

Planning and Zoning Commission

September 8, 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 #: **E.1. & E.2.** Supplementary Packet #: **2**

- Comments submitted after original packet and Supplementary Packet #1 were finalized (9/3 - 9/8, 2 p.m.)
- Additional information
- Other:

Sent by email: **X** yes no

PZC Cases 2025-0030 and 2025-0034
September 8, 2025
Supplementary Packet 2 Comments

Commenters (9/5-9/8)	Page
• Melissa Syphus	1
• Clay Davis	2
• Sharon Stockard	3
• Anonymous in South Addition.....	4
• Jim Richardson.....	5

Public Comments: 2025-0030

Commenter	Email	Phone Number	Submitted
Melissa Syphus Anchorage, AK 99517	melinkolli@gmail.com		9/8/2025 10:00:42 AM
<p>I am strongly in support of the TSDO as it is written. Anchorage is in dire need of more affordable housing infrastructure, and increased access to public transportation.</p> <p>I have lived here for 20 years. When I moved here in my mid-20's to attend UAA, I was not able to easily navigate the city on foot or by bus. Sidewalks were either not plowed in winter, or were non-existent. I would often have to walk in the snowy streets in high traffic areas to get groceries or walk to the nearest bus stop. I often had to take a cab when other methods of transportation were not available to me. These issues are still present in the Municipality today, and I believe that the TSDO will address these problems and be a great benefit to our community.</p>			

Public Comments: 2025-0030

Commenter	Email	Phone Number	Submitted
Clay Davis			9/7/2025 5:20:36 PM
<p>I support the TSDO in its current form and would like to see higher building heights, reduced parking requirements, and smaller minimum lot sizes than what is currently planned. I see the majority of commenters appear to be current home-owning Anchorage residents. While their perspective is valuable, I'd like to speak for the thousands of people who would benefit from the TSDO.</p> <p>My wife and I moved to Anchorage a few months ago and were hoping to buy a house to make a long term home here. We were disappointed by Anchorage's lack of walkable areas and were priced out of buying in the few neighborhoods that offered amenities within walking distance. Anchorage desperately needs higher density housing to provide options for younger people moving to the area and new families just starting out. Smaller lots and higher buildings provide this denser housing that would ease pressure on high housing costs in Anchorage.</p> <p>Furthermore, I'm shocked people are pushing back on eased parking requirements. To anyone who has been to thriving small cities elsewhere, Anchorage is a town of empty parking lots. Much of downtown is empty parking lots to say nothing of the countless empty lots outside businesses spaces in midtown. Street parking is largely untapped and the empty lots detract from the character of the town.</p> <p>Lastly, Anchorage has the potential to be a world class city. Access to the outdoors is unmatched and the town has rich character. However, the built environment of Anchorage leaves a lot to be desired. Increasing density would allow new talent to come to the city and provide areas for new coffeeshops, restaurants, and places for people to gather.</p> <p>The TSDO will no doubt face efforts to delay it or halt it from those who already have a secure place in Anchorage. But upzoning efforts like this are not made for them - they are made for our children and grandchildren who deserve an Anchorage with affordable homes, walkable streets, and a vibrant economic and social life. Please do not delay the TSDO and please continue working to make Anchorage a better place.</p>			

Public Comments: 2025-0030

Commenter	Email	Phone Number	Submitted
<p>Sharon Stockard</p> <p>1518 Garden St. Anchorage, AK 99508</p>	sharonstockard@yahoo.com		9/7/2025 3:48:19 PM
<p>I am strongly opposed to the TSDO as currently proposed. The city has done a poor job of informing the public of this ordinance and its consequences – which are significant for the thousands of people who live within the proposed overlay.</p> <p>TSDO is a massive zoning change that is counter to our adopted comprehensive and land use plans; it would negatively affect our long-established neighborhoods because of the increased building heights, small setbacks, commercial uses, and larger lot coverage that could block sunlight and be out of scale with existing structures.</p> <p>The higher housing density and commercial uses – along with the associated on-street parking and increased traffic on residential streets that were not built for such uses – would negatively affect vehicle safety, pedestrian safety, and snow removal.</p> <p>TSDO would permit new non-resident uses, including commercial uses, in residential neighborhoods without requiring off-street parking. For example, in my neighborhood, I have watched a small bakery morph into a much bigger commercial business that dumps its customer parking onto residential streets. Neighbors put up orange cones to maintain access to their driveways because of the increase in on-street parking – reminiscent of the Rustic Goat in West Anchorage years ago.</p> <p>There has been significant backlash as word has spread about TSDO. It should not be forced onto communities without overwhelming support from those neighborhoods. TSDO should be paused indefinitely.</p> <p>In the meantime:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The city should provide demographic and land use data that show today’s residential densities and access to transit, and compare those numbers to national data. • The city should calculate the number of housing units needed to bring TSDO to transit-supportive thresholds of 36 DUA and the proposed 35 DUA. A timeline should be provided for when those DUAs would be produced considering Anchorage’s current economy. Only neighborhoods overwhelming in favor of TSDO should be included. • The city should look at why Anchorage has not yet developed a single small urban neighborhood with a cluster of apartment buildings, coffee shops and amenities, served by frequent transit, in the 25 years since Anchorage 2020 endorsed this concept. • The city should look at the design and scale of infrastructure that makes highly desirable urban neighborhoods feasible in other cities. <p>The LaFrance administration should change its approach to TSDO; otherwise it risks losing credibility with the public in terms of its ability to achieve its housing, transit and walkability goals; its failure to consider a declining population; its departure from key Anchorage 2020 and 2040 goals; a biased and exclusionary public review process; its failure to inform residents, homeowners and other taxpayers of future property appraisals and tax consequences; its failure to produce fundamental data about current densities, DUAs needed to achieve the target densities, and impacts on livability; the near-term degradation to single- and two-family neighborhoods in terms of shadowing, street safety (on-street parking), broad commercial uses, green space, and reducing the proportion of homeowners; and the near-term loss of faith with housing advocates who expect TSDO to be a panacea to bringing down housing costs.</p> <p>The city should invest the time and energy to conduct timely, meaningful, and professionally managed public involvement processes to achieve public support and a vision for Anchorage we can all get behind. The city should reinstate the two staff positions in Long Range Planning that were eliminated during the Berkowitz administration. Money is better spent there than on the inflation of the Assembly budget that we have seen the past three years.</p> <p>The Planning Department should identify one or two model locations for compact, walkable infill, following the principles of “Strong Towns”: act incrementally, act in neighborhoods where there is strong support and energy for change; do a rapidly achievable project first; assess results; and use feedback to move to the next project.</p>			

Public Comments: 2025-0030

Commenter	Email	Phone Number	Submitted
Anonymous in South Addition	solvidarica@gmail.com		9/6/2025 8:20:55 AM
<p>I support the concept of improving housing stock and making Anchorage more walkable. However, a blanket rezone of well-established neighborhoods with strong community and character on top of a declining population makes zero sense. While it's beyond the scope of this project, the focus should be on improving existing pedestrian infrastructure along corridors (i.e. wider sidewalks, safer crossings at intersections) and adding infrastructure that supports pedestrian safety where it doesn't exist. With respect to the Transit Supportive Development Overlay (TSDO), I disagree with the proposed solution for several reasons. One, the public process for the proposed rezone is nebulous at best. Introducing a city-wide, blanket rezone through the TSDO process with limited time for public input appears to be a way to circumvent a robust public process informed by those that built and thrive in the communities defined by the specific character of their neighborhood. Two, it's unclear to me who receives the tax abatement. Is it all properties within the TSDO? New developments only within the TSDO? What empirical evidence exists to support of a blanket rezone? For example, what percentage of the Anchorage population has expressed the desire to live in a specific part of town and use mass transit? I personally don't feel safe taking mass transit. Four, the rezone could dramatically change the character of well-established neighborhoods and the communities within those neighborhoods. I don't necessarily have issue with the proposed TSDO, but a more reasonable approach would be to establish different criteria for the distinct communities within the TSDO. For example, a six-story multi-family housing unit may be appropriate for midtown or downtown proper, but not necessarily for South Addition or Rogers Park.</p>			

Public Comments: 2025-0034

Commenter	Email	Phone Number	Submitted
<p>Jim Richardson 1543 E 26th Avenue</p>			<p>9/5/2025 3:47:12 PM</p> <p>Planning and zoning: My name is Jim Richardson. I have been a homeowner and resident of Rogers Park for 35 years. I attended the Rogers Park Community Council special meeting on August 25th and support the resolution that was approved overwhelmingly at that meeting. I believe that this proposed zoning change has been an inappropriately fast moving and changing concept. The public has not had the level of awareness and information about the proposed zoning changes (that appear to be constantly changing, even on a daily basis), without public information disclosures that should be mandatory for such a huge change to the existing zoning rules for such a large proportion of the city. As an economist who spent many years researching the state and federal economies and also evaluating regulatory impact reviews for hundreds of proposed government actions, I believe that Planning and Zoning and the Anchorage Assembly would benefit from information that would provide perspectives on the trends in the Anchorage population, population projections, the Anchorage economy and future demographic trends. Many factors, including those mentioned above, have a pervasive effect on the demand and affordability of Anchorage housing. Setting up meetings and work sessions with Dan Robinson, the Research Chief for the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development would be a good place to start.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>