

Planning and Zoning Commission

July 14, 2025

Case #: **2025-0030 and 2025-0034**

Case Title: PZC Case No. 2025-0030, Establishing a Transit-Supportive Development Overlay
PZC Case No. 2025-0034, Amending the Comprehensive Plan

Agenda Item #: **G.2. & G.3.**

Supplementary Packet #: **1**

Comments submitted after the packet was finalized

Additional information

Other:

Sent by email: yes no

Anchorage2040

From: Patrick Carnahan <carnahanpatrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 10:44 AM
To: Anchorage2040; Downey, Graham P.
Subject: TSDO Comments

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Planning and Zoning Commission Members:

I write today in opposition to the proposed TSDO overlay currently under consideration. Specifically, I object to the increased building height maximum of 75 feet and the removal of setbacks from property lines. I am in support of increased density, (particularly in the downtown core) and smaller lot sizes allowing for more homes per acre. Building heights of 75 feet or more are acceptable in the downtown core area which is in dire need of redevelopment. It is poor planning to have flat parking lots in the downtown core and allow 75-foot residential towers in adjacent neighborhoods, that disincentivizes development downtown. The transportation infrastructure that exists and which could easily be further built out is in the downtown core. A 75-foot maximum in the rest of the overlay would negatively impact neighbors and adjacent public spaces like parks and schools by shadowing them.

I also oppose the removal of setbacks from property lines as it impacts fire safety, noise reduction, and snow storage. The number of people that already shovel or plow snow into public areas is too large, this will only increase the problem. Setbacks are a small resource which increases property value and curb appeal of the structure.

Please do not approve the TSDO as proposed. I support higher density development in appropriate areas and urge you to incentivize development in the downtown core. I recognize Anchorage is in dire need of increasing housing stock, but throwing up our hands and abandoning good planning standards isn't the way to achieve it. Thank you for your work on behalf of Anchorage residents.

Sincerely,

Patrick Carnahan
232 E. 10th Ave.
Anchorage AK 99501

Anchorage2040

From: Frank Broderick <archgraphics4@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 13, 2025 9:40 PM
To: Anchorage2040
Subject: Planning/Zoning

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

I echo the comments made by Mara Carnahan...height

and setback allowances should the stay as same as the

current levels; I vote for more sunlight, not less;

more space between buildings, not less...

Francis Broderick
145 E 11 Avenue

Public Comments: 2025-0030

Commenter	Email	Phone Number	Submitted
Colby McMichael 1805 Parkside dr Anchorage, AK 99501	colbyodi@gmail.com		7/7/2025 7:20:07 PM
Helen Malley Anchorage, AK 99517	helen.malley@gmail.com		7/10/2025 2:25:27 PM
Will Walker Anchorage, AK 99503		4074978603	7/10/2025 7:07:41 PM

With the raising cost of living in Anchorage, I've seen first hand how the lack of affordable housing and accessible public transportation has hurt families and the most vulnerable in our communities. It's vital that the assembly takes action toward a city that works for all over it's residents, and I believe that the Transit-Supportive Development Overlay ordinance is a move in the right direction.

I strongly support the Transit-Supportive Development overlay in Anchorage. This proposal would help make housing in Anchorage more affordable and accessible by encouraging the development of multi-unit housing near transit. It will also help ensure that people living there can walk or use public transit to get to the places they need. In doing so, it will help foster a stronger and more vibrant sense of community in our neighborhoods.

I am writing in strong support of the Transit-Supportive Development Overlay. The proposal would be a big step in removing barriers to building more housing and mixed-use development in areas of the city that the community has already indicated that they want additional development through the 2020 Plan and 2040 Land Use Plan.

I am especially excited about the overlay as a Spenard resident. The Spenard Corridor Plan calls for transit-supportive development along Spenard Road, including specifically calling for overlays, to better activate our neighborhood, and I am glad that we are on the cusp of implementing a policy that I believe will help foster greater community and an even better and more vibrant neighborhood.

Overall, I believe that policies like this Transit-Supportive Development Overlay are necessary for us to build the housing that we desperately need. Further, I think that a strength of the proposal is allowing for more mixed-use development, which can help foster community and greater quality of life as more neighborhoods allow for small-scale commercial uses such as local cafes or restaurants, like we see in neighborhoods like Airport Heights with Fire Island. This policy also has the potential to create a positive feedback loop between housing and transit in our city and break us out of the chicken-and-egg problem where we don't have sufficient density of people to support frequent and reliable transit, which then dissuades transit use and results in service cuts. Instead, as these targeted corridors add density, they can support our transit system, thus increasing opportunities for folks who have limited transportation options.

While I wholeheartedly support the overall policy, I have a few suggestions for possible tweaks to make the proposal even better. One tweak would be adjusting the height limit of the overlay district based on the functional classification of the road the property is on to allow for greater gradations within neighborhoods. Another item to consider is how the overlay district interfaces with areas of very high ground failure susceptibility. In general, it is not an issue with most of the area under the proposed map, but it could be worth considering whether it might make sense to remove areas where there is the highest risk, which includes part of South Addition, the northern edge of Downtown generally north of 3rd Ave., and an area just east of Westchester Lagoon. I'm not an engineer or geologist myself, so I don't know what the actual risks of developing property in those areas looks like, but depending on an expert assessment, it may be prudent to exclude those areas if there is sufficient risk to having greater density in those areas.

Thank you very much for your consideration!

Public Comments: 2025-0030

Commenter	Email	Phone Number	Submitted
Carol Howarth 2471 Belmont Drive Anchorage, 99517	cbhowarth@alaska.net	9072720160	7/11/2025 10:44:52 AM
<p>I am a resident in an established neighborhood zoned R1 who owns a parcel designated within the Multifamily Tax Incentive bonus area (MTI Map).</p> <p>I support Transit-Supported Development Overlays (TSDOs) within the context of LUP2040's action plans. I do not support the blanket implementation of the MTI Map for the TSDO Map. The Muni is proposing changes to zoning for members of the community without following important Action Items outlined in the Comp Plan or Land Use Plans. My recommendations are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. For the area outlined in the Spenard Corridor Plan, follow the Plan recommendations.2. For all other areas that have not developed LUP2040 follow-on plans, have community meetings on the proposed changes. <p>Most property owners in R1 and R2 zoned neighborhoods who are in the proposed TSDO are not aware of the TSDO exemptions and permitted uses outlined in the proposed 2025-0030. Public notice has been reduced. Map resolution of public noticed attachments is poor, making interpretation difficult. And most importantly, there is the belief that the Municipality operates within the spirit of the 2020 Comp Plan and Action Items of LUP 2040, and community meetings would have been scheduled for such significant changes to zoning.</p> <p>My neighborhood? Some might argue, "There is low probability of a Research Laboratory, Railroad Passenger Terminal, or a 75' tall 8-plex being built with no setbacks or parking." Probability is not the issue. What is relevant is what is Permitted Use.</p> <p>This isn't about NIMBY. It is about unintended consequences. My family resided in North Mountain View for 43 years, moving from Bootleggers Cove in 1963. The neighborhood had every aspirational element we now wish for our town centers. Changes in lifestyle, the pipeline boom and the mid-'80s real estate crash were not probabilities when very reasonable zoning regulations were drafted. It is unintended consequences that create long term damage to communities and/or their reputations.</p> <p>The primary force driving the proposed application of the MTI Map as the TSDO to address our community's very real housing needs appears to be impatience. That is not a good city planning process.</p>			

From: Dianne Holmes <dianneholmes12@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2025 12:38 PM
To: Appleby, Elizabeth I. <elizabeth.appleby@anchorageak.gov>
Cc: Kimmel, Corliss A. <corliss.kimmel@anchorageak.gov>; Blake, Lori A. <lori.blake@anchorageak.gov>
Subject: PZC 2025-0030 + 0034

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

To Planning and Zoning Commission:

The goal for more housing is admirable and needed, however 2025-0030 & 0034 is a wholesale rezone. The overlay for commercial and industrial development are emphasized rather than more intensive residential along the transit-supportive-corridors (TSC)

If planners, PZC and the Assembly are serious about increasing housing, why is only one residential unit required per development? Why not limit one commercial entity per development with the rest required to be residential? Of course the answer is that commercial makes more money for the developer.

Why is industrial use even being considered in areas that should be primarily residential?

Allowing an overlay of increased density 1/2 mile each side of TSC is not what our land use plans had in mind to support more residential. The staff report justifying this change isn't valid.

Changing the wording that requires increasing transit before more developing more density to now saying more development would create more transit opportunities is not valid either. Increasing transit should at the very least accompany residential development.

DOT's comment is well-stated. Without open space, kids will play in the street. Safety standards are not in place for pedestrians nor vehicle access.

The public has been hoodwinked into believing this overlay (area-wide rezone) will produce more housing. It will not, because so little residential is being required.

These ordinances need to go back to the drawing board to comply with the 2040 and 2020 to protect neighborhoods while also increasing residential, rather than emphasizing commercial/industrial.

Dianne Holmes

Blake, Lori A.

From: Davina Napier <thediva216@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2025 11:18 AM
To: Kimmel, Corliss A.; Blake, Lori A.
Subject: 2025-0030+2025-0034

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

My name is Davina Napier, President of YWCA Alaska, and resident of Jewel Lake. I ask for a yes vote on this ordinance. Housing has long been used to divide, to deprive, and to debase minority communities. The legacy of those deliberate actions can be seen in the housing crisis we are dealing with today. The long term effects of segregation, restrictive covenants, redlining, and discriminatory lending have resulted in a situation where our minority communities must work twice as hard for half the housing. We saw that minorities were disproportionately affected by the subprime mortgage crisis and disproportionately left out of the recovery. This AO can help to begin rectifying the harms of the past by encouraging much needed investment and redevelopment in the areas of our city most heavily affected by systemic inequalities surrounding housing. Not only is this good for families, good for workers, and good for business, it's the morally correct thing to do. Please help Anchorage heal from the sins of past by voting yes.

Blake, Lori A.

From: Cassandra Gardner Raun <cassandraraun@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2025 10:01 AM
To: Kimmel, Corliss A.; Blake, Lori A.
Subject: Cases 2025-0030 and 2025-0034

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hello Planning and Zoning Commissioners,

My name is Cassandra Gardner Raun and I am a longtime midtown Anchorage resident. I am asking that you vote in favor of Cases 2025-0030 and 2025-0034.

I have been a Realtor in Anchorage for over 20 years and in that time I have seen first-hand how housing has become more and more unaffordable. Early in my career, first-time homebuyers (young families, military personnel, single people just beginning professional careers) had options in Anchorage. As time went by, those buyers migrated first to Eagle River and eventually to Palmer and Wasilla to find options. Today those same clients often don't have any options to buy at all. Additionally, we know that the housing crisis disproportionately affects minorities and already at-risk populations. Anchorage is suffering. While I am sure we can agree that Anchorage has a housing problem, I also feel that Anchorage has an investment problem. We are not investing in our community. We are losing our best and brightest young students and professional families. We are also losing our Veterans. I want Anchorage to be a thriving community where people choose to stay, where ALL people can afford to stay, where young people like my daughters and their friends will have opportunities to come home to after college. It starts with housing. Housing is the investment we need most. I'm not an expert, but this plan gives me hope for our community and I ask that you support it.

Thank you,
Cassandra Gardner Raun

UES

From: Timothy Alderson <tjalderson@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 10:40 AM
To: Blake, Lori A. <lori.blake@anchorageak.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Comments on PZC 2025-030

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Tim Alderson

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tim Alderson <tjalderson@mac.com>
Date: July 14, 2025 at 07:55:59 AKDT
To: Nancy Pease <nancypease2@gmail.com>, Mike Malvick <malvick@alaska.net>, Dianne Holmes <dianneholmes12@gmail.com>, JOHN RILEY <johnr.rccc@gmail.com>, Judith Michael <judym.rccc@gmail.com>, Matthew Blakeslee <m.w.blakeslee@gmail.com>, Rachel Blakeslee <rachel.g.blakeslee@gmail.com>, David Sterling <dsterling@davisconstructors.com>, Ann Rappoport <annr.rccc@gmail.com>, RCCC-Justin Veit <justinveit@yahoo.com>
Subject: Comments on PZC 2025-030

Good morning!

Here are the comments we submitted on 2 planning and zoning cases for background if anyone is available to testify today per Nancy's previous communication:

PZC 2025-0030 - An ordinance to create a new transit-supportive development overlay which will implement the town centers and transit-supportive development corridors established by the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan.

PZC 2025-0034 -Title 21 Text Amendment-AO to update Transit Supportive Development Corridors in Anchorage 2020 Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan and Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan

Thanks,

Tim

Correspondence



RABBIT CREEK COMMUNITY COUNCIL (RCCC) A Forum for Respectful Communication & Community Relations



1057 West Fireweed Lane, Suite 100 / Anchorage, AK 99503

July 1, 2025

TO: Planning and Zoning Commission

RE: Comments on Planning and Zoning Commission Case Number PZC 2025-0030

“An ordinance to create a new transit-supportive development overlay which will implement the town centers and transit-supportive development corridors established by the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan.”

GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

RCCC generally supports the expansion of mixed-use core areas known as Town Centers as well as Transit Supportive Development Corridors (TSD) where high frequency bus service is provided. Compact infill in designated areas makes efficient use of public services and infrastructure, compared to random infill across the Bowl.

However, this proposed TSD Overlay (Exhibit A Map) does not resemble the Transit Supported development corridors shown on the 2040 Land Use Plan Map 3-1 and the earlier Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan. By encompassing all of Midtown, Downtown, and almost all of East Anchorage, is this TSDO too sprawling to produce compact, efficient infill when our local growth rate is negative? It is unclear whether this TSDO supports the neighborhood centers envisioned in our 2020 Comp Plan and 2040 Land Use Plan, or instead disperses commercial development and high density infill in a pattern that induces more driving.

We are concerned that few community councils and property owners are aware that this Overlay effectively rezones many areas both in terms of uses and scale of development. The areawide TSDO map is at a very small scale and it is hard for the public to compare it to existing zoning. How has the Planning Department presented this complex revision to directly- affected Community Councils? We feel that community discussion is vital for a broad overarching project such as this.

We are concerned that some of the TSDO changes, such as 100 percent lot coverage and exemption of design standards, will override the policies adopted in our Comprehensive Plan and Title 21 to maintain a human scale, promote public health and safety, and integrate development with the natural environment.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

RCCC has the following specific concerns with the proposed details of 2025-0030:

- We oppose the proposed allowance of 100 percent lot coverage in Table 21.06.020, the Dimensional Table Standards. Drainage infrastructure in many areas of the Bowl is

overburdened or outdated. RCCC is concerned with the drainage impacts from eliminating setbacks and allowing 100 percent lot coverage.

- It is unclear why there is a proposal for to eliminate the minimum width for lots in Table 21.06.020. Lot width allows a street to have a predictable pattern for physical access, daylight access, and building scale and proportion.
- WE oppose the change in Section 5 to Title 21.06.030. D.3.c.ii. Retain building height transitions at the periphery of the Transit Supportive Development Overlay area and Town Centers. The proposed elimination of the height transition, as well as eliminating side and rear setbacks, means that that 75-foot tall buildings could directly abut the lot lines in adjoining neighborhoods. This will adversely affect privacy, daylight, sunlight, air circulation and other desirable characteristics of existing residential neighborhoods.
- Provide the intention that transit service should increase concurrently with development, including new hubs and better frequencies.
- RCCC opposes the proposed exemption from design standards in 21.04.070.D.3.d. Retain the residential design standards for large multi-family construction (over 5 units per lot) in the TSDO. In the larger context of the recent changes to Title 21, RCCC opposes the piecemeal deletion of design standards that produce a human-scale especially for residential occupants (for example, building articulations on long facades, and windows facing the street).
- RCCC opposes the change in Section 6 to revise 21.07.030.C.8., which would eliminate all private open space requirements in the TSDO. In high density, mixed use development private open space is important for both individual and community health. Private open space, such as roof top patios, need not be at the expense of building footprint. Title 21 allows a menu of options for private open space.
- There could be a boost to neighborhood centers with some of the commercial uses that the TSDO will allow under 21.05.010, Table of Allowed Uses. However, a Site Plan Review or Conditional Use process is warranted for some of the proposed uses. Neighborhoods should have an opportunity to address the impacts from high traffic, all-hours uses such as fitness centers, movie theaters, restaurants, grocery stores, hotels and motels.

Sincerely,



Tim Alderson, Chair

cc: Melisa Babb, Planning Director

Correspondence



RABBIT CREEK COMMUNITY COUNCIL (RCCC)
A Forum for Respectful Communication & Community Relations



1057 West Fireweed Lane, Suite 100 / Anchorage, AK 99503

July 1, 2025

TO: Planning and Zoning Commission

RE: Comments on Planning and Zoning Commission Case Number PZC 2025-0034
Title 21 Text Amendment-AO to update Transit Supportive Development Corridors in Anchorage 2020
Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan and Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan

Rabbit Creek Community Council (RCCC) reviewed PZC Case Number 2025-0034 and discussed the case at our June 12 meeting. RCCC voted to submit the following comments by a vote of 20 yeas/0 nays/3 abstentions.

RCCC supports the updated housing density minimums in the transit-supportive corridors. Compact infill makes efficient use of public services and infrastructure compared to random infill. Compact infill within ¼ mile of transit corridors will contribute to the 2040 LUP goal for corridors where “expanded public transit service will support a compact, walkable pattern of commercial, residential and mixed use development”.

RCCC supports the change in Section 2 Item 5 to consider the design of streets and pedestrian facilities in an expanded area adjoining TSD corridors: ½ mile rather than the current ¼ mile.

RCCC urges that high frequency bus service keep pace with infill housing development. We do not favor the proposed revision in Section 2, Item 4, stating merely that infill housing in the transit corridors will create ridership demand. This revision weakens the intent of transit-supported development. If the frequent transit service isn't available, the transit corridor doesn't work. We support the existing language on page 60, that “expanded public transit will support a compact, walkable pattern...”.

Sincerely,

Tim Alderson, Chair
Rabbit Creek Community Council