



Municipality of Anchorage

Planning Department

Memorandum



Date: February 11, 2025
To: Nolan Klouda,
Thru: Mélisa R.K. Babb, Planning Director
From: Daniel Mckenna-Foster, Senior Planner
Subject: Tax Abatement Area Map Boundary Selections

Overview

Staff from GDIC and the Planning Departments worked together to create a draft boundary map for a new tax abatement area in the Anchorage Bowl. The initial boundary area was based on a composite of:

- Parcels touching Transit Supportive Corridor boundaries, as outlined in the online version of the 2040 Land Use Plan.
- Some areas that extend ½ mile on either side of existing People Mover routes.
- Parcels within the Our Downtown Plan Area
- Parcels within the ongoing Midtown District Plan process

After an initial meeting with the Administration, staff further refined the boundary based on the following:

| Action | Reasoning |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing properties that list MOA Parks & Recreation as the owner. Also removing lakes, wetlands, or rights of way. | This reduces pressure to change the designation of public parcels now in use for parks, it also removes the abatement from areas that cannot be developed. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing parcels zoned Industrial (I-1 or I-2), except for those with a 2040 Land Use Map designation that would allow rezoning to a zone that allows residential development (such as city center, town center, etc). | Residential uses are not allowed in industrial zones. However, if a parcel has a future land use designation that allows a rezoning to a non-industrial district, including the abatement in those areas might encourage a rezoning in conformity with the plan. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing parcels in areas without practical access to infrastructure. | Removing the incentive in this areas encourages more development on existing infrastructure. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including parcels in contiguous areas on the border if they were located at an intersection or on a corner or belonged to a higher- | These parcels seemed more likely to be able to benefit from incentives for more housing development in the future. |

| Action | Reasoning |
|--|---|
| density zoning district such as R-2M, R-3 or R-4. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Including parcels in contiguous areas on the border if they seemed undeveloped or underdeveloped according to 2024 aerial imagery. | A tax abatement incentive could help encourage development on undeveloped parcels already served by infrastructure. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adding or removing parcels that were singled out or stood out differently from neighboring properties. | These types of changes were mainly intended to reduce confusion about where boundaries might apply. For example, a single parcel on a street that <i>had</i> been included by itself might be removed, or a single parcel on a street that <i>had not</i> been included might be included in the area in order to move towards parity with neighbors. |