-to-freeway connection has the potential to remove regional through-traffic from surface streets, and make neighborhood revitalization and redevelopment possible in east Downtown.</p> <p>Therefore, more areas of northeast and east Downtown, extending all the way to the conceptual freeway alignment as it curves up eastward to 3rd Avenue alignment, should be depicted as Residential City Center. More of the eastern fringe near the Cemetery and 3rd Avenue should provide more Downtown residential housing to support the Downtown core, rather than dilute the core business area with outlying Commercial Corridor designation.</p> <p>The former Native Hospital site should also be housing.</p>	<p>Fairview Community Council</p>	<p>Planning Department did not have enough transportation planning evidence to indicate with any certainty that future transportation projects will remove truck traffic and enough through traffic from surface roads to make the area east of Gambell and south of 3rd Avenue a living environment.</p> <p>The <u><i>Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)</i></u> adopted recently includes the extension of the Gambell-Ingra couplet northward into the Ship Creek industrial area. This would lead to increased truck traffic at least on the north end of the Gambell-Ingra couplet. It is assumed that this area is likely to continue to bear heavy volumes of through traffic and truck traffic, in addition to the nearby freeway cut. As a result, most of this area may continue to be unattractive as a high density living environment, and more suited for commercial/industrial.</p> <p>For the time being, the draft Land Use Plan Map continues to depict the area east of Downtown with a mix of <i>Commercial</i> and <i>Industrial</i> designations. Planning staff will further review the concept of a residential redevelopment area in east Downtown. Further discussions</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		<p>with transportation agencies and the community could result in changes to the draft Plan Map. Moreover, the <i>Fairview Neighborhood Plan</i> or later transportation planning may provide more focused opportunities to review and plan the future of the area east of Downtown.</p> <p><i>5th and 6th Avenue Corridor:</i> The 5th and 6th Avenue corridor should remain in a commercial or commercial/mixed-use designation because of heavy traffic into and out of the Downtown.</p> <p><i>Native Hospital Site:</i> The former Native Hospital site is a designated future park use area because of seismic constraints. Planning will review its data for this site.</p> <p><i>East of Cemetery:</i> If Gambell no longer bears regional through traffic, it might seem appropriate to designate the Gambell area east of the Cemetery and south of 6th Avenue for high-density residential redevelopment. A review of Merrill Field flight patterns is in progress to determine whether a high-density residential designation is appropriate for the area immediately east of the Cemetery.</p>
<p>Neighborhood Commercial / Mixed-use Center along Gambell should extend across the freeway on decked area along 15th Avenue to Ingra Street. The deck should extend north from the south side of 15th Avenue to 13th Avenue. The commercial mixed-use area should include the half-block of properties fronting Ingra Street at the corner of Ingra and 15th Avenue, (between 14th and 15th Avenues and also south of 15th).</p> <p>This deck over the freeway should not just be a park or open space. It connects the east and west sides of an existing commercial area designated as a mixed-use center. It should provide for an active use as part of the mixed-use center, rather than an inactive open space. This will ensure that the mixed-use center has adequate depth of usable area beyond the Gambell-Ingra corridors to support adequate redevelopment and a critical mass of active uses in the center.</p>	<p>Fairview Community Council</p>	<p>Planning staff has revised the Plan Map to depict the commercial / mixed-use center extending along both sides of Gambell Street as a main street, and along 15th Avenue with a deck over freeway as part of the center.</p> <p>Some kind of decking over the freeway in the vicinity of 13th and 15th Avenues is essential. The deck in area should contain an active use that adds to the vitality of the mixed-use center. Designating the deck as a part of the mixed-use center provides the greatest flexibility as to what it might include—active uses, supportive parking, plazas, or some combination that best supports the mixed-use center. There is a precedent in the U.S. for freeway decking that consists</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		<p>of active uses in mixed-use areas.</p> <p>In consideration of the potential synergy with nearby public assemblies at sporting events, and of the abutting high-density residential designation to the west, Planning recommends promoting the scale of the mixed-use center from <i>Neighborhood Center</i> to <i>Community Activity Center</i>. This allows more stories and therefore more housing above lower-floor commercial. It is a scale of mixed-use development that is more consistent with the adjacent <i>Residential City Center Intensity</i> area.</p>
<p>The bank located across Gambell from the Sullivan Arena should be depicted as an Office designated area east of the main freeway which uses the Gambell alignment.</p>	<p>Fairview Community Council</p>	<p>Planning for the time being has depicted the freeway in an alignment that is straighter and allows less decking. The alignment shown is not intended to indicate that the freeway is merged with Ingra; a buffer or greenbelt symbol can be added to the draft map as necessary to clarify that it is intended there be a separation to buffer the residences.</p> <p>Planning staff will revisit its assumptions regarding the future of the area between the Sullivan Arena and the financial office building near Ingra. It was assumed for this draft that it would be extremely difficult to maintain the bank building and fit a freeway in between Sullivan and the neighborhood to the east, plus on/off ramps to Gambell-Ingra. The concept recommended is that the freeway avoids cutting into existing residential areas or arena areas, and that the remainder lands east of Sullivan Arena be somehow eventually related to the community assembly facility. However, this is only a draft and further discussion is necessary.</p> <p>It is also important to remember that this is an amend-able plan map, illustrating general land use plans and conceptual intended relationships between major land uses – freeway, arena, residential and mixed-use. Although it is intended to</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		influence freeway alignment planning, actual freeway route planning will determine a more exact freeway location.
<p>All of the neighborhood east of Ingra and south of 9th Avenue should be designated <i>Low / Medium Intensity Residential</i>. The area east of Ingra to Karluk should not be designated at <i>Medium Intensity Residential</i>.</p> <p>The community discussion draft Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map depicted the area between Ingra and Karluk as Residential Medium Intensity (which translates to R-3/R-4 zoning in the existing code). Medium Intensity would allow primarily medium to large sized multifamily structures. The east Fairview area should consist of a mix of single-family and relatively low intensity duplex, triplex and small multifamily structures. It is a small-lot neighborhood with a substantial number of single family homes. It is not within 10-minute walking distance of Downtown or other major employment.</p>	Fairview Community Council	<p>The Planning Department recommends reducing the designated density of most of east Fairview from what it is currently zoned down to <i>Low / Medium Intensity</i>. This designation corresponds most closely to R-2M zoning in the existing code, although the neighborhood is currently zoned R-3 and R-4. Most of east Fairview is beyond walking distance to Downtown, as Fairview Community Council points out. The Gambell-Ingra corridor is three blocks wide, and separates the residential east part of Fairview from residential areas to the west. A <i>Low / Medium Intensity</i> residential designation is consistent with the neighborhood’s development pattern of small lots and a substantial number of single-family homes. It allows for small multifamily structures which may fit on the small lots, as well as a mix of single-, two-family and townhouse structures.</p> <p>However, Planning recommends that the area immediately north and west of the Fairview Recreation Center between the Rec Center and Ingra Street, west of Karluk and north of 13th should remain <i>Medium Intensity Residential</i>. There are several different factors at work in this area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The area includes some of the highest existing densities and zoning in Fairview east of Ingra. Some of it is zoned R-4, high density multifamily. ▪ The area is closest to Downtown. Its connection to Downtown via 9th Avenue will improve after the freeway cut-and-cover. The bus route to Downtown crosses Ingra at 9th Avenue. This makes the area more appropriate for continued multifamily development. ▪ Redevelopment in this area is in the community

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		<p>interest, using the design standards in <i>Title 21 Draft #2</i> and possible standards to be identified through the <i>Fairview Neighborhood Plan</i>. Well-designed multifamily and condo development which responds to neighborhood character can provide vitality to the area, to Fairview’s mixed-use center, and to Downtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The freeway-to-freeway cut-and-cover project will eliminate many blocks of residential zoning just west of Ingra. This will demolish more than 130 existing housing units and eliminate much housing redevelopment potential for areas near Downtown. ▪ The locational criteria for <i>Medium Intensity Residential</i> includes access to public services. The Fairview Recreation Center, Fairview Health Center and other public amenities in this area are major public services appropriate for a medium density multifamily area. Planning recommends that the Plan Map preserve affordable housing opportunities in the area.
<p>The LUPM should depict Park use over decked portions of the freeway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The four-block area extending between Gambell and Ingra, 9th and 11th Avenues should be depicted as a park-over-freeway land use. ▪ the west side of Ingra from 13th to 11th ▪ a freeway deck park as a gateway into Downtown between 5th and 6th Avenues and south of 6th Avenue. ▪ Park uses should extend along the west side of the freeway alignment between 3rd and 9th Avenue to depict the concept of a greenbelt trail connection from Ship Creek area through Fairview, eventually connecting via a main street environment on Gambell to the Chester Creek greenbelt. 	<p>Fairview Community Council</p>	<p>Planning supports the cut-and-cover as essential to the freeway-to-freeway project. The four-block area extending south from 9th to 11th Avenues is an essential area for a decked area to connect the eastern residential area to neighborhoods and Downtown areas west.</p> <p>However Planning does not recommend that the Land Use Plan Map show a deck park where 5th and 6th Avenues would cross over the freeway into Downtown. It seems to staff that the value of a park deck here is probably open to question. The 5th and 6th Avenue corridor east of Downtown will continue to bear heavy traffic loads and few residents. A deck park over a freeway between two major arterials may get little use.</p> <p>The small-scale, Bowl-wide land use plan map is probably</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		not the appropriate document to introduce and recommend the concept of a north-south greenbelt trail connection through Fairview. The <i>Fairview Neighborhood Plan</i> is probably the more appropriate document for this.
The area at the north end of the Gambell-Ingra corridor should be depicted as a special study area. The future of this area is unclear until a study of appropriate roadway connections from the Ship Creek / Port area up to Gambell, Ingra and the freeway would be completed.	Fairview Community Council	There are many areas of town in which planned or pending area-specific land use plans are anticipated to eventually amend the overall Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map. A <i>Special Study Area</i> designation for this area is not necessary. The Land Use Plan Map is not intended as a fixed predetermination of land use. It is anticipated to be updated and amended as area-specific land use plans (e.g. <i>Fairview Neighborhood Plan</i>) and transportation planning for this area of town progresses.
<p>The proposed designation of medium density residential for the area located at the southwest corner of Arctic Boulevard and 36th Avenue is inappropriate. A substantial portion of this area—the blocks nearest the two arterials—should be Major City Center, with areas south and west of this becoming City Center Intensity Residential. [LUPM map illustration submitted by J. Jay Brooks is available online with his comments] Following are the reasons for this recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Anchorage 2020 Redevelopment Policies:</i> <i>Anchorage 2020</i> designates this area as a Redevelopment/Mixed-Use Area. Pedestrian-oriented residential and mixed-use redevelopment is intended to support and connect to major employment centers, forming “urban villages” that balance housing, neighborhood amenities and jobs in the nearby employment centers. The LUPM should encourage higher intensity mixed-use redevelopment rather than continuing the existing use of the area by poor quality commercial buildings and a run-down mobile home park. This is a city center location. It should be utilized for higher quality, higher density residential and mixed-use projects. Sustainable high-density residential-mixed-use development could surround and complement the commercial core while buffering established lower density residential areas to the southwest. The high-density core could 	J. Jay Brooks, property owner	<p><u>(1) Commercial / Mixed-use and Residential Areas</u></p> <p>Planning has changed the designation fronting Arctic Boulevard and 36th Avenue to <i>Commercial Corridor</i> for one block (approximately 300 feet) of depth along both streets. This would result in an expansion of existing commercial zoning in this area, and a reduction in residential areas in Midtown from today’s zoning. The 300’ depth should be adequate for mixed-use development, and buffer interior residential areas from the street.</p> <p>Further encroachment into the existing residential land base from the arterial frontages would conflict with <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> policies for neighborhood protection and preserving the residential land base. Analysis shows a lack of residential development capacity in the Northwest Bowl. More residential area is needed to maximize the vitality of city centers and to improve the geographic balance between the location of housing and the location of employment and urban services in the Bowl. The best way</p>

to ensure this capacity is to use *Residential* designations –

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>“anchor” the western border of Midtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Higher Density Needed to Meet Projected Growth Needs:</i> Medium density does not accommodate the projected growth of Anchorage. High density will invite young professionals to live in the Midtown community. ▪ <i>Neighborhood Building / Community Environment:</i> It is a major focus of Anchorage 2020 that people live near and be able to walk to work. But the proposed LUPM continues to use roadways to isolate residential from commercial. Major roads are barriers to pedestrian movement. A planned transition in use from city center to residential neighborhoods should be defined by use rather than a forced break created by major roads. Residents to the SW should be able to access city center commercial uses without having to cross Arctic. An major city center development on the SW corner of Arctic and 36th would allow and encourage individuals living in the immediate neighborhood area (as far south as Tudor Road) to walk or bike to work. A south/southwest orientation of a commercial development along Arctic would allow the residents to utilize Chugach Way as a pedestrian friendly means to access different types of commercial needs. New development in our proposed commercial core area could act as a gateway for existing residential to the surrounding office and other commercial in Midtown, and support the surrounding neighborhood community with a high-quality pedestrian environment. By tapering the development from high-density commercial to mixed-use and high-medium density residential, the framework is provided for a vibrant, community-focused core area. ▪ <i>Noise and Traffic:</i> It is inappropriate to locate primarily residential uses near the noise, dust and vibration of a high traffic intersection. ▪ <i>Integrating with Midtown Amenities and Employment to the East:</i> The emerging office employment centers and Loussac Library next to Midtown Park are establishing the nature of Midtown. Additional commercial office and high density residential with supporting retail at the area SW of Arctic/36th will complement and connect to the direction Midtown is growing east of Arctic. Medium density residential does not complement this trend, or enhance the quality of life in Midtown Anchorage. 		<p>not just commercial / mixed-use. <u>The mixed-use land use designations and the draft mixed-use zones do not require or ensure housing will be a part of a development project.</u></p> <p><u>(2) Major City Center Versus Medium Density Mixed-use</u></p> <p>The <i>Commercial Corridor</i> designation in this area would most likely be implemented by a mixed-use zoning district because Arctic Boulevard is a designated transit supportive development corridor in the <u>Comprehensive Plan</u>. The draft CMU zone is a flexible zoning district that would allow substantial medium-density redevelopment consisting of most any mix of commercial office, retail and/or housing.</p> <p>Planning does not consider this to be an appropriate <i>Major City Center</i> site on the Land Use Plan Map. Arctic Boulevard is a relatively narrow commercial corridor too far west removed from the commercial core of Midtown. It is west of the designated <u>Anchorage 2020</u> Redevelopment / Mixed-use Area. It is isolated from the primary Midtown <i>Major City Center</i> area designated on the draft Plan Map. <i>Major City Center</i> should be reserved for the heart of Downtown and Midtown. This designation is not intended for narrow commercial corridors or intersections isolated from the primary <i>Major City Center</i> areas on the Map.</p> <p>The <i>Major City Center</i> area of Midtown already covers a very large area. Its coverage is likely to be refined and may be more focused geographically through the upcoming <u>Midtown District Plan</u>. Additional high density office / commercial to the west would lead to further geographic sprawl of the Midtown core area rather than the intended concentration of future highest-intensity development around existing centers. The medium density CMU zone provides for adequate commercial redevelopment in scale</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Flexibility of Regulations to Allow Major Commercial:</i> There is a natural market demand for professional commercial space in this area. Redevelopment that includes a substantial commercial (non-residential) component is more practical in today’s market. The greatest zoning flexibility that would allow and encourage redevelopment based on the highest demand would facilitate development of the community. Due to the flat rental rate environment that multi-tenant residential has experienced over the past three years combined with a migration of renters to home ownership (spurred by low interest rates), the economics required to support new residential development have become marginal. ▪ <i>Align Long-term City Vision with Opportunities:</i> The most likely scenario under which the <i>Anchorage 2020</i> plan will be implemented in Midtown is to work with the existing capacity and objectives of land owners. It must also recognize where actual opportunities for redevelopment exist. Operating in a vacuum will never result in successful redevelopment. Our site is one of the last available large pieces of land that can be utilized to distinguish the Midtown area of Anchorage. The ownership of our site has a development team with the capacity for redevelopment. There is strong likelihood that this team can successfully redevelop this underutilized area of Midtown. 		<p>with its west Midtown / Spenard neighborhood context.</p> <p><u>(3) Medium and City Center Intensity Residential</u></p> <p>The draft Plan Map recommends increasing the residential density on the interior of the site from existing R-2M zoning. Planning advises that the <i>Medium Intensity</i> multifamily designation is more appropriate than <i>City Center Intensity</i> in this location. The <i>Medium Intensity</i> designation alone is higher than the existing surrounding neighborhood along Chugach Way. Planning believes that <i>City Center Intensity</i> is too high for this location. It is intended only for areas that are immediately adjacent to the <i>Major City Centers</i> of Downtown and Midtown, already established as the highest density residential areas in town, and are underutilized commercial areas buffered from lower density residential neighborhoods. A higher designation for this location would be in conflict with neighborhood protection policies of the <u><i>Comprehensive Plan</i></u>.</p> <p><u>4. Adequate Redevelopment Opportunities (Summary)</u></p>
<p>I disagree with the <i>Medium Intensity Residential</i> designation for the area SW of Arctic and 36th. This is not the best use of this land area, and could even be detrimental to the immediate area, and the larger community of southwest Midtown.</p> <p><u><i>Anchorage 2020</i></u> objectives for urban villages, city centers, and transitional mixed-use development that encourage pedestrian traffic and other alternative transportation will only be met if there are strong, well-developed, and non-restrictive zoning measures put in place. Due to this lack of available, developable land, we should leave open the options for re-development, especially in those areas which are blighted or functionally in need of redevelopment. Because of Anchorage’s substantial growth curve, it is vital for its citizens to have the best possible environment for living and working in close proximity.</p> <p>It should also be a goal to minimize daily road usage as much as possible, by</p>	<p>Anna Luksich</p>	<p>The <i>Medium Intensity Residential</i> and <i>Commercial Corridor</i> designation (implemented by the CMU zone) should be adequate to provide for redevelopment opportunities for a property owner.</p> <p>These designations would increase the commercial area and residential density over current zoning.</p> <p>These designations are being applied throughout the Bowl. Their draft implementation zones (CMU and RM-3) are being calibrated to be adequate to allow for redevelopment opportunities throughout the Bowl. There should be no reason why either should deter redevelopment. Each provides for substantial density. If there is a specific problem with the draft implementation zones, then these zones should be corrected in the Title 21 Rewrite, rather</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>building into the development and infrastructure the encouragement to walk, bicycle, and use public transportation. It is vital to Anchorage's sustainable livability that we recognize and protect those areas that are usable for high-density city center developments (such as the southwest corner of Arctic and 36th avenue).</p> <p>I believe that the land at Arctic and 36th would greatly benefit from a higher-end mixed-use development (retail, commercial office, and multi-family). Such an improvement would complement both the recently built and in-construction commercial office in the area, as well as the low-density residential surrounding the property. A well-designed development would act as a gateway for the residents to enter into the commercial areas, creating a well-integrated community, and increasing the overall quality of life in southwest Midtown. Based on this vision, I would like to see the re-zone include a combination of high-density residential and major city center commercial.</p> <p>I think that all parties can benefit the most from erring on the side of an open, rather than restrictive, zoning code for appropriate re-developable properties. By doing so, the creativity of resourceful land-owners and developers can be utilized in their greatest capacity, and the Municipality of Anchorage is able to maintain the capacity to invite and support a growing urban community even within its limiting physical boundaries.</p>		<p>than removed from areas on the Land Use Plan Map.</p> <p>[continued next page]</p> <p><u>5. Still a Draft</u></p> <p>Planning staff has agreed to site visit the Chugach Way area, and discuss the issues further with the community. Planning may still recommend changes during the public hearing process based on new information and further comments and discussion.</p>
<p>The Turnagain Community Council Board (TCCB) comments at this time will largely focus on Key Principal #10 as listed on pages 2-3 of the Land Use Plan Map Overview: "Parks, Natural Open Space and Ecological Functions are conserved and enhanced to preserve the unique livability of the growing city."</p> <p>Long-term protection of these important areas is essential as our city continues to grow, so that future generations have the opportunity to benefit from the recreational, natural open space and wildlife assets we now value as a community. The draft Land Use Plan Map needs to reflect historical intent and public use of important parkland and natural resource use areas.</p>	<p>Turnagain Community Council</p>	<p>The public hearing draft continues to identify "Conservation of parks, natural open spaces, and ecological functions" as a key land use policy that directly shaped the content of the Land Use Plan Map. A second policy of importance is an economically healthy community with a balance of jobs, housing and recreational opportunities. The Plan Map must balance economic growth opportunities and protection of open spaces. A third key policy that Planning applies is "Neighborhood protection with compatible infill development."</p> <p>These policies must be balanced against other factors. Existing public recreation use of an area by an interim use permit or simply because the area has not yet developed</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		<p>does not by itself necessarily officially encumber that land for long-term permanent park use. In designating park and open space areas, Planning Department identified key criteria, including: area-specific planning studies adopted by the Municipality that clearly designate a parcel for park use, or severe environmental constraints which preclude future development. Other factors such as deed restrictions may also come into play. Planning Department has not completed its research of all factors and may upon further review recommend further changes to the public hearing draft Land Use Plan Map.</p>
<p>The municipal land south of Pt. Woronzof and east of the sewage treatment facility should be designated Park and Natural Resource Use, rather than the draft LUPM proposal for Major Transportation Facility with a Special Study Area overlay. This is an extremely significant piece of land. Because of its narrow east/west boundaries and incompatible land uses on both sides (Pt. Woronzof Road and the North/South Runway to the east and sewage treatment plant to the west), the entire parcel is considered by the public as a trail greenbelt for the portion of the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail (Coastal Trail) that runs through the area. The land to the east of the trail, which is sloped and wooded, serves as an essential buffer between the trail and high-impact land uses to the east. The draft LUPM designation does not accurately reflect how the public is currently using this land and because it is city-owned property, this land does not fall within the Airport’s transportation facility boundary.</p> <p>Historically, there are several municipal documents that reflect the intention for this land to be designated as protected open space parkland/greenbelt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1982 Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Development Plan (page 46); ▪ 1983 Coastal Trail Route Study (Plan Sheet 12 indicating intended trail route, page 1 statements of intent including to “Provide a greenbelt corridor lining existing and future park and open space plans.”); ▪ 1993 HLB Resource Inventory statement that this land has a Covenant/Title restriction: “Use restricted to Park, Recreation or Other Public Purposes 	<p>Turnagain Community Council</p>	<p>Planning has changed the designation of the land to the east of the Coastal Trail as the trail runs behind the municipal sewer treatment plan from <i>Major Transportation Facility</i> to <i>Special Study Area</i>.</p> <p>Planning has yet to complete its research of this particular site and may recommend further changes. For example, it has yet to research the impact of possible covenant/title deed restrictions the 1993 HLB resource inventory, referenced by Turnagain Community Council.</p> <p>The 2005 draft <u><i>Anchorage Bowl Park Plan, Natural Resource and Recreation Facility Plan</i></u> does not depict this area as parkland.</p> <p>The International Airport 2002 <u><i>Master Plan Update</i></u> depicts this area as needed for an additional north-south runway.</p> <p>The draft Plan Map does provide for the existing Coastal Trail greenbelt corridor through this area. The <i>Special Study Area</i> designation leaves the ultimate width of the greenbelt east of the trail to be resolved in a future planning process. The 1997 <u><i>Areawide Trails Plan</i></u> and 2005 draft <u><i>Anchorage Bowl Park Plan, Natural Resource and Recreation Facility Plan</i></u> maps designate a trail corridor</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>Only”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1997 Anchorage Areawide Trails Plan ▪ 2001 Anchorage 2020 / Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan: Conceptual Natural Open Space Map (p. 63), based on the 1999 Combined Community and Neighborhood Preferences for Natural Open Spaces Map, identifies this area as “Community Preference for Natural Open Space, and most, if not all, identified as “Important Wildlife Habitat.” ▪ 2005 (draft) Anchorage Bowl Park, Natural Resource and Rec Facility Plan: Map 7 “Recreation Trails and Connections” designates this area as “Scenic / Greenbelt Trail Network Connections to Parks and Schools”. 		<p>route that is consistent with the green trail route on the draft Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map, but do not designate a specific corridor width or adjacent park buffer area in this location. The intent statement in the 1983 <u>Coastal Trail Route Study</u> does not specifically reference this Special Study Area or direct a certain width to the trail greenbelt corridor buffer in this area.</p> <p>It is unclear to Planning staff whether the 1982 <u>Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Development Plan</u> depicted this <u>Special Study Area</u> as a park or community public lands area. The 1982 <u>Plan</u> might be interpreted as indicating a Transportation Related designation for this site, but this is also unclear to staff. The 1982 Plan Map is an old and in some areas outdated document. It does not indicate the Coastal Trail greenbelt and many other plans and developments of the past two decades. A major purpose of the new Plan Map is to update and amend outdated features of the old map.</p> <p><u>Anchorage 2020</u> states that the Conceptual Natural Open Space Map “<i>is not intended to represent the future pattern of preserved open space. Instead, it shows a range of future possibilities which future planning efforts and a public process will review to develop an open space system.</i>” The Conceptual Natural Open Space Map should be considered during a future area-specific land use planning process to determine the use of the land in question. In the meantime, the draft Anchorage Bowl Plan Map uses the <u>Special Study Area</u> designation to defer the decision on municipal HLB lands to a <u>West Anchorage District Plan</u> process.</p> <p>Planning staff has yet to research the 1993 HLB Resource Inventory statement that this land has a Covenant/Title restriction that the commentator has referenced. Planning could, upon further review of this document and its impacts</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		on land use choices, recommend further changes in the draft Land Use Plan Map for this area in question east of the sewer treatment plant.
<p>The municipal HLB land west of the airport should be designated Park and Natural Resource Use without a Special Study Area overlay. Trail users view this as de facto trail greenbelt/natural open space. This area also serves as an essential buffer between two incompatible uses (passive recreation in a natural setting and a major transportation facility whose operations generate high impacts). Finally, this coastal natural open space also serves as important wildlife habitat and a part of a wildlife travel corridor between Kincaid and Earthquake Parks.</p> <p>The draft LUPM designates the eastern section of the HLB land as Major Transportation Facility. This does not reflect how the public is currently using the land. This is municipal not airport land. The entire boundary of city-owned land should be designated Park and Natural Resource Use.</p> <p>Historical documentation of municipal intent for this area is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1982 Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Development Plan (page 46); ▪ 1982 Pt. Woronzof – Pt. Campbell Wetlands Master Plan: Land within most, if not all, of the three HLB parcels fall within the Land Use Study area of this document. The plan states on page 31, “Parking areas should be provided ...just north of the Clitheroe Center...This will provide more convenient access to the viewing facilities for users who do not ride bikes or walk long distances.” On page 32: “South on the trail, just west of the potato patch [near Clitheroe Center], another viewing area should be provided.” ▪ 1983 Coastal Trail Route Study: Plan Sheet 15 states “Potential coastal park with trail link to Point Woronzof Drive, parking facilities, shelters, restrooms and information signing.” [near Clitheroe Center] ▪ 1987 Revised Anchorage Coastal Management Plan: Most of the HLB land falls within the Anchorage Coastal Zone Management boundaries and is designated either “Preservation” or “Conservation” Environment. This land is identified as “High Hazard”, “Marginal” and/or “Scenic Vistas”. Passive 	<p>Turnagain Community Council</p>	<p>For the public hearing draft, the Planning Department has changed the designation of the HLB land to the east of the Coastal Trail corridor from <i>Major Transportation Facility</i> to <i>Special Study Area</i>. The Plan Map continues to depict an approximate 300 – 500 foot wide Coastal Trail greenbelt corridor above the coastal bluffs, also with a <i>Special Study Area</i> overlay. The overlay extends into the greenbelt corridor area because the future intended width of the greenbelt area within existing municipal lands west of the Airport has not been determined.</p> <p>Most of the municipally owned land immediately west of Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport has yet to be formally designated by municipal plan for a specific land use. The exception is the Coastal Trail corridor in use along the westernmost bluff area. This corridor is shown in green with an overlay of <i>Special Study Area</i> diagonal line pattern to indicate that the specific width of the greenbelt corridor has yet to be determined.</p> <p>The 2005 draft <i>Anchorage Bowl Park Plan, Natural Resource and Recreation Facility Plan</i> does not depict this area as parkland. The draft Land Use Plan Map depicts more areas north of Kincaid and west of the Airport as a park or natural open space use than does the draft <i>Parks Plan</i>. The draft <i>Parks Plan</i> does not depict long-term park use areas north of Kincaid, except to depict a Coastal Trail corridor of undetermined width along the coast.</p> <p>The 1997 <i>Areawide Trails Plan</i> and 2005 draft <i>Anchorage Bowl Park Plan, Natural Resource and Recreation Facility Plan</i> maps designate a trail corridor route that is consistent</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>recreation is the highest and best use for geologically hazardous lands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1993 HLB Resource Inventory: Parcels 4-032, 4-033 and 4-034 have a Covenant / Title restriction – all are to be used by the Municipality for “public” and “recreation”. ▪ 2001 Anchorage 2020 / Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan: Conceptual Natural Open Space Map (p. 63), based on the 1999 Combined Community and Neighborhood Preferences for Natural Open Spaces Map, identifies this area as “Community Preference for Natural Open Space, and “Important Wildlife Habitat.” This map was compiled from interviews with wildlife experts and from scientific reports. 		<p>with the green trail route on the draft Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map, but do not designate a specific corridor width or adjacent park buffer area in this location.</p> <p>The International Airport 2002 <i>Master Plan Update</i> indicates interest on the part of the Airport for the future use of this land for future airport related development.</p> <p><i>Anchorage 2020</i> states that the Conceptual Natural Open Space Map “is not intended to represent the future pattern of preserved open space. Instead, it shows a range of future possibilities which future planning efforts and a public process will review to develop an open space system.” The Conceptual Natural Open Space Map should be considered during a future area-specific land use planning process to finally determine the use of the land in question. In the meantime, the draft Anchorage Bowl Plan Map uses the <i>Special Study Area</i> designation as a means to defer the decision on municipal HLB lands to the <u><i>West Anchorage District Plan</i></u>.</p> <p>Planning Department staff would be interested in reviewing the 1983 <u><i>Coastal Trail Route Study</i></u> Plan Sheet 15 referenced by Turnagain Community Council. It may not be a binding plan but simply stating the “potential” for a park that would be advantageous at a location near the Clitheroe Center site. The draft Plan Map will provide for potential park use in this area, subject to Special Study, and so may be consistent with Plan Sheet 15. Likewise, the draft Plan Map does not seem inconsistent with potential scenic viewing platforms north of Clitheroe or west of the potato patch site, as recommended in the 1982 <u><i>Pt. Woronzof – Pt. Campbell Wetlands Master Plan</i></u>. However, the <i>Special Study Area</i> suggests that the Plan Map is generalized for this area and the area requires more area-specific study before land use boundaries within this</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		<p>municipal land are established.</p> <p>The 1987 <i>Coastal Zone Management Plan (CZM)</i> is no longer in effect as of July of this year. Planning Department is preparing a draft revised CZM for adoption this year. <i>Designated Important Habitat and Recreation Areas</i> have recently been mapped for inclusion in the new CZM, based on more updated environmental data and information technology. These <i>Designation</i> areas are not intended to be special land use areas, rather as areas in which development should follow environmentally sensitive permitting and development design. Planning staff intends to review the new CZM habitat and recreation area designation as new information in the process.</p> <p>Planning Department staff has yet to research the 1993 HLB Resource Inventory statement that this land has a Covenant/Title restriction that the commentator has referenced. Planning Department could, upon further review of this document and documented historic intent for municipal ownership of this land, recommend further changes in the draft Land Use Plan Map for this area.</p> <p>The “<i>Special Study Area</i>” hatch overlay may be unnecessary to extend all the way west to the coastal bluff, including the existing Coastal Trail corridor. It may be appropriate to depict the existing corridor width on the map as being simply <i>Park</i> use without a <i>Special Study Area</i> symbol overlay, even at the scale of the Land Use Plan Map. Planning will pursue this possibility and may recommend changes after further community discussion.</p>
<p>The definition of “Special Study Area” should change in order for it to be an appropriate designation for certain airport owned lands being used for a specific purpose by the public as park and natural areas. Because they are owned by the airport, there is some disagreement or non-resolution regarding long-term best use of</p>	<p>Turnagain Community Council</p>	<p>(1) “<i>Special Study Area</i>” Designation in General</p> <p>The Planning Department recommends that the definition of <i>Special Study Area</i> remain limited to <u>municipal lands</u> for which a specific land use has yet to be identified, and which</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>the land. The definition of Special Study Areas should address the land use conflicts of Airport-owned land currently being used by the public as parkland—whether because of a formal park use agreement or because of its value to the community as natural open space.</p> <p>The highest and best use can be determined through a public process—regardless of ownership, in part through the West Anchorage District Plan. Page 57 of <i>Anchorage 2020</i> states, “In response to airport growth, community growth surrounding the airport, recreational uses on the airport, and related airport impacts to the surrounding community, Anchorage 2020 creates the West Anchorage Planning Area. Along with related strategies, this planning district serves as a mechanism to formally identify, address and resolve land use conflicts within and near the airport.”</p> <p>The following Airport properties should be designated as Special Study Area overlaying a green-color Parks and Natural Resource designation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land west of Earthquake Park that runs along the coast and up to the boundary of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge at Pt. Woronzof. ▪ Land at Pt. Woronzof, down to the northern boundary of AWWU sewage treatment facility. ▪ Land along the coast south of Pt. Woronzof Park ▪ Land west of the East/West Runway ▪ Land directly west and adjacent to Kincaid Elementary School ▪ Spenard Beach Park along Lake Shore Drive, Lions Club Picnic area along Lake Shore Drive and Land in the Little Campbell Lake area historically been used by the public as parkland for many years because the city has leased these lands and identified them as public parkland with signage. ▪ All remaining areas of Turnagain Bog and associated uplands, with priority for special study on the land directly adjacent to Turnagain neighborhood ▪ All lands currently zoned “Transitional” as defined in the current municipal Title 21 Land Use Regulations. ▪ The Coastal Trail needs a permanently protected greenbelt area in non- 		<p>are subject to a site-specific land use study before any use can be identified.</p> <p>If use of the <i>Special Study Area</i> designation were to expand to other areas in which land use issues have yet to be settled, a substantial portion of the entire Bowl might become classified as <i>Special Study Area</i>.</p> <p>There are many areas of the Bowl with unresolved land use issues, for which there are planned neighborhood or district plans. As stated in <i>Anchorage 2020</i> policy #2, the draft Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map is only a starting point, and intended to be updated and amended as the community completes its district plans. Examples include the <i>Downtown Plan</i>, <i>Midtown District Plan</i>, <i>Mountain View Neighborhood Plan</i>, <i>Hillside District Plan</i> and the <i>Fairview Neighborhood Plan</i>, as well as a <i>West Anchorage District Plan</i>.</p> <p>In each of these areas, it is anticipated that the area-specific neighborhood or district plan will resolve long-term land use issues that the overall Bowl Land Use Plan Map cannot resolve at this time. In each area, the area-specific plan may resolve the issue and amend the Bowl Plan Map. For example, the geographic extent of water/sewer service or urban residential density into Hillside would be guided by the <i>Hillside District Plan</i>.</p> <p>The draft Land Use Plan Map should not be interpreted to suggest that the land use pattern in any area is resolved permanently or set in stone. Pages 1 and 2 of the Plan Map narrative make clear that a combination of neighborhood and district plans, rezonings, public facility site selections and other changes in the community <u>will result in updates and amendments to the Land Use Plan Map</u>.</p> <p>Therefore, even though the <i>Special Study Area</i> designation</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>municipal lands, wide enough to buffer it from incompatible, high-impact land uses. Protecting a buffer of land along the length of trail is critical to ensure the viability of the trail against erosion for many years to come.</p> <p>Historical documentation supports long-term use of these areas as Park and Natural Resource Use, and a Special Study Area designation, to be resolved through the West Anchorage District Plan process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1982 Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Development Plan (page 46); ▪ 1983 Coastal Trail Route Study: Plan Sheets 9-12; Page 45 “One of the most important routing considerations was to keep the trail away from the edge of the bluff to avoid additional erosion of the highly unstable slopes.” ▪ 1987 Revised Anchorage Coastal Management Plan: Most of the HLB land falls within the Anchorage Coastal Zone Management boundaries and is designated either “Preservation” or “Conservation” Environment. This land is identified as “High Hazard”, “Marginal” and/or “Scenic Vistas”. Passive recreation is the highest and best use for geologically hazardous lands. ▪ 1996 Anchorage Wetlands Management Plan: Most of Turnagain Bog and in northern Connors Bog are designated as “A” Preservation wetlands. ▪ 1997 Anchorage Areawide Trails Plan designates the Coastal Trail route. ▪ 2001 Anchorage 2020 / Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan: Conceptual Natural Open Space Map (p. 63), based on the 1999 Combined Community and Neighborhood Preferences for Natural Open Spaces Map, identifies this area as “Community Preference for Natural Open Space, and “Important Wildlife Habitat.” This map was compiled from interviews with wildlife experts and from scientific reports. 		<p>does not typically apply to Airport lands, the <u>West Anchorage District Plan</u> is anticipated to resolve land use conflicts regarding Airport lands that are valuable to the community as natural open space buffers, and can amend the Bowl Land Use Plan Map accordingly.</p> <p><u>(2) Parks and Natural Resource Designations on Specific Airport Properties</u></p> <p>The draft Plan Map reserves its light green colored <i>Park and Natural Resource</i> designation for <u>municipal</u> lands. <u>Non-municipal</u> lands that function as part of the community system of parks or natural open spaces appear in a brighter, spring green color as <i>Other Areas that Function as Park or Natural Resource</i>. This designation includes lands that, by formal agreement, easement or use permit are provided for park or natural resource use. Even if the park use permit is renewed on an interim basis, the Plan Map still depicts certain areas as having long-term community value as park or natural open space. Where this designation appears on the lands of either of the Airports, it is depicted on the map with a striped combination of two colors—one representing the park use and the other representing the predominant land use of the transportation facility. Airport lands are subject to FAA use regulations. It is the understanding of Planning staff that the FAA does not permit an airport to provide its property for long-term non-airport use. A community recreation use may be permitted but must not interfere with airport operations or future development needs, and the airport is required to demonstrate that it has received compensation in return for community use of the property. The FAA in recent years has become more stringent in application of these requirements. Therefore, local community maps should be careful when depicting long term park use on properties of an FAA grant funded airport. These include some of the following lands</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		<p>referenced by Turnagain Community Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Coastal Trail greenbelt on Airport lands.</u> The draft Plan Map depicts what might be interpreted as a relatively wide greenbelt use buffer around the trail. This is not intended to settle the buffer width issue. Planning does not consider the Bowl-wide Plan Map to be the appropriate process through which to come to agreement with the Airport on the precise width of buffer needed to protect the trail from incompatible, high-impact land uses. ▪ <u>Land at Pt. Woronzof, down to the northern boundary of AWWU sewage treatment facility.</u> This is designated to indicate the community preference for a continued long-term park and open space use area at Point Woronzof. ▪ <u>Land west of the East/West Runway used as part of the Kincaid system of recreation trails (Sisson Loop).</u> The Airport has indicated that the use permit for this area has expired however the Plan Map depicts the long-term value of this area for community recreation. ▪ <u>Airport land directly west and adjacent to Kincaid Elementary School.</u> This is vacant Airport land, and not currently used for park. The 2005 draft <i>Parks Plan</i> does not identify as parkland. The <i>Anchorage 2020</i> Conceptual Open Space Map does not identify it. The <i>West Anchorage District Plan</i> is a more appropriate process through which to propose a recommended park buffer designation. ▪ <u>Spenard Beach Park along Lake Shore Drive, Lions Club Picnic area along Lake Shore Drive.</u> Planning staff will review its designation of the Lions Club Picnic area and Lake Shore Drive, based on further

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		<p>research and community discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Land in the Little Campbell Lake area.</u> This area is used by the community as an integral part of Kincaid Park system of trails and open spaces, and is depicted on the draft Plan Map to indicate the continued long-term value of this area for community open space. ▪ <u>Turnagain Bog and associated uplands and land directly adjacent to Turnagain neighborhood.</u> Planning has not completed its research on the Turnagain Bog area. For example, the <i>Airport Master Plan</i> preferred alternative for land use in this area has recently become available. Upon further research and discussion with stakeholders, Planning may recommend changes to the draft land use designation for the Turnagain Bog area or the buffer area between the General Aviation airport and Turnagain neighborhood, in order to indicate the continued value of the area to the community as a long-term open space / buffer area.
<p>Turnagain Bog: All T zoned property in the Turnagain Bog should be designated Special Study Area and become part of the West Anchorage District Plan, so that conflicts and incompatible land use issues can be resolved.</p> <p>Land Use Regulations (Title 21) state that T Transition zoned areas are not expected to develop in the immediate future, but that “as development patterns start to emerge within these areas and the sophistication of their protection becomes more critical to the general public interest, it is anticipated that such lands within the T districts will be proposed for more restrictive zoning classifications. Turnagain Bog area of the Airport is zoned T and is becoming developed with general aviation related projects. Prohibited uses in the T zone include “any uses that may be noxious, injurious or hazardous to surrounding property or persons by reason of production or emission of dust, smoke, refuse matter, odor, gas fumes, noise, vibration or similar substances or conditions, or the production or storage of explosive materials” and “any use or</p>	<p>Turnagain Community Council</p>	<p>Land Use Plan Map designates International Airport lands as <i>Major Transportation Facility</i>, to be implemented by the draft AD (Airport) District. Airport AD zoning district regulations would replace the current “T” zone.</p> <p>Title 21 Public Review Draft #2 content for the AD zone is primarily limited to a placeholder at this time. Planning staff intends to further research airport related issues and provide a more complete draft of the Airport District and its regulations in the public hearing draft of Title 21.</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>structure which is likely to be incompatible with established permanent uses within the area to be affected by the proposed use or structure.” Operations at general aviation park lot and lease lot areas generate noise odors and fumes. Aviation fuel is an explosive material.</p> <p>Under 21.40.240.M Land contiguous to land zoned for less intensive use”, states “No building or land use permit shall be issued in a T zone except for a permitted use. Land zoned T lying contiguous to residential-zoned land shall be permitted to be used only in accordance with provisions and standards less intense or equal to provisions and standards allowed under this title for the least intensive land use zone within a 1,000 foot radius of existing T zoned property for which a building permit or land use permit has been requested. The airport has developed lands with no regard to municipal code adherence. This land should be designated and rezoned to a more restrictive designation, in conjunction with the West Anchorage District Plan process.</p>		
<p>The LUPM should include the traditional hatched line symbol indicating a railroad track in the Alaska Railroad Utility Corridor, which is designated as “Major Transportation Facility” use. The railroad line symbol will make clear to the public that this is a railroad track corridor and not for some other type of “Transportation Facility”.</p>	<p>Alaska Railroad Corporation</p>	<p>Planning has revised the description of the <i>Major Transportation Facility</i> designation to include “railroad utility corridor”. Further changes to the description can be made to clarify the railroad use further if necessary.</p> <p>Planning considers a line RR track symbol to be unnecessary to the purpose of a color-coded land use plan map. It would obscure the color shade beneath which already designates the transportation land use.</p>
<p>The Ship Creek Greenbelt and the park use areas along the Government Hill bluff are not Municipal parkland properties, and so should not be designated as Park and Natural Resource Use. They should be designated as “Other Area that Functions as Park and Natural Resource”, and depicted as a line pattern in the same way that park use areas are depicted on airport lands. The “Park” designation should apply only to municipal land designated for public park use.</p> <p>The Ship Creek Greenbelt appears to be too wide on the draft LUPM. It should not be more than 25 feet (per Title 21 setback requirements) on the north side of the creek. Alaska Railroad is not aware of a formal agreement between the Alaska</p>	<p>Alaska Railroad Corporation</p>	<p>Planning has changed the designation of the Ship Creek Greenbelt to <i>Other Area that Functions as Park, Recreation or Natural Resource</i>, and has depicted it in a hatched line pattern that also indicates Alaska Railroad Corporation land ownership.</p> <p>The boundaries of the Ship Creek Greenbelt are based on the adopted <i>Ship Creek / Waterfront Land Use Plan</i>. The Land Use Plan Map does not intend to depict the 25 foot Title 21 setback requirement. Planning intends to work</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
Railroad and the Municipality allowing for a wide greenbelt in so many places along Ship Creek.		with the Railroad over the next two months to correct these draft boundaries where necessary.
The Land Use Plan Map does not depict the Alaska Railroad Utility Corridor with railroad track on the Railroad spur along International Airport Road from Minnesota Drive to the Anchorage International Airport terminal area.	Alaska Railroad Corporation	Planning has added the railroad utility corridor spur and indicated it as <i>Major Transportation Facility</i> .
<p>The draft Land Use Plan Map does not depict what happens to the Railroad corridor or tracks once these leave the Plan Area Boundary to the north and south of the Bowl. It seems to indicate that the Municipality concedes that it does not have land use regulatory authority for the Railroad Utility Corridor in these areas.</p> <p>The Plan Area Boundary description on the poster sized version of the draft Land Use Plan Map implies that any lands, including Railroad lands, outside the Bowl are subject to either U.S. military or State DNR authority. This is not true. Suggest “and other entities” or other language inclusive of entities like the Alaska Railroad Corporation.</p>	Alaska Railroad Corporation	Planning department has provided a definition for the “Plan Area Boundary” symbol in the narrative. The definition states that areas outside the Plan Area Boundary <u>may</u> still be subject to the overall municipal <u>Comprehensive Plan</u> and <u>Title 21 Land Use Regulations</u> . The Map legend no longer implies that all areas outside of the Bowl are subject to either military or State DNR authority. It is outside the scope of the Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map to designate the status of lands outside the Bowl plan area.
The primary color and designation for all Alaska Railroad properties should be a Major Transportation Facility designation oriented to the Railroad. Any non-transportation uses that the Municipality wishes to depict on the LUPM for this area should be shown, if at all, as a line pattern over the Major Transportation Facility designation. For example, industrial and park related uses in the Terminal Reserve should appear as a line pattern, similar to how the LUPM depicts park use permit areas in the airports.	Alaska Railroad Corporation	<p>Planning has revised the narrative to state that essential railroad uses are in certain cases subject to exclusive Surface Transportation Board authority. Any such land use area must be depicted as a Transportation land use.</p> <p>Because the Railroad has indicated that it could possibly convert most any non-railroad use area within its terminal reserve lands into an essential railroad use area in the future, the public hearing draft Land Use Plan Map depicts this possibility, showing all Railroad-owned areas as potential <i>Major Transportation Facility</i> use areas. This indicates flexibility for the Railroad to convert any areas that it owns into a Railroad transportation use if necessary.</p> <p>The narrative states that non-railroad use areas may be implemented by the appropriate residential, commercial or industrial zoning relevant to that non-railroad use.</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
The Community Facilities Map Layer should break up the “Major Transportation Facility” designation into “Major Transportation Facility – Air”, “Major Transportation Facility – Port” and “Major Transportation Facility – Railroad”. This would be consistent with how the map breaks out other community facilities. The draft LUPM needs to communicate to the public the differences between the major transportation land uses, or identify where one land use ends and another begins (e.g., what is the boundary between rail yard and port use areas.)	Alaska Railroad Corporation	The Planning Department recommends a shared color for the major transportation facilities. The facilities share an industrial character and a similar primary function that defines Anchorage’s position in the region and global economy. The areas also have similar off-site land use impacts. A land use plan map is necessarily generalized. It allows the reader to sense the overall pattern in land use for the city. The “Transportation Facility Property Boundary” line symbol should be adequate to distinguish Railroad and Port owned lands.
LUPM narrative and legend should refer to the Railroad Utility Corridor, rather than railway utility corridor. Add language to the description of the Railroad Utility Corridor which states that this corridor is under certain circumstances subject to STB regulations.	Alaska Railroad Corporation	Planning Department has revised the description to “railroad utility corridor”, and has inserted a statement referring to the exclusive authority of the Surface Transportation Board regulations over some railroad uses.
The <i>South Central Rail Network Final Report</i> , prepared for the Alaska Railroad Corporation, identified the most likely locations of potential future commuter rail stations in Anchorage. Specific station sites were chosen according to the availability of access roads to the rail system, and plans for future rail relocation and upgrades. Stations for the Anchorage Bowl include: Anchorage Intermodal Station at the existing Alaska Railroad Anchorage Passenger Terminal; Spenard Station located between Spenard Road and 36 th Avenue which would serve the Midtown area of Anchorage and the U-Med District; and the Dimond Center Station.	Alaska Railroad Corporation	Planning Department has added an <i>Intermodal / Transit Focus Area</i> symbol to depict the possible Spenard Station between Spenard Road and 36 th Avenue. A commuter rail station at this location could be well-positioned to interact with the Spenard Road transit corridor and nearby mixed-density housing, and to serve Midtown. It is also consistent with the draft Plan Map designation of <i>Neighborhood Commercial</i> for the immediate area.
There is a cut bank in the eastern end of the Government Hill bluff above Ship Creek. This does not appear to be a park use. Quality check the LUPM to ensure it is being designated accurately.	Alaska Railroad Corporation	Planning Department will work with the Railroad, Parks Department and Heritage Land Bank to identify the proper boundaries of the park use.
<i>Area-specific Comments - Southwest Anchorage Bowl</i>		
The business district at the southwest quadrant of C Street and O’Malley is proposed to be changed to residential. This area is not well suited for residential use. It is	Dan Bolles	Planning staff determined that future development of the area as multifamily residential would be a preferable land

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
better suited for mixed use development. There only exists one nonconforming single family dwelling on this property. No public utilities have been extended to this location. The existing owners petitioned for business zoning to permit the driving range that exists on the majority of the area. The existing zoning to the north and east are industrial with PLI to the west.		use buffer between existing residential neighborhoods and full-scale commercial/industrial activities further north. This would be more consistent with neighborhood protection policies than would be the extension of commercial activities southward into the neighborhood. Medium density residential could also help support a neighborhood commercial center to the south.
The area east of Minnesota Dr., north of O’Malley Rd. and south of 100th Ave. should not be changed to an Industrial Reserve. The land uses immediately adjacent to this property are zoned residential and PLI. The property to the northeast is designated for an elementary school. Industrial seems out of character with the neighborhood. Given the high water table, depth of peat and lack of utilities to the area PLI zoning seems a more appropriate designation.	Dan Bolles	The Bowl lacks strategically located large industrial tracts. This site is isolated from existing neighborhoods by Minnesota Drive. It is well connected via 100 th Avenue to the industrial reserve to the east. It has immediate access to the freeway network and 5-10 minute access to the International Airport. The school site to the northeast is separated from the site by future industrial truck routes and zoning. A commercial or commercial / mixed-use designation would be even less desirable than residential: the Bowl has an excess of commercially zoned land.
Area west of the Old Seward Highway south of Dimond Blvd. has been under going change but still has remnants of industrial uses. It should not be changed from industrial to commercial designation. Remnant nonconforming uses will be an ongoing concern for this area.	Dan Bolles	Planning staff will further research existing activities along this corridor, review the proposed designations in relation to adopted land use policies and the draft locational criteria, and possibly recommend changes to the draft Plan Map.
What is the intent for changing the designation of the area east of Arctic Blvd. and north of International Airport Rd. to industrial? This area is currently vacant but lies within a predominantly residential district. It would seem that a higher intensity residential use would be more appropriate.	Dan Bolles	This area is currently zoned industrial and fronts on International Airport Road. It is well-located in relationship to major transportation facilities. An objective of the Plan Map project is to identify and preserve existing, well-located industrial and mixed-industrial/commercial areas for future industrial and compatible commercial uses. A residential use along Anchorage International Airport Road east of Arctic would be incompatible with truck and industrial commercial traffic, as well as with surrounding commercial/industrial uses. This area is well-positioned for

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		future redevelopment to a more intensive use.
<p>The map which depicts changes in residential density suggests that the draft Plan Map proposes designating the existing R-5 districts in south Anchorage for a lower density. The existing single-family lots within the areas to the south and north of 68th Ave., and either side of Lake Otis Pkwy., have numerous existing mobile homes. These will become nonconforming structures and uses. The attempt to change R-5 zoning to a large lot residential district works contrary to the interest of numerous landowners in these areas. Mobile homes should be made a viable housing option in other districts or the R-5 district needs to be rewritten. Example areas with mobile homes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The area of Queens Gate and Newland Subd. ▪ The area north of Klatt Rd. and east of C Street ▪ The area north of DeArmoun Rd. at Hare Dr. 	Dan Bolles	<p>Planning staff has corrected the map of “recommended changes in land use and density”. The map included an inaccuracy which depicted many existing R-5 areas as areas proposed for reduction in residential density. The map of “changes” no longer characterizes these areas as being reduced in residential density from existing R-5 zoning.</p> <p>The commentator is correct that the Land Use Plan Map designation and draft implementation zoning will not result in a lower density in most areas currently zoned R-5.</p> <p>The draft Title 21 would permit manufactured homes in residential zoning districts. Mobile homes built prior to the mid-1970s would continue to be permitted in mobile home parks, or as nonconforming uses elsewhere in the Bowl.</p>
<p>There are a few areas where an industrial category is placed next to residential. Consider a buffer zone as possible between residential an industrial areas.</p>	Dan Bolles	<p>Based on <i>Anchorage 2020</i> policies, the draft Plan Map recommends preserving most existing industrially zoned areas that meet the locational criteria for industrial use. Most industrial areas designated on the Plan Map are existing areas. It is very difficult to locate new industrial areas in the Bowl. Project staff will review draft Title 21 to confirm if it is recommending increased transitional standards between industrial areas and abutting residential.</p>
<i>Area-specific Comments - Southeast Anchorage Bowl</i>		
<p>The parcel above Potter Creek designated as “Other Area that Functions as Park, Recreation and Natural Resource” is Alaska Mental Health Trust land. It should be designated as the same Residential category as the adjoining private land.</p>	Alison L. Smith / Alaska Mental Health Trust	<p>Planning Department has changed the designation for this Mental Health Trust parcel above Potter Creek to <i>Residential Limited Intensity</i>.</p>
<p>The Mayor reassured the public at the 9-7-05 public meeting that Section 36 will be dedicated as park. However, the draft LUPM designates Section 36 as a Special Study Area. The Assembly voted to place it into PLI-p and HLB recognized that</p>	Dan Stone, Bear Valley resident 9-7- 05 public meeting	<p>Planning Department has changed the designation of Section 36 to <i>Park and Natural Resource</i>.</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
vote. I find the draft LUPM designation extremely disturbing.	comment	At the recommendation of HLB, this designation appears in the public hearing draft as overlaid by a diagonal line pattern representing <i>Special Study Area</i> .
Please eliminate the diagonal line “Special Study Area” pattern on Section 36 and depict it as a “Park and Natural Resource” area. Zoning for most of Section 36 was ordained by the Assembly for parks and recreation purposes (PLI-p) pursuant to AO 2002-160 and AO 92-122. The specific use for most land within Section 36 has been legally identified for parks and recreation purposes via the 1991 Land Use Study, numerous Heritage Land Bank Annual Work Plans and 5-year Management Plans, Assembly ordinances including AO 2002-160 and AO 92-122, and the Anchorage Bowl Park, Natural Resource, and Recreation Facility Plan recently adopted by the Planning and Zoning Commission.	Scott Pexton	With the assistance of HLB, a second paragraph has been added to the Special Study Area description in the Plan Map narrative. The new paragraph refers primarily to Section 36 and to HLB Parcel 2-140 on upper Hillside.
The draft LUPM map legend shows a residential zone of 1-8 DUA for parts of Rabbit Creek and adjacent areas. One to eight DUA covers a wide margin of densities. The maps reflect these locales are scattered over varied terrain—including some on steep, wet slopes that have not been fully developed yet. The current zoning for some of these areas is R7 and R6. The council is concerned that unless the R7 blocks are delineated with a separate legend color, that higher densities may inappropriately be attributed to them during the rezone. Therefore, add a new color and designation to the LUPM to reflect areas where densities are currently 1-2 DUA.	Rabbit Creek Community Council	<p><u>1. Categorization of R-7 Areas</u></p> <p>The Land Use Plan Map needs to be simpler and more generalized than a zoning map. Most every residential land use designation on the Plan Map covers multiple zoning districts within its density range.</p> <p>The R-7 zoning district has relatively little geographic coverage across the Bowl. It is a niche zoning district. It should not appear as its own color category of residential density on the plan map. The Plan Map groups R-7 with R-1 rather than with the acre-or-larger R-6, R-9 and R-10 areas. The acre-or-larger lot zones are designated <i>Limited Intensity</i> on the Plan Map.</p>
The draft Land Use Plan Map designates land in Rabbit Creek Heights subdivision in Bear Valley Community Council as Low Intensity Residential (1-8 DUA). Change this to a >1 – 2 DUA designation so that we will not have 8 dwellings on an acre in Bear Valley.	Deborah Mole, Bear Valley resident, 9-7-05 public meeting comment	<p>The Land Use Plan Map reflects existing lot size patterns and zoning on the Hillside. It recognizes developed areas zoned and built to R-7 lot size and density. A lower density designation would lead to nonconforming built lots. The Land Use Plan Map does not take an aggressive strategy toward such areas, and leaves more substantial recommendations for change to the <u>Hillside District Plan</u>.</p> <p><u>2. Allowable Densities and Implementation Zones</u></p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
		<p>The narrative description is essential to the Plan Map and will effectively become a section of <i>Anchorage 2020</i> upon adoption. Planning staff has revised the narrative to state that the maximum intended density of the <i>Low Intensity Residential</i> designation is 5 dwellings per acre, except that only areas with attached or two-family housing may reach 8 dwellings per acre.</p> <p>Furthermore, Planning has clarified the narrative to state that not every corresponding implementation zone listed for any given Land Use Designation is necessarily appropriate in all areas shown in that Designation. A proposed zone change for an area should be shown to be the most appropriate for that location, taking into consideration the purpose of each zone, the proposed rezoning site and the zoning and/or development pattern of the surrounding land. Just because a zoning district is listed as a potential implementation zone for a Designation does not mean that the Plan Map suggests the zone is appropriate for any given area. The narrative specifically names the Rabbit Creek Heights area of Hillside as an example: the only appropriate zone for that area designated <i>Low Intensity Residential</i> is RS-2 (i.e., R-7 and not R-1 or R-2).</p> <p>Planning staff will explore possible further changes to the legend on the Plan Map to better indicate what the narrative report states about the maximum five dwellings per acre for most areas designated “<i>Low Intensity</i>”.</p>
Show areas in existing R6, R9, R10 districts in a different color from R7 areas.	Rabbit Creek Community Council	The draft Land Use Plan Map shows areas intended for zoning equivalent to existing R-6, R-9 and R-10 zoning in a different color from existing R-7 zoned areas.

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
Rabbit Creek Community Council agrees with the LUPM proposal to lower densities (Limited Intensity 0-1 DUA) for parts of Potter Valley that are now zoned R1A. This zoning should not have been applied to this region with its soil and slope challenges and grossly inadequate road system.	Rabbit Creek Community Council	This area is not appropriate for densities above one dwelling unit per acre, for reasons such as those Rabbit Creek Community Council has provided.
The R-3 zone is inappropriate for Potter Valley given the huge road impacts. These districts in Potter Valley mean public utilities would be needed; that decision should be determined through the Hillside District Plan.	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Subdivision plans have been in progress for the Potter Valley area and it is assumed that its planning process is likely to be completed before the Bowl Land Use Plan Map is adopted. The subdivision will exceed one dwelling unit per acre density. This area has been zoned R-3 SL since 1984. The southernmost portion of the R-3 SL area is developing at a density of less than one dwelling unit per acre and so the draft Plan Map designates it <i>Limited Intensity Residential</i> .
Rabbit Creek Community Council questions the increase in density immediately south of Potter Creek (water body). The map titled “increase/decrease density” shows a brown zone south of the creek. While that same color north of the creek reflects reality for what is already developed, it is questioned whether south of the creek should be categorized the same. It would be more appropriate for the LUPM to designate the area 0-1 DUA because of the terrain and soils. Additionally, any recommendation to change the HWMP should be made through the public process of the Hillside District Plan.	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Paradise Valley subdivision on either side of Potter Creek consists of lots that are typically between 20,000 square feet and 1 acre in size. Most of the lots are slightly larger than ½ acre. The majority of the lots have been built on. This is an existing neighborhood that is platted and at least partly developed at a density of nearly 2 housing units per acre. Therefore, although the existing zoning is R-6, the actual development density is closer to R-7.
The area east of Goldenview Dr. either side of Potter Creek is slated for higher intensity residential use. This area is already platted as R-6 large lot residential, and for the most part is developed. The only hope for development in this area is to extend public water and sewer, which will prove difficult due to the depth of bedrock and steep grades throughout the area.	Dan Bolles	The draft Plan Map reflects that this density is unlikely to go away.

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>The draft LUPM narrative on page 6 depicts the NMU-1 small-scale neighborhood mixed-use district as a compatible implementation zone for areas designated as Low Intensity (1-8 DUA) Residential. This designation includes areas zoned R-7 in our area. Rabbit Creek Community Council does not agree with the inclusion of NMU-1 as a compatible implementation district for Residential Designations in our area. Testimony during the <i>Anchorage Bowl / Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan</i> process clearly showed a desire to keep the area free of commercial use. Therefore, remove NMU-1 in R7 districts east of the New Seward Hwy.</p>	<p>Rabbit Creek Community Council</p>	<p>Planning Department staff has revised the Land Use Plan Map narrative to clarify that neighborhood commercial or mixed-use zoning is not a primary implementation zone for any Residential designation. It is only for existing neighborhood business districts within residential areas. For example, there are B-1A zoned sites in some residential areas that are too small for the Land Use Plan Map to indicate at its map scale.</p>
<p>The draft LUPM designates the Huffman area between the old and new Seward Hwys as “Community Activity Center”, which basically corresponds to the scale of “Town Center” from the <i>Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan</i>. This commercial center is essentially our NMU-1 [i.e., <u>neighborhood</u>-scale rather than town center scale] facility. While Huffman already has features of a town center—post office, bus service, and restaurants—the concern is that it would not be appropriate to develop it as a full scale town center given our proximity to centers at Abbott/Lake Otis and Dimond. High density residential that accompanies town centers would also be inappropriate because of the lack of open space that rightfully should accompany it and the impacts beyond the highways to established lower density neighborhoods.</p> <p>Therefore, reclassify Huffman community activity center as a neighborhood center. The upper limits for a neighborhood center are more appropriate than an activity center for this area of town.</p>	<p>Rabbit Creek Community Council</p>	<p><i>Anchorage 2020</i> designates the Huffman Carrs area as a town center, rather than a neighborhood center. It has the variety and scale of land use functions of a town center. More community discussion would be necessary before demoting this area to a <i>Neighborhood Center</i>.</p> <p>The <i>Community Activity Center</i> designation on the Plan Map is not a high-rise, high-density designation. The recommended height limit for the implementing zoning district (CMU) in Title 21 is 60 feet. By contrast, existing B-3 and I-1 height limits for the area are unlimited. Planning has also clarified its description in the narrative description of <i>Community Activity Center</i> that residential densities are not intended to exceed that of a <i>Medium Intensity Residential</i> designation.</p>
<p>The residential area immediately south of the commercial portion of the Huffman business area should be designated for higher density residential development.</p>	<p>Jim Shepards, property owner in Huffman area</p>	<p>Planning Department review and community discussion of this issue is still pending. Planning will make any recommendations for change to the PZC and Assembly during the public hearing process.</p>
<p>The draft LUPM designates a higher residential density than current zoning in areas of south Hillside. Staff suggested at a public meeting that this is a “housekeeping” change that reflects no substantive increase in density over existing development patterns. This seems to be a smokescreen of what proposed plats we have seen. You</p>	<p>Greg Rothwell, resident, Rabbit Creek Community Council, 9-7-05</p>	<p>The draft Plan Map is intended to reflect existing development patterns of areas on Hillside that have at least partially developed. Planning staff has reviewed the draft <i>Residential</i> designations in south Hillside in comparison to</p>

Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
Public Comments Regarding the June 28, 2005 Community Discussion Draft
Issue – Response Summary – 3/6/2006

Comment Summary	Commentator / Affiliation	Planning Department Response
<p>appear to be releasing the developers from having to present to the community councils, which are the only organized neighborhood group that can raise the correct questions about access, utilities, road maintenance and housing density.</p>	<p>public meeting comment</p>	<p>existing development patterns and lot sizes. The review confirmed to staff that the draft Plan Map designates no area which has developed at a density of 1 dwelling unit per acre or less in a higher density category.</p> <p>Areas that have developed at a higher density than 1 dwelling unit per acre appear in the next-lowest density category possible.</p>