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ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
AO No. 2023-42, As Amended

# AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE R-4A DISTRICT IN ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 21 SECTIONS 21.04.020, RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS; 21.05.010, TABLE OF ALLOWED USES; 21.06.020, DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS TABLES, 21.060.030, MEASUREMENTS AND EXCEPTIONS; 21.07.110, RESIDENTIAL DESIGN STANDARDS; 21.07.120, LARGE ESTABLISHMENTS; AND 21.08.70, ALTERNATIVE RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISIONS. 

(Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2021-0127)
WHEREAS, Action 3-1 of the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the amendment of Title 21 to simplify zoning regulations for mixed-use projects relative to commercial or other projects; and

WHEREAS, Policy 2.3 of the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the removal of barriers to desired infill development and for the incorporation of flexibility in development requirements; and

WHEREAS, very few properties have been rezoned to R-4A across the Municipality, suggesting it is less attractive for development than other zoning designations; and

WHEREAS, the proposed updates to the existing R-4A are intended to create a more pedestrian-oriented environment, allow more commercial space within mixed-use developments, simplify phasing requirements, and make the zoning district's requirements easier to follow; and

WHEREAS, a more flexible R-4A zoning district will help the Municipality provide the framework for additional housing in areas designated for that use by the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan; now, therefore,

## THE ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY ORDAINS:

Section 1. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.04.020 is hereby amended to read as follows: (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.04.020 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS

*** *** ***
I. R-4: Multifamily Residential District.
*** *** ***
2. District-specific Standards.
$\begin{array}{ll}* * * & * * * \quad * * * \\ \text { c. Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) }\end{array}$ in the R-4 district is 1.0, but may be increased through the bonus provisions [IN SUBSECTION 21.04.020I.2.D. ]below. These incentives provide for an incremental increase in the floor area of a development in exchange for incremental increases in any of the following special features deemed of benefit to the community.
i. Bonus for Open Space. One square foot of additional floor area is allowed per square foot of additional open space area. This space shall meet the standards of 21.07.030D. and be in addition to any open space required by section 21.07.030. The floor area bonus increases to two square feet for open space that meets the standards for high quality spaces in 21.07.030D.4.
ii. Bonus for Below Grade Parking. Two square feet of additional floor area is allowed per gross square foot of covered below grade parking floor area, up to a maximum increase of 1.0 FAR. The floor area bonus increases to four square feet on the second parking level below grade.
iii. Bonus for Affordable Rental Housing. Four square feet of additional gross floor area is allowed per square foot of affordable rental housing unit floor area, up to a maximum increase of 1.0 FAR. The affordable housing units shall be consistent with the standards of 21.07.110G., Affordable Housing.
iv. Bonus for Enhanced Sidewalk/Walkway Widening. Two square feet of additional floor area is allowed per square foot of area provided as part of a primary pedestrian walkway or enhanced sidewalk that meets the requirements of subsections 21.07.060F.4. or 21.07.060F.17.
v. Bonus for Upper Level Setbacks/Step Backs for Sunlight Access. A floor area bonus is allowed equal to one-third of the sum of step back areas on each upper floor where the step back is at least 16 feet from the face of the building at the floor immediately below, such that the floor's existence does not increase the amount of shadowing on surrounding residences, private open spaces, sidewalks, schools, or parks on

March/September 21, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. solar time.
vi. Bonus for Ambient Daylight for Residences. A floor area bonus equal to 10 percent of the lot area ( 0.10 FAR) but not to exceed 4,000 square feet is allowed for preservation of daylight for all dwellings in the development and facing the development, using the standards of 21.07.110C.8.h.
vii. Bonus for Pedestrian-Interactive Use. Three square feet of additional floor area is allowed per each square foot of ground-floor space which is to be occupied by a pedestrian-interactive use that meets the standards of 21.07.060F.16.
viii. Bonus for Wrapped Parking. One square foot of additional floor area is allowed per each square foot of habitable floor area around a wrapped parking structure that conforms to subsection 21.06.030E.2.g., up to a maximum increase of 0.5 FAR.
J. R-4A: Multifamily Residential Mixed-use District.

1. Purpose. The R-4A district is a primarily residential district intended for high-density[MULTIFAMILY DWELLINGS], residential and mixed-use development with a minimum gross densit[IES]y of 20 dwelling units per acre and gross densities intended to be greater than 35 dwelling units per acre. This district is intended to implement the land use plan, meet housing needs for the community, establish a pedestrian-oriented environment that helps support transit, and provide the flexibility to integrate residential and non-residential uses. [COMMERCIAL RETAIL, SERVICES, AND OFFICE USES ARE ALSO ALLOWED IN COMBINATION WITH HOUSING TO CREATE A TRULY MIXED-USE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT, ALTHOUGH A MAJORITY OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE A RESIDENTIAL USE. THIS DISTRICT IS TO BE APPLIED IN AREAS NEAR DOWNTOWN AND MIDTOWN, IN ORDER TO PROVIDE HOUSING DENSITIES WHICH SUPPORT THESE CITY CENTERS, EFFICIENT USE OF RESIDENTIAL LAND, AND RESIDENTIAL LIVING OPPORTUNITIES NEAR EMPLOYMENT AND SERVICES. BY PROVIDING THE FLEXIBILITY FOR INTEGRATED MIXED-USE SITE DEVELOPMENT, THE R-4A DISTRICT FACILITATES REINVESTMENT AND REVITALIZATION

WITHIN AREAS IN TRANSITION. NEW MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT SHOULD FACILITATE STRONG PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE CONNECTIONS WITH NEARBY NEIGHBORHOODS AND CITY CENTERS.]
2. District-specific Standards.
a. Dwelling Units Required[MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS. DEVELOPMENT IN THE R-4A DISTRICT SHALL COMPLY WITH THE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS IN SUBSECTION 21.04.030G.6. AND G.7. REGARDING ENHANCED SIDEWALK OPTION AND BUILDING PLACEMENT AND ORIENTATION].
i. Unless limited by physical constraints or determined otherwise through a Small Area Implementation Plan (SAIP), development in the R-4A district shall include at least 20 dwelling units per gross acre per phase, or on average of subsequent phases.
ii. The overall development site shall include at least 20 dwelling units per gross acre at the completion of all phases unless provided otherwise through a major site plan review, conditional use process, or Small Area Implementation Plan.
b. Allowed Commercial Uses. A maximum percentage of gross floor area per table 21.04-2 on the development site may be non-residential uses, as provided in i. through ii. below.[MAINTAINING RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER. DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE PRIMARILY RESIDENTIAL. THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS AND EXCEPTIONS APPLY:]
i. Non-residential uses may be located in the same building(s) as the residential units or in one or more separate buildings on the development site. [NONRESIDENTIAL USES ALLOWED IN THE R-4A DISTRICT SHALL BE MIXED WITH RESIDENTIAL ACCORDING TO THE PROVISIONS THAT FOLLOW. (THE USES "PARK, PUBLIC OR PRIVATE," "COMMUNITY GARDEN," "UTILITY SUBSTATION," TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWERS, "PARKING LOT, PRINCIPAL USE," AND "PARKING STRUCTURE, PRINCIPAL USE" ARE EXEMPT FROM THE MIXED-USE REQUIREMENT.)
(A) IF RESIDENTIAL USES OCCUPY AT LEAST 90 PERCENT OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA DEPICTED ON A SITE PLAN, NO REVIEW BEYOND THAT REQUIRED BY TABLE 21.051 IS REQUIRED.
(B) A MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW IS REQUIRED FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL USES PROPOSED TO OCCUPY GREATER THAN 10 AND LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE DEVELOPMENT AS DEPICTED ON A SITE PLAN.
(C) A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT IS REQUIRED FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL USES PROPOSED TO OCCUPY GREATER THAN 20 AND LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO 49 PERCENT OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE DEVELOPMENT AS DEPICTED ON A SITE PLAN.
(D) MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEWS OR CONDITIONAL USE REVIEWS UNDER B.I.(B). AND B.I.(C). SHALL MEET THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA. THIS SHALL BE IN ADDITION TO THE GENERAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL CRITERIA (21.03.180F.) AND CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL CRITERIA (21.03.080D.).
(1) THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL RESULT IN A NET INCREASE IN DWELLING UNITS OVER PRE-DEVELOPMENT DENSITY, OR SHALL BE AT LEAST 20 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE, WHICHEVER IS GREATER. THE TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA OF HOUSEHOLD LIVING USES SHALL BE EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN ANY PRIOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.
(2) STIPULATIONS MAY BE IMPOSED RELATING TO BUILDING DESIGN, TRAFFIC, PRIVACY, FLOOR AREA RESTRICTIONS, RESTRICTIONS AGAINST COMMERCIAL ABOVE THE GROUND FLOOR, AND OTHER

| CONDITIONS | NECESSARY TO |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| MAINTAIN | A | RESIDENTIAL |
| CHARACTER AND | COMPATIBILITY |  |
| WITH ADJACENT | RESIDENTIAL |  |
| DISTRICTS.] |  |  |

ii. The development site may comprise multiple adjoining and/or adjacent lots. A master fill and grade permit for the entire development is required to ensure the site meets all applicable provisions of this title [THE NON-RESIDENTIAL PORTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL NOT BE GIVEN A CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE OR A CONDITIONAL CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE UNTIL ALL OF THE RESIDENTIAL PORTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT IS GIVEN A CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE].
[III. GROUND FLOOR BUILDING FACADES FACING AND WITHIN 100 FEET OF PUBLIC STREETS, PRIMARY CIRCULATION DRIVES, OR PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS SHALL MEET THE FOLLOWING WINDOW STANDARDS ON THOSE FACADES:
(A) NON-RESIDENTIAL USES: AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF THE LENGTH AND 25 PERCENT OF THE AREA OF GROUNDLEVEL WALLS SHALL BE WINDOWS PROVIDING VISUAL ACCESS TO THE INTERIOR OF THE BUILDING.
(B) RESIDENTIAL USES: AT LEAST 25 PERCENT OF THE LENGTH AND 12 PERCENT OF THE AREA OF GROUND-LEVEL WALLS SHALL BE WINDOWS.
(C) ALL USES: BLANK WALLS SHALL NOT EXCEED 30 FEET IN LENGTH.
IV. ALL COMMERCIAL USES SHALL BE CONDUCTED ENTIRELY WITHIN A COMPLETELY ENCLOSED BUILDING EXCEPT FOR PARKING AND LOADING FACILITIES AND OUTDOOR RESTAURANT SEATING. OUTDOOR STORAGE OF GOODS ACCESSORY TO A COMMERCIAL USE IS PROHIBITED.]
c. Uses which are not counted towards any gfa calculation [FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR) INCENTIVES FOR THE R-4 AND R-4A DISTRICTS. THE MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR) WITHIN THE R-4 AND R-4A DISTRICTS IS 1.5 AND 2.0 FAR RESPECTIVELY, BUT MAY BE INCREASED UP TO A MAXIMUM TOTAL FAR OF 2.0 IN THE R-4 DISTRICT AND 3.0 IN THE R-4A DISTRICT THROUGH THE FOLLOWING BONUS PROVISIONS, SUBJECT TO SECTION 21.06.030E. THESE INCENTIVES PROVIDE FOR AN INCREMENTAL INCREASE IN THE FLOOR AREA OF A DEVELOPMENT IN EXCHANGE FOR INCREMENTAL INCREASES IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING SPECIAL FEATURES DEEMED OF BENEFIT TO THE COMMUNITY. INCREASES IN THE FAR MAY BE ACHIEVED THROUGH THE USE OF ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING]:
i. Any community uses allowed by the zoning district;[BONUS FOR OPEN SPACE. ONE SQUARE FOOT OF ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA IS ALLOWED PER SQUARE FOOT OF ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE AREA. THIS SPACE SHALL MEET THE STANDARDS OF 21.07.030D. AND BE IN ADDITION TO ANY OPEN SPACE REQUIRED BY SECTION 21.07.030. THE FLOOR AREA BONUS INCREASES TO TWO SQUARE FEET FOR OPEN SPACE THAT MEETS THE STANDARDS FOR HIGH QUALITY SPACES IN 21.07.030D.6.]
ii. Park, public or private;[BONUS FOR BELOW GRADE PARKING. TWO SQUARE FEET OF ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA IS ALLOWED PER GROSS SQUARE FOOT OF COVERED BELOW GRADE PARKING FLOOR AREA, UP TO A MAXIMUM INCREASE OF 1.0 FAR. THE FLOOR AREA BONUS INCREASES TO FOUR SQUARE FEET ON THE SECOND PARKING LEVEL BELOW GRADE.]
iii. Community garden;[BONUS FOR AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING. FOUR SQUARE FEET OF ADDITIONAL GROSS FLOOR AREA IS ALLOWED PER SQUARE FOOT OF AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING UNIT FLOOR AREA, UP TO A MAXIMUM INCREASE OF 1.0 FAR. THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STANDARDS OF 21.07.110H., AFFORDABLE HOUSING.] SIDEWALK/WALKWAY WIDENING. TWO SQUARE FEET OF ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA IS ALLOWED PER SQUARE FOOT OF AREA PROVIDED AS PART OF A PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY OR ENHANCED SIDEWALK THAT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF SUBSECTIONS 21.07.060F.4. OR 21.07.060F.17.]
v. Parking lot, principal use;[BONUS FOR UPPER LEVEL SETBACKS/STEP BACKS FOR SUNLIGHT ACCESS. A FLOOR AREA BONUS IS ALLOWED EQUAL TO ONE-THIRD OF THE SUM OF STEP BACK AREAS ON EACH UPPER FLOOR WHERE THE STEP BACK IS AT LEAST 16 FEET FROM THE FACE OF THE BUILDING AT THE FLOOR IMMEDIATELY BELOW, SUCH THAT THE FLOOR'S EXISTENCE DOES NOT INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF SHADOWING ON SURROUNDING RESIDENCES, PRIVATE OPEN SPACES, SIDEWALKS, SCHOOLS, OR PARKS ON MARCH/SEPTEMBER 21, FROM 9:00 A.M. TO 3:00 P.M. SOLAR TIME.] and
vi. Parking structure, principal use[BONUS FOR AMBIENT DAYLIGHT FOR RESIDENCES. A FLOOR AREA BONUS EQUAL TO 10 PERCENT OF THE LOT AREA (0.10 FAR) BUT NOT TO EXCEED 4,000 SQUARE FEET IS ALLOWED FOR PRESERVATION OF DAYLIGHT FOR ALL DWELLINGS IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND FACING THE DEVELOPMENT, USING THESTANDARDS OF 21.07.110C.8.H].

| Maximum | Allowance |
| :---: | :---: |
| Up to 49\% | Allowed by right when the development complies with the district-specific standards of this section 21.04.020J.2. |
| $\geq 50$ Percent | The development is approved through one of the following procedures: <br> a. Major site plan review (21.03.180D.) and provides up to 35 dwelling units per gross acre on the development site; (21.03.180D.) <br> b. Conditional use (21.03.080) and provides greater than 35 dwelling units per gross acre on the development site; or <br> c. Small Area Implementation Plan (21.03.115). |

# [VII. BONUS FOR PEDESTRIAN-INTERACTIVE USE. THREE SQUARE FEET OF ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA IS ALLOWED PER EACH SQUARE FOOT OF GROUND-FLOOR SPACE WHICH IS TO BE OCCUPIED BY A PEDESTRIAN-INTERACTIVE USE THAT MEETS THE STANDARDS OF 21.07.060F.16. 

VIII. BONUS FOR WRAPPED PARKING. ONE SQUARE FOOT OF ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA IS ALLOWED PER EACH SQUARE FOOT OF HABITABLE FLOOR AREA AROUND A WRAPPED PARKING STRUCTURE THAT CONFORMS TO SUBSECTION 21.06.030E.2.G., UP TO A MAXIMUM INCREASE OF 0.5 FAR.]
d. Timing of mixed-use developments. Except by decision of the director or through a small area implementation plan, prior to the issuance of any CO or CCO any development must:
i. Meet the minimum housing unit requirement of 21.04.020J.2.a; and
ii. Meet the maximum allowed proportionate share of nonresidential use in table 21.04-2. at all phases of construction.
e. Street Frontage Requirements.
[D. BUILDING HEIGHT INCREASE: EXCEED THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT ESTABLISHED IN TABLE 21.06-1, UP TO A MAXIMUM TOTAL HEIGHT OF 90 FEET, SUBJECT TO ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS.THESE CONDITIONS ENCOURAGE SLENDER TOWERS WITH CONDENSED FLOOR PLATES, LIGHT AND AIR AT THE PEDESTRIAN LEVEL, AND ACTIVE USES ON THE GROUND FLOOR FACING THE STREET:]
i. Notwithstanding 21.07.110C.6.e.-f., new parking facilities shall not be located between buildings and the nearest public street in the R-4A zoning district. On lots with two or more street frontages, this limitation shall apply only on the primary front setback; however, when the site abuts a street designated in the comprehensive plan as a "main street," a "transit street," a "mixed-use street," or a derivation of these street typologies, this limitation may be changed to such street with the concurrence of the director.[THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL PARTICIPATE IN THE FAR INCENTIVES
PROVIDED FOR THE R-4A DISTRICT IN SUBSECTION 21.04.020I.2.C. ABOVE;]
ii. Existing requirements for multifamily development outlined in 21.07.110 THE GROUND FLOOR OF THE BUILDING SHALL BE RESIDENTIAL OR OTHER PERMITTED NON-PARKING USE FOR AT LEAST 25 FEET OF DEPTH FACING THE STREET FOR THE FULL LENGTH OF THE BUILDING, EXCEPT FOR VEHICLE ENTRANCES AND EXITS. WHERE THE SITE HAS TWO OR MORE FRONTAGES, THE STANDARD SHALL BE MET ON TWO FRONTAGES;]
[III. ALL FLOOR AREA PROVIDED BY THE HEIGHT INCREASE SHALL BE FOR RESIDENTIAL USES;
IV. THE HEIGHT INCREASE SHALL ADHERE TO THE HEIGHT TRANSITIONS OF SUBSECTION 21.06.030D.8.
V. THE HEIGHT INCREASE SHALL ADHERE TO THE APPLICABLE DESIGN STANDARDS FOR TALL BUILDINGS IN SUBSECTION 21.07.120C.; AND
VI. UNLESS A MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW OR A CONDITIONAL USE IS REQUIRED BY OTHER PARTS OF THIS SECTION, ALL DEVELOPMENTS REQUESTING THE HEIGHT INCREASE SHALL BE SUBJECT TO ADMINISTRATIVE SITE PLAN REVIEW.]
f. Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) in the R-4A district is 4.0.
g. Building Height Increase. Buildings in the R-4A district may reach a height of 60 feet, and up to 90 feet if they undergo an Administrative Site Plan Review as outlined in 21.03.180C.
3. District Location Requirement. In addition to meeting the general rezoning approval criteria, a new or enlarged R-4A district shall[IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THIS DISTRICT BE LIMITED IN EXTENT TO PARTICULAR STRATEGIC LOCATIONS. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY SHALL BE]:
a. Locate in a land use designation, center, or corridor in the 2040 Anchorage Land Use Plan that allow R-4A as an implementation zoning district; or an equivalent designation in a neighborhood or district plan, or meet at least one of the
following: [IN AN AREA DESIGNATED IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR RESIDENTIAL CITY CENTER INTENSITY OR REDEVELOPMENT/MIXED-USE, OR SIMILAR DESIGNATION IN A NEIGHBORHOOD OR DISTRICT PLAN; AND]
i. Be adjacent to or within a designated major employment center or major city center, or on a designated transit supportive development corridor or transit route, or
ii. Be located within a quarter mile of the intersection of an arterial street and another street of collector classification or greater.
[B. ADJACENT TO OR WITHIN A DESIGNATED MAJOR EMPLOYMENT CENTER OR MAJOR CITY CENTER, OR ON A DESIGNATED TRANSIT SUPPORTIVE DEVELOPMENT CORRIDOR OR TRANSIT ROUTE WITH 15- MINUTE BUS SERVICE HEADWAYS; AND
C. CONCENTRATED AS A NODE NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF AN ARTERIAL STREET AND ANOTHER STREET OF COLLECTOR CLASSIFICATION OR GREATER, IN A COMPACT FORM LIMITED IN EXTENT TO NO MORE THAN A QUARTER MILE BETWEEN ANY TWO POINTS ON THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY, UNLESS SPECIFICALLY DESIGNATED OTHERWISE IN AN ADOPTED NEIGHBORHOOD OR DISTRICT PLAN.]
P. R-10: Low-Density Residential, Alpine/Slope District
***
2. District-Specific Standards
a. Lot and Site Requirements. Table 21.04-3[2] provides the lot and site requirements for the $\mathrm{R}-10$ district. This table applies in addition to the dimensional standards stated in table 21.061.


| Average Slope of Lot (percent) | Minimum <br> Lot <br> Area (acres) | Minimum Lot Width (feet) | Maximum Lot Coverage of All Buildings (percent) | Coverage Impervious Surfaces (percent) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20.00 or less | 1.25 | 100 | 10 | 20 |
| Average slope $S=\frac{I^{*} L}{A} * 0.002$ <br> Where; <br> S = Average slo <br> I = Contour inte <br> L = Sum of leng <br> A = Area of the | calculated <br> e of lot or tr al (20 feet of all cont or tract in | the following fo <br> t in percent less) urs on lot or tract res | mula: <br> in feet |  |

(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO No. 2015-100, § 1, 10-13-15; AO No. 2017-176, § 3, 1-9-18; AO No. 2019-58, § 2, 5-7-19; AO 2022-36, § 2, 4-26-22)

Section 2. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.05.010E. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.05.010E. Table 21.05-1: Table of Allowed Uses

*** *** ***
(Abridged—omitting zoning district columns except those shown.)

| TABLE 21.05-1: TABLE OF ALLOWED USES - RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND <br> OTHER DISTRICTS <br> P = Permitted $\quad \mathrm{S}=$ Administrative Site Plan Review $\quad \mathrm{C}=$ Conditional Use Review For uses allowed in the A, TA, and TR districts, see section 21.04.050. <br> All other uses not shown are prohibited. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use Category | Use Type | ¢ | ¢ ¢ ஷ̀ | $\stackrel{+}{\text { + }}$ | ¢ | m | O |
| RESIDENTIAL USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Household Living | Dwelling, mixed-use |  | P | P | P | P | P |
|  | Dwelling, multifamily | P | P | P | P | P | P |
|  | Dwelling, single-family attached | P | P | P | P |  |  |
|  | Dwelling, single-family detached | P | P | P | $\underline{P}$ |  |  |
|  | Dwelling, townhouse | S | S | S | $\underline{\bar{P}}$ | S | S |
|  | Dwelling, two-family | P | P | P | $\underline{P}$ |  |  |
|  | Manufactured home community | C |  | C | $\underline{\underline{C}}$ |  |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMMUNITY USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transportation Facility | Airport |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Airstrip, private |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Heliport |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  | Rail yard |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| TABLE 21.05-1: TABLE OF ALLOWED USES - RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND OTHER DISTRICTS$\begin{array}{cc} P=\text { Permitted } & S=\text { Administrative Site Plan Review } \quad C=\text { Conditional Use Review } \\ & \text { For uses allowed in the A, TA, and TR districts, see section 21.04.050. } \\ \text { All other uses not shown are prohibited. } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use Category | Use Type | ¢ | c <br> $\substack{1 \\ \\ \hline}$ | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $¢$ $\ddagger$ $\downarrow$ | ¢ | O |
|  | Railroad freight terminal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Railroad passenger terminal |  |  |  |  | S |  |
|  | Transit center |  |  |  | S | S |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMMERCIAL USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agricultural Uses | Commercial horticulture |  |  |  |  | P |  |
| Animal, Sales, Service, \& Care | Animal boarding |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Animal shelter |  |  |  |  | S |  |
|  | Large domestic animal facility, principal use |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  | Retail and pet services |  |  |  | $\underline{P}$ | P |  |
|  | Veterinary clinic |  | P |  | $\underline{P}$ | P | P |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entertainment and Recreation | Amusement establishment |  |  |  | $\underline{P}$ | P |  |
|  | Entertainment facility, major |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  | Fitness and recreational sports center |  | P | S | P | P | P |
|  | General outdoor recreation, commercial |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Golf course |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Motorized sports facility |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Movie theater |  |  |  |  | M |  |
|  | Night club |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Shooting range, outdoor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Skiing facility, alpine |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theater company or dinner theater |  |  |  | S | P | P |
| Food and Beverage Service | Bar |  |  |  | $\underline{S}$ | P |  |
|  | Food and beverage kiosk |  | P |  | $\underline{P}$ | P |  |
|  | Restaurant |  | P | S | P | P |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail Sales | Auction house |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Building materials store |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Convenience store | C | P | S | P | P |  |
|  | Farmers market |  |  |  | P | P |  |
|  | Fueling station |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Furniture and home appliance store |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | General retail |  | P |  | P | P |  |
|  | Grocery or food store |  | P | S | S | P |  |
|  | Liquor store |  |  |  | $\underline{C}$ | P |  |
|  | Pawnshop |  |  |  |  | P |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitor Accommodations | Camper park | C |  | C |  | P |  |
|  | Extended stay lodging |  | C | C | S | P | S |
|  | Hostel | S | S | S | S | P | S |
|  | Hotel/motel |  | C | C | S | P | M |
|  | Inn |  | S |  | S | P | S |


| TABLE 21.05-1: TABLE OF ALLOWED USES - RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND OTHER DISTRICTS <br> $P=$ Permitted $\quad S=$ Administrative Site Plan Review $\quad C=$ Conditional Use Review For uses allowed in the A, TA, and TR districts, see section 21.04.050. <br> All other uses not shown are prohibited. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use Category | Use Type | $\xrightarrow{\substack{\text { ¢ } \\ \text { ¢ }}}$ | ¢ <br> $\substack{\text { che } \\ \text { ¢ } \\ \\ \hline}$ | $\stackrel{ষ}{\text { ¢ }}$ |  | ¢ | O |
|  | Recreational and vacation camp |  |  |  |  | P |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INDUSTRIAL USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *** *** | *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing and Production | Commercial food production |  |  |  | $\underline{C}$ | C |  |
|  | Cottage crafts |  |  |  | P | P |  |
|  | Manufacturing, general |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Manufacturing, heavy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Manufacturing, light |  |  |  | $\underline{\mathrm{S} /}$ | S/ C |  |
|  | Natural resource, extraction, organic and inorganic | C | C | C | C | C | C |
| *** ***** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO No. 2013-139, § 1, 1-2814; AO No. 2014-58, § 2(Att. A), 5-20-14; AO No. 2015-133(S), § 3(Exh. A), 2-2316; AO No. 2015-142(S-1), § 3(Exh. B), 6-21-16; AO No. 2016-3(S), §§ 6, 7, 2-2316; AO No. 2016-131, § 1, 11-15-16; AO No. 2016-136am, § 2, 11-15-16; AO No. 2016-156, § 1, 12-20-16; AO No. 2017-10, § 1, 1-24-17; AO No. 2017-57, § 1, 4-11-17; AO No. 2017-74, § 1, 5-23-17; AO No. 2017-176, § 4, 1-9-18; AO No. 2017175(S), § 3(Exh. A), 2-13-18; AO No. 2020-38, § 6, 4-28-20; AO No. 2020-56, § 2, 6-23-20; AO No. 2021-54, § 1, 6-22-21)

Section 3. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.06.020, is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.06.020 DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS TABLES *** *** ***

A. Table of Dimensional Standards: Residential Districts.

(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO No. 2015-100, § 2(Exh. A), 10-13-15; AO No. 2016-71, § 1, 6-21-16; AO No. 2017-160, § 3, 12-19-17; AO No. 2017-176, § 6, 1-9-18; AO No. 2018-43(S), § 3(Exh. B), 6-12-18; AO No. 2019-11, § 4, 2-12-19; AO No. 2019-58, § 3, 5-7-19; AO No. 2020-38, § 7, 5-28-20; AO No. 2021-89(S), § 9, 2-15-22; AO No. 2022-36, § 3, 4-26-22)

Section 4. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.06.030, is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):
21.06.030 MEASUREMENTS AND EXCEPTIONS
D. Height
9. Height Transitions for Neighborhood Compatibility
*** *** ***
b. Applicability. This standard shall apply to structures located in any non-residential district (except for the DT districts), the R-3A district, or the R-4 district,[ OR THE R-4A DISTRICT,] that is within 200 feet of any lot designated in the comprehensive plan land use plan map as "large lot residential," "single family—detached," "single family- attached and detached," "compact and mixed housing," and "multifamily."
(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO No. 2015-100, § 3, 10-1315; AO No. 2017-176, § 7, 1-9-18; AO No. 2018-12, § 1, 2-27-18; AO No. 202010(S), § 1, 3-10-20; AO No. 2020-38 , § 7, 5-28-20; AO No. 2021-89(S) , § 10, 2-15-22;AO 2022-36 , § 3, 4-26-22)

Section 5[4].Anchorage Municipal Code 21.07 .110 is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.07.110 RESIDENTIAL DESIGN STANDARDS <br> *** *** *** <br> F. Site Design. <br> 2. Multiple Structures on One Lot. <br> *** *** *** <br> b. Applicability and Review Process.

i. This section applies to the development of three or more principal residential structures on a single lot. It does not apply to the development of an accessory dwelling unit or a caretaker's unit, or to developments $\frac{\text { in the R-4A district. }}{* * *}$.
H. Conditional Use for a Residential Planned Unit Development.
*** *** ***
2. Minimum Standards.
*** *** ***
a. Minimum Site Area

The minimum site area for a PUD shall be 2.0 acres for PUDs located entirely in the R-2M, R-3, [AND] R-4, and R-4A zoning districts. If any portion of a proposed PUD is located within the R-1, R-1A, R-2A, R-2D, R-5, R-7, GR-1, GR-2, GR-2A, GR-3, GR-4, or GR-5 zoning districts, the minimum site area shall be 5.0 acres. If any portion of a proposed PUD is located within the R-6, R-8, or R-9 zoning districts, the minimum site
 $\begin{array}{cc} & \text { TABLE 21.07-12 } \\ \text { Zoning District } & \text { Dwelling Units per Acre (gross }\end{array}$

| $\mathrm{R}-1$ and $\mathrm{R}-5$ | 8 |
| :---: | :---: |
| R-1A |  |

### 21.07.120 LARGE ESTABLISHMENTS

A. Large Commercial Establishments.
*** *** ***

1. Applicability.

The standards of this section 21.07 .120 shall apply to any use in the Retail Sales; Animal Sales, Service, and Care; Food and Beverage Services; Entertainment and Recreation use categories; the Vehicle Parts and Supplies, Vehicle-Large Sales and Rental, Vehicle-Small Sales and Rental; and Marijuana Retail Sales Establishment use types, or any combination thereof, occupying more than 20,000 gross square feet of floor area, provided the following limitations:
a. The standards of this section shall apply only to buildings, and the non-residential portions of mixed-use buildings, which are intended principally for the uses listed above[, SUCH AS A GENERAL MERCHANDISE RETAIL STORE, GROCERY STORE, OR MULTI-TENANT RETAIL BUILDING].
b. This section shall not apply to distinct floors and/or sections of buildings designed specifically for residential, office, or other uses not listed in subsection 21.07.120A.1. above.
(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO No. 2017-121 , § 1, 9-2617; AO No. 2021-89(S) , § 21, 2-15-22)

Section 7[6].Anchorage Municipal Code 21.08 .070 is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):
21.08.070 ALTERNATIVE RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISIONS
C. Cluster Housing.
3. $\underset{* * *}{\text { Maximum }} \underset{* * *}{\text { Density }}$ and Minimum Site Area.

TABLE 21.08-10: MAXIMUM DENSITY FOR CLUSTER HOUSING SUBDIVISIONS

| Zoning District | Dwelling Units <br> Per Acre | Minimum Site <br> Area (acres) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R-1 | 5.0 | 2.5 |
| R-1A | 5.0 | 2.5 |
| R-2A | 10.0 | 1.5 |
| R-2D | 16.0 | 1.5 |
| R-2M | 19.0 | 1.5 |
| R-3 | 20.0 | 1.0 |
| R-4 | 24.0 | 1.0 |
| R-4A | $\underline{35.0}$ | $\underline{1.0}$ |


| R-5 | 5.0 | 2.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R-6 | 0.8 | 5.0 |
| R-7 | 2.0 | 5.0 |
| R-8 | 0.2 | 10.0 |
| R-9 | 0.4 | 5.0 |
| R-10 | See 21.04.0200.2. | 10.0 |
| TA | As provided in the Turnagain Arm Comprehensive Plan | 5.0 |
| GR districts | As determined by the Platting Board | 5.0 |

D. Narrow Lot Housing.
*** *** ***
2. Applicability. Narrow lot housing is permitted in the R-2A, R-2D, R$2 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{R}-3, \mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{R}-5$, and RO districts. The various applicable standards of Title 21 apply, unless specifically addressed and replaced below. 17; AO No. 2020-38 , § 9, 5-28-20; AO No. 2020-93 , § 3, 10-1-20; AO No. 202189(S), § 15, 2-15-22)
Section $8[7]$.This ordinance shall be effective immediately upon passage and approval by the Assembly.
PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Assembly this 22nd day of August, 2023.

ATTEST:
Chair
Municipal Clerk
(Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2021-0127)

MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE
ASSEMBLY MEMORANDUM

No. AM 238-2023

Meeting Date: April 11, 2023


#### Abstract

FROM: MAYOR SUBJECT: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE R-4A DISTRICT IN ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 21, SECTIONS 21.04.020, RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS; 21.05.010, TABLE OF ALLOWED USES; 21.06.020, DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS TABLES, 21.060.030, MEASUREMENTS AND EXCEPTIONS; 21.07.110, RESIDENTIAL DESIGN STANDARDS; 21.07.120, LARGE ESTABLISHMENTS; AND 21.08.70, ALTERNATIVE RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISIONS.


## INTRODUCTION AND PZC RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) first heard PZC Case No. 2021-0127 at its February 7, 2022, regular meeting, and the Commission directed staff to gather additional information before making additional changes and returning to the body. At the October 3, 2022 work session and subsequent regular meeting, the Planning, and Zoning Commission heard an overview of the case, discussed its merits, continued the public hearing, and ultimately voted to forward it to the Assembly for approval. The PZC recommendation is attached as PZC Resolution No. 2022-034 (Exhibit A).

## OVERVIEW

While the R-4A district already exists in current Title 21 land use regulations, its development standards need to be updated and simplified in accordance with Action 3-1 from the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan. The proposed updates are intended to create a more pedestrian-oriented environment, allow more commercial space within mixed-use developments, simplify phasing requirements, and make the zoning district's requirements easier to follow. No changes to the zoning map are proposed.

## SUMMARY OF UPDATES TO TITLE 21

This ordinance introduces a variety of changes to the existing R-4A zoning district. It does not rezone any land to this designation. Changes include but are not limited to:

- Simplified frontage standards.
- Simplified height standards.
- Reduction of minimum lot size requirements.
- Increase in the number of uses permitted in this zone.


## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SUMMARY

Between January 10, 2022, PZC work session and August 1, 2022, staff delivered presentations and held meetings with the following community councils, groups, and property owners.

- 1/10/2022: Planning \& Zoning Commission Work Session.
- 2/7/2022: Planning \& Zoning Commission Regular Meeting.
- 2/10/2022: Targeted email to all community councils with any land eligible for rezoning to R-4A: Airport Heights, Downtown, Fairview, Midtown, North Star, Rogers Park, South Addition, Spenard, and University Area.

| Council | Presentation Date |
| :--- | :--- |
| Fairview CC | $2 / 22 / 2022$ |
| South Addition CC | $2 / 24 / 2022$ |
| Downtown CC | $3 / 2 / 2022$ |
| Spenard CC | $3 / 2 / 2022,3 / 21 / 2022,8 / 1 / 2022$ |
| University Area CC | $3 / 2 / 2022$ |
| Midtown CC | $3 / 9 / 2022$ |
| North Star CC | $3 / 9 / 2022$ |
| Airport Heights CC | $3 / 17 / 2022$ |
| Rogers Park CC | No response |

- $3 / 13 / 2022$ : Presentation to the Public Transit Advisory Board (PTAB).
- 6/28/2022: Meeting with Chair of Spenard Corridor Plan Committee and developer J. Jay Brooks.
- Fielding calls and emails about the project as necessary.


## RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff requests Assembly approval of the ordinance as recommended on September 19, 2022, PZC staff packet (Exhibit B) and adopted in PZC Resolution No. 2022-034 (Exhibit A). The draft minutes for the February 7 and October 3, 2022, PZC regular meetings are attached as Exhibit C.

## THE ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDS APPROVAL.

Prepared by: Daniel Mckenna-Foster, Planning Department
Approved by: Craig H. Lyon, Planning Director
Concur: Lance Wilber, OECD Director
Concur: Courtney Petersen, OMB Director
Concur: Anne Helzer, Acting Municipal Attorney
Concur: Grant Yutrzenka, CFO
Concur: Kent Kohlhase, Acting Municipal Manager
Respectfully submitted: Dave Bronson, Mayor
Attachments: Exhibit A— Planning and Zoning Commission Resolution 2022-034
Exhibit B— Planning and Zoning Commission Staff Packet
Exhibit C—Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
(Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2021-0127)

## MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE <br> Summary of Economic Effects -- General Government

Title: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE R-4A DISTRICT IN ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 21, SECTIONS 21.04.020, RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS; 21.05.010, TABLE OF ALLOWED USES; 21.06.020, DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS TABLES, 21.060.030, MEASUREMENTS AND EXCEPTIONS; 21.07.110, RESIDENTIAL DESIGN STANDARDS; 21.07.120, LARGE ESTABLISHMENTS; AND 21.08.70, ALTERNATIVE RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISIONS.

| Sponsor: <br> Preparing Agency: <br> Others Impacted: <br> Planning Department |
| :--- |
|  <br> CHANGES IN EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES: |

No direct impacts anticipated.

## PRIVATE SECTOR ECONOMIC EFFECTS:

No direct impacts anticipated.

## MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 2022-034

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 21, MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS IN THE R-4A ZONING DISTRICT.
(Case No. 2021-0127)
WHEREAS, Action 3-1 of the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the amendment of Title 21 to simplify zoning regulations for mixed-use projects relative to commercial or other projects; and

WHEREAS, Policy 2.3 of the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the removal of barriers to desired infill development and for the incorporation of flexibility in development requirements; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission first opened the public hearing for this case at its February 7, 2022, regular meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission directed staff to gather more information and conduct more outreach around the proposal; and

WHEREAS, staff conducted additional research, refined the amendment, clarified additional questions, and returned the proposal to the Planning and Zoning Commission at its October 3, 2022 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission concluded its deliberations and finalized its recommendation to the Anchorage Assembly on October 3, 2022.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Municipal Planning and Zoning Commission that:
A. The Commission makes the following findings of fact:

1. Action 3-1 of the 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the simplification of zoning regulations to encourage new mixed- use commercial and residential projects.
2. Policy 2.3 of the 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the removal of barriers to desired infill development and for the incorporation of flexibility in development requirements.
3. The intent of the R-4A zoning district is intended to implement the land use plan, meet housing needs for the community, establish a pedestrian-oriented environment that help support transit, and provide the flexibility to integrate residential and nonresidential uses, and encourage reinvestment and revitalization within areas in transition.
4. There is very little land in the Municipality currently zoned with this designation.
5. The Planning Department researched ways to improve the R-4A district through a public engagement process initiated in 2019 and continued through 2021 with developers, community groups, and community councils.
6. The Planning Department brought an amendment to the Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing on February 7, 2022, and since then has received and incorporated more feedback from developers, community members, and internal staff.
7. Based on feedback received, the amendment changes $R-4 A$ dimensional standards to revise height allowances, eliminate specific lot sizes, and add additional residential housing types as allowable uses.
8. The amendment removes Floor-Area-Ratio bonuses from R-4A and places them solely in the R-4 section where they are applicable.
9. The amendment simplifies frontage standards and increases allowed commercial floor area while preserving a majority of the property for residential use.
10. The amendment removes unique standards and duplication by referring any required design standards to existing design and compatibility standards in 21.07.
11. The amendment adds additional commercial, light manufacturing, and production uses to the R-4A zone by right.
12. $\mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$ is intended to provide an attractive development alternative to the B-3 zoning district that allows commercial uses while also maintaining a minimum requirement for residential density.
13. The Planning Department has produced a proposal to simplify standards, allow more types of housing, and streamline processes for a mixed-use zoning district consistent with the goals and policies of the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan.
14. There was no public testimony for or against this item at the October 3, 2022 Regular meeting.
B. The Commission recommends to the Anchorage Assembly approval of the ordinance amending Title 21, Mixed-Use Development Standards in the R-4A zoning district.
PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Planning and Zoning Commission on the 3rd day of October 2022.

ADOPTED by the Anchorage Planning and Zoning Commission this 7th day of November 2022.


Craig H. Lyon
Secretary

(Case No. 2021-0127)
dmf

Municipality of Anchorage
Planning Department
Memorandum

Date: October 3, 2022
To:
Thru:


Thru: Kristine Bunnell, Long-Range Planning Manager
From Daniel Mckenna-Foster, Senior Planner, Long-Range Planning Division
Subject: PZC Case No. 2021-0127, R-4A District

## PROJECT NEED AND PURPOSE

While the R-4A district already exists in current Title 21 land use regulations, its development standards need to be updated and simplified in accordance with Action 3-1 from the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan. The proposed updates are intended to create a more pedestrian-oriented environment, allow more commercial space within mixed-use developments, simplify phasing requirements, and make the zoning district's requirements easier to follow. No changes to the zoning map are proposed.

Staff presented an amendment to update this zone to the Planning \& Zoning Commission (PZC) at its January 10, 2022 work session and February 7, 2022 regular meeting. At the conclusion of the discussion at the February 7, 2022 meeting, the PZC moved and voted to "postpone to a time determined by staff and reopen the public hearing in order to renotice the public." Staff is now returning to the PZC with an updated amendment for the district.

## PUBLIC OUTREACH

Between the January 10, 2022 PZC work session and August 1, 2022, staff delivered presentations and held meetings with the following community councils, groups, and property owners.

- 1/10/2022: Planning \& Zoning Commission Work Session
- 2/7/2022: Planning \& Zoning Commission Regular Meeting
- 2/10/2022: Targeted email to all community councils with any land eligible for rezoning to R-4A: Airport Heights, Downtown, Fairview, Midtown, North Star, Rogers Park, South Addition, Spenard, and University Area.

| Council | Presentation Date |
| :--- | :--- |
| Fairview CC | $2 / 22 / 2022$ |
| South Addition CC | $2 / 24 / 2022$ |
| Downtown CC | $3 / 2 / 2022$ |
| Spenard CC | $3 / 2 / 2022,3 / 21 / 2022$, |
|  | $8 / 1 / 2022$ |
| University Area CC | $3 / 2 / 2022$ |
| Midtown CC | $3 / 9 / 2022$ |
| North Star CC | $3 / 9 / 2022$ |
| Airport Heights CC | $3 / 17 / 2022$ |
| Rogers Park CC | Did not schedule a <br> meeting |

- 3/13/2022: Presentation to the Public Transit Advisory Board (PTAB).
- 6/28/2022: Meeting with Chair of Spenard Corridor Plan Committee and developer J. Jay Brooks.
- Fielding calls and emails about the project as necessary.

Staff also held multiple internal meetings with the Current Planning Division to discuss aspects of and changes to the amendment.

## COMMENT RESPONSE

Most comment during this period came from questions raised during community council meetings or internal meetings with Current Planning or other divisions. Staff spoke with the Spenard Community Council multiple times as Spenard is one of the few areas with land already zoned $R-4 A$. It is possible that the relatively low interest in $R-4 A$ stems from the fact that this is a newer zone, and there is very little land with this zoning district designation located anywhere in the Municipality.

## SCOPE OF PROPOSED CODE CHANGES

The original proposed changes to existing code focused on the following:

| Item | Details | Rationale |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Update and simplify mixed- <br> use design standards: | The amendment allows for both horizontal <br> mixed use (multiple buildings with different <br> uses) and vertical mixed use (multiple uses <br> within the same building). | This adds flexibility to <br> the development <br> process. |
| Revise height allowances: | Height limit reduced to 60 feet, but can go <br> up to 90 under an administrative site plan <br> review. | Address public <br> concerns, but allow <br> flexibility. |
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| Item | Details | Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Simplify frontage standards: | Simplify the percentage of a façade that be windows. | Frontage requirements add cost but do not always produce a tangible result. |
| Change access standards: | Require townhomes to be accessed by alleys or internal streets. | This results in fewer curb cuts along street frontages. |
| Provide increased allowances for commercial floor area: | Up to $49 \%$ of the site may be commercial uses without a higher review. | This allows more flexibility for financing and development of mixed-use sites. |
| Add certain Commercial, Manufacturing, \& Production Uses by-right or via review procedures: | - Theater company or dinner theater <br> - Retail pet services and Veterinarians <br> - Bar <br> - Commercial food production <br> - Farmers market <br> - Cottage Crafts <br> - Liquor store <br> - Manufacturing, light use | This allows more uses that might be conducive to a mixeduse setting. |

Since the February PZC meeting, staff has continued research and discussions with the community and added the additional changes to the proposed amendment, including:

| Item | Details | Rationale |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Remove bonuses from R-4A |  |  |
| and place them solely in R-4: | The R-4A amendment allows <br> a Floor-Area-Ratio (FAR) of <br> up to 4.0. The R-4 zone <br> allows a FAR of 1.0 or 1.5 <br> but with bonuses allows up <br> to 2.0. | It is not clear that the existing bonus <br> provisions have ever been used to <br> obtain higher FAR allowances. The <br> amendment seeks to allow a set <br> amount of FAR without special <br> considerations. |
| Dimensional Standards: | Eliminate minimum lot sizes <br> specific to this zone. | This allows for smaller lots by-right, <br> but does not supersede the existing <br> lot size limitations in chapter 8 <br> (subdivisions) of Title 21. |
| Add Residential Uses: | Add Dwelling, single family <br> attached and Dwelling, <br> single family detached. | The R-4A purpose statement calls for <br> residential densities of 35 dwelling <br> units or more, but only requires <br> residential densities of 20 dwelling <br> units or more. This amendment seeks <br> to allow for more housing types to <br> meet either the required or proposed <br> density. Information gathered since |
| February 2022 suggests that there |  |  |
| may be a market for detached units on |  |  |
| smaller lots. |  |  |
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| Item | Details | Rationale |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | - Eliminate previously <br> proposed stepback <br> standards. | Stepback standards already exist in <br> 21.06 .030 D. |
|  | - Façade standards are no <br> longer specifically called <br> out in this zone, but left to <br> existing façade standards <br> in Chapter 7 for <br> commercial buildings and <br> multifamily. | If functional façade/design standards <br> already exist to apply to types of land <br> uses in all zones (such as 21.07.110), it <br> would be redundant to add specific <br> standards in different zones. |
| Design/frontage Standards: | - New parking facilities are <br> not allowed between <br> buildings and the nearest <br> public street. | Parking between buildings and the <br> street is a significant deterrent to <br> pedestrian activity. |
| - Eliminated alley access |  |  |
| requirement for |  |  |
| townhouses. |  |  |$\quad$| Street access for single residential |
| :--- |
| units can be addressed through other |
| standards requiring alley access such |
| as 21.07.110F.4, Alleys. |

The full extent of the proposed changes is in the draft Assembly Ordinance in Attachment 1a, with a version without deletions provided in Attachment 1b. The version presented at the February 7, 2022 PZC meeting is provided as Attachment 2, and minutes from that meeting are included as Attachment 3. A comparison of changes between these two versions is in Attachment 4. Comments and responses are in Attachments 5 and 6.

## ATTACHMENTS:

```
Attachment 1a: Draft Assembly Ordinance (Code Amendment)
Attachment 1b: Draft Assembly Ordinance Without Deletions Shown (Code Amendment)
Attachment 2: Previous Draft Assembly Ordinance from 2/7/2022 PZC Meeting
(Code Amendment)
Attachment 3: Minutes from the February 7, 2022 PZC Meeting
Attachment 4: Comparison Table of Changes Between Versions
Attachment 5: Comment Response Table
Attachment 6: Comments Received
```


# Attachment 1a 

## Draft Assembly Ordinance (Code Amendment) Case 2021-0127

This page intentionally left blank.

## ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

 AO No. 2022-AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 21 SECTIONS 21.04.020I., 21.04.020J., 21.05.010E., [21.05.060B.5.,] 21.06.020, 21.06.030C.5., 21.07.110., 21.07.120A., AND 21.08.70.<br>(Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2021-0127)

WHEREAS, Action 3-1 of the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the amendment of Title 21 to simplify zoning regulations for mixed-use projects relative to commercial or other projects; and

WHEREAS, Policy 2.3 of the 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the removal of barriers to desired infill development and for the incorporation of flexibility in development requirements; and

WHEREAS, very few properties have been rezoned to R-4A across the municipality, suggesting it is less attractive for development than other zoning designations; and

WHEREAS, the proposed updates to the existing R-4A are intended to create a more pedestrian-oriented environment, allow more commercial space within mixed-use developments, simplify phasing requirements, and make the zoning district's requirements easier to follow; and

WHEREAS, a more flexible R-4A zoning district will help the Municipality provide the framework for additional housing in areas designated for that use by the 2040 Land Use Plan; now, therefore,

## THE ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY ORDAINS:

Section 1. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.04 .020 is hereby amended to read as follows: (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.04.020I. R-4: Multifamily Residential District.

*** *** ***
2. District Specific Standards
*** *** ***
c. Floor Area ratio

The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) in the R-4 district is 1.0, but may be increased through the bonus provisions [IN

SUBSECTION 21.04.020I.2.D.] below. These incentives provide for an incremental increase in the floor area of a development in exchange for incremental increases in any of the following special features deemed of benefit to the community.
i. Bonus for Open Space One square foot of additional floor area is allowed per square foot of additional open space area. This space shall meet the standards of 21.07.030D. and be in addition to any open space required by section 21.07.030. The floor area bonus increases to two square feet for open space that meets the standards for high quality spaces in 21.07.030D.6.
ii. Bonus for Below Grade Parking

Two square feet of additional floor area is allowed per gross square foot of covered below grade parking floor area, up to a maximum increase of 1.0 FAR. The floor area bonus increases to four square feet on the second parking level below grade.
iii. Bonus for Affordable Rental Housing

Four square feet of additional gross floor area is allowed per square foot of affordable rental housing unit floor area, up to a maximum increase of 1.0 FAR. The affordable housing units shall be consistent with the standards of 21.07.110H., Affordable Housing.
iv. Bonus for Enhanced Sidewalk/Walkway Widening Two square feet of additional floor area is allowed per square foot of area provided as part of a primary pedestrian walkway or enhanced sidewalk that meets the requirements of subsections 21.07.060F.4. or 21.07.060F.17.
v. Bonus for Upper Level Setbacks/Step Backs for Sunlight Access
A floor area bonus is allowed equal to one-third of the sum of step back areas on each upper floor where the step back is at least 16 feet from the face of the building at the floor immediately below, such that the floor's existence does not increase the amount of shadowing on surrounding residences, private open spaces, sidewalks, schools, or parks on March/September 21, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. solar time.
vi. Bonus for Ambient Daylight for Residences

A floor area bonus equal to 10 percent of the lot area (0.10 FAR) but not to exceed 4,000 square feet is
allowed for preservation of daylight for all dwellings in the development and facing the development, using the standards of 21.07.110C.8.h.
vii. Bonus for Pedestrian-Interactive Use

Three square feet of additional floor area is allowed per each square foot of ground-floor space which is to be occupied by a pedestrian-interactive use that meets the standards of 21.07.060F.16.
viii. Bonus for Wrapped Parking

One square foot of additional floor area is allowed per each square foot of habitable floor area around a wrapped parking structure that conforms to subsection 21.06.030E.2.g., up to a maximum increase of 0.5 FAR.

Section 2. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.04.020J. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

## CHAPTER 21.04.020J. R-4A: Multifamily Residential Mixed-Use District

## 1. Purpose.

The R-4A district is a primarily residential district intended for highdensity [MULTIFAMILY DWELLINGS], residential and mixed-use development with a minimum gross density of 20 dwelling units per acre and intended gross densities intended to be greater than 35 dwelling units per acre. [COMMERCIAL RETAIL, SERVICES, AND OFFICE USES ARE ALSO ALLOWED IN COMBINATION WITH HOUSING TO CREATE A TRULY MIXED-USE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT, ALTHOUGH A MAJORITY OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE A
RESIDENTIAL USE. THIS DISTRICT IS TO BE APPLIED IN AREAS NEAR DOWNTOWN AND MIDTOWN, IN ORDER TO PROVIDE HOUSING DENSITIES WHICH SUPPORT THESE CITY CENTERS, EFFICIENT USE OF RESIDENTIAL LAND, AND RESIDENTIAL LIVING OPPORTUNITIES NEAR EMPLOYMENT AND SERVICES. BY PROVIDING THE FLEXIBILITY FOR INTEGRATED MIXED-USE SITE DEVELOPMENT, THE R-4A DISTRICT FACILITATES REINVESTMENT AND REVITALIZATION WITHIN AREAS IN TRANSITION. NEW MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT SHOULD FACILITATE STRONG PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE CONNECTIONS WITH NEARBY NEIGHBORHOODS AND CITY CENTERS.] This district is intended to implement the land use plan, meet housing needs for the community, establish a pedestrian-oriented environment that helps support transit, and provide the flexibility to integrate
residential and non-residential uses.

## 2. District-Specific Standards.

a. Dwelling Units Required [MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS] [MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT IN THE R-4A DISTRICT SHALL COMPLY WITH THE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS IN SUBSECTION 21.04.030G.6. AND G.7. REGARDING ENHANCED SIDEWALK OPTION AND BUILDING PLACEMENT AND ORIENTATION.]
i. Unless limited by physical constraints or determined otherwise through a Small Area Implementation Plan (SAIP), development in the R-4A district shall include at least 20 dwelling units per gross acre per phase, or on average of subsequent phases.
ii. The overall development site shall include at least 20 dwelling units per gross acre at the completion of all phases unless provided otherwise through a major site plan review, conditional use process, or Small Area Implementation Plan.
[B. MAINTAINING RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE PRIMARILY RESIDENTIAL. THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS AND EXCEPTIONS APPLY:
I. NON-RESIDENTIAL USES ALLOWED IN THE R-4A DISTRICT SHALL BE MIXED WITH RESIDENTIAL ACCORDING TO THE PROVISIONS THAT FOLLOW. (THE USES "PARK, PUBLIC OR PRIVATE," "COMMUNITY GARDEN," "UTILITY SUBSTATION," TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWERS, "PARKING LOT, PRINCIPAL USE," AND "PARKING STRUCTURE, PRINCIPAL USE" ARE EXEMPT FROM THE MIXED-USE REQUIREMENT.) (A) IF RESIDENTIAL USES OCCUPY AT LEAST 90 PERCENT OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA DEPICTED ON A SITE PLAN, NO REVIEW BEYOND THAT REQUIRED BY TABLE 21.051 IS REQUIRED.
(B) A MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW IS REQUIRED FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL USES PROPOSED TO OCCUPY GREATER THAN 10 AND LESS

THAN OR EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE
DEVELOPMENT AS DEPICTED ON A SITE PLAN.
(C) A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT IS REQUIRED FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL USES PROPOSED TO OCCUPY GREATER THAN 20 AND LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO 49 PERCENT OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE DEVELOPMENT AS DEPICTED ON A SITE PLAN.
(D) MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEWS OR CONDITIONAL USE REVIEWS UNDER B.I.(B). AND B.I.(C). SHALL MEET THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA. THIS SHALL BE IN ADDITION TO THE GENERAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL CRITERIA (21.03.180F.) AND CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL CRITERIA (21.03.080D.).
(1) THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL RESULT IN A NET INCREASE IN DWELLING UNITS OVER PRE-DEVELOPMENT DENSITY, OR SHALL BE AT LEAST 20 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE, WHICHEVER IS GREATER. THE TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA OF HOUSEHOLD LIVING USES SHALL BE EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN ANY PRIOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.
(2) STIPULATIONS MAY BE IMPOSED RELATING TO BUILDING DESIGN, TRAFFIC, PRIVACY, FLOOR AREA RESTRICTIONS, RESTRICTIONS AGAINST COMMERCIAL ABOVE THE GROUND FLOOR, AND OTHER CONDITIONS NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN A RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER AND COMPATIBILITY WITH ADJACENT RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS.
II. THE NON-RESIDENTIAL PORTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL NOT BE GIVEN A

CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE OR A CONDITIONAL CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE UNTIL ALL OF THE RESIDENTIAL PORTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT IS GIVEN A CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE.
III. GROUND FLOOR BUILDING FACADES FACING AND WITHIN 100 FEET OF PUBLIC STREETS, PRIMARY CIRCULATION DRIVES, OR PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS SHALL MEET THE FOLLOWING WINDOW STANDARDS ON THOSE FACADES:
(A) NON-RESIDENTIAL USES: AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF THE LENGTH AND 25 PERCENT OF THE AREA OF GROUNDLEVEL WALLS SHALL BE WINDOWS PROVIDING VISUAL ACCESS TO THE INTERIOR OF THE BUILDING.
(B) RESIDENTIAL USES: AT LEAST 25 PERCENT OF THE LENGTH AND 12 PERCENT OF THE AREA OF GROUND-LEVEL WALLS SHALL BE WINDOWS.
(C) ALL USES: BLANK WALLS SHALL NOT EXCEED 30 FEET IN LENGTH.
IV. ALL COMMERCIAL USES SHALL BE CONDUCTED ENTIRELY WITHIN A COMPLETELY ENCLOSED BUILDING EXCEPT FOR PARKING AND LOADING FACILITIES AND OUTDOOR RESTAURANT SEATING. OUTDOOR STORAGE OF GOODS ACCESSORY TO A COMMERCIAL USE IS PROHIBITED.]
b. Allowed Commercial Uses

A maximum percentage of gross floor area per table 21.04-2 on the development site may be non-residential uses, as provided in i. through ii. below.
i. Non-residential uses may be located in the same building(s) as the residential units or in one or more separate buildings on the development site.
ii. The development site may comprise multiple adjoining and/or adjacent lots. A master fill and grade permit for the entire development is required to ensure the site meets all applicable provisions of this title.
[C. FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR) INCENTIVES FOR THE R-4 AND R-4A DISTRICTS

> THE MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR) WITHIN THE R-4 AND R-4A DISTRICTS IS 1.5 AND 2.0 FAR RESPECTIVELY, BUT MAY BE INCREASED UP TO A MAXIMUM TOTAL FAR OF 2.0 IN THE R-4 DISTRICT AND $3.0 ~ I N ~ T H E ~ R-4 A ~ D I S T R I C T ~ T H R O U G H ~ T H E ~ F O L L O W I N G ~$ BONUS PROVISIONS, SUBJECT TO SECTION 21.06.030E. THESE INCENTIVES PROVIDE FOR AN INCREMENTAL INCREASE IN THE FLOOR AREA OF A DEVELOPMENT IN EXCHANGE FOR INCREMENTAL INCREASES IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING SPECIAL FEATURES DEEMED OF BENEFIT TO THE COMMUNITY. INCREASES IN THE FAR MAY BE ACHIEVED THROUGH THE USE OF ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING:
I. BONUS FOR OPEN SPACE

ONE SQUARE FOOT OF ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA IS ALLOWED PER SQUARE FOOT OF ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE AREA. THIS SPACE SHALL MEET THE STANDARDS OF 21.07.030D. AND BE IN ADDITION TO ANY OPEN SPACE REQUIRED BY SECTION 21.07.030. THE FLOOR AREA BONUS INCREASES TO TWO SQUARE FEET FOR OPEN SPACE THAT MEETS THE STANDARDS FOR HIGH QUALITY SPACES IN 21.07.030D.6.
II. BONUS FOR BELOW GRADE PARKING TWO SQUARE FEET OF ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA IS ALLOWED PER GROSS SQUARE FOOT OF COVERED BELOW GRADE PARKING FLOOR AREA, UP TO A MAXIMUM INCREASE OF 1.0 FAR. THE FLOOR AREA BONUS INCREASES TO FOUR SQUARE FEET ON THE SECOND PARKING LEVEL BELOW GRADE.
III. BONUS FOR AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING FOUR SQUARE FEET OF ADDITIONAL GROSS FLOOR AREA IS ALLOWED PER SQUARE FOOT OF AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING UNIT FLOOR

AREA, UP TO A MAXIMUM INCREASE OF 1.0 FAR. THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STANDARDS OF 21.07.110H., AFFORDABLE HOUSING.
IV. BONUS FOR ENHANCED SIDEWALK/WALKWAY WIDENING
TWO SQUARE FEET OF ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA IS ALLOWED PER SQUARE FOOT OF AREA PROVIDED AS PART OF A PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY OR ENHANCED SIDEWALK THAT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF SUBSECTIONS 21.07.060F.4. OR 21.07.060F.17.
V. BONUS FOR UPPER LEVEL SETBACKS/STEP BACKS FOR SUNLIGHT ACCESS
A FLOOR AREA BONUS IS ALLOWED EQUAL TO ONE-THIRD OF THE SUM OF STEP BACK AREAS ON EACH UPPER FLOOR WHERE THE STEP BACK IS AT LEAST 16 FEET FROM THE FACE OF THE BUILDING AT THE FLOOR IMMEDIATELY BELOW, SUCH THAT THE FLOOR'S EXISTENCE DOES NOT INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF SHADOWING ON SURROUNDING RESIDENCES, PRIVATE OPEN SPACES, SIDEWALKS, SCHOOLS, OR PARKS ON MARCH/SEPTEMBER 21, FROM 9:00 A.M. TO 3:00 P.M. SOLAR TIME.
VI. BONUS FOR AMBIENT DAYLIGHT FOR RESIDENCES A FLOOR AREA BONUS EQUAL TO 10 PERCENT OF THE LOT AREA (0.10 FAR) BUT NOT TO EXCEED 4,000 SQUARE FEET IS ALLOWED FOR PRESERVATION OF DAYLIGHT FOR ALL DWELLINGS IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND FACING THE DEVELOPMENT, USING THESTANDARDS OF 21.07.110C.8.H.
VII. BONUS FOR PEDESTRIAN-INTERACTIVE USE THREE SQUARE FEET OF ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA IS ALLOWED PER EACH SQUARE FOOT OF GROUND-FLOOR SPACE WHICH IS TO BE OCCUPIED BY A PEDESTRIAN-INTERACTIVE USE THAT MEETS THE STANDARDS OF 21.07.060F.16.
VIII. BONUS FOR WRAPPED PARKING

ONE SQUARE FOOT OF ADDITIONAL FLOOR AREA IS ALLOWED PER EACH SQUARE FOOT OF HABITABLE FLOOR AREA AROUND A WRAPPED

PARKING STRUCTURE THAT CONFORMS TOSUBSECTION 21.06.030E.2.G., UP TO A MAXIMUM INCREASE OF 0.5 FAR.]
c. Uses which are not counted towards any GFA calculation:
i. Any community uses allowed by the zoning district;
ii. "park, public or private";
iii. "community garden";
iv. "utility substation";
v. "parking lot, principal use"; and
vi. "parking structure, principal use".

Table 21.04-2: Maximum Percentage of Site GFA for Non-residential Uses

| Maximum |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Up to 49\% | Allowance |
| $\frac{\text { Allowed by right when the development complies with the district-specific }}{\text { standards of this section 21.04.020J.2. }}$ |  |

[D. REDUCED PARKING RATIOS
DEVELOPMENT IN THE R-4A DISTRICT SHALL BE ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES, AS PROVIDED IN 21.07.090F.6.]
d. Timing of Mixed-Use Developments

Except by decision of the Director or through a Small Area Implementation Plan, prior to the issuance of any CO or CCO any development must:
i. Meet the minimum housing unit requirement of 21.04.020J.2.a; and
ii. Meet the maximum allowed proportionate share of nonresidential use in table 21.04-2. at all phases of construction.
[E. BUILDING HEIGHT INCREASE
BUILDINGS IN THE R-4A DISTRICT MAY EXCEED THE
MAXIMUM HEIGHT ESTABLISHED IN TABLE 21.06-1, UP

TO A MAXIMUM TOTAL HEIGHT OF 90 FEET, SUBJECT TO ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS. THESE CONDITIONS ENCOURAGE SLENDER TOWERS WITH CONDENSED FLOOR PLATES, LIGHT AND AIR AT THE PEDESTRIAN LEVEL, AND ACTIVE USES ON THE GROUND FLOOR FACING THE STREET:
I. THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL PARTICIPATE IN THE FAR INCENTIVES PROVIDED FOR THE R-4A DISTRICT IN SUBSECTION 21.04.020I.2.C. ABOVE;
II. THE GROUND FLOOR OF THE BUILDING SHALL BE RESIDENTIAL OR OTHER PERMITTED NONPARKING USE FOR AT LEAST 25 FEET OF DEPTH FACING THE STREET FOR THE FULL LENGTH OF THE BUILDING, EXCEPT FOR VEHICLE ENTRANCES AND EXITS. WHERE THE SITE HAS TWO OR MORE FRONTAGES, THE STANDARD SHALL BE MET ON TWO FRONTAGES;
III. ALL FLOOR AREA PROVIDED BY THE HEIGHT INCREASE SHALL BE FOR RESIDENTIAL USES;
IV. THE HEIGHT INCREASE SHALL ADHERE TO THE HEIGHT TRANSITIONS OF SUBSECTION 21.06.030D.8.;
V. THE HEIGHT INCREASE SHALL ADHERE TO THE APPLICABLE DESIGN STANDARDS FOR TALL BUILDINGS IN SUBSECTION 21.07.120C.; AND
VI. UNLESS A MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW OR A CONDITIONAL USE IS REQUIRED BY OTHER PARTS OF THIS SECTION, ALL DEVELOPMENTS REQUESTING THE HEIGHT INCREASE SHALL BE SUBJECT TO ADMINISTRATIVE SITE PLAN REVIEW]
e. Street Frontage Requirements
i. New parking facilities shall not be located between buildings and the nearest public street (supersedes 21.07.110.C.6.e-f). On lots with two or more street frontages, this limitation shall apply only on the primary front setback. When the site abuts a street designated in the comprehensive plan as a "main street", a "transit street", a "mixed-use street", or a derivation of these street typologies, this limitation may be changed to such street with the concurrence of the director.
ii. Existing requirements for multifamily development outlined in 21.07.110
f. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) [INCENTIVES FOR THE R-4 AND R-4A DISTRICTS]

The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) in the R-4A district is 4.0,
g. Building Height Increase

Buildings in the R-4A district may reach a height of 60 feet, and up to 90 feet if they undergo an Administrative Site Plan Review as outlined in 21.03.180C.

## 3. District Location Requirement

[IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THIS DISTRICT BE LIMITED IN EXTENT TO PARTICULAR STRATEGIC LOCATIONS. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY SHALL BE:]
[A. IN AN AREA DESIGNATED IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR RESIDENTIAL CITY CENTER INTENSITY OR REDEVELOPMENT/MIXED-USE, OR SIMILAR DESIGNATION IN A NEIGHBORHOOD OR DISTRICT PLAN; AND
B. ADJACENT TO OR WITHIN A DESIGNATED MAJOR EMPLOYMENT CENTER OR MAJOR CITY CENTER, OR ON A DESIGNATED TRANSIT SUPPORTIVE DEVELOPMENT CORRIDOR OR TRANSIT ROUTE WITH 15- MINUTE BUS SERVICE HEADWAYS; AND
C. CONCENTRATED AS A NODE NEAR THE

INTERSECTION OF AN ARTERIAL STREET AND ANOTHER STREET OF COLLECTOR CLASSIFICATION OR GREATER, IN A COMPACT FORM LIMITED IN EXTENT TO NO MORE THAN A QUARTER MILE BETWEEN ANY TWO POINTS ON THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY, UNLESS SPECIFICALLY DESIGNATED OTHERWISE IN AN ADOPTED NEIGHBORHOOD OR DISTRICT PLAN.]

In addition to meeting the general rezoning approval criteria, a new or enlarged R-4A district shall:
a. Locate in a land use designation, center, or corridor in the 2040 LUP that allow R-4A as an implementation zoning

> district; or an equivalent designation in a neighborhood or district plan, and meet at least one of the following:
i. Be adjacent to or within a designated major employment center or major city center, or on a designated transit supportive development corridor or transit route, or
ii. Be located within a quarter mile of the intersection of an arterial street and another street of collector classification or greater.
(AO No. 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO No. 2014-132, 11-5-14; AO No. 2015-100, § 1, 10-13-15; AO No. 2017-176, § 3, 1-9-18; AO No. 2019-58, § 2, 5-7-19)

Section 3. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.05.010E. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.05.010E. Table 21.05-1: Table of Allowed Uses

*** *** ***
(Abridged—omitting zoning district columns except those shown.)

| TABLE 21.05-1: TABLE OF ALLOWED USES - RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND OTHER DISTRICTS <br> $\mathrm{P}=$ Permitted $\quad \mathrm{S}=$ Administrative Site Plan Review $\quad \mathrm{C}=$ Conditional Use Review For uses allowed in the A, TA, and TR districts, see section 21.04.050. <br> All other uses not shown are prohibited. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use Category | Use Type | m |  | ષ | ¢ | ¢ | O |
| RESIDENTIAL USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Household Living | Dwelling, mixed-use |  | P | P | P | P | P |
|  | Dwelling, multifamily | P | P | P | P | P | P |
|  | Dwelling, single-family attached | P | P | P | P |  |  |
|  | Dwelling, single-family detached | P | P | P | $\underline{P}$ |  |  |
|  | Dwelling, townhouse | S | S | S | PS | S | S |
|  | Dwelling, two-family | P | P | P | P |  |  |
|  | Manufactured home community | C |  | C | $\underline{\underline{C}}$ |  |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMMUNITY USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transportation Facility | Airport |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Airstrip, private |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Heliport |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  | Rail yard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Railroad freight terminal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Railroad passenger terminal |  |  |  |  | S |  |
|  | Transit center |  |  |  | S | S |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TABLE 21.05-1: TABLE OF ALLOWED USES - RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND } \\ & \text { OTHER DISTRICTS } \\ & \begin{array}{c} \text { P }=\text { Permitted } \end{array} \quad \mathrm{S}=\text { Administrative Site Plan Review } \quad \mathrm{C}=\text { Conditional Use Review } \\ & \\ & \text { For uses allowed in the A, TA, and TR districts, see section 21.04.050. } \\ & \text { All other uses not shown are prohibited. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use Category | Use Type | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ |  | ¢ | O |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMMERCIAL USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agricultural Uses | Commercial horticulture |  |  |  |  | P |  |
| Animal, Sales, Service, \& Care | Animal boarding |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Animal shelter |  |  |  |  | S |  |
|  | Large domestic animal facility, principal use |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  | Retail and pet services |  |  |  | P | P |  |
|  | Veterinary clinic |  | P |  | P | P | P |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entertainment and Recreation | Amusement establishment |  |  |  | $\underline{P}$ | P |  |
|  | Entertainment facility, major |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  | Fitness and recreational sports center |  | P | S | P | P | P |
|  | General outdoor recreation, commercial |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Golf course |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Motorized sports facility |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Movie theater |  |  |  |  | M |  |
|  | Night club |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Shooting range, outdoor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Skiing facility, alpine |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theater company or dinner theater |  |  |  | S | P | P |
| Food and Beverage Service | Bar |  |  |  | $\underline{S}$ | P |  |
|  | Food and beverage kiosk |  | P |  | $\underline{P}$ | P |  |
|  | Restaurant |  | P | S | P | P |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail Sales | Auction house |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Building materials store |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Convenience store | C | P | S | P | P |  |
|  | Farmers market |  |  |  | $\underline{P}$ | P |  |
|  | Fueling station |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Furniture and home appliance store |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | General retail |  | P |  | P | P |  |
|  | Grocery or food store |  | P | S | S | P |  |
|  | Liquor store |  |  |  | $\underline{\underline{C}}$ | P |  |
|  | Pawnshop |  |  |  |  | P |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitor Accommodations | Camper park | C |  | C |  | P |  |
|  | Extended stay lodging |  | C | C | S | P | S |
|  | Hostel | S | S | S | S | P | S |
|  | Hotel/motel |  | C | C | S | P | M |
|  | Inn |  | S |  | S | P | S |
|  | Recreational and vacation camp |  |  |  |  | P |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TABLE 21.05-1: TABLE OF ALLOWED USES }- \text { RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND } \\ & \text { OTHER DISTRICTS } \\ & \begin{array}{c} \text { P = Permitted } \end{array} \quad \mathrm{S}=\text { Administrative Site Plan Review } \quad \text { Conditional Use Review } \\ & \text { For uses allowed in the A, TA, and TR districts, see section 21.04.050. } \\ & \text { All other uses not shown are prohibited. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use Category | Use Type |  | ¢ | $\underset{\sim}{ \pm}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { ¢ } \\ \text { ¢ }}}{\text { ¢ }}$ | ¢ | O |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INDUSTRIAL USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *** *** *** | *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing and Production | Commercial food production |  |  |  | $\underline{C}$ | C |  |
|  | Cottage crafts |  |  |  | P | P |  |
|  | Manufacturing, general |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Manufacturing, heavy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Manufacturing, light |  |  |  | $\underline{\text { S/ }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{S} / \\ & \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | Natural resource, extraction, organic and inorganic | C | C | C | C | C | C |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO No. 2013-139, § 1, 1-2814; AO No. 2014-58, § 2(Att. A), 5-20-14; AO No. 2015-133(S), § 3(Exh. A), 2-2316; AO No. 2015-142(S-1), § 3(Exh. B), 6-21-16; AO No. 2016-3(S), §§ 6, 7, 2-2316; AO No. 2016-131, § 1, 11-15-16; AO No. 2016-136am, § 2, 11-15-16; AO No. 2016-156, § 1, 12-20-16; AO No. 2017-10, § 1, 1-24-17; AO No. 2017-57, § 1, 4-11-17; AO No. 2017-74, § 1, 5-23-17; AO No. 2017-176, § 4, 1-9-18; AO No. 2017175(S), § 3(Exh. A), 2-13-18; AO No. 2020-38, § 6, 4-28-20; AO No. 2020-56, § 2, 6-23-20; AO No. 2021-54, § 1, 6-22-21)

Section 4. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.06.020, is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.06.020 DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS TABLES

A. Table of Dimensional Standards: Residential Districts

| TABLE 21.06-1: TABLE OF DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS - RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS <br> (Additional standards may apply. See district-specific standards in chapter 21.04 and use-specific standards in chapter 21.05.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Minimum lot dimensions ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Minimum Setback Requirements (ft) |  |  | Max number of principal structures per lot or tract ${ }^{2}$ | Maximum height of structures (ft) |
| Use | Area (sq ft) | Width (ft) |  | Front | Side | Rear |  |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R-4A: Multifamily Residential Mixed-Use District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| [DWEL <br> LING, <br> TOWN <br> HOUSE <br> DWELL <br> ING, <br> MIXED- <br> USE <br> DWELL <br> ING, <br> MULTI- <br> FAMILY <br> ALL <br> OTHER <br> USES] <br> All uses | $\begin{aligned} & {[2,000} \\ & 6,000 \\ & 6,000 \\ & 6,000] \\ & \frac{\text { As }}{\frac{\text { required }}{b y}} \\ & \frac{21.08 .30}{K} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { [20 (30 ON } \\ \text { CORNER } \\ \text { LOTS) } \\ 50 \\ 50\} \\ \frac{\text { Unrestricte }}{\underline{d}} \end{gathered}$ | N/A | [MIN: 5 10 MAX: SEE 21.04.02 OJ.2.D.] $\underline{0 \text { or at }}$ $\underline{\text { least } 5}$ $\frac{\text { Maximu }}{\frac{\text { m: } 20}{(S e e}}$ $\frac{21.06 .03}{0 C .5)}$ | 0 , or at least 5 | [15 IF <br> ADJACENT <br> TO A <br> RESIDENTIA <br> L DISTRICT <br> (EXCEPT R-4 <br> OR R4A); <br> OTHERWISE <br> 10] <br> 10 | [MORE THAN ONE PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE MAY BE ALLOWED ON <br> ANY LOT OR TRACT IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUBSECTION] | $\begin{gathered} {[35]} \\ {\left[70^{6}\right]} \\ {[45]} \\ 60 \text { and up to } 90 \\ \frac{\text { subject to }}{} \\ \frac{\text { Administrative Site }}{\text { Plan Review }} \end{gathered}$ |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Section 5. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.07.110. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.07.110 RESIDENTIAL DESIGN STANDARDS

F. Site Design

## 2. Multiple Structures on One Lot

b. Applicability and Review Process
i. This section applies to the development of three or more principal residential structures on a single lot. It does not apply to the development of an accessory dwelling unit or a caretaker's unit[.], or to developments in the R-4A district.

## H. Conditional Use for a Residential Planned Unit Development


a. Minimum Site Area

The minimum site area for a PUD shall be 2.0 acres for PUDs located entirely in the R-2M, R-3, [AND] R-4, and R-4A zoning districts. If any portion of a proposed PUD is located within the R-1, R-1A, R-2A, R-2D, R-5, R-7, GR-1, GR-2, GR-2A, GR-3, GR-4, or GR-5 zoning districts, the minimum site area shall be 5.0 acres. If any portion of a proposed PUD is located within the R-6, R-8, or R-9 zoning districts, the minimum site area shall be 10 acres.

## 3. Development Options

## a. Density

The number of dwelling units per acre allowable on the gross are of a PUD shall be determined by the planning and zoning commission. However, in no event shall the number of dwelling units per acre exceed the maximums established by the following schedule:

| Zoning District |  |
| :--- | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}TABLE 21.07-12 <br>

Dwelling Units per Acre (gross <br>
area)\end{array}\right]\)
*** *** ***
c. Dimensional Standards
i. Height limitations in the $R-1, R-1 A, R-2 A, R-2 D, R-2 F$, R-2M, R-6, R-7, R8, R-9, GR-1, GR-2, GR-2A, GR-3, GR-4, or GR-5 zoning districts may be exceeded by an additional five feet. Height limitations in the $R-3_{2}$ [AND] $R-4$, and R-4A districts may be exceeded by an additional 10 feet.

Section 6. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.07.120A. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.07.120A. Large Commercial Establishments

*** *** ***

1. Applicability

The standards of this section 21.07.120 shall apply to any use in the Retail Sales; Animal Sales, Service, and Care; Food and Beverage Services; Entertainment and Recreation use categories; the Vehicle Parts and Supplies, Vehicle-Large Sales and Rental, Vehicle-Small Sales and Rental; and Marijuana Retail Sales Establishment use types, or any combination thereof, occupying more than 20,000 gross square feet of floor area, provided the following limitations:
a. The standards of this section shall apply only to buildings, and the non-residential portions of mixed-use buildings, which are intended principally for the uses listed above
b. This section shall not apply to distinct floors and/or sections of buildings designed specifically for residential, office, or other uses not listed in subsection 21.07.120A.1. above.
(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO No. 2017-121, § 1, 9-26-17)
Section 7. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.08.70. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.08.070 ALTERNATIVE RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISIONS

## C. Cluster Housing <br> *** *** *** <br> 3. Maximum Density and Minimum Site Area

TABLE 21.08-10: MAXIMUM DENSITY FOR CLUSTER HOUSING SUBDIVISIONS


Section 8. This ordinance shall be effective immediately upon passage and approval by the Assembly.

PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Assembly this $\qquad$ day
of $\qquad$ 2022.

Chair of the Assembly
ATTEST:

Municipal Clerk
(Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2021-0127)

This page intentionally left blank.

## Attachment 1b

# Draft Assembly Ordinance Without Deletions Shown <br> (Code Amendment) 

Case 2021-0127

This page intentionally left blank.

## ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

 AO No. 2022-AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 21 SECTIONS 21.04.020I., 21.04.020J., 21.05.010E., [21.05.060B.5.,] 21.06.020, 21.06.030C.5., 21.07.110., 21.07.120A., AND 21.08.70.<br>(Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2021-0127)

WHEREAS, Action 3-1 of the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the amendment of Title 21 to simplify zoning regulations for mixed-use projects relative to commercial or other projects; and

WHEREAS, Policy 2.3 of the 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the removal of barriers to desired infill development and for the incorporation of flexibility in development requirements; and

WHEREAS, very few properties have been rezoned to $\mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$ across the municipality, suggesting it is less attractive for development than other zoning designations; and

WHEREAS, the proposed updates to the existing R-4A are intended to create a more pedestrian-oriented environment, allow more commercial space within mixed-use developments, simplify phasing requirements, and make the zoning district's requirements easier to follow; and

WHEREAS, a more flexible R-4A zoning district will help the Municipality provide the framework for additional housing in areas designated for that use by the 2040 Land Use Plan; now, therefore,

## THE ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY ORDAINS:

Section 1. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.04 .020 is hereby amended to read as follows: (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.04.020I. R-4: Multifamily Residential District.

*** *** ***
2. District Specific Standards
*** *** ***
c. Floor Area ratio

The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) in the R-4 district is 1.0 , but may be increased through the bonus provisions below.

These incentives provide for an incremental increase in the floor area of a development in exchange for incremental increases in any of the following special features deemed of benefit to the community.
i. Bonus for Open Space One square foot of additional floor area is allowed per square foot of additional open space area. This space shall meet the standards of 21.07.030D. and be in addition to any open space required by section 21.07.030. The floor area bonus increases to two square feet for open space that meets the standards for high quality spaces in 21.07.030D.6.
ii. Bonus for Below Grade Parking

Two square feet of additional floor area is allowed per gross square foot of covered below grade parking floor area, up to a maximum increase of 1.0 FAR. The floor area bonus increases to four square feet on the second parking level below grade.
iii. Bonus for Affordable Rental Housing

Four square feet of additional gross floor area is allowed per square foot of affordable rental housing unit floor area, up to a maximum increase of 1.0 FAR. The affordable housing units shall be consistent with the standards of 21.07.110H., Affordable Housing.
iv. Bonus for Enhanced Sidewalk/Walkway Widening Two square feet of additional floor area is allowed per square foot of area provided as part of a primary pedestrian walkway or enhanced sidewalk that meets the requirements of subsections 21.07.060F.4. or 21.07.060F.17.
v. Bonus for Upper Level Setbacks/Step Backs for Sunlight Access
A floor area bonus is allowed equal to one-third of the sum of step back areas on each upper floor where the step back is at least 16 feet from the face of the building at the floor immediately below, such that the floor's existence does not increase the amount of shadowing on surrounding residences, private open spaces, sidewalks, schools, or parks on March/September 21, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. solar time.
vi. Bonus for Ambient Daylight for Residences

A floor area bonus equal to 10 percent of the lot area (0.10 FAR) but not to exceed 4,000 square feet is allowed for preservation of daylight for all dwellings in

> the development and facing the development, using the standards of 21.07.110C.8.h. vii. Bonus for Pedestrian-Interactive Use Three square feet of additional floor area is allowed per each square foot of ground-floor space which is to be occupied by a pedestrian-interactive use that meets the standards of 21.07.060F.16. viii. Bonus for Wrapped Parking One square foot of additional floor area is allowed per each square foot of habitable floor area around a a wrapped parking structure that conforms to subsection 21.06.030E.2.g., up to a maximum increase of 0.5 FAR.

Section 2. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.04.020J. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

CHAPTER 21.04.020J. R-4A: Multifamily Residential Mixed-Use District

## 1. Purpose.

The R-4A district is a primarily residential district intended for highdensity residential and mixed-use development with a minimum gross density of 20 dwelling units per acre and intended gross densities intended to be greater than 35 dwelling units per acre. This district is intended to implement the land use plan, meet housing needs for the community, establish a pedestrian-oriented environment that helps support transit, and provide the flexibility to integrate residential and non-residential uses.

## 2. District-Specific Standards.

a. Dwelling Units Required [MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS]
i. Unless limited by physical constraints or determined otherwise through a Small Area Implementation Plan (SAIP), development in the R-4A district shall include at least 20 dwelling units per gross acre per phase, or on average of subsequent phases.
ii. The overall development site shall include at least 20 dwelling units per gross acre at the completion of all phases unless provided otherwise through a major site
plan review, conditional use process, or Small Area Implementation Plan.

## b. Allowed Commercial Uses

A maximum percentage of gross floor area per table 21.04-2 on the development site may be non-residential uses, as provided in i. through ii. below.
i. Non-residential uses may be located in the same building(s) as the residential units or in one or more separate buildings on the development site.
ii. The development site may comprise multiple adjoining and/or adjacent lots. A master fill and grade permit for the entire development is required to ensure the site meets all applicable provisions of this title.
c. Uses which are not counted towards any GFA calculation:
i. Any community uses allowed by the zoning district;
ii. "park, public or private";
iii. "community garden";
iv. "utility substation";
v. "parking lot, principal use"; and
vi. "parking structure, principal use".

Table 21.04-2: Maximum Percentage of Site GFA for Non-residential Uses

Maximum
Allowance
Allowed by right when the development complies with the district-specific standards of this section 21.04.020J.2.

The development is approved through one of the following procedures:
a. Major site plan review (21.03.180D) and provides up to 35 dwelling units per gross acre on the development site; (21.03.180D.)
b. Conditional use (21.03.080.) and provides greater than 35 dwelling units per gross acre on the development site; or
c. Small Area Implementation Plan (21.03.115).
d. Timing of Mixed-Use Developments

Except by decision of the Director or through a Small Area Implementation Plan, prior to the issuance of any CO or CCO any development must:
i. Meet the minimum housing unit requirement of 21.04.020J.2.a; and
ii. Meet the maximum allowed proportionate share of nonresidential use in table 21.04-2. at all phases of construction.
e. Street Frontage Requirements
i. New parking facilities shall not be located between buildings and the nearest public street (supersedes 21.07.110.C.6.e-f). On lots with two or more street frontages, this limitation shall apply only on the primary front setback. When the site abuts a street designated in the comprehensive plan as a "main street", a "transit street", a "mixed-use street", or a derivation of these street typologies, this limitation may be changed to such street with the concurrence of the director.
ii. Existing requirements for multifamily development outlined in 21.07.110
f. Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) in the R-4A district is 4.0,
g. Building Height Increase

Buildings in the R-4A district may reach a height of 60 feet, and up to 90 feet if they undergo an Administrative Site Plan Review as outlined in 21.03.180C.

## 3. District Location Requirement

In addition to meeting the general rezoning approval criteria, a new or enlarged R-4A district shall:
a. Locate in a land use designation, center, or corridor in the 2040 LUP that allow R-4A as an implementation zoning district; or an equivalent designation in a neighborhood or district plan, and meet at least one of the following:
i. Be adjacent to or within a designated major employment center or major city center, or on a
designated transit supportive development corridor or transit route, or
ii. Be located within a quarter mile of the intersection of an arterial street and another street of collector classification or greater.
(AO No. 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO No. 2014-132, 11-5-14; AO No. 2015-100, § 1, 10-13-15; AO No. 2017-176, § 3, 1-9-18; AO No. 2019-58, § 2, 5-7-19)

Section 3. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.05.010E. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.05.010E. Table 21.05-1: Table of Allowed Uses

(Abridged—omitting zoning district columns except those shown.)

| TABLE 21.05-1: TABLE OF ALLOWED USES - RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND OTHER DISTRICTS <br> P = Permitted $\quad S=$ Administrative Site Plan Review $\quad C=$ Conditional Use Review For uses allowed in the A, TA, and TR districts, see section 21.04.050. All other uses not shown are prohibited. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use Category | Use Type | $\xrightarrow{\substack{\text { ² }}}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { ¢ }}$ | ¢ | ¢ | O |
| RESIDENTIAL USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Household Living | Dwelling, mixed-use |  | P | P | P | P | P |
|  | Dwelling, multifamily | P | P | P | P | P | P |
|  | Dwelling, single-family attached | P | P | P | P |  |  |
|  | Dwelling, single-family detached | P | P | P | $\underline{\bar{P}}$ |  |  |
|  | Dwelling, townhouse | S | S | S | PS | S | S |
|  | Dwelling, two-family | P | P | P | P |  |  |
|  | Manufactured home community | C |  | C | $\underline{\underline{C}}$ |  |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMMUNITY USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transportation Facility | Airport |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Airstrip, private |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Heliport |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  | Rail yard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Railroad freight terminal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Railroad passenger terminal |  |  |  |  | S |  |
|  | Transit center |  |  |  | S | S |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMMERCIAL USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agricultural Uses | Commercial horticulture |  |  |  |  | P |  |
| Animal, Sales, Service, \& Care | Animal boarding |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Animal shelter |  |  |  |  | S |  |
|  | Large domestic animal facility, principal use |  |  |  |  | C |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TABLE 21.05-1: TABLE OF ALLOWED USES - RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND } \\ & \text { OTHER DISTRICTS } \\ & \begin{array}{c} \text { P }=\text { Permitted } \end{array} \quad \mathrm{S}=\text { Administrative Site Plan Review }=\text { Conditional Use Review } \\ & \\ & \text { For uses allowed in the A, TA, and TR districts, see section 21.04.050. } \\ & \text { All other uses not shown are prohibited. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use Category | Use Type | $\stackrel{m}{\text { ¢ }}$ |  | $\stackrel{\ddagger}{\square}$ |  | m | O |
|  | Retail and pet services |  |  |  | P | P |  |
|  | Veterinary clinic |  | P |  | P | P | P |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entertainment and Recreation | Amusement establishment |  |  |  | $\underline{P}$ | P |  |
|  | Entertainment facility, major |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  | Fitness and recreational sports center |  | P | S | P | P | P |
|  | General outdoor recreation, commercial |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Golf course |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Motorized sports facility |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Movie theater |  |  |  |  | M |  |
|  | Night club |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Shooting range, outdoor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Skiing facility, alpine |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theater company or dinner theater |  |  |  | S | P | P |
| Food and Beverage Service | e Bar |  |  |  | $\underline{S}$ | P |  |
|  | Food and beverage kiosk |  | P |  | $\underline{P}$ | P |  |
|  | Restaurant | - | P | S | P | P |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail Sales | Auction house |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Building materials store |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Convenience store | C | P | S | P | P |  |
|  | Farmers market |  |  |  | $\underline{P}$ | P |  |
|  | Fueling station |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Furniture and home appliance store |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | General retail |  | P |  | P | P |  |
|  | Grocery or food store |  | P | S | S | P |  |
|  | Liquor store |  |  |  | $\underline{C}$ | P |  |
|  | Pawnshop |  |  |  |  | P |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitor Accommodations | Camper park | C |  | C |  | P |  |
|  | Extended stay lodging |  | C | C | S | P | S |
|  | Hostel | S | S | S | S | P | S |
|  | Hotel/motel |  | C | C | S | P | M |
|  | Inn |  | S |  | S | P | S |
|  | Recreational and vacation camp |  |  |  |  | P |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INDUSTRIAL USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing and Production | Commercial food production |  |  |  | C | C |  |
|  | Cottage crafts |  |  |  | P | P |  |


| $\begin{array}{cc} P=\text { Permitted } & S=\text { Administrative Site Plan Review } \quad C=\text { Conditional Use Review } \\ & \text { For uses allowed in the A, TA, and TR districts, see section 21.04.050. } \\ \text { All other uses not shown are prohibited. } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use Category | Use Type | ¢ | ¢ $\substack{\text { che } \\ \text { ¢ }}$ | $\underset{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ |  | ¢ | O |
| Manufacturing, general |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing, heavy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing, light |  |  |  |  | $\underline{\text { S/ }}$ | S/ |  |
|  | Natural resource, extraction, organic and inorganic | C | C | C | C | C | C |
| *** *** *** | *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO No. 2013-139, § 1, 1-2814; AO No. 2014-58, § 2(Att. A), 5-20-14; AO No. 2015-133(S), § 3(Exh. A), 2-2316; AO No. 2015-142(S-1), § 3(Exh. B), 6-21-16; AO No. 2016-3(S), §§ 6, 7, 2-2316; AO No. 2016-131, § 1, 11-15-16; AO No. 2016-136am, § 2, 11-15-16; AO No. 2016-156, § 1, 12-20-16; AO No. 2017-10, § 1, 1-24-17; AO No. 2017-57, § 1, 4-11-17; AO No. 2017-74, § 1, 5-23-17; AO No. 2017-176, § 4, 1-9-18; AO No. 2017175(S), § 3(Exh. A), 2-13-18; AO No. 2020-38, § 6, 4-28-20; AO No. 2020-56, § 2, 6-23-20; AO No. 2021-54, § 1, 6-22-21)

Section 4. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.06.020, is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):
21.06.020 DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS TABLES
***
Table of Dimensional Standards: Residential Districts


Section 5. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.07.110. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.07.110 RESIDENTIAL DESIGN STANDARDS

```
*** *** ***
F. Site Design
```


## 2. Multiple Structures on One Lot

## b. Applicability and Review Process

i. This section applies to the development of three or more principal residential structures on a single lot. It does not apply to the development of an accessory dwelling unit or a caretaker's unit, or to developments in the R-4A district.
H. Conditional Use for a Residential Planned Unit Development
*** *** ***
2. Minimum Standards

## *** *** *** <br> a. Minimum Site Area

The minimum site area for a PUD shall be 2.0 acres for PUDs located entirely in the $\mathrm{R}-2 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{R}-3, \mathrm{R}-4$, and $\mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$ zoning districts. If any portion of a proposed PUD is located within the R-1, R-1A, R-2A, R-2D, R-5, R-7, GR-1, GR-2, GR-2A, GR-3, GR-4, or GR-5 zoning districts, the minimum site area shall be 5.0 acres. If any portion of a proposed PUD is located within the R-6, R-8, or R-9 zoning districts, the minimum site area shall be 10 acres.

## 3. Development Options

a. Density

The number of dwelling units per acre allowable on the gross are of a PUD shall be determined by the planning and zoning commission. However, in no event shall the number of dwelling units per acre exceed the maximums established by the following schedule:

| Zoning District | TABLE 21.07-12 <br> Dwelling Units per Acre (gross <br> area) |
| :--- | :---: |
| R-1 and R-5 | 8 |
| R-1A | 6 |
| R-2A | 12 |
| R-2D | 15 |
| R-2M | 22 |
| R-3 | 55 |
| R-4 | 110 |
| R-4A | $\underline{110}$ |
| R-6 | 2 |
| R-7 | 4.5 |
| R-8 | 0.5 |
| R-9 | As determined by the planning and |
| GR districts |  |

*** *** ***
c. Dimensional Standards
i. Height limitations in the $R-1, R-1 A, R-2 A, R-2 D, R-2 F$, R-2M, R-6, R-7, R8, R-9, GR-1, GR-2, GR-2A, GR-3, GR-4, or GR-5 zoning districts may be exceeded by an additional five feet. Height limitations in the R-3, R-4,
and R-4A districts may be exceeded by an additional 10 feet.

Section 6. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.07.120A. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.07.120A. Large Commercial Establishments

## 1. Applicability

The standards of this section 21.07.120 shall apply to any use in the Retail Sales; Animal Sales, Service, and Care; Food and Beverage Services; Entertainment and Recreation use categories; the Vehicle Parts and Supplies, Vehicle-Large Sales and Rental, Vehicle-Small Sales and Rental; and Marijuana Retail Sales Establishment use types, or any combination thereof, occupying more than 20,000 gross square feet of floor area, provided the following limitations:
a. The standards of this section shall apply only to buildings, and the non-residential portions of mixed-use buildings, which are intended principally for the uses listed above
b. This section shall not apply to distinct floors and/or sections of buildings designed specifically for residential, office, or other uses not listed in subsection 21.07.120A.1. above.
(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO No. 2017-121, § 1, 9-26-17)
Section 7. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.08.70. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.08.070 ALTERNATIVE RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISIONS

## C. Cluster Housing

*** *** ***
3. Maximum Density and Minimum Site Area
*** *** ***

| TABLE 21.08-10: MAXIMUM DENSITY FOR |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CLUSTER HOUSING SUBDIVISIONS |  |  |$|$| Zoning District | Dwelling Units <br> Per Acre | Minimum Site <br> Area (acres) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R-1 | 5.0 | 2.5 |
| R-1A | 5.0 | 2.5 |
| R-2A | 10.0 | 1.5 |
| R-2D | 16.0 | 1.5 |


| $\mathrm{R}-2 \mathrm{M}$ | 19.0 | 1.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{R}-3$ | 20.0 | 1.0 |
| $\mathrm{R}-4$ | 24.0 | 1.0 |
| $\mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$ | $\underline{35.0}$ | $\underline{1.0}$ |
| $\mathrm{R}-5$ | 5.0 | 2.5 |
| $\mathrm{R}-6$ | 0.8 | 5.0 |
| $\mathrm{R}-7$ | 2.0 | 5.0 |
| $\mathrm{R}-8$ | 0.2 | 10.0 |
| $\mathrm{R}-9$ | 0.4 | 5.0 |
| $\mathrm{R}-10$ | See 21.04.0200.2. | 10.0 |
| TA | As provided in the <br> Turnagain Arm <br> Comprehensive Plan | 5.0 |
| GR districts | As determined by the <br> Platting Board | 5.0 |
| Bisthe minimum site area may be reduced by up to 5 percent to account for iregular lots or <br> difficult sites. |  |  |

*** *** ***
D. Narrow Lot Housing
*** *** ***
2. Applicability Narrow lot housing is permitted in the R-2A, R-2D, R$2 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{R}-3, \mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{R}-5$, and RO districts. The various applicable standards of title 21 apply, unless specifically addressed and replaced below.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be effective immediately upon passage and approval by the Assembly.

PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Assembly this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 2022.

Chair of the Assembly
ATTEST:

Municipal Clerk
(Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2021-0127)

# Attachment 2 

# Previous Draft Assembly Ordinance from February 7, 2022 

PZC Meeting (Code Amendment)
Case 2021-0127
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## ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

 AO No. 2022-
# AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 21 SECTIONS 21.04.020J., 21.05.010E., 21.05.060B.5., 21.06.020, 21.06.030C.5., 21.07.120A., AND 21.15.040. 

(Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2021-0127)
WHEREAS, Action 3-1 of the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the amendment of Title 21 to simplify zoning regulations for mixed-use projects relative to commercial or other projects; and

WHEREAS, Policy 2.3 of the 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the removal of barriers to desired infill development and for the incorporation of flexibility in development requirements; and

WHEREAS, Very few properties have been rezoned to R-4A across the municipality, suggesting it is less attractive for development than other zoning designations; and

WHEREAS, The proposed updates to the existing R-4A are intended to create a more pedestrian-oriented environment, allow more commercial space within mixed-use developments, simplify phasing requirements, and make the zoning district's requirements easier to follow; and

WHEREAS, A more flexible R-4A zoning district will help the Municipality provide the framework for additional housing in areas designated for that use by the 2040 Land Use Plan; now, therefore,

## THE ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY ORDAINS:

Section 1. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.04.020J. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.04.020J. R-4A: Multifamily Residential Mixed-Use District.

## 1. Purpose.

The R-4A district is a primarily residential district intended for highdensity multi-unit[MULTIFAMILY] dwellings[, WITH GROSS DENSITIES INTENDED TO BE GREATER THAN 35 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE] and mixed-use development. [COMMERCIAL RETAIL, SERVICES, AND OFFICE USES ARE ALSO ALLOWED IN COMBINATION WITH HOUSING TO CREATE A TRULY MIXEDUSE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT, ALTHOUGH A

MAJORITY OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE A RESIDENTIAL USE. THIS DISTRICT IS TO BE APPLIED IN AREAS NEAR DOWNTOWN AND MIDTOWN, IN ORDER TO PROVIDE HOUSING DENSITIES WHICH SUPPORT THESE CITY CENTERS, EFFICIENT USE OF RESIDENTIAL LAND, AND RESIDENTIAL LIVING OPPORTUNITIES NEAR EMPLOYMENT AND SERVICES. BY PROVIDING THE FLEXIBILITY FOR INTEGRATED MIXED-USE SITE DEVELOPMENT, THE R-4A DISTRICT FACILITATES REINVESTMENT AND REVITALIZATION WITHIN AREAS IN TRANSITION. NEW MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT SHOULD FACILITATE STRONG PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE CONNECTIONS WITH NEARBY NEIGHBORHOODS AND CITY CENTERS. JThis district is intended to implement the 2040 land use plan, establish a pedestrian-oriented environment that helps support transit, and provide the flexibility to integrate residential and nonresidential uses.

## 2. District-Specific Standards.

## a. Housing Units Required[MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS]

Unless limited by environmental constraints, defined otherwise by the Director or through a Small Area Implementation Plan (SAIP), development in the R-4A district shall include at least 20 dwelling units per gross acre per phase, or on average of subsequent phases. Without special conditions, at the completion of all phases, the overall development site shall include at least 20 dwelling units per gross acre. [DEVELOPMENT IN THE R-4A DISTRICT SHALL COMPLY WITH THE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS IN SUBSECTION 21.04.030G.6. AND G.7. REGARDING ENHANCED SIDEWALK OPTION AND BUILDING PLACEMENT AND ORIENTATION.]
b. Allowed Commercial Uses[MAINTAINING RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER]
A maximum percentage of gross floor area per table 21.04-2 on the development site may be non-residential uses, as provided in i. through ii. below. Allowed non-residential uses are identified in section 21.05.010, table 21.05-1: table of allowed uses. [DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE PRIMARILY RESIDENTIAL. THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS AND EXCEPTIONS APPLY:
i. Non-residential uses may be located in the same building(s) as the residential units or in one or more separate buildings on the development site.[ALLOWED IN THE R-4A DISTRICT SHALL BE

MIXED WITH RESIDENTIAL ACCORDING TO THE PROVISIONS THAT FOLLOW. (THE USES "PARK, PUBLIC OR PRIVATE," "COMMUNITY GARDEN," "UTILITY SUBSTATION," TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWERS, "PARKING LOT, PRINCIPAL USE," AND "PARKING STRUCTURE, PRINCIPAL USE" ARE EXEMPT FROM THE MIXED-USE REQUIREMENT.)]
(A) IF RESIDENTIAL USES OCCUPY AT LEAST 90 PERCENT OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA DEPICTED ON A SITE PLAN, NO REVIEW BEYOND THAT REQUIRED BY TABLE 21.051 IS REQUIRED.
(B) A MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW IS REQUIRED FOR NON RESIDENTIAL USES PROPOSED TO OCCUPY GREATER THAN 10 AND LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE
DEVELOPMENT AS DEPICTED ON A SITE PLAN.
(C) A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT IS REQUIRED FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL USES PROPOSED TO OCCUPY GREATER THAN 20 AND LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO 49 PERCENT OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE DEVELOPMENT AS DEPICTED ON A SITE PLAN.
(D) MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEWS OR CONDITIONAL USE REVIEWS UNDER B.I.(B). AND B.I.(C). SHALL MEET THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA. THIS SHALL BE IN ADDITION TO THE GENERAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL CRITERIA (21.03.180F.) AND CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL CRITERIA (21.03.080D.).
(1) THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL RESULT IN A NET INCREASE IN DWELLING UNITS OVER PRE-DEVELOPMENT DENSITY, OR SHALL BE AT LEAST 20 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE, WHICHEVER IS GREATER. THE TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA OF HOUSEHOLD LIVING USES SHALL BE EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN ANY

PRIOR
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.]
(2) STIPULATIONS MAY BE IMPOSED RELATING TO BUILDING DESIGN, TRAFFIC, PRIVACY, FLOOR AREA RESTRICTIONS, RESTRICTIONS AGAINST COMMERCIAL ABOVE THE GROUND FLOOR, AND OTHER CONDITIONS NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN A RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER AND COMPATIBILITY WITH ADJACENT RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS.]
ii. The development site may comprise multiple adjoining and/or adjacent lots[THE NON-RESIDENTIAL PORTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL NOT BE GIVEN A CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE OR A CONDITIONAL CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE UNTIL ALL OF THE RESIDENTIAL PORTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT IS GIVEN A CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE].
[III. GROUND FLOOR BUILDING FACADES FACING AND WITHIN 100 FEET OF PUBLIC STREETS, PRIMARY CIRCULATION DRIVES, OR PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS SHALL MEET THE FOLLOWING WINDOW STANDARDS ON THOSE FACADES:
(A) NON-RESIDENTIAL USES: AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF THE LENGTH AND 25 PERCENT OF THE AREA OF GROUNDLEVEL WALLS SHALL BE WINDOWS PROVIDING VISUAL ACCESS TO THE INTERIOR OF THE BUILDING.
(B) RESIDENTIAL USES: AT LEAST 25 PERCENT OF THE LENGTH AND 12 PERCENT OF THE AREA OF GROUNDLEVEL WALLS SHALL BE WINDOWS.
(C) ALL USES: BLANK WALLS SHALL NOT EXCEED 30 FEET IN LENGTH
IV. ALL COMMERCIAL USES SHALL BE CONDUCTED ENTIRELY WITHIN A COMPLETELY ENCLOSED

BUILDING EXCEPT FOR PARKING AND LOADING FACILITIES AND OUTDOOR RESTAURANT SEATING. OUTDOOR STORAGE OF GOODS ACCESSORY TO A COMMERCIAL USE IS PROHIBITED.]
c. Allowed Commercial Uses

A maximum percentage of gross floor area per table 21.04-2 on the development site may be non-residential uses, as provided in i. through ii. below. Allowed non-residential uses are identified in Section 21.05.010, Table 21.05-1: Table of Allowed Uses.
i. Non-residential uses may be located in the same building(s) as the residential units or in one or more separate buildings on the development site.
ii. The development site may comprise multiple adjoining and/or adjacent lots.
d. Uses which do not count towards non-residential gross floor area:
i. Any community uses allowed by the zoning district; ii. "park, public or private"; iii. "community garden";
iv. "utility substation";
v. "parking lot, principal use"; and
vi. "parking structure, principal use."

Table 21.04-2: Maximum Percentage of Site GFA for Non-residential Uses

Maximum
Requirement

| 35 Percent | Allowed by right when the development complies with the district-specific standards of this section 21.04.020J.2. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 36-50 <br> Percent | The development is approved through one of the following procedures: <br> a. Major site plan review (21.03.180D.) and provides 35 dwelling units or more per gross acre on the development site; <br> b. Conditional use (21.03.080) and provides up to 35 dwelling units per gross acre on the development site; or <br> c. Small Area Implementation Plan (21.03.115). |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{>50}{\text { Percent }} \end{aligned}$ | The development meets the following: <br> a. Approved through a Small Area Implementation Plan process (21.03.115); and <br> b. For each additional percentage of non-residential gross floor area above 50 percent, the development provides an additional 2 dwelling units per gross acre above the base of 20 dwelling units per gross acre. |

e. Timing of Mixed-Use Developments

Except by decision of the Director or through a Small Area Implementation Plan, non-residential portions of the development shall receive a certificate of occupancy (CO) or conditional certificate of occupancy (CCO) only after:
i. The development meets the minimum housing unit requirement of 21.04.020J.2.a. and has received a CO or CCO ; and
ii. The sum of all portions of the development receiving the CO or CCO is within the maximum allowed proportionate share of non-residential use in table 21.04-2. at all phases of construction.
f. Street Frontage Requirements

The following standards apply to any street-side frontage of developments in the R-4A district. A primary frontage shall not be located on interior or private streets.
i. Parking lots shall not be located between buildings and the nearest street
ii. Maximum setback applies to the first three stories or 35 feet of street-facing facades, whichever is less (supersedes 21.06.30C.5.)
iii. $30 \%$ of the first three stories of any street-facing building elevation wall shall be windows or doors providing visual access (supersedes 21.07.110C.3.)
iv. At least one street-facing primary entrance located at or within the maximum setback.
v. Enhanced sidewalk incentive allowed per 21.04.020J.2.e.iv.
g. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Incentives for the R-4 and R-4A Districts

| Zoning District | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Maximum base } \\ & \text { FAR } \end{aligned}$ | Maximum FAR <br> with Bonus <br> Provisions in <br> 21.04.020J.2.e. i-x |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{R}-4$ | 1.0 | 3.0 |
| R-4A | 3.0 | 4.0 |

Bonus provisions for additional FAR, subject to section 21.06.030E.:
[THE MAXIMUM BY-RIGHT FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR) WITHIN THE R-4 AND R-4A DISTRICTS IS 1.5 AND 3.0 FAR RESPECTIVELY, BUT MAY BE INCREASED UP TO A MAXIMUM TOTAL FAR OF 2.0 IN THE R-4 DISTRICT AND 4.0 IN THE R-4A DISTRICT THROUGH ONE OR MORE OF

THE FOLLOWING THROUGH THE FOLLOWING BONUS PROVISIONS, SUBJECT TO SECTION 21.06.030E. THESE INCENTIVES PROVIDE FOR AN INCREMENTAL INCREASE IN THE FLOOR AREA OF A DEVELOPMENT IN EXCHANGE FOR INCREMENTAL INCREASES IN ANY OF the following special features deemed of BENEFIT TO THE COMMUNITY. INCREASES IN THE FAR MAY BE ACHIEVED THROUGH THE USE OF ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING:]
v. Bonus for Upper Level Setbacks/Step Backs for Sunlight Access.
For every upper floor stepped back 16 feet from the top of the floor below it, a bonus of one-third of that stepped back area shall be applicable to general FAR for the project,[A FLOOR AREA BONUS IS ALLOWED EQUAL TO ONE-THIRD OF THE SUM OF STEP BACK AREAS ON EACH UPPER FLOOR WHERE THE STEP BACK IS AT LEAST 16 FEET FROM THE FACE OF THE BUILDING AT THE FLOOR IMMEDIATELY BELOW,] such that the floor's existence does not increase the amount of shadowing on surrounding residences, private open spaces, sidewalks, schools, or parks on March/September 21, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. solar time.
*** *** ***
ix. Bonus for Housing Density An additional 0.50 FAR is allowed if the development site provides a gross housing density of at least 35 dwelling units per acre.
x. Bonus for Smaller Dwelling Units For each dwelling unit that is 450 square feet or less, the development shall receive twice the amount of that unit's floor area as bonus. The maximum bonus allowed is 0.50 FAR.
[D. REDUCED PARKING RATIOS]
[DEVELOPMENT IN THE R-4A DISTRICT SHALL BE ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES, AS PROVIDED IN 21.07.090F.6.]

## h. Building Height Increase

Buildings in the R-4A district may reach a total height of 90 feet. At elevations above 60 feet, all floor area shall be
residential uses and the building facade shall be stepped back one (1) foot for every two (2) feet of rise from street rights-ofway and projected rights-of-way[EXCEED THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT ESTABLISHED IN TABLE 21.06-1, UP TO A MAXIMUM TOTAL HEIGHT OF 90 FEET, SUBJECT TO ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS. THESE CONDITIONS ENCOURAGE SLENDER TOWERS WITH CONDENSED FLOOR PLATES, LIGHT AND AIR AT THE PEDESTRIAN LEVEL, AND ACTIVE USES ON THE GROUND FLOOR FACING THE STREET:
I. THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL PARTICIPATE IN THE FAR INCENTIVES PROVIDED FOR THE R-4A DISTRICT IN SUBSECTION 21.04.020I.2.C. ABOVE;
II. THE GROUND FLOOR OF THE BUILDING SHALL BE RESIDENTIAL OR OTHER PERMITTED NONPARKING USE FOR AT LEAST 25 FEET OF DEPTH FACING THE STREET FOR THE FULL LENGTH OF THE BUILDING, EXCEPT FOR VEHICLE ENTRANCES AND EXITS. WHERE THE SITE HAS TWO OR MORE FRONTAGES, THE STANDARD SHALL BE MET ON TWO FRONTAGES;
III. ALL FLOOR AREA PROVIDED BY THE HEIGHT INCREASE SHALL BE FOR RESIDENTIAL USES;
IV. THE HEIGHT INCREASE SHALL ADHERE TO THE HEIGHT TRANSITIONS OF SUBSECTION 21.06.030D.8.;
V. THE HEIGHT INCREASE SHALL ADHERE TO THE APPLICABLE DESIGN STANDARDS FOR TALL BUILDINGS IN SUBSECTION 21.07.120C.; AND
VI. UNLESS A MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW OR A CONDITIONAL USE IS REQUIRED BY OTHER PARTS OF THIS SECTION, ALL DEVELOPMENTS REQUESTING THE HEIGHT INCREASE SHALL BE SUBJECT TO ADMINISTRATIVE SITE PLAN REVIEW.]

## 3. District Location Requirement

Eligible areas for this zoning district include[IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THIS DISTRICT BE LIMITED IN EXTENT TO PARTICULAR STRATEGIC LOCATIONS. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY SHALL BE]:
a. Land use designations, centers, or corridors in the 2040 LUP that allow R-4A as an implementation zoning district; or[IN AN AREA DESIGNATED IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR RESIDENTIAL CITY CENTER INTENSITY OR REDEVELOPMENT/MIXED-USE, OR SIMILAR DESIGNATION IN A NEIGHBORHOOD OR DISTRICT PLAN; AND]
b. Equivalent designations in a neighborhood or district plan.[ADJACENT TO OR WITHIN A DESIGNATED MAJOR EMPLOYMENT CENTER OR MAJOR CITY CENTER, OR ON A DESIGNATED TRANSIT SUPPORTIVE DEVELOPMENT CORRIDOR OR TRANSIT ROUTE WITH 15-MINUTE BUS SERVICE HEADWAYS; AND]
[C. CONCENTRATED AS A NODE NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF AN ARTERIAL STREET AND ANOTHER STREET OF COLLECTOR CLASSIFICATION OR GREATER, IN A COMPACT FORM LIMITED IN EXTENT TO NO MORE THAN A QUARTER MILE BETWEEN ANY TWO POINTS ON THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY, UNLESS SPECIFICALLY DESIGNATED OTHERWISE IN AN ADOPTED NEIGHBORHOOD OR DISTRICT PLAN.]
(AO No. 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO No. 2014-132, 11-5-14; AO No. 2015-100, § 1, 10-13-15; AO No. 2017-176, § 3, 1-9-18; AO No. 2019-58, § 2, 5-7-19)

Section 2. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.05.010E. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.05.010E. Table 21.05-1: Table of Allowed Uses

(Abridged—omitting zoning district columns except those shown.)

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TABLE 21.05-1: TABLE OF ALLOWED USES - RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND } \\ & \text { OTHER DISTRICTS } \\ & \begin{array}{c} \text { P }=\text { Permitted } \end{array} \quad \mathrm{S}=\text { Administrative Site Plan Review } \quad \mathrm{C}=\text { Conditional Use Review } \\ & \\ & \text { For uses allowed in the A, TA, and TR districts, see section 21.04.050. } \\ & \text { All other uses not shown are prohibited. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use Category | Use Type | ¢ |  | $\stackrel{ \pm}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}{\ddagger}$ | ¢ | O |
| RESIDENTIAL USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Household Living | Dwelling, mixed-use |  | P | P | P | P | P |
|  | Dwelling, multifamily | P | P | P | P | P | P |
|  | Dwelling, single-family Attached | P | P | P |  |  |  |
|  | Dwelling, single-family Detached | P | P | P |  |  |  |
|  | Dwelling, townhouse | S | S | S | $\underline{P}$ | S | S |
|  | Dwelling, two-Family | P | P | P | $\underline{P}$ |  |  |
|  | Manufactured home community | C |  | C | $\underline{\underline{C}}$ |  |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMMUNITY USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transportation Facility | Airport |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Airstrip, private |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Heliport |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  | Rail yard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Railroad freight terminal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Railroad passenger terminal |  |  |  |  | S |  |
|  | Transit center |  |  |  | S | S |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMMERCIAL USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agricultural Uses | Commercial horticulture |  |  |  |  | P |  |
| Animal, Sales, Service, \& Care | Animal boarding |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Animal shelter |  |  |  |  | S |  |
|  | Large domestic animal facility, principal use |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  | Retail and pet services |  |  |  | $\underline{P}$ | P |  |
|  | Veterinary clinic |  | P |  | P | P | P |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entertainment and Recreation | Amusement establishment |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Entertainment facility, major |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  | Fitness and recreational sports center |  | P | S | P | P | P |
|  | General outdoor recreation, commercial |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Golf course |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Motorized sports facility |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Movie theater |  |  |  |  | M |  |
|  | Night club |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Shooting range, outdoor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Skiing facility, alpine |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theater company or dinner theater |  |  |  | S | P | P |
| Food and Beverage Service | Bar |  |  |  | S | P |  |
|  | Food and beverage kiosk |  | P |  | $\underline{p}$ | P |  |
|  | Restaurant |  | P | S | P | P |  |
| *** *** *** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail Sales | Auction house |  |  |  |  | P |  |
|  | Building materials store |  |  |  |  | P |  |



Section 3. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.05.060B.5. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.05.060B.5. Use-specific Standards

```
*** *** ***
```


## 5. Manufacturing, Light

## a. Definition

A general manufacturing establishment that, because of the nature of its equipment, operations, processes, materials, and products, has little or no potential of creating noise, vibration, dust, smoke, fumes, odor, glare, or other environmental impacts on surrounding properties or uses. The scale and intensity of operations are limited by bulk controls and other use-specific standards such that it may be compatible in some commercial areas. This use may include production, assembly, finishing, or packaging of articles from parts made at another location, such as assembly of electrical appliances or medical equipment. It includes additive (three-dimensional printing) manufacturing. It may also include production of finished household and office goods, such as furniture, clothing, or tents, from materials that are already refined, or from raw materials that do not need refining, such as paper, fabric, or pre-milled wood; or wool, clay, fiber, or similar materials.

## b. Use-Specific Standards

Light manufacturing is subject to the following limitations in the B-3 and R-4A districts to ensure compatibility and protect commercial and residential property.
i. This use shall comply with the use-specific standards set for in subsection 21.05.060A.1. for contractor and special trades, light, except that subsection 21.05.060A.1.b.i. shall not apply in the R-4A district.

(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO No. 2015-82, § 2, 7-2815; AO No. 2015-131, § 3, 1-12-16; AO No. 2016-131, § 2, 11-15-16; AO No. 2017-10, § 1, 1-24-17; AO No. 2017-74, § 2, 5-23-17; AO No. 2020-56, § 1, 6-23-20)

Section 4. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.06.020, is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.06.020 DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS TABLES

A. Table of Dimensional Standards: Residential Districts


Section 5. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.06.030C.5., is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.06.030C.5. Maximum Setbacks

## *** *** *** <br> a. Measurement and Applicability

*** *** ***
i. The maximum setback applies to the ground-floor, street-facing [ELEVATION OF THE ]building, except as provided otherwise in the zoning district[AS DEPICTED BELOW].
*** *** ***
vii. Where the required setback is from a private street without a dedicated right-of-way, the maximum setback shall be measured from the building-side edge of the $\frac{\text { abutting sidewalk. }}{* * *}$
c. General Exceptions to Maximum Setback
i. The maximum front setback established by the zoning district may be increased[EXCEEDED BY UP TO 20

ADDITIONAL FEET (OR MORE] through administrative site plan review[)] if the additional area between the building and the property line is used to provide common open space that conforms to the standards of section 21.07.030, contains site enhancement landscaping, and/or contains pedestrian amenities as described in subsection 21.07.060F. The additional area shall not be developed for motor vehicle parking or driveways, loading or refuse collection, or ground-mounted utilities.
ii. For buildings where all the floor area is in residential use, a stoop or the street-facing façade of a covered porch qualifies for meeting this standard. The porch shall have at least one entrance accessible from the street.
iii. Where other Title 21 requirements necessitate the building to be set back further than the maximum setback, those provisions shall govern.
(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO No. 2015-100, § 3, 10-1315; AO No. 2017-176, § 7, 1-9-18; AO No. 2018-12, § 1, 2-27-18; AO No. 202010(S), § 1, 3-10-20; AO No. 2020-38, § 7, 5-28-20)

Section 6. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.07.120A. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):

### 21.07.120A. Large Commercial Establishments

## *** *** ***

## 1. Applicability

The standards of this section 21.07 .120 shall apply to any use in the Retail Sales; Animal Sales, Service, and Care; Food and Beverage Services; Entertainment and Recreation use categories; the Vehicle Parts and Supplies, Vehicle-Large Sales and Rental, Vehicle-Small Sales and Rental; and Marijuana Retail Sales Establishment use types, or any combination thereof, occupying more than 20,000 gross square feet of floor area, provided the following limitations:
a. The standards of this section shall apply only to buildings, and the non-residential portions of mixed-use buildings, which are intended principally for the uses listed above[, SUCH AS A GENERAL MERCHANDISE RETAIL STORE, GROCERY STORE, OR MULTI-TENANT RETAIL BUILDING].
b. This section shall not apply to distinct floors and/or sections

```
                of buildings designed specifically for residential, office, or other uses not listed in subsection 21.07.120A.1. above.
(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO No. 2017-121, § 1, 9-26-17)
Section 7. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.15 .040 is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out):
```


### 21.15.040. Definitions

## Architectural Feature

```
A part, portion, or projection that contributes to the aesthetic quality of a building or structure, exclusive of signs, that is not necessary for the structural integrity of the building structure or to make the building or structure habitable.
```



## Blank Wall

```
A section of the ground-floor building wall, as measured horizontally across the building elevation, without windows, architectural features, or primary entrances.
```



## Stoop

A small staircase ending in a platform that leads to the entrance of a residential building.
(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO 2014-132, 11-5-14; AO No. 2015-82, § 7, 7-28-15; AO No. 2015-100, § 9, 10-13-15; AO No. 2015133(S), § 6, 2-23-16; AO No. 2015-138, § 5, 1-12-16; AO No. 2015-142(S-1), § 10, 6-21-16; AO No. 2016-3(S), § 18, 2-23-16; AO No. 2016-144(S), § 2, 1-1-17; AO No. 2017-55, § 14, 4-11-17; AO No. 2017-75, § 4, 5-9-17; AO No. 2018-12,

> § 2, 2-27-18; AO No. 2018-67(S-1), § 9, 10-9-18; AO No. 2018-92, § 1, 10-23- 18; AO No. 2019-132, 12-2-19; AO No. 2020-38, §§ 11, 14, 4-28-20)

Section 8. This ordinance shall be effective immediately upon passage and approval by the Assembly.

PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Assembly this $\qquad$ day
of $\qquad$ , 2022.

## Chair of the Assembly

## ATTEST:

Municipal Clerk
(Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2021-0127)

## Attachment 3

Minutes of February 7, 2022 PZC Meeting
Case 2021-0127
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# PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION 

Assembly Chambers
Z.J. Loussac Library 3600 Denali Street
Anchorage, Alaska
MINUTES OF
February 07, 2022
6:30 PM

A work session on an Ordinance of the Anchorage Assembly amending AMC Code Title 21, Land Use Planning to create a new procedure for approving Reinvestment Focus Areas (2022-0010) was held prior to the meeting and conducted by Daniel Mckenna-Foster with the MOA Long-Range Planning Division.

## A. ROLL CALL

| Present | Andre Spinelli, Greg Strike, Jared Gardner (Chair), Jim Winchester, <br> Radhika Krishna (Vice Chair), Jeff Raun, Scott Pulice |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { Excused }}$ | Aaron O'Quinn <br> Staff |

## B. MINUTES

1. Monday, January 3, 2022
2. Monday, January 10, 2022

COMMISSIONER PULICE moved to approve the minutes. VICE CHAIR KRISHNA seconded.

AYE: Spinelli, Strike, Gardner, Winchester, Krishna, Raun, Pulice NAY: None

## PASSED

## C. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS / EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

## 1. Disclosures

COMMISSIONERS WINCHESTER and RAUN disclosed that they will abstain from voting on Resolution 2022-001 as they were absent from the January 3 meeting.

COMMISSIONER SPINELLI moved to approve the consent agenda. COMMISSIONER PULICE seconded.

AYE: Spinelli, Strike, Gardner, Winchester, Krishna, Raun, Pulice
NAY: None
PASSED
Commissioners Winchester and Raun abstained from voting on Resolution 2022-001.

## E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ACTIONS OF PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

## F. REGULAR AGENDA - None

1. Resolutions for Approval
2. Introduction for Public Hearings
3. Site / Landscape Plan Approval
4. Time Extensions; Expedited Hearing Requests; Minor Conditional Use Amendments
5. Other

## G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CASE: 2021-0127 (DM)

PETITIONER: MOA, Long-Range Planning Division
REQUEST: Review and Recommend approval to the Anchorage Assembly of the Public Hearing Draft Title 21 Text Amendment to update Mixed-Use Development Standards in the R-4A Zoning District.

DANIEL MCKENNA-FOSTER presented the staff report and recommendations on behalf of the Municipality's Long-Range Planning Division.

The Commissioners discussed the following:

1. Did the public hearing draft that was released for public review and comment include the substantive changes made since the last work session?
2. Nonconformity with respect to the 10 percent provision and any other provisions including prohibitions on expanding nonconformity.
3. Any issues or concerns with the variance standards that the Planning Director should look at and how often does the Director make a determination?
4. Is it the intent that the 30 percent requirement would no longer apply to a street that has a façade facing the street with pedestrian and utility infrastructure built to the most current municipal standards? How many streets in the city are built to the most current standards? Is the exclusion broader than the intent?
5. Clarification that if the municipal standards for sidewalks and utilities infrastructure were to have a minor change, then something that was previously to standard no longer meets the most current standard.
6. One of the development comments submitted pertained to 36th and Arctic, perhaps Olympic Park, regarding overhead utilities possibly impeding pedestrian flow at the right-of-way and very close to the side of a building creating a circumstance that is less than ideally walkable. We should be enabling a safe and inviting pedestrian access, and the way in which a building faces a street and sidewalk is an important component of that.
7. With regard to glazing, is the 30 percent reflected elsewhere in code? Is it standard? Is there an energy efficiency element this might be affecting?

CHAIR GARDNER opened the hearing to public testimony. There was no public testimony.
MR. MCKENNA-FOSTER provided brief rebuttal testimony.
VICE CHAIR KRISHNA clarified that since the work session held in January, some of the proposed changes were shared with developers but community councils and members of the public have not had a chance to review the changes proposed in this staff report, which include by right commercial uses going from 35 percent to 49 percent, and some additional proposed changes. She could not support this proposal believing it should go back out for a public hearing because these are substantial content changes that could have significant impacts on the ground.

CHAIR GARDNER closed the public hearing.
COMMISSIONER RAUN raised a point of clarification to keep the public hearing open.
CHAIR GARDNER noted that it is an option to reopen the public hearing,
MR. MCKENNA-FOSTER explained that the text amendment could be redistributed to the community councils, if the Commission wishes. This proposal is just to create the zone and does not establish any zone. If someone were to rezone, they would have to follow the rezone process. This is just setting the parameters that could be accepted for the existing three or four acres of R-4A in the municipality. Is there a broader need or is the Commission looking primarily for feedback from one group or the entire community?

COMMISSIONER RAUN reiterated that concerns had been expressed by Vice Chair Krishna that the amendments before us had not been fully communicated through the public process. He did not know if a new notice was necessary but would like to see that happen.

VICE CHAIR KRISHNA requested for the Planning Department to use the standard public hearing draft process.

COMMISSIONER SPINELLI moved in Case 2021-0127 to postpone to a time determined by staff and reopen the public hearing in order to renotice the public. VICE CHAIR KRISHNA seconded.

COMMISSIONER SPINELLI intends to support the motion even though he was not 100 percent sure this motion is necessary. When he thinks of $\mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$, he thinks of $\mathrm{B}-3$ areas that are moving to R-4A. This code is so much more protective than what these properties were prior to that. It would be a welcomed change from the community and that is probably why we did not hear a significant amount of community feedback.

AYE: Spinelli, Strike, Gardner, Winchester, Krishna, Raun, Pulice
NAY: None

## PASSED

## H. APPEARANCE REQUEST - None

## I. REPORTS - None

1. Chair
2. Secretary

## 3. Committee

## J. TITLE 21 DISCUSSION - None

## K. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

The Commission discussed Parliamentary Procedures regarding the Chair handing over the gavel to the Vice Chair when providing comments once a motion is on the floor.

## L. ADJOURNMENT

COMMISSIONER RAUN moved to adjourn. VICE CHAIR KRISHNA seconded.
AYE: Spinelli, Strike, Gardner, Winchester, Krishna, Raun, Pulice
NAY: None
PASSED
The meeting adjourned at 7:21 p.m.

## Attachment 4

## Comparison Table of Changes Between Versions Case 2021-0127

This page intentionally left blank.

| February 2022 Version | October 2022 Version | Page \# in new |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | ANCHORAGE, ALASKA <br> AO No. 2022- $\qquad$ <br> AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 21 SECTIONS 21.04.020I., 21.04.020J., 21.05.010E., [21.05.060B.5.,] 21.06.020, 21.06.030C.5., 21.07.110., 21.07.120A., AND 21.08.70. <br> (Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2021-0127) | Page 1/19. New sections have been changed so new sections have been added to the header. |
| THE ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY ORDAINS: <br> Section 1. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.04.020J. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out): <br> 21.04.020J. R-4A: Multifamily Residential Mixed-Use District. <br> 1. Purpose. <br> The R-4A district is a primarily residential district intended for highdensity multi-unit[MULTIFAMILY] dwellings[, WITH GROSS UNITS PER ACREland mixed-use development. [COMMERCIAL RETAIL, SERVICES, AND OFFICE USES ARE ALSO ALLOWED IN COMBINATION WITH HOUSING TO CREATE A TRULY MIXED- USE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT, ALTHOUGH A |  | Pages 1-2/19. R-4 section added so that bonus provisions which apply to that zone are located within the R-4 zoning section. |
| AO regarding AMC Title $21 \mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$ Amendments <br> MAJORITY OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE A RESIDENTIAL USE. THIS DISTRICT IS TO BE APPLIED IN AREAS NEAR DOWNTOWN AND MIDTOWN, IN ORDER TO PROVIDE HOUSING DENSITIES WHICH SUPPPORT THESE CITY CENTERS, EFFICIENT USE OF RESIDENTIAL LAND, AND RESIDENTIAL LIVING OPPORTUNITIES NEAR EMPLOYMENT AND SERVICES. BY PROVIDING THE FLEXIBILITY FOR INTEGRATED MIXED-USE SITE DEVELOPMENT, THE R-4A DISTRICT FACILITATES |  |  |


| February 2022 Version | October 2022 Version | Page \# in new |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br> AO regarding AMC Title 21, R-4A Amendments <br> A TRULY MIXED-USE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT, ALTHOUGH A MAJORITY OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE A RESIDENTIAL USE. THIS DISTRICTIS TO BE APPLIED INAREAS NEAR DOWNTOWN AND MIDTOWN, IN ORDER TO PROVIDE HOUSING DENSITIES WHICH SUPPORT THESE CITY CENTERS, EFFICIENT USE OF RESIDENTIAL LAND, AND RESIDENTALL LIVING OROVIDING THE FLEXIBILITY FOR INTEGRATED MIXED.USE SITE DEVELOPMENT, THE R-4A DISTRICT FACILITATES REINVESTMENT AND REVITALIZATION WITHIN AREAS IN TRANSITION. NEW MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT SHOULD FACILITATE STRONG PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE CONNECTIONS WITH NEARBY NEIGHBORHOODS AND CITY CENTERS.JThis district is intended to implement the 2040 land use plan, establish a pedestrian-oriented environment that helps support residential uses. |  | Page $3 / 19$, line 19. Section 2 is now what was previously section 1. A requirement for 20 DUA was added and the intention statement for 35 DUA kept in. |



| February 2022 Version | October 2022 Version | Page \# in new |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| c. Allowed Commercial Uses <br> A maximum percentage of gross floor area per table 21.04-2 on the development site may be non-residential uses, as provided in i. through ii. below. Allowed non-residential uses are identified in Section 21.05.010, Table 21.05-1: Table of Allowed Uses. <br> i. Non-residential uses may be located in the same building(s) as the residential units or in one or more separate buildings on the development site. <br> ii. The development site may comprise multiple adjoining and/or adjacent lots. | b. Allowed Commercial Uses <br> A maximum percentage of gross floor area per table 21.04-2 on the development site may be non-residential uses, as provided in i. through ii. below. <br> i. Non-residential uses may be located in the same building(s) as the residential units or in one or more separate buildings on the development site. <br> ii. The development site may comprise multiple adjoining and/or adjacent lots. A master fill and grade permit for meets all applicable provisions of this title. | Page 6/19, line 38. Added new language about master fill and grade permit per Land Use Review comment. |
| Table 21.04-2: Maximum Percentage of Site GFA for Non-residential Uses | Table 21.04-2: Maximum Percentage of Site GFA for Non-residential Uses <br> Maximum <br> Allowance <br> Up to $49 \%$ <br> Allowed by right when the development complies with the district-specific standards of this section 21.04 .020 J .2 . <br> The development is approved through one of the following procedures: <br> a. Major site plan review ( 21.03 .180 D ) and provides up to 35 dwelling units per gross acre on the development site; (21.03.180D.) <br> b. Conditional use (21.03.080.) and provides greater than 35 dwelling units per gross acre on the development site; or <br> c. Small Area Implementation Plan (21.03.115). | Page 9/19, line 14. <br> Percentages simplified. |

## R-4A Comparison Table of Changes Between Versions

 October 2022| February 2022 Version |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Timing of Mixed-Use Developments <br> Except by decision of the Director or through a Small Area Implementation Plan, non-residential portions of the development shall receive a certificate of occupancy (CO) or conditional certificate of occupancy (CCO) only after: <br> i. The development meets the minimum housing unit requirement of 21.04 .020 J .2 a. and has received a CO or CCO; and <br> ii. The sum of all portions of the development receiving the CO or CCO is within the maximum allowed proportionate share of non-residential use in table 21.04-2. at all phases of construction. |

## October 2022 Version

d. Timing of Mixed-Use Developments

Except by decision of the Director or through a Small Area Implementation Plan, prior to the issuance of any CO or CCO any development must:
i. Meet the minimum housing unit requirement of 21.04.020J.2.a; and
ii. Meet the maximum allowed proportionate share of nonresidential use in table 21.04-2. at all phases of construction. CO or CCO is within the maximum allowed proportionate share of non-residential use in table 21.04-2. at all phases of construction.
f. Street Frontage Requirements

The following standards apply to any street-side frontage of developments in the R-4A district. A primary frontage shall not be located on interior or private streets.
i. Parking lots shall not be located between buildings and the nearest street
ii. Maximum setback applies to the first three stories or 35 feet of street-facing facades, whichever is less (supersedes 21.06.30C.5.)
iii. $30 \%$ of the first three stories of any street-facing building elevation wall shall be windows or doors providing visual access (supersedes 21.07 .110 C .3 .)
iv. At least one street-facing primary entrance located at or within the maximum setback.
v. Enhanced sidewalk incentive allowed per 21.04.020J.2.e.iv.
e. Street Frontage Requirements i. New parking facilities shall not be located between $\frac{\text { buildings and the nearest public street (supersedes }}{21.07 .110 . C .6 . e-f) . ~ O n ~ l o t s ~ w i t h ~ t w o ~ o r ~ m o r e ~ s t r e e t ~}$ 21.07.110.C.6.e-f). On lots with two or more street
frontages, this limitation shall apply only on the primary frontages, this limitation shall apply only on the primary front setback. When the site abuts a street designated in the comprehensive plan as a "main street", a "transit street", a "mixed-use street", or a derivation of these street typologies, this limitation may be changed to such street with the concurrence of the director.
ii. Existing requirements for multifamily development .

## Page \# in new

AO/Rationale
Page 9/19, line 22. Wording simplified per guidance from current planning.

Page 10/19, line 37. Frontage standards have been reduced and simplified, with the primary limitation being on new parking facilities between buildings and the street. Existing design requirements for multifamily development are listed but not changed.

| February 2022 Version | October 2022 Version | Page \# in new AO/Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| g. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Incentives for the R-4 and R-4A Districts <br> Bonus provisions for additional FAR, subject to section 21.06.030E: <br> [THE MAXIMUM BY-RIGHT FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR) WITHIN THE R-4 AND R-4A DISTRICTS IS 1.5 AND 3.0 FAR | f. $\qquad$ Floor Area Ratio (FAR) [INCENTIVES FOR THE R-4 AND R-4A DISTRICTS] <br> The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) in the R-4A district is 4.0 , | Page 11/19, line 6. FAR allowance unchanged, but bonuses moved to the R4 section. There are now no bonuses for additional FAR R-4A as the FAR allowances have been increased to allow them by right. |
| h. Building Height Increase <br> Buildings in the R-4A district may reach a total height of 90 feet. At elevations above 60 feet, all floor area shall be <br> ding AMC Title 21 R-4A Amendments <br> Page 8 of 16 <br> residential uses and the building façade shall be stepped back one (1) foot for every two (2) feet of rise from street rights-ofway and projected rights-of-way[EXCEED THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT ESTABLISHED IN TABLE 21.06-1, UP TO A MAXIMUM TOTAL HEIGHT OF 90 FEET, SUBJECT TO ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS. THESE CONDITIONS ENCOURAGE SLENDER TOWERS WITH CONDENSED FLOOR PLATES, LIGHT AND AIR AT THE PEDESTRIAN LEVEL, AND ACTIVE USES ON THE GROUND FLOOR FACING THE STREET: | g. Building Height Increase Buildings in the R-4A district may reach a height of 60 feet, and up to 90 feet if they undergo an Administrative Site Plan Review as outlined in 21.03.180C. | Page 11/19, Line 12. <br> Building height increase simplified to Administrative Site Plan review. |



## R－4A Comparison Table of Changes Between Versions

October 2022



| February 2022 Version | October 2022 Version | Page \# in new AO/Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Page 15/19. Some language changed from "N/A" to unrestricted, lot size changed (reduced) to reflect existing requirements in the subdivision code. Setback language changed to say "0 or at least 5". FAR section removed. Height language changed. <br> These changes aim to simplify use and application of the zoning district. |
| Section 5. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.06 .030 C .5 ., is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out): <br> 21.06.030C.5. Maximum Setbacks <br> *** *** *** <br> $\underset{* * *}{\text { a. }} \quad \underset{* \star \star}{\text { Measurement }} \underset{\star \star k}{ }$ and Applicability <br> i. The maximum setback applies to the ground-floor, street-facing [ELEVATION OF THE ]building, except as provided otherwise in the zoning district[AS DEPICTED BELOW] <br> vii. Where the required setback is from a private street without a dedicated right-of-way, the maximum setback shall be measured from the building-side edge of the $\frac{\text { abutting sidewalk. }}{* k \star}$ <br> c. $\quad$ General Exceptions to Maximum Setback <br> i. The maximum front setback established by the zoning district may be increased[EXCEEDED BY UP TO 20 |  | Page 15/19, line 6. Section 5 removed and replaced as maximum setbacks are no longer explicitly mentioned in the R-4A zone. The new version of the ordinance exempts multi-building developments from a site plan review requirement for the sake of streamlining development. |



## R-4A Comparison Table of Changes Between Versions

October 2022


| February 2022 Version | October 2022 Version | Page \# in new AO/Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [None] | Section 7. Anchorage Municipal Code 21.08.70. is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the section is not affected and therefore not set out): <br> 21.08.070 ALTERNATIVE RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISIONS <br> C. Cluster Housing <br> 3. Maximum Density and Minimum Site Area | Pages 17-18/19, Line 46. This section added to include R-4A in cluster housing requirements. |
| [None] |  | Page 18/19, line 8. This section added to allow narrow lot housing developments in R-4A. |

## R-4A Comparison Table of Changes Between Versions

October 2022

## Reference Table of Organizational Changes Between Versions (illustrative)

## Original Code <br> J. R-4A: Multifamily Residential Mixed-Use District <br> 1. Purpose <br> 2. District Specific Standards <br> a. Mixed-Use Development Standards <br> b. Maintaining Residential Character

i. Non-Residential Uses allowed
(A) Residential uses occupying 90\% of floor area.
(B) Major site plan review required in some cases.
(C) Conditional use permit required
(D) Major site plan
reviews/Conditional reviews shall meet the following criteria
(1)-(2)
ii. No CO until residential completed
iii. Ground floor façade requirements
(A) Non-residential uses
(B) Residential uses
(C) All uses
iv. Commercial uses shall be enclosed
c. FAR incentives which apply to both R-4 and $\mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$ i-viii
d. Reduced parking ratios
e. Building height increase i-vi
3. District Location Requirement
a.-c.
February 2022 Version
J. R-4A: Multifamily Residential Mixed-Use
District

## 1. Purpose

## 2. District Specific Standards

a. Housing Units Required
b. Allowed Commercial Uses
i. Non-residential allowed in same buildings or same site.
ii. Development site can be multiple lots
c. Uses which do not count towards residential gross floor area. i.-vi.
d. Timing of mixed-use developments
e. Street frontage requirements
i.-v.
f. Floor area Ratio (FAR Incentives for the R-4 and R-4A Districts i.-x.
g. Building Height Increase

## 3. District location requirement

a. Land Use Plan Area
b. Equivalent in neighborhood/district plan

## October 2022 Version

J. R-4A: Multifamily Residential Mixed-Use District

## 1. Purpose

## 2. District Specific Standards

a. Dwelling Units Required
b. Allowed Commercial Uses
i. Non-residential allowed in same buildings or same site.
ii. Development site can be multiple lots
c. Uses which do not count towards residential gross floor area.
d. Timing of mixed-use developments
e. Street frontage requirements i.-ii
f. Floor area Ratio
g. Building Height increase

## 3. District Location Requirement

a. Land Use Plan Area
i. Adjacent or within corridor
ii. Close to an arterial/collector

# Attachment 5 

Comment Response Table Case 2021-0127
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## Comment Response Table

## Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2021-0127 Text Amendments to the R-4A Zoning District

| \#/Date | Source | Comment | Staff Response | PZC <br> Feb 27, 2022 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fairview <br> Community <br> Council | We wish to suggest the Planning Division work <br> cooperatively with the Fairview Community <br> Council (FVCC) to craft a more nuanced approach <br> to revision of the R4A zone, Such an approach is <br> needed in order to accurately reflect underlying <br> differences in platted development in different <br> parts of town. The current approach may not <br> achieve the intent of planning staff. Wholesale <br> zone code changes applicable across the <br> Anchorage Bowl with its varying platted <br> properties can be perceived as a blunt ax <br> approach to a problem. It may be appropriate to <br> use a bit more refined approach. | The R-4A project is intended to address <br> R-4A in all zones, and does not address <br> overlays or special zoning districts. |  |  |
| 2. |  | Fairview <br> Community <br> Council | We suggest past ineffectiveness of the R4A zone <br> category is due to the lack of a vision for how <br> such density and associated characteristics fit <br> into the urban fabric. For example, the R4A zone <br> is what one might expect to see within a City <br> Center sub-area. A cursory review of <br> development patterns will show the Anchorage <br> Bowl has a long way to go before market <br> demand supports such dense development. <br> Absent significant public subsidies, private land <br> markets will continue to meet demand by <br> exporting development to the Mat-Su where | Staff's approach to making R-4A more <br> attractive to residential development <br> focuses on reducing complexity. |


| \#/Date | Source | Comment | Staff Response | PZC <br> Comment/Action |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Feb 27, 2022 | Fairview <br> Community <br> Council | The one area where it may be reasonable to <br> development regulations are minimal. <br> attract the interest of private developers is <br> where a cohesive vision exists conducive to such <br> densities. The Anchorage Land Use Plan (ALUP) is <br> a very high level guiding document providing a <br> general framework - too general for risking <br> investment capital by itself. Implementation of <br> the ALUP requires a corridor or sub-area <br> strategy. The Neighborhood Plans are a welcome <br> step as are the nodal plans such as those for <br> Downtown and the U-Med District. But these are <br> still a bit too high level for advancing specific <br> profit oriented development. The Reinvestment <br> Focus Areas identified in the ALUP would appear <br> to be a way forward but to date there does not <br> does not address specific corridor or <br> sub-area rezonings. <br> appear to be any with detailed Action Plans. It is <br> at the Action Plan level that one may attract the <br> interest of private capital. | The R-4A process has been guided by <br> the |  |



| \#/Date | Source | Comment | Staff Response | PZC <br> Feb 27, 2022 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fairview <br> Community <br> Council | Shadowing impacts - <br> (a) The height of the structures envisioned <br> within this zoning category will cast significant <br> shadows in our sub-arctic environment. For the <br> Fairview area, we request application be limited <br> to those blocks where lots have been developed <br> with an east-west orientation as such lot design <br> means the shadows will fall primarily on the <br> north side lots which would share the zoning <br> category. This would minimize the negative <br> impacts on adjacent lots. | Shadows are an inevitability of <br> structures of any height, especially in <br> an urban area. Limiting heights by <br> specific blocks introduces a high level <br> of complexity which is antithetical to <br> the intent of simplifying R-4A. |  |  |


| \#/Date | Source | Comment | Staff Response | $\begin{gathered} \text { PZC } \\ \text { Comment/Action } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 7 . \\ \text { Feb 27, } 2022 \end{gathered}$ | Fairview Community Council | Pedestrian orientation - <br> (a) The proposed density will experience a significant amount of pedestrian movement at street level. As such, the removal of any front setbacks will leave little room for pedestrians given the typical 60' rights-of-way present in the urban core. We request the proposed language be changed to require first floor colonnades as shown in the figures. The second floor of the structure can extend to the edge of the rights-ofway. Allowances should be made to allow for the inclusion of small patios on upper levels, especially on south and west facing walls. <br> (b) we request the first floor wall should be set back $10^{\prime}$ from the right-of-way and that the walls be required to have at least a 60 percent transparency. This will create a visually stimulating pedestrian environment, provide protection from inclement weather conditions and minimize the need for snow and ice removal. | While the code proposal does not mandate setbacks, it also does not limit buildings from setting back from the street. Landscaping standards, which often act as setbacks, still apply. <br> During the code-writing process, highly prescriptive design standards were identified as a cost to development and so the proposal does not include them. |  |


| \#/Date | Source | Comment | Staff Response | PZC <br> Feb 27, 2022 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fairview | Community <br> Council | Pedestrian protection - <br> (a) It is suggested that street awnings or other <br> horizontal/angled feature be required on <br> exterior facades for the lower levels. These <br> elements will break up the wind downdrafts that <br> currently plague the area around the Atwood <br> Building and the new Convention Center. | For the sake of streamlining residential <br> and mixed-use development, this <br> proposal does not add any prescriptive <br> design standards. |  |
| Feb 27, 2022 | (b) We request incentives be included that <br> encourage the developer to install removable <br> transparent barriers on the colonnades street <br> side. This would allow the space to be closed off <br> during the winter months and provide enhanced <br> protection for pedestrians and, if applicable, for <br> patrons of street level restaurants and/or small <br> shops. | Community <br> Council | Building/Street Environment - <br> We suggest that application of such densities <br> would be more likely to be embraced by the <br> private sector if there were corresponding <br> changes to the urban street environment. Such <br> densities need substantive public amenities <br> within close proximity so that residents have <br> ready access to an attractive and pleasant public <br> realm. As such, we request that within the urban <br> core the revised R4A be targeted toward those <br> rights-of-way designated as pedestrian streets. | Changes to the ROW are beyond the <br> purview of this project. ROW <br> investments are generally a function of <br> the ROW or PME departments and are <br> not regulated by planning code. |


|  | \#/Date | Source | Comment | Staff Response | $\begin{gathered} \text { PZC } \\ \text { Comment/Action } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 10 . \\ \text { Feb } 27,2022 \end{gathered}$ | Fairview Community Council | Building/Street Environment - <br> We request the Planning Division initiate a vibrant public discussion about urban design in our sub-arctic community. Anchorage is competing with other metropolitan areas for investment capital and in order for Anchorage to be competitive, our City needs a much stronger and more positive :"Winter City Sense of Place." We stronger encourage the Municipality to facilitate development of an Action Plan for the Council's proposed Innovation Area as soon as is reasonable. It is our assertion an opportunity exists for our City to attract global investment capital but we need to promote an attractive and compelling urban design. | The department will note this comment for future discussions. |  |
| $\infty$ | 11. | Fairview Community Council | Building/Street Environment - <br> The proposed height and width for development will create very unpleasant street environments unless mitigating actions are included. Research has documented that a building height of three stories and width of 36 feet, with a street width of 72 feet, are the maximum dimension for a building of human scale. The smaller intimate scale requires a building height of 24 feet and a street width of 48 feet. See note below for source. Fortunately for the ALUP and the desire for higher densities within the Anchorage Bowl, the human eyed can be tricked through the judicious use of visual cues. Such visual cues are described above and illustrated in the images. | The primary priority of this proposal is to encourage more housing production using the R-4A zone. The proposal has sought to avoid prescriptive design standards beyond what already exists in code. |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \underset{+}{\mathrm{O}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


| \#/Date | Source | Comment | Staff Response | $\begin{gathered} \text { PZC } \\ \text { Comment/Action } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline 12 . \\ \operatorname{Mar} 22,2022 \end{gathered}$ | Cheryl Richardson | What's the big picture here? What priority actions does MOA planning recommend to improve the residential desirability of this underdeveloped section of downtown Anchorage - C to Cordova, 10th to 15th? | The big picture is to implement the 2040 Land Use Plan, which calls for R4A in the areas identified on the land use plan maps. A piece of this is to allow the creation of more efficient and infill housing on existing infrastructure. This would help encourage better transportation outcomes, climate outcomes, and housing outcomes. |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 13 . \\ \text { Mar } 22,2022 \end{gathered}$ | Cheryl Richardson | Has MOA considered the feasibility of redesigning A and C as complete streets to increase residential investment? | The planning department has no power over right of way investments/redevelopments. Any proposed redesigns, they would have to have been identified by the Muni ROW department, put on their funding plan, and then designed/funded. The R4A project only focuses on private property, as zoning doesn't cover right of way. |  |


| \#/Date | Source | Comment | Staff Response | $\begin{gathered} \text { PZC } \\ \text { Comment/Action } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 14 . \\ \text { Mar 22, } 2022 \end{gathered}$ | Cheryl Richardson | How do new MOA R4A proposals improve the residential desirability of this area? | The R4A proposal seeks to follow the guidance of the plan: <br> - 2040 LUP 2.3. Remove barriers to desired infill development and incorporate flexibility in development requirements to promote adaptive reuse of older buildings and compact infill/redevelopment, including that which reflects traditional urban neighborhood design contexts. LUP Policies 1.5, 3.1, $4.2,5.2,5.3,7.1,7.2$, and 9.3 are also integral to this Goal. <br> - 2040 LUP 3.2. Promote the development of main street, transit-oriented, and mixed-use corridors that help meet the city's needs for retail, services, jobs, and housing; and that support these uses and adjoining neighborhoods with access to multiple modes of travel and attractive pedestrian environments. LUP Policies 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 8.3 are also integral to this Goal. |  |


| \#/Date | Source | Comment | Staff Response | PZC Comment/Action |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | - 2040 LUP 4.2. Allow and encourage innovative compact housing types and a variety of housing options that respond to changing preferences. <br> Furthermore, the R4A proposal needs to address the needs of the entire community, rather than any specific area. |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 15 . \\ \text { Mar } 22,2022 \end{gathered}$ | Cheryl Richardson | Is MOA intentionally encouraging expansion of commercial activity into South Addition, immediately outside the downtown core with its acres of surface parking? | A significant piece of the R4A proposal is that without special conditions, developments are supposed to be primarily residential. The Muni Planning department is only encouraging having zoning align with the intent of the 2040 land use plan. The area in South Addition which is eligible for R4A was identified on the future land use map several years ago through the planning process. <br> If the Muni was really seeking to expand commercial activity in this area it would need to be changing the future land use map, which currently precludes exclusive commercial zoning in the area identified for R4A. |  |


| \#/Date | Source | Comment | Staff Response | PZC <br> Mar 22, 2022 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16. | Cheryl <br> Richardson | Why would MOA allow 'phased development' of <br> 90 foot tall R4A commercial/residential <br> development at only 20 DUA when the existing <br> R3 allows up to 35 DUA at 35 feet height? | 20 dwelling units per acre is a <br> minimum requirement. More dwelling <br> units per acre would be welcomed in <br> the zone and by the plan. The existing <br> proposal sets the lower minimum at 20 <br> du/a because of comments we <br> received (including from the planning <br> commission) that other numbers were <br> too high. |  |
| 17. |  | Why hasn't Weidner built on its RO zoned lot at <br> 14 th and C? | The Planning Department doesn't have <br> any information on the choices of this <br> private property owner. |  |
| 18. |  | Why would MOA allow duplexes in R4A zones <br> when housing is so scarce? | Zoning is restrictive, rather than <br> productive, so the proposal aims to <br> allow the widest range of housing that <br> could possibly meet both plan <br> (community) needs and economic <br> feasibility of development. If someone <br> can meet the density requirement via <br> duplexes, there doesn't seem to be a <br> compelling reason to forbid them. |  |

This page intentionally left blank.

# Attachment 6 <br> Comments Received <br> Case 2021-0127 
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| From: | Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. |
| :---: | :---: |
| To: | Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. |
| Cc: | Bunnell, Kristine R.; Perry, Susan; Community Councils |
| Bcc: | ahccpresident@hotmail.com; Matt Johnson; downtown.c.council@gmail.com president@fairviewcommunity.org; Al Tamagni; Peter Mjos; John Thurber; |
| Subject: | spenardcc@gmail.com; <br> UACCPresident@gmail.com <br> R4A Zoning District Update |
| Date: | Thursday, February 10, 2022 4:32:00 PM |
| Attachments: | image002.pnq |

Dear Representatives of the Airport Heights, Downtown, Fairview, Midtown, North Star, Rogers Park, South Addition, Spenard, and University Area Community Councils,

The long range planning department has been working on updates to the R-4A mixed use zoning district and would like to present information on the project at your next meeting if you have time available.

According to the adopted 2040 Land Use Plan, your council areas have at least some property which could potentially be eligible for this zone through a normal rezoning process. This project itself is not a rezone, but rather addresses changes to what is allowed in the zone when it gets implemented (there is currently only a small amount of land zoned R4A city-wide).

If you would be interested in having a presentation at your next meeting, please contact me directly, and I will look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Daniel Mckenna-Foster


Daniel McKenna-Foster
Senior Planner - Planning Department
Long-Range Planning Division
Email: daniel.mckenna-foster@anchorageak.gov Phone: (907) 343-7918
4700 Elmore Road, Anchorage, AK 99507
www.muni.org/planning

| From: | John Thurber |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. |
| Subject: | Re: R4A Presentation at South Addition CC meeting |
| Date: | Thursday, February 17, 2022 2:43:33 PM |

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]
Good Afternoon Daniel,
You have been added to the agenda for the South Addition Community Council Meeting on Thursday, February 24, 2022. The agenda is on our FCC website and a ten minute time slot has been provided for your presentation under New Business. The Community Council Meeting will be held by Zoom and the link to the Zoom Connection is on our FCC Website. The Council Meeting begins at 7:00 PM and we look forward to your presentation. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to me.

Sincerely,

## John Thurber

Sent from my iPad

On Feb 17, 2022, at 11:14 AM, Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. wrote:

```
Hello,
I just wanted to follow up on an email I sent last week to see if the South Addition community council would be interested in a presentation on changes to the R4A zoning district. Only a small area of South Addition is potentially eligible for this district. This project itself is not a rezone, but rather addresses changes to what is allowed in the zone when it gets implemented (there is currently only a small amount of land zoned R4A city-wide).
The long range planning department has been working on updates to the R-4A mixed use zoning district and would like to present information on the project at your next meeting if you have time available. (For reference, the eligible area is depicted in the map below).
<image001.jpg>
```

Sincerely,
Daniel Mckenna-Foster
<image002.png>

| From: | Allen Kemplen |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. |
| Subject: | Re: R4A meetings next week |
| Date: | Sunday, February 27, 2022 8:00:11 PM <br> image004.pna <br> Attachments: |
|  | R4A discussion Draft Comments.pdf |

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]
Hello Daniel,
The attached draft Response Paper will be discussed at our Thursday Executive Board meeting. Thought I would share the draft with you.
Respectfully
Allen
On Thu, Feb 17, 2022 at 10:40 AM Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. wrote:
Hi Alan,

My best time to discuss R4A next week would be in the evening of $2 / 22$, although I could do any other evening except Monday that week. For reference, below is the map of areas currently eligible for rezoning to R4A (but I don't believe any are actually zoned R4A currently).

Areas Eligible for R-4A Zoning According to the 2040 LUP


Sincerely,
Daniel

## Proposed Chnages to the R4A zoning ctegoty

We wish to suggest the Planning Division work cooperatively with the Fairview Community Council (FVCC) to craft a more nuanced approach to revision of the R4A zone, Such an approach is needed in order to accurately rellect underlyiing differences in platted development in different parts of town. The current approach may not achieve the intent of planning staff. Wholesale zone code changes applicable across the Anchorage Bowl with its varyiing platted properties can be perceived as a blunt ax approach to a problem. It may be appropriate to use a bit more refined approach.

We suggest past ineffectiveness of the R4A zone category is due to the lack of a vision for how such density and associated characteristics fit into the urban fabric. For example, the R4A zone is what one might expect to see within a City Center sub-area. A cursury review of development patterns will show the Anchorage Bowl has a long way to go before market demand supports such dense development. Absent significant public subsidies, private land markets will continue to meet demand by exporting development to the Mat-Su where land rents are substantially lower and land development regulations are minimal.

The one area where it may be reasonable to attract the interest of private developers is where a cohesive vision exists condusive to such densities. The Anchorage Land Use Plan (ALUP) is a very high level guiding document providing a general framework - too general for risking investment capital by itself. Implementation of the ALUP requires a corridor or sub-area strategy. The Neighborhood Plans are a welcome step as are the nodal plans such as those for Downtown and the U-Med District. But these are still a bit too high level for advancing specific profit oriented development. The Reinvestment Focus Areas identified in the ALUP would appear to be a way forward but to date there does not appear to be any with detailed Action Plans. It is at the Action Plan level that one may attract the interest of private capital.

An Action Plan approach would focus on what specific steps are to advanced by whom within a relatively short planning period - typically no longer than five years. The Action Plan should also be developed in a cooperative manner with major stakeholders and would include signed Memorandums of Agreement commiting participating parties to the allocation of capital along with specific and ancillary development actions.

The Action Plan would focus on a specific corridor or sub-area and break things down to specific parcels and development schedules.

R4A densities require fairly high rents to justify the costs of such dense development. Dense development has to have some particulary redeeming qualities, proximity to high quality development of similar density or access to unique public amenities. Investors need to have reasonable assurances their investments will produce acceptable returns for the length of the investment period. Given the above, it seems the R4A re-zoning effort would be more productive if was crafted in a different way. For example, one could include a R4A-F subcategory. The "F" standing for Fairview. This particular sub-section would be linked to on-going efforts to develop the Fairview Innovation Area and associated Fairview Greenway.

## Proposed Chnages to the R4A zoning ctegoty

We wish to make the following more specific comments:

1. Shadowing impacts -a ) The height of the structures envisioned within this zoning category will cast significant shadows in our sub-arctic environment. For the Fairview area, we request application be limited to those blocks where lots have been developed with an east-west orientation as such lot design means the shadows will fall primarily on the north side lots which would share the zoning category. This would minimize the negative impacts on adjacent lots. b) The shadowing impact will be felt even with the above placement and as a result we request inclusion of language requiring the city center density development to incorporate a certain percentage of vertical surfaces on upper levels with reflective materials placed so as to "bounce" sunlight into the shadow footprint created by the structure. Such an approach will significantly increase the amount of ambient light within the areas of cast shadow and reduce the impacts of deep shadow.
2. Pedestrian orientation -a) The proposed density will experience a significant amount of pedestrian movement at street level. As such, the removal of any front setbacks will leave little room for pedestrians given the typical 60' rights-of-way
 present in the urban core. We request the proposed language be changed to require first floor collonades as shown in the figures. The second floor of the structure can extend to the edge of the rights-of-way. Allowances should be made to allow for the inclusion of small patios on upper levels, especially on south and west facing walls. b) we request the first floor wall should be set back 10 ' from the right-of-way and that the walls be required to have at least a 60 percent transparency. This will create a visually stimulating pedestrian environment, provide protection from inclement weather conditions and minimize the need for snow and ice removal
3. Pedestrian protection -a ) It is suggested that street awnings or other horizontal/angled feature be required on exterior facades for the lower levels.. These elements will break up the wind downdrafts that currently plague


## Proposed Chnages to the R4A zoning ctegoty

the area around the Atwood Building and the new Convention Center.b) We request incentives be included that encourage the developer to install removale transparent barriers on the colonnades street side. This would allow the space to be closed off during the winter months and provide enhanced protection for pedestrians and, if applicable, for patrons of street level restaurants and/or small
 shops.
4. Building/Street Environment - We suggest that application of such densities would be more likely to be embraced by the private sector if there were corresponding changes to the urban street environment. Such densities need substantive public amenities within close proximity so that residents have ready access to an attractive and pleasant public realm. As such, we request that within the urban core the revised R4A be targeted toward those rights-of-way designated as pedestrian streets.
5. Building/Street Envirronment - We request the Planning Division initatie a vibrant public discussion about urban design in our sub-arctic community. Anchorage is competing with other metropolitan areas for investment capital and in order for Anchorage to be competitve, our City needs a much stronger and more positve :"Winter City Sense of Place." We stronger encourage the Municipality to facilitate
 development of an Action Plan for the Council's proposed Innovation Area as soon as is reasonable. It is our assertion an opportunity exists for our City to attract global investment capital but we need to promote an attractive and compelling urban designr.
6. Building/Street Environment - The proposed height and width for development will create very unpleasant street environments unless mitigating actions are included. Research has documented that a building height of three stories and width of 36 feet, with a street width of 72 feet, are the maximum dimension for a building of human scale. The smaller intimate scale requires a building height of 24 feet and a street width of 48 feet. See note below for source. Fortunately for the ALUP and the desire for higher densities within the Anchorage Bowl, the human eyed can be tricked through the judicious use of visual cues. Such visual cues are described above and illustrated in the images.

## Proposed Chnages to the R4A zoning ctegoty

We greatly appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on proposed land use development code changes that have the potential to significantly impact the built environment in our part of the City. We hope our input is perceived as constructive.
A. great Winter City is built on the experiences of the people living and working within it. It is our hope that, by working together towards a common goal of a more livable Winter City we can make substantive progress and Anchorage will truly become a City built to be enoyed by people all year round..

Respectfully,

## Allen Kemplen

President
Fairview Community Council

Cc: Fairview Executive Board

Source Note: "Great Streets", Allan B. Jacobs, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1993, Page 278, Several of the images above are from this resource document.

# ANCHORAGE DOWNTOWN COMMUNITY COUNCIL 

Wednesday, March 2, 2022
Virtual Meeting
Downtown.c.council@gmail.com
CALL MEETING TO ORDER

- Welcome \& Introductions

Participants: Silvia Villamides, Jason Motyka, Richard Irwin, Alexandria McCormick, Tom Begich, Tristan Walsh, Margo Bellamy, Amanda Moser, Kristine Bunnell, Joy Boston, Daniel McKenna, Elizabeth Appleby, Sami Graham, Kim Stalder, Megan Moffitt, Karen Klass, Redar Dalthorp, Steven Callahan, Bridget Sanders, Chris Rapan , James Toussaint, Brian Neilson, Briana Glasionov, Barbara Block, Niko Conteros, Mike Robbins, Charlie Watson, Cliff Burnett, Dan Knops, Mike Robuck, Philip Elm, Robert Manley, Sven Fedorow, Tina Morris, Troy Holland, Adam Blomfield, David Hall, Jared Hayes, Amber McDonald, Nicole Cusack, John Snead, Bob Neumann, Jon McNeil, Julie Saupe, Lawrence Michael , Mark Glasionov, Mike Robuck, Renae Kennicot, Quinn, JC Durante, Brandon - (Bernies Bungalow), Eric Ritner, Fernado Lee, Robert Alexander, Russ Reno, Jamey Walker, Robert Manley, Steve Rader, Ritesh Laud, Tina Morris, Terri Rospy, Doug Farris, Mary Rohlfing, Buzz Rohlfing, Logan Rammell, Jamey Walker, Dave Syren, Cliff Groh, Michelle Klouda, Kristin Anderson, Malena Hausinger, Jeffrey Petersen, Jessica Rostad, Richard Shafer, Doug Holton, John McManamin, William Ehelebe, Jesse Ackerson, Mark Zorbin, Roy Habib, Rominy Dob, David McCarthy, Clayton Murray, Susan Knowles, Daniel Volland, Christopher Reynolds, Wilma Klass, Jeff Peterson, Robert Good, Terrance Shanigan

- Additions/changes to the agenda. Approval of agenda.

Richard Irwin made the motion to approve the agenda. Amanda Moser seconded the motion. Motion passed. Agenda approved

- Approval of February 2, 2022 minutes.

Amanda Moser made the motion to approve the meeting minutes from February 2, 2022. Russ Reno seconded the motion. Motion passed. Meeting minutes approved.

- Reports: 3minute limit
- Assembly Report - Chris Constant n/a
- Senate Representative Report - Tom Begich
- Working on Budget issues - the legislature is working on negotiating budget items
- CAPS applications are in - previewing them now
- Considering using ARPA, federal money
- General obligation bond is being considered
- Pre -K reading bill being introduced
- Essential Workers - Free college tuition for up to 4 years with Covid money - for those loosing jobs or going part time or working during Covid
- Back log in doing background checks on childcare workers is holding up people being hired. Drafted letter addressing back log to Adam Crum
- Ukrainian - trying to look at not investing in Russia. Have some invested there already
- House of Representative - Tristan Walsh for Zach Fields
- Wrapping up budget process
- Dealing with federal money
- General bond
- Homecare workers - trying to help those vulnerable and in need.
- HB 133 - updates savings accounts for disabled - without effecting their money through programs of assistance.
- HB - links between colleges, apprentices and high schools. Work force readiness.
- HB 149 - Childcare workers to collectively bargain with the state. Vote on forming a union or join a union. They could have benefits. Better reimbursements, more training.
- Mayor's Office Report - Alexis
- Women's month - round table Tues March 15, Thurs. March 19, Wed March 23 at noon Facebook page will have these noted
- Tues April 5 - election
- Coffee with a cop
- Tax Help - AARP Tuesdays and Thursdays at Lousaac Library
- Anchorage Police Department n/a
- Anchorage School Board - Margo Bellamy
- Feb. highlights; agreements with 2 unions, Totem and Teacher's
- Search update for superintendent - 23 applications received. Narrowing down to 11. March 14 start interviews. 2-3 candidates will be brought forth to the community
- Lottery open for schools
- Friday joint meeting with the assembly
- Encouraging input from public
- Next week is spring break
- Superintendent update to Covid - choice masking for students, children can travel domestically now, graduations in person this year
- Anchorage Downtown Partnership - Amanda Moser
- Team working last month - removed snow and ice from sidewalks
- Downtown conversation times
- Getting ready for summer events
- Museum and PAC teaming up with ADP for events
- March 11 5-8pm town square park ice skating
- Our Downtown Update - Kristine Bunnell

Work session March 11 @ 1:00 pm. Anchorage Assembly March $15^{\text {th }}$

- JBER - Joy Boston
- Updates March 1 - mask mandate is in line with CDC. Low medium levels in Anchorage do not have to wear a mask when on base if vaxed.
- Arctic Edge going on - mixed military groups
- Great Alaskan Sportsman Show - Deniana Center - tables there along with recruiters
- Arctic Thunder this summer
- National Cemetery for those vets without family.
- ACDA - Mike Robbins
- $\quad 6^{\text {th }}$ Ave. project on track and on time. Construction begins October 2022
- JC Penney garage project coming up - not purchased yet
- 6-12 potential projects being looked at for downtown
- New Business: 6minute limit
- Alcohol and Marijuana Committee Update - Silvia Villamides
- LED and neighbors meeting on zoom March 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}$. Mike Ward will run the meeting
- Treasurer Update - Jason Motyka
- \$4,066.
- CIP Update - Jason \& Mike
- Presentations: 6minute limit (3minutes - to speak / 3minutes - for questions)
- MOA Planning Department - Daniel McKenna Foster
- Shared screen. Reinvestment Focused Area, (RFA) March 14 - going to planning \& zoning department. Many variants of property and ideas on how to do this. Public investments used. RFAs in 2040 LUP. Can happen in any area of the town. Can target neighborhoods. Identified areas in 2016. Downtown area factored in heavily. Small Area Implement Plan (SAIP)
- Update to the R-4A citywide mixed use zoning district project.

MOA Plamning Department ㄷlizabeth Appleby

- Public information center on March $8^{\text {th }}$. Planning and zoning meeting for approval. This looks at neighborhoods besides downtown area. Lowering parking requirements in these areas. Title 21 parking and site access code amendments
- Downtown Library within Old City Hall - Sami Graham
- Mayor Bronson's administration and the Anchorage Library Foundation have agreed to collaborate on incorporating a Downtown Library within Old City Hall.
- Anchorage Equal Rights Commission Outreach - Megan Moffitt
- AERC - investigator Megan Moffitt. Sharing resources they offer and what they do. Housed $1^{\text {st }}$ floor of the City Hall. Law enforcement for people being discriminated against.
- Resolution opposing the relocation of transit stops from the Downtown transit center to $6^{\text {th }}$ Avenue between C Street and E Street. -Kim Stalder
- 6 businesses will be affected for 12-18 months. Businesses would like the transit center relocated elsewhere. If not, they would like accommodations.
- Tent City Tap House - lose deliveries, business bus parking and curbside pick-up
- Mike Robbins - when bus stop relocates there will be bathrooms and they will be maintained and clean, security will be present.
- Kim - talked with Acton (transit center) this morning. New software coming onboard in the fall. New software could help to find another location for transit center.
Kim - Would like to suggest not relocate transit center until the project actually breaks ground.
- Recommendations: meet with Mayor's office, Mike Robbins, Transit and businesses effected to mediate.
- Announcements / Neighbor Comments (2minute limit)

Mike Robbins - growing, hiring for admin. assistant

- ADJOURN MEETING

Richard Irwin moved to adjourn the meeting. Mike Robbins seconded the motion. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at: 7:30pm

| From: | Spenard Community Council |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. |
| Subject: | Re: R4A for spenard |
| Date: | Thursday, March 3, 2022 4:25:01 PM |
| Attachments: | image001.png |

## [EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Daniel,
Thank you for joining us last name and sending this along!
Meg

On Thu, Mar 3, 2022 at 2:44 PM Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. wrote:

Good afternoon,

I sent the previous email from my phone last night so it probably was not very well organized. Here are the links for R4A (please note, some are direct download pdf):

- PZC packet on R4A (map is out of date on this one because it shows downtown, Spenard area is accurate)
- Developer comments on R4A that didn't make it into the packet
- Code section21.07.20 on stream setbacks

| Stream | Streamside <br> Zone | Riparian Edge Zone | Total <br> Stream <br> Setback <br> Width Per <br> Side |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bird Creek, California Creek, Eagle River, Eklutna River, Glacier Creek, Knik River, Placer River Portage Creek, Skookum Creek, Twentymile River, | 25 feet | 75 feet | 100 feet |
| Bayshore Creek, Campbell Creek, Carol Creek, Chester Creek, Clunie Creek, Craig Creek, Crow Creek, Crystal Creek, Edmonds Lake Creek, Elmore Creek, Falling Water Creek, Fire Creek, Fossil Creek, Gunnery Creek, Hidden Creek, Indian Creek, Kern Creek, Little Peters Creek, Little Campbell Creek, Little Rabbit Creek, Little Survival Creek, Meadow Creek, McHugh Creek, Mink Creek, Mirror Creek, Parks Creek, North Branch North Fork Little Campbell Creek, North Fork Campbell Creek, North Fork Little Campbell Creek, Penguin Creek, Peters Creek, Peterson Creek, Potter Creek, Rabbit Creek, Ship Creek, South Fork Campbell Creek, South Fork Eagle River, South Branch North Fork Little Campbell Creek, South Fork Little Campbell Creek, Stuckagain Creek, Rainbow Creek, Tidewater Slough, Thunderbird Creek, Tiny Creek, Virgin Creek, Winner Creek, | 25 feet | 25 feet | 50 Feet |
| Alyeska Creek, Eagle Loop Creek, Fish Creek, Furrow Creek, Hood Creek, Middle Fork Chester Creek, Moose Meadows Creek, North Fork Chester Creek, North Branch South Fork Chester Creek, Reflection Lake Creek, All other streams and unnamed stream tributaries | 25 feet | 0 feet | 25 feet |
| Within the Hillside Watershed Protection Area: All named streams listed above | 50 feet | 0 feet | 50 feet |
| Within the Hillside Watershed Protection Area: All other streams and unnamed stream tributaries | 25 feet | 25 feet | 50 feet |
| Ephemeral channels | 10 feet | 0 feet | 10 feet |

Finally, a few materials on the Reinvestment Focus Area, which I ran out of time for last night:

- Project page
- Info Sheet (attached)

Please let me know if there is anything I missed or other info I can provide.

Sincerely,
Daniel Mckenna-Foster

From: Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R.
Sent: Wednesday, March 2, 2022 8:40 PM
To: spenardcc@gmail.com
Subject: R4A for spenard

Hello,

Please find below some materials discussed at tonight's meeting.

The project page, which has some historical documents on the project:
https://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Projects/AnchLandUse/Pages/Action-3-1.aspx

Agenda \& materials for the $2 / 9$ meeting when the PZC discussed R4A.
https://meetings.muni.org/AgendaOnline/Meetings/ViewMeeting?id=4553\&doctype=1

Comment from developers can be found in the packet, and also the late-received comment at the link below:


Spenard Community Council
1057 West Fireweed Lane, Suite 100
Anchorage, Alaska 99503
spenardcc@gmail.com

| From: | University Area Community Council |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. |
| Subject: | Re: R4A Zoning District Update |
| Date: | Thursday, March 3, 2022 9:20:24 PM |
| Attachments: | image001.png |

## [EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Thanks for the participation and the response. Let me provide some feedback to your email. I hope to do that tomorrow, if not early next week. I particularly want to give you a tour related to \#3.

On Thu, Mar 3, 2022 at 11:28 AM Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. wrote:

Hi Tyler,

Thank you again for having me last night and giving me a bit of flexibility. If anyone had any follow up questions, below is a bit more detail on some of the things I heard last night (all of which I am sure you are familiar with):

1. Rezoning in the "University/Medical Center" Designation: our department would not support a rezone to R4A within this designation because it isn't clearly identified that way in the 2040 LUP, plus there is a specific call out for R4A in the UMED area plan. So If the University sought to rezone to this mixed use zone, we would direct them to go through the comp plan amendment process so the rezone aligned with both plans.
2. Parking: This R4A update doesn't touch any of the parking requirements, as they live in a separate chapter and generally apply to uses rather than zones. However it's worth mentioning that another long range project on parking and site access has proposed changes to the parking standards, with an ultimate possibility of an "open option" where vehicle storage problems are managed directly where they occur (the public street) rather than indirectly on private property. The stated purpose of off-street parking requirements is to minimize on-street congestion and spillover, but no amount of parking mandate can ever make a convenient, free street space not free or convenient-so if the problem is on-street congestion, the only real solution is simply managing the street. Rather than "making the public" pay for vehicle storage, this is really just proposing that the Municipality take active responsibility for managing its own ROW, as it (ideally) would for any other public property. Thus the costs are not borne by the public, but by users who take up public space to store their own private vehicles--that is, drivers. Bundling vehicle storage costs into housing increases costs and unfairly impacts people with lower or no car storage needs, so unless they are desired as a way to actively encourage motor vehicle use, there isn't a great rationale for including them (although they do function pretty well in preventing
new housing or giving cities a way out from having to manage public resources). Ultimately all just a policy question of values/priorities.
3. Facades: Throughout this project we have had a lot of discussions about what should be required along roadways, and how buildings "should" interact with the streets they sit on. More than one stakeholder has pointed out that it is a bit unfair to require a building to be "pedestrian oriented" along a ROW that is fundamentally automobile oriented. To address this we changed the standards so that the higher frontage requirements apply only along ROW where the Municipality is committed to peoplecentered improvements, and other facades can basically treat the street with the same "attitude" they receive from the street outside. As you know, the values of traffic engineering which shape the right-of-way-moving vehicles quickly and smoothly above all else-and the values of the 2040 LUP which influence private propertycreating a livable place for people---are often in contradiction with each other, and unfortunately this zone won't go anywhere near being able to resolve that.
4. Transportation modeling: There was a final comment about road builders using the R4A designation as a way to justify new road projects-I don't have enough information to say anything about this either way, although I can note that we are trying to work more closely with local transportation partners to get them to look at their processes in a less auto-centric way-mainly by talking about person-trips rather than vehicle trips, and updating code language to acknowledge where assumptions about vehicle use may or may not have any objective basis. Unfortunately Title 21 is full of examples of all travel activity assumed to be performed by motor vehicles, rather than people, so getting to a more objective baseline might take some time.

Please feel free to have anyone send comments to me or Anchorage2040@muni.org. I've also attached our info sheet for reference.

If your council would be interested in sending a letter of support (or just comments) we would be glad to receive it as well. Currently we have no definite date for the next PZC hearing, but were tentatively thinking about sometime in mid-April.

Sincerely,
Daniel Mckenna-Foster

From: University Area Community Council < uaccpresident@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 8:46 PM
To: Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R.
Subject: Re: R4A Zoning District Update

## [EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hi Daniel, I'm particularly interested if you are able to keep things high level and really show where the MOA thinks these districts, within the UACC, are most appropriate. That something that sounds doable?

I find that people often don't understand process, so being able to explain that you are creating the tool, and to implement the tool there are other steps.

Let me know if that sounds right. Thanks for reaching out. I was out of town last week and completely unplugged. Sorry for not getting back to you sooner.

Tyler

On Thu, Feb 10, 2022 at 4:32 PM Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. wrote:

Dear Representatives of the Airport Heights, Downtown, Fairview, Midtown, North Star, Rogers Park, South Addition, Spenard, and University Area Community Councils,

The long range planning department has been working on updates to the $\mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$ mixed use zoning district and would like to present information on the project at your next meeting if you have time available.

According to the adopted 2040 Land Use Plan, your council areas have at least some


#### Abstract

property which could potentially be eligible for this zone through a normal rezoning process. This project itself is not a rezone, but rather addresses changes to what is allowed in the zone when it gets implemented (there is currently only a small amount of land zoned R4A city-wide).


If you would be interested in having a presentation at your next meeting, please contact me directly, and I will look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Daniel Mckenna-Foster


Planning Department
Daniel McKenna-Foster
Senior Planner - Planning Department
Long-Range Planning Division
Email: daniel.mckenna-foster@anchorageak.gov
Phone: (907) 343-7918
4700 Elmore Road, Anchorage, AK 99507
www.muni.org/planning

Tyler Robinson, President
University Area Community Council (UACC)
Anchorage, Alaska

| From: | Matt Johnson |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. |
| Cc: | Community Councils |
| Subject: | Re: North Star \& R4A |
| Date: | Thursday, March 10, 2022 10:22:53 PM |
| Attachments: | image003.png |

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]
Thanks Daniel,
I will make this material available to the NSCC membership.
Thanks for taking the time to share this info with us.

## Matt

NSCC

## From: "Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R." <br> To: Matt Johnson <br> Cc: "Info" [info@communitycouncils.org](mailto:info@communitycouncils.org) <br> Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2022 4:04:44 PM <br> Subject: North Star \& R4A

Good afternoon Matt,

Thanks for having me on the show last night--please find attached my presentation from last night and a project info summary of the project. Here is the project webpage. We will probably bring this item back to the Planning \& Zoning Commission sometime in April or May, so if Northstar has any comments please feel free to submit them to me or Anchorage2040@muni.org.

Sincerely,
Daniel Mckenna-Foster


Daniel McKenna-Foster
Senior Planner • Planning Department
Long-Range Planning Division
Email: daniel.mckenna-foster@anchorageak.gov
Phone: (907) 343-7918
4700 Elmore Road, Anchorage, AK 99507
www.muni.org/planning

| From: | Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Lindsey Hajduk |
| Subject: | RE: Spenard Key Points |
| Date: | Tuesday, March 15, 2022 10:09:00 AM |
| Attachments: | image001.png |

By all means. Do you need any other materials? Maps, etc?

From: Lindsey Hajduk
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2022 10:09 AM
To: Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R.
Subject: Re: Spenard Key Points

## [EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Sounds good. Can I share this out? I'll probably send a zoom invite for all this later today and can include this doc and your email too.

LH

From: Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R.
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2022 10:00 AM
To: Lindsey Hajduk
Subject: RE: Spenard Key Points
$3 / 21$ sounds great, I added it to my calendar.

If you circulate that document to the group beforehand and anyone has any questions just let me know and I can prepare some responses/discussion for the meeting.

From: Lindsey Hajduk
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2022 9:44 AM
To: Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R.
Subject: Re: Spenard Key Points
[EXTERNAL EMAIL]
Thanks Daniel,

I like where you're going with it. I get what you're saying about "simplify." It helps me understand some of the current proposed changes that are different than the original proposal.

Looks like most of our task force members will be able to meet Monday, March 21 at 6:30pm. Would you want to be first on the agenda and join at 6:30? Then we'd shift to talk Spenard Road, which you
could stay on for if you'd like.

Lindsey
From: Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R.
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2022 1:05 PM
To: Lindsey Hajduk
Subject: Spenard Key Points

Hi Lindsey,

Please find attached a quick table of the changes to R4A. I've highlighted in blue the items that I think people might be most interested in—but that's not to say that other items won't be worth discussion as well.

I may keep working on this a bit before next week, but wanted to get you a rough version for orientation beforehand. As I was writing this, I realized that my use of "simplify" might be the same as a traffic engineer's use of "improve"...just a word of warning.

Please let me know if there are any questions.

Sincerely,
Daniel
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Daniel McKenna-Foster
Senior Planner • Planning Department
Long-Range Planning Division
Email: daniel.mckenna-foster@anchorageak.gov
Phone: (907) 343-7918
4700 Elmore Road, Anchorage, AK 99507
www.muni.org/planning

```
From: James Brooks
To: Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R.
Subject: RE: R4A + Spenard Meeting Option
Date: Sunday, March 13, 2022 12:49:02 PM
Attachments: imaqe001.pnq
```

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]
Hi Daniel.
Thanks for all of your work on the R4A. I spoke with Lindsey on Friday. I think our conversation helped her understand the problems with the prescriptive criteria in the code. Things like the glazing are very problematic and makes no sense. The examples that we discussed are obvious (Fang C St/N Lights, North Face Store C St and $5^{\text {th }}$ downtown....). Forcing all of the parking in to the interior could cause unintended consequences.... Setbacks are problematic with contiguous parcels, etc.
Hope you are doing well.
J. Jay

From: Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R.
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2022 4:48 PM
To: J. Jay Brooks
Subject: R4A + Spenard Meeting Option

Good Afternoon J.Jay,

Per the Planning \& Zoning Commission's direction, over the past few weeks I have been giving presentations on R4A to a number of community councils across town. Not surprisingly, we have gotten some support and some opposition, and I am looking at what it will take to keep moving the zone forward.

With the aim of helping the Commission and larger community to feel comfortable with any changes when the proposal goes back to public hearing, I wanted to ask if you would be willing to sit down with Lindsey Hajduk or some others from Spenard to help address any worries or concerns and ultimately build up some general support. This is my suggestion and not a public meeting, but rather a sort of roundtable meeting where everyone could look at things from the same angle so that we can eventually move the zoning changes forward. My role would be to sit in the middle and clarify any code or plan requirements if needed, and hopefully help temper any concerns about any costs and benefits of change or development.

I spoke with Lindsey this afternoon and she mentioned that she had planned to talk to you soon anyway, so if it is something that you think would be useful, please let me know. Again, there is no obligation at all, and if you don't think this would be a productive use of time I completely understand.

Sincerely, Daniel

## Municipality of Anchorage

Public Transit Advisory Board Resolution \#2022-02

## A RESOLUTION OF THE ANCHORAGE PUBLIC TRANSIT ADVISORY BOARD SUPPORTING THE ORDINANCE <br> AMENDING ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 21 SECTIONS 21.04.020J., 21.05.010E., 21.05.060B.5., 21.06.020, 21.06.030C.5., 21.07.120A., AND 21.15.040.

WHEREAS, the Planning Department at the Municipality of Anchorage has presented proposed updates to the R-4A zoning district; and

WHEREAS, the Board is intended to contribute to the long-range planning of a balanced public transit system in the municipality; and

WHEREAS, the Board's core values are connection, equity, riders, and safety; and

WHEREAS, the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan (LUP) designates transit-supportive development corridors; and

WHEREAS, the proposed updates to the existing R-4A are intended to create a more pedestrian-oriented environment and allow more commercial space within mixed-use developments along transit-supportive development corridors; and

WHEREAS, dense neighborhoods along high-frequency transit routes with places to walk to, such as stores and services, encourage more walking and improve access to transit; and

WHEREAS, the best way to encourage transit ridership is to create neighborhoods that are walkable (and bikeable), incorporate a mix of uses, and encompass a compact neighborhood form; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Anchorage Public Transit Advisory Board supports the proposed amendments to Anchorage Municipal Code, Title 21 sections 21.04.020j., 21.05.010e., 21.05.060b.5., 21.06.020, 21.06.030c.5., 21.07.120a., and 21.15.040

PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Public Transit Advisory Board this $10^{\text {th }}$ day of March 2022.


Sarah Preskitt
Chair

| From: | Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | ahccpresident@hotmail.com |
| Subject: | 3/17 R4A Presentation |
| Date: | Thursday, February 17, 2022 10:54:00 AM |
| Attachments: | imaqe002.pnq |

Hello,

I am just confirming that I will attend the 3/17/2022 Airport Heights Community Council Meeting at around 7:50pm. For your reference, the map below shows the areas which are currently eligible for R4A zoning according to the 2040 Land Use Plan. Please note this map does not consider other restrictions such as wetlands, salmon streams, or other land use limitations.

Areas Eligible for R-4A Zoning According to the $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ LUP


I will send you additional materials as we get closer to the meeting.

Thank you,
Daniel
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## Daniel McKenna-Foster

Senior Planner - Planning Department
Long-Range Planning Division
Email: daniel.mckenna-foster@anchorageak.gov
Phone: (907) 343-7918
4700 Elmore Road, Anchorage, AK 99507
www.muni.org/planning

| From: | Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Brita Mjos; Carolyn Ramsey |
| Subject: | RE: Airport Heights zoning presentation and public comment period |
| Date: | Tuesday, March 15, 2022 3:10:00 PM |
| Attachments: | R4AEliqibleAH.pnq |

Hello,

This is a project that went to public hearing but was sent back by the Planning \& Zoning Commission for additional comment.

- Any comments you send now, make during the meeting this week, send after the meeting, or make leading up to or during the public hearing (tentatively scheduled for April or May) will be public comment.
- Attached is a map which shows the parcels in Airport Heights which are eligible for existing R4A today---any rezone would be required to go through the normal rezone process.
- The R4A project isn't proposing to change the zoning of any existing land or propose any development, but rather changes to the existing standards of the R4A zone.
- The wetland protection standards in $\underline{21.07 .20}$ are not changed or altered as part of this proposal.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,
Daniel

From: Brita Mjos
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2022 2:27 PM
To: Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R.; Carolyn Ramsey
Subject: Airport Heights zoning presentation and public comment period

## [EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hello Daniel,
I am the Parks Chair for the Airport Heights Community Council. I understand you'll be presenting to the AHCC meeting on Thursday regarding areas which are currently eligible for R4A zoning according to the 2040 Land Use Plan. Maybe you will cover this on Thursday, but can you please clarify what the status is of this zoning consideration, and if or when there will be an opportunity for public comment? As you probably know, the area includes Chester Creek (a salmon stream) and wetlands, and is adjacent to Tikishla Park, which is heavily used and highly valued by the neighborhood. We look forward to learning more about any proposed land use changes/designations or development.

Thank you,

The March meeting will be held via Zoom (see link below) All attendees will be asked to provide their full name and street they live on for the record.

## Join Zoom

Meeting https://zoom.us/j/92937817203?pwd=MFJSQUpvbGNYWmtyVU1OVGhzODRjZz09
Meeting ID: 92937817203
Passcode: 215692
Dial by your location
+12532158782 or +1 6699009128

7:00 pm Call to Order, establish quorum, introductions
7:05 pm Approve March 2022 Agenda \& Approve February 2022 Minutes

7:10 pm AFD/Assembly/Legislative/School Board Reports and JBER

7:40 pm PTA Report

7:45 pm Reapportionment Update - Felix
$7: 55 \mathrm{pm} 36^{\text {th }}$ Update with DOWL

8:00 pm R-4 Zoning for land Southeast of Tikishla Park - Daniel McKenna-Foster, Muni Planning

8:15 pm APD CAP Team due to suspected drug house on Primrose

8:30 pm Presidents Report and Committee Reports - PEL update, Yes Bistro renewed their liquor license.

8:35 pm Annual Airport Heights Picnic

8:45 pm FCC Report

8:50 pm Community Concerns

| From: | Cheryl Richardson |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. |
| Subject: | Proposed R4A amendments |
| Date: | Tuesday, March 22, 2022 9:00:59 PM |

## [EXTERNAL EMAIL]

My apologies for the delay in my response Daniel, I'm simply not digging into zoning details as deeply as I used to, and have to admit my understanding of the R4A proposals is still limited.

But when I said I find the latest R4A proposals 'threatening' I mean South Addition is committed to maintaining and improving our 'neighborhood character.' And many of us are concerned about the need for quality residential development between C and Cordova. The rezone most of us remember: Weidner at 14th and C, R3 to RO SL, allowing 37 units rather than R3's 17 units is still problematic, especially since the lot is still vacant.

Some questions for you:

- What's the big picture here? What priority actions does MOA planning recommend to improve the residential desirability of this under-developed section of downtown Anchorage - C to Cordova, 10th to 15th?
- Has MOA considered the feasibility of redesigning A and C as complete streets to increase residential investment?
- How do new MOA R4A proposals improve the residential desirability of this area?
- Is MOA intentionally encouraging expansion of commercial activity into South Addition, immediately outside the downtown core with its acres of surface parking?
- Why would MOA allow 'phased development' of 90 foot tall R4A commercial/residential development at only 20 DUA when the existing R3 allows up to 35 DUA at 35 feet height?
- Why hasn't Weidner built on its R0 zoned lot at 14 th and C?
- Why would MOA allow duplexes in R4A zones when housing is so scarce?

I look forward to learning more about these proposals.
Thank you, Cheryl

On Fri, Mar 11, 2022 at 8:40 AM Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. wrote:

## Thanks Tom.

Cheryl, what do you mean that the presentation was threatening? Are you speaking about content, or something else? I'd be glad to provide any additional information or respond to any concerns.

Thank you, Daniel

From: Davis, Tom G.
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 8:32 AM
To: Cheryl Richardson
Cc: Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R.
Subject: RE: how do i learn the process for r 4 a amendments?

Sorry, Cheryl, I meant to cc Daniel McKenna Foster on my response below to your question.

Thanks,
Tom

From: Davis, Tom G.
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 8:31 AM
To: Cheryl Richardson
Subject: RE: how do i learn the process for r 4 a amendments?

Hi, Cheryl,

The R-4A amendments project is among the 2040 LUP implementation projects (follow link). From there you will find the R-4A project web page.

For more information, contact Daniel McKenna-Foster (cc'ed), our long-range division planner who is lead on the R-4A amendments.

Thank you,

Tom

From: Cheryl Richardson

Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2022 8:21 PM
To: Davis, Tom G.
Subject: how do i learn the process for r 4 a amendments?
[EXTERNAL EMAIL]
i found sacc's latest presentation quite threatening.
c.

| From: | Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Peter Mios |
| Subject: | RE: Rogers Park presentation |
| Date: | Friday, April 1, 2022 3:24:00 PM |

Good afternoon Peter,
Just checking in if I could present on the potential changes to the R4A zone at this month's Roger's Park council meeting. There isn't much land in Rogers Park that could currently ever be rezoned to R4A, but we are trying to reach every neighborhood with even a small designation in the 2040 land use plan.

Thank you,
Daniel Mckenna-Foster
-----Original Message-----
From: Peter Mjos
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 8:44 AM
To: Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R.
Cc: Lindbeck Steve; McMurren Scott; Linda Chase; Raun Cassandra; Wilson Ric; Jim Wright
Subject: Re: Rogers Park presentation
[EXTERNAL EMAIL]
Thanks, Dan. We will plan on probably April.
Best,
Peter Mjos

```
> On Feb 14, 2022, at 08:11, Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R. wrote: >
> Hello,
>
> Not really---the item has been postponed indefinitely by the Planning & Zoning Commission. We are hoping to
conduct a bit more outreach in order to get it back to them sooner rather than later.
>
> Daniel
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Peter Mjos
> Sent: Friday, February 11, 2022 5:05 PM
> To: Mckenna-Foster, Daniel R.
>Subject: Rogers Park presentation
>
> [EXTERNAL EMAIL]
>
> Hi Dan,
> Is there a looming deadline for this issue?
> Best,
Pete
```

Date: February 7, 2022
To: Planning and Zoning Commission

## Thru: $C$ Craig Lyon, Planning Director

Thru:- Kristine Bunnell, Long-Range Planning Manager
From: Daniel Mckenna-Foster, Senior Planner, Long-Range Planning Division
Subject: Case No. 2021-0127, Title 21 Text Amendment to update Mixed-Use Development Standards in the R-4A Zoning District.

## Plann

To access the original packet from 2/7/2022 please click this link:
The P : please click this link:
No. 2021-0127, an amendment to R-4A Mixed-Use District. This is an amendment to the regulations in the Anchorage Municipal Code Title 21 Zoning Ordinance (Title 21). For review are the consid delibe

R-4A https://meetings.muni.org/AgendaOnline/Docume nts/ViewDocument/20210127.PDF.pdf?meetingld=4553\&documentType=Ag enda\&itemId=35356\&publishId=26814\&isSection=f
While
standa alse

2040
enviro

opment achorage riented phasing requirements, and make the zoning district's requirements easier to follow. No changes to the zoning map are proposed. Ordinance highlights are:

- Update and simplify mixed-use design standards
- Revise height allowances: Change by-right base building height from 75 feet to 60 feet but allow heights up to 90 feet with stepbacks.
- Simplify frontage standards
- Simplify access standards
- Provide increased allowances for commercial floor area: Allows commercial space to comprise up to $49 \%$ of a development, with larger percentages allowed with several conditions.

[^0]PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION<br>Assembly Chambers<br>Z.J. Loussac Library 3600 Denali Street<br>Anchorage, Alaska<br>MINUTES OF<br>February 07, 2022<br>6:30 PM

A work session on an Ordinance of the Anchorage Assembly amending AMC Code Title 21, Land Use Planning to create a new procedure for approving Reinvestment Focus Areas (2022-0010) was held prior to the meeting and conducted by Daniel Mckenna-Foster with the MOA Long-Range Planning Division.

## A. ROLL CALL

| Present | Andre Spinelli, Greg Strike, Jared Gardner (Chair), Jim Winchester, <br> Radhika Krishna (Vice Chair), Jeff Raun, Scott Pulice |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { Excused }}$ | Aaron O'Quinn <br> Staff |

## B. MINUTES

1. Monday, January 3, 2022
2. Monday, January 10, 2022

COMMISSIONER PULICE moved to approve the minutes. VICE CHAIR KRISHNA seconded.

AYE: Spinelli, Strike, Gardner, Winchester, Krishna, Raun, Pulice NAY: None

## PASSED

## C. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS / EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

## 1. Disclosures

COMMISSIONERS WINCHESTER and RAUN disclosed that they will abstain from voting on Resolution 2022-001 as they were absent from the January 3 meeting.

COMMISSIONER SPINELLI moved to approve the consent agenda. COMMISSIONER PULICE seconded.

AYE: Spinelli, Strike, Gardner, Winchester, Krishna, Raun, Pulice
NAY: None

## PASSED

Commissioners Winchester and Raun abstained from voting on Resolution 2022-001.

## E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ACTIONS OF PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

## F. REGULAR AGENDA - None

1. Resolutions for Approval
2. Introduction for Public Hearings
3. Site / Landscape Plan Approval
4. Time Extensions; Expedited Hearing Requests; Minor Conditional Use Amendments
5. Other

## G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CASE: 2021-0127 (DM)

PETITIONER: MOA, Long-Range Planning Division
REQUEST: Review and Recommend approval to the Anchorage Assembly of the Public Hearing Draft Title 21 Text Amendment to update Mixed-Use Development Standards in the R-4A Zoning District.

DANIEL MCKENNA-FOSTER presented the staff report and recommendations on behalf of the Municipality's Long-Range Planning Division.

The Commissioners discussed the following:

1. Did the public hearing draft that was released for public review and comment include the substantive changes made since the last work session?
2. Nonconformity with respect to the 10 percent provision and any other provisions including prohibitions on expanding nonconformity.
3. Any issues or concerns with the variance standards that the Planning Director should look at and how often does the Director make a determination?
4. Is it the intent that the 30 percent requirement would no longer apply to a street that has a façade facing the street with pedestrian and utility infrastructure built to the most current municipal standards? How many streets in the city are built to the most current standards? Is the exclusion broader than the intent?
5. Clarification that if the municipal standards for sidewalks and utilities infrastructure were to have a minor change, then something that was previously to standard no longer meets the most current standard.
6. One of the development comments submitted pertained to 36th and Arctic, perhaps Olympic Park, regarding overhead utilities possibly impeding pedestrian flow at the right-of-way and very close to the side of a building creating a circumstance that is less than ideally walkable. We should be enabling a safe and inviting pedestrian access, and the way in which a building faces a street and sidewalk is an important component of that.
7. With regard to glazing, is the 30 percent reflected elsewhere in code? Is it standard? Is there an energy efficiency element this might be affecting?

CHAIR GARDNER opened the hearing to public testimony. There was no public testimony.
MR. MCKENNA-FOSTER provided brief rebuttal testimony.
VICE CHAIR KRISHNA clarified that since the work session held in January, some of the proposed changes were shared with developers but community councils and members of the public have not had a chance to review the changes proposed in this staff report, which include by right commercial uses going from 35 percent to 49 percent, and some additional proposed changes. She could not support this proposal believing it should go back out for a public hearing because these are substantial content changes that could have significant impacts on the ground.

CHAIR GARDNER closed the public hearing.
COMMISSIONER RAUN raised a point of clarification to keep the public hearing open.
CHAIR GARDNER noted that it is an option to reopen the public hearing,
MR. MCKENNA-FOSTER explained that the text amendment could be redistributed to the community councils if the Commission wishes. This proposal is just to create the zone and does not establish any zone. If someone were to rezone, they would have to follow the rezone process. This is just setting the parameters that could be accepted for the existing three or four acres of R-4A in the municipality. Is there a broader need or is the Commission looking primarily for feedback from one group or the entire community?

COMMISSIONER RAUN reiterated that concerns had been expressed by Vice Chair Krishna that the amendments before us had not been fully communicated through the public process. He did not know if a new notice was necessary but would like to see that happen.

VICE CHAIR KRISHNA requested for the Planning Department to use the standard public hearing draft process.

COMMISSIONER SPINELLI moved in Case 2021-0127 to postpone to a time determined by staff and reopen the public hearing in order to renotice the public. VICE CHAIR KRISHNA seconded.

COMMISSIONER SPINELLI intends to support the motion even though he was not 100 percent sure this motion is necessary. When he thinks of $R-4 A$, he thinks of $B-3$ areas that are moving to $\mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$. This code is so much more protective than what these properties were prior to that. It would be a welcomed change from the community and that is probably why we did not hear a significant amount of community feedback.

AYE: Spinelli, Strike, Gardner, Winchester, Krishna, Raun, Pulice
NAY: None

## PASSED

## H. APPEARANCE REQUEST - None

## I. REPORTS - None

1. Chair
2. Secretary
3. Committee

## J. TITLE 21 DISCUSSION - None

## K. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

The Commission discussed Parliamentary Procedures regarding the Chair handing over the gavel to the Vice Chair when providing comments once a motion is on the floor.

## L. ADJOURNMENT

COMMISSIONER RAUN moved to adjourn. VICE CHAIR KRISHNA seconded.
AYE: Spinelli, Strike, Gardner, Winchester, Krishna, Raun, Pulice
NAY: None

## PASSED

The meeting adjourned at 7:21 p.m.

# PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION <br> Assembly Chambers <br> Z.J. Loussac Library 3600 Denali Street <br> Anchorage, Alaska <br> MINUTES OF <br> October 03, 2022 <br> 6:30 PM 

A work session on an ordinance proposing Title 21 text amendments for Mixed-Use Development Standards in the R-4A Zoning District was held prior to the meeting and conducted by Daniel Mckenna-Foster and Kristine Bunnell with the MOA Long-Range Planning Division.

## A. ROLL CALL

| Present | Andre Spinelli, Greg Strike, Jared Gardner (Chair), Radhika Krishna (Vice <br> Chair), Jeff Raun, Brandy Eber |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { Excused }}$ | Jim Winchester, Scott Pulice <br> Daniel Mckenna-Foster, Kristine Bunnell |

## B. MINUTES

1. Monday, September 12, 2022
2. Monday, September 19, 2022

COMMISSIONER SPINELLI moved to approve the minutes. COMMISSIONER STRIKE seconded.

AYE: Spinelli, Strike, Eber, Gardner, Krishna, Raun
NAY: None
PASSED

## C. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS / EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

## 1. Disclosures

COMMISSIONER EBER disclosed that she was absent from both September meetings and will abstain from participating in the consent agenda.

## 5. Other

COMMISSIONER STRIKE moved to approve the consent agenda. COMMISSIONER RAUN seconded.

AYE: Spinelli, Strike, Gardner, Krishna, Raun

NAY: None
ABSTAINED: Eber

## PASSED

Chair Gardner abstained from voting on Resolution 2022-033.

## E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ACTIONS OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CASE: 2021-0127 (DM)

PETITIONER: Municipality of Anchorage - Long-Range Planning Division
REQUEST: Recommendation by the Planning and Zoning Commission to the Anchorage Assembly of an ordinance amending Title 21 Mixed-Use Development Standards in the R-4A Zoning District.

DANIEL MCKENNA-FOSTER and KRISTINE BUNNELL presented the staff report and revised recommendations on behalf of the Municipality's Long-Range Planning Division.

The Commissioners discussed the conditional use process when exceeding the $49 \%$ for non-residential uses and dwelling units per acre.

CHAIR GARDNER opened the hearing to public testimony.
There was no public testimony. There was no rebuttal testimony.
CHAIR GARDNER closed the public hearing.
COMMISSIONER STRIKE moved in Case 2021-0127 to recommend to the Anchorage Assembly approval of an ordinance amending Title 21 Mixed-Use Development Standards in the R-4A Zoning District. COMMISSIONER SPINELLI seconded.

COMMISSIONER STRIKE intends to support the motion noting that staff did an excellent job clarifying and responding to questions during the work session. This was a very clear succinct approach. He noted the incorporation by reference of staff's recommended findings of fact (copied from staff's memorandum):

1. Action $3-1$ of the 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the simplification of zoning regulations to encourage new mixed-use commercial and residential projects.
2. Policy 2.3 of the 2040 Land Use Plan calls for the removal of barriers to desired infill development and for the incorporation of flexibility in development requirements.
3. The intent of the $\mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$ zoning district is intended to implement the land use plan, meet housing needs for the community, establish a pedestrian-oriented environment that helps support transit, and provide the flexibility to integrate residential and non-residential uses, and encourage reinvestment and revitalization within areas in transition.
4. There is very little land in the municipality currently zoned with this designation.
5. The Planning Department researched ways to improve the R-4A district through a public engagement process initiated in 2019 and continued through 2021 with developers, community groups, and community councils.
6. The Planning Department brought an amendment to the Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing on February 7, 2022, and since then has received and incorporated more feedback from developers, community members, and internal staff.
7. Based on feedback received, the amendment changes $\mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$ dimensional standards to revise height allowances, eliminate specific lot sizes, and add additional residential housing types as allowable uses.
8. The amendment removes Floor-Area-Ratio bonuses from R-4A and places them solely in the R4 section where they are applicable.
9. The amendment simplifies frontage standards and increases allowed commercial floor area while preserving a majority of the property for residential use.
10. The amendment removes unique standards and duplication by referring any required designed standards to existing design and compatibility standards in 21.07.
11. The amendment adds additional commercial, light manufacturing, and production uses to the $\mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$ zone by right.
12. $\mathrm{R}-4 \mathrm{~A}$ is intended to provide an attractive development alternative to the $\mathrm{B}-3$ zoning district that allows commercial uses while also maintaining a minimum requirement for residential density.
13. The Planning Department has produced a proposal to simplify standards, allow more types of housing, and streamline processes for a mixed-use zoning district consistent with the goals and policies of the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan.

He added that no public testimony was heard and no written comments were received.
CHAIR GARDNER appreciated the process and the efforts of the Planning Department with responding to the Commission's request for further discussions and review, and with making the necessary changes incorporating the additional feedback received by the public. It is challenging to get the factors right and he is hopeful of its success.

AYE: Spinelli, Strike, Eber, Gardner, Krishna, Raun
NAY: None

## PASSED

MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE Assembly Information Memorandum

No. AIM 164-2023

Meeting Date: August 22, 2023

## FROM: MAYOR

## SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION ON THE TITLE 21 R-4A CODE AMENDMENT, AO NO. 2023-42.

On May 23, 2023, the Assembly voted to approve the R-4A Code Amendment to Title 21, AO No. 2023-42 but then voted to reconsider this matter during the June 6, 2023, meeting. Following reconsideration, the Assembly Chair directed the Planning Department to present the code amendment to the Fairview Community Council before further consideration by the Assembly.

The Planning Department conducted an in-person presentation of the proposed code amendment on August 10, 2023, at the monthly meeting of the Fairview Community Council at 7 p.m. in the Anchorage Central Lutheran Church at 1420 Cordova Street.

The attached handout was provided. Staff answered questions and addressed any concerns about the proposed code change from those in attendance.

Prepared by: Daniel Mckenna-Foster, Senior Planner Planning Department<br>Approved by Craig Lyon, Planning Director<br>Concur: Lance Wilber, Community Development Director<br>Concur: Kent Kohlhase, P.E., Municipal Manager<br>Respectfully submitted: Dave Bronson, Mayor

Attachment: R-4A Code Update Handout for the Fairview Community Council

## R-4A Code Update Project

What is it? A multi-year process to update the R-4A mixed-use zoning district so that a) people are more likely to use it and b) the Muni implements the 2040 land use plan.

Why: The 2040 plan called for a series of new zones to allow mixed-use development across the Bowl. None of these zones have ever seen any new developments.

## Existing R-4A zoning in the Municipality:



## Overview of Proposed Changes to R-4A

| Change | Details | Rationale |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Remove <br> bonuses from R- <br> 4A and place <br> them solely in R- <br> 4: | The R-4A amendment allows a <br> Floor-Area-Ratio (FAR) of up to 4.0. <br> The R-4 zone allows a FAR of 1.0 or <br> 1.5 but with bonuses allows up to <br> 2.0. | It is not clear that the existing bonus provisions <br> have ever been used to obtain higher FAR <br> allowances. The amendment seeks to allow a set <br> amount of FAR without special considerations. |
| Dimensional <br> Standards: |  <br> widths specific to this zone, reduce <br> setbacks, reduce by-right height <br> from 70' to 60'; increase height <br> allowed through administrative site <br> plan review. | This allows for smaller lots by-right, but does not <br> supersede the existing lot size limitations in <br> chapter 8 (subdivisions) of Title 21. Setbacks <br> reduced for flexibility. |
| Add Residential <br> Uses: | Add Dwelling, single family attached <br> and Dwelling, single family <br> detached. Allow townhouses without <br> special review. | The R-4A purpose statement calls for residential <br> densities of 35 dwelling units or more, but only <br> requires residential densities of 20 dwelling units <br> or more. This amendment seeks to allow for more <br> housing types to meet either the required or <br> proposed density. Information gathered since <br> February 2022 suggests that there may be a |
| market for detached units on smaller lots. |  |  |

## R-4A Timeline

2012: R-4A created as part of the Title 21 rewrite: "The $R-4 A$ district is a primarily residential district intended for high-density multifamily dwellings, with gross densities intended to be greater than 35 dwelling units per acre. Commercial retail, services, and office uses are also allowed in combination with housing to create a truly mixed-use neighborhood environment, although a majority of the gross floor area of the development shall be a residential use."

2014: Properties in Midtown rezoned to R-4A (AO 2014-109).
2018: MOA Planning department begins working on an update to R-4A.
2020: MOA Planning department publishes a community discussion draft for community \& agency review.

2021: Properties in Spenard rezoned to R-4A (AO 2021-47).
2022: Project returns to public hearing:

- R-4A PZC work session on 1/10/2022
- R-4A PZC regular meeting on 2/7/2022. Instruction for more feedback.
- Meetings throughout 2022:

| Council or Representatives | Presentation Date |
| :--- | :--- |
| Allen Kemplen, others from <br> Fairview** | $2 / 22 / 2022$ |
| South Addition CC | $2 / 24 / 2022$ |
| Downtown CC | $3 / 2 / 2022$ |
| Spenard CC | $3 / 2 / 2022,3 / 21 / 2022,8 / 1 / 2022$ |
| University Area CC | $3 / 2 / 2022$ |
| Midtown CC | $3 / 9 / 2022$ |
| North Star CC | $3 / 9 / 2022$ |
| Airport Heights CC | $3 / 17 / 2022$ |
| Rogers Park CC | No response |
| *This may not have been an official Fairview CC meeting |  |

- R-4A PZC regular meeting on 10/3/2022

2023: Project continues for public discussion:

- R-4A Assembly regular meeting on $5 / 23 / 2023$. Staff instructed to return to the Fairview Community Council meeting.
- Attendance/Presentation at the 8/10/2023 Fairview CC meeting.


## Areas Which the Adopted 2040 LUP Shows As Potentially Eligible for R-4A (Following A Rezone Public Process)




[^0]:    1 "Amend Title 21 to simplify zoning regulations for mixed-use projects relative to commercial or other projects." Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan, page 84.

