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Proposal
Proposal

- No owner occupancy requirement
- ADUs can be added to a single unit or duplex
- ADUs can be up to 900 SF or 40% of the principal structure, whichever is larger (but smaller than the main unit)
- No vehicle storage required
- No distinction between class A and class B districts
- Setbacks: same as the rest of the zone
- Bedrooms: No restriction
- Height: same as the rest of the zone
- Flexibility for the Eagle River/Chugiak Zone
Process to Get to This Point:

- A working group convened five times between November 2021 and July 2022 composed of local developers, community members, and non-profit organizations.

- A survey sent to all community councils which collected over 330 responses between November and December 2021.

- Data from a research project completed by Lindsay Hajduk of Neighborworks America in Anchorage.

- A presentation at the March 10, 2022 Community and Economic Development Committee meeting.

- Fielding calls and emails about the project as necessary.

- A walking tour of compact housing in the South Addition neighborhood on May 5, 2022.

- Staff canvassed all community councils via presentation at the Federation of Community Councils to offer presentations to anyone interested in hearing about the project.

- Presentations to 17 community councils and the Federation of Community Councils throughout the project.
Context
The near-term implementation actions include allowing and encouraging property owners to build accessory dwellings (aka, “grandmother apartments”). The 2040 LUP housing capacity estimate for “Compact Housing Types” in Figure 1-10 includes 1,000 new accessory units in the Bowl by 2040."
Figure 1-10. Housing Need and Land Capacity for Housing under 2040 LUP
By Housing Type. Anchorage Bowl, 2015-2040.

New Housing Units Needed (Adjusted by Housing Type)

- 20,000 - 20,800
  - 7,300 Compact Housing Types
  - 9,300 Multifamily / Other

- 15,000 - 8,200
  - 7,100 Single-Family
  - 1,100 Large-Lot Single Family

- 10,000 - 4,500
  - 3,600

- 5,000 - 800
  - 1,700

Housing Capacity

- 21,700

Source: Housing Capacity Analysis of 2016 Public Hearing Draft 2040 LUP. Building icons from Creative Commons.
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE SUBSECTIONS 21.05.070.C.1.g., TABLE 21.05-3, TABLE OF ACCESSORY USES; 21.05.070.1., DEFINITIONS AND USE-SPECIFIC STANDARDS FOR ALLOWED ACCESSORY USES AND STRUCTURES, ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU), AND 21.06.020.B., TABLE 21.06-1, TABLE OF DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS, TO ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT OF ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS.

WHEREAS, Accessory Dwelling Units can expand the supply of residential rental units maximizing efficient use of land supply; and

WHEREAS, Accessory Dwelling Units can make homeownership easier to attain and sustain by providing homeowners with a source of rental income; and

WHEREAS, Accessory Dwelling Units foster multigenerational living and aging in place; and

WHEREAS, the current standards for Accessory Dwelling Units do little to encourage the development of this alternative housing type; and

WHEREAS, this amendment ensures that Accessory Dwelling Units are compatible with the desired character of Anchorage's residential neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, amending development standards for Accessory Dwelling Units will allow more efficient use of residential property, development is compatible with existing neighborhoods, and more affordable housing alternatives; now, therefore,

THE ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY ORDINANS:

Section 1. Anchorage Municipal Code subsection 21.05.070.C.1.g., Table 21.05-3 Table of Permitted Accessory Uses and Structures, is hereby amended to read as follows:

**SEE EXHIBIT B: TABLE 21.06-3**

Section 2. Anchorage Municipal Code subsection 21.05.070.G.1.f., Definitions and use-specific standards for allowed accessory uses and structures, is hereby amended to read as follows:

D. Definitions and use-specific standards for allowed accessory uses and structures. This section defines the accessory uses listed in Table 21.05-3 and also contains use-specific standards that apply to those uses.
ADUs vs All Residential Permits With 20% Goal

Data Source: MOA ADU Affidavit file, MOA Permitting data
ADUS Permitted since 2005

Data Source: MOA ADU Affidavit file
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TREND LINE

Data Source: MOA ADU Affidavit file
Assessing Records Where Land Use Category = Single Family w/ Accessory Dwelling Unit
November 2021 MOA Survey:

11/16 respondents in Rabbit Creek expressed interest in building ADUs
November 2021 MOA Survey:

5/11 respondents in Hillside expressed interest in building ADUs
Muni Survey

330 responses
3. Do you work in, or are you involved in any industry related to property development, management, or sales?

330 responses

- 80.9% Yes
- 17% No
- Prefer not to answer
- We own 2 rental properties in Anchorage
- I work to maintain smaller trailer units that really need to be replaced with park model minin houses for safety, mainte...
- Architect
- Retired
4. Have you considered adding, or already added an ADU to your property?

330 responses

- Yes, I have considered adding an ADU, but have not added one yet (49.7%)
- Yes, I have already added an ADU to my property (44.2%)
- No (6.1%)
5. What type of ADU would you be interested in building (or have you built)?

- A new unit separate from an existing house (detached new construction): 131
- Convert an existing outside garage, shed or other structure to an ADU (detached conversion): 58
- Convert part of the existing house to an ADU (internal/attached conversion): 57
- A new unit attached to an existing house (attached addition): 47

Single-instance answers and responses indicating “not applicable” are not shown on this chart. See full data set for details.
6. What best describes your primary reason for adding an ADU to your property?

- House myself/family/friends in the future: 112
- Generate income: 97
- House family members/friends: 86
- Add more housing to the community: 48

Single-instance answers and responses indicating “not applicable” are not shown on this chart. See full data set for details.
7. If you considered adding an ADU but haven't yet, what factors contributed most to your decision NOT to build?

- **Construction costs/Materials costs**: 120
- **Limitations of the zoning district (i.e., maximum lot coverage, setback requirements, etc)**: 76
- **Permitting costs**: 67
- **Not sure how to get started**: 61
- **Future tax burden**: 46
- **Property review process (bringing other aspects of the property into compliance)**: 43
- **Did not want to use my property for a second unit**: 35
- **Lack of bank or other financing**: 22

Single-instance answers and responses indicating “not applicable” are not shown on this chart. See full data set for details.
8. If you already added an ADU to your property, what factors were the biggest obstacles throughout the process?

- Construction costs/Materials costs: 12
- Limitations of the zoning district (i.e., maximum lot coverage, setback requirements, etc.): 11
- Property review process (bringing other aspects of the property into compliance): 8
- Permitting costs: 8
- Future tax burden: 6
- Not sure how to get started: 2
- Lack of bank or other financing: 1

Single-instance answers and responses indicating “not applicable” are not shown on this chart. See full data set for details.
9. If zoning standards were a contributing factor in your decision to NOT construct an ADU, which of the following were the greatest barrier?

- Height restrictions: 12
- Zoning was not a barrier: 14
- Requirements for compatibility with appearance & character of existing residence: 19
- ADU size restrictions: 31
- Owner occupancy requirement: 35
- Minimum parking requirements: 37
- Maximum lot coverage requirements: 37
- Setbacks: 44
- Compliance concerns related to the rest of the property: 49

Single-instance answers and responses indicating “not applicable” are not shown on this chart. See full data set for details.
Neighborworks Survey
Realistically, how much do you think can be done to solve the problem of housing affordability?

- Nothing at all
- Just some
- Not sure
- A fair amount
- A great deal

Source: Survey conducted by Lindsey Hajduk, Neighborworks
Do you think the local government (meaning the Anchorage Assembly and Mayor) is doing enough to ensure that there is sufficient affordable quality housing in Anchorage?

- Gov should do more: 69%
- Gov doing enough: 8.2%
- Gov doing too much: 7.4%
- Not sure: 15.3%
Accessory Dwelling Unit Code Update Project
December 16, 2022 Assembly Work Session

Anchorage Housing Survey – Summary

Survey by Lindsey Hajduk
NeighborhoodWorks Alaska, Director of Community Engagement
University of New Hampshire, Casey School of Public Policy
Masters in Community Development graduate student

Introduction

The Anchorage Housing Survey was intended for Anchorage residents to share their experiences with housing issues and hear they engage in their neighborhoods. This survey sought feedback from the public on housing policies in Anchorage and on the potential opportunities to meet our housing needs.

The effort is in partnership with the Municipality of Anchorage’s Planning Department, as well as additional stakeholders including NeighborhoodWorks Alaska (NWAK), Lindsey Hajduk in an Anchorage resident who works for NWAK and is currently undergoing a remote graduate program at the University of New Hampshire. This information was provided in the introduction to the survey.

The Anchorage Housing Survey launched on November 29, 2021, and closed on January 3, 2022. This survey was provided online only through Qualtrics and distributed through the Federation of Community Councils and NWAK’s Facebook, as well as promoted on Facebook through NWAK.

Overall, 510 surveys were completed. An incentive of four $25 gift cards was also promoted to encourage participation. The survey responses were removed from any self-identifying information for the incentive, keeping the survey response data confidential.

Demographics

Age

Respondents were asked to share the year they were born in, which was converted into decade groupings. Of the 511 responses, most responses came from the 31-40 year old range. Most respondents were in their sixties (19.4%).

Demographics Summary

Housing Status

The largest group of respondents were homeowners (59.0%), followed by renters (41.0%). In the case of renters (59.0%), the renter was either a homeowner or a non-conforming.

Household Type

Most respondents were a single person (54.5%), followed by those with children (46.0%).

Income

Most respondents had incomes between $30,000 and $39,999 (48.0%), followed by those with incomes between $40,000 and $49,999 (21.0%).

Incidence of housing issues

Most respondents said that they had experienced the most frequently experienced issues were noise (32.9%), followed by graffiti (10.5%).

Household

Most respondents were married couples with children under 18 living at home (32.9%), followed by those with children over 18 (23.9%).

Education

Most respondents were high school graduates (43.0%), followed by those with some college (33.4%).

Significant

Most respondents were in the 31-40 year old range (31.4%), followed by those in the 21-30 year old range (27.9%).

Survey Responses

510
Comments
Frequent Comments

• Concerns about short term rentals (STRs)
• Concerns about character
• Concerns about height
• Concerns about privacy
• Concerns about shadows/solar access
Short Term Rentals

- Many types of housing get rented out as STRs
- Owner occupancy does not address the problem
- Other tools exist to regulate short term rentals more effectively
• Under current code there aren’t any criteria for assessing compatibility with appearance and character.

• Zoning review: a staff person looks at a picture and compares it with the main structure or the rest of the neighborhood.

• No recent denials, no recent comments
RE: ADU-related complaints

Fern, Richard A.

To: McKenna-Foster, Daniel R.; Calhoun, Sonnet L.

None of the folks remember having a complaint about the operation of an ADU. I see every complaint that comes in before it is assigned and I don’t recall any. We go through about 1400 Service Requests a year so we may have missed one or two but it is certainly not an issue with us here in Land Use.
50’x140’ R-1A Lot

Existing code: primary structure with ADU may be built to cover 30% of the lot. Single family may reach 30’ and ADU 25’

Proposal: primary structure with ADU may be built to cover 30% of the lot.

Same height for the main structure and ADU
Privacy
Privacy
Shadows/solar access

8,400 SF R-1A Lots in Rogers Park: November Shadows

- 30% lot coverage
- 30’ Height limit
Shadows/solar access
Shadows/solar access

Property rights of neighbor

Perceived property rights of person with solar panels

Property rights of neighbor
Aerial Imagery
Airport Heights: 1950
Airport Heights: 1970
Rabbit Creek: 1960
Rabbit Creek: 1970
Rabbit Creek: 1980
Other Feedback
Hi, Daniel,

I own a small duplex (1400 sq. ft. total) in the Grandview Gardens neighborhood off Airport Heights. I am 64 years old, retired, and live permanently on one side. The other side is rented to a young couple. This is the only property I own. I am thinking about adding a garage off the alleyway and thought it might be a good idea to add a small apartment above the garage to accommodate an older relative. Is this currently permitted?

Regards,

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hi,

I own a small duplex (1400 sq. ft. total) in the Grandview Gardens neighborhood off Airport Heights. I am 64 years old, retired, and live permanently on one side. The other side is rented to a young couple. This is the only property I own. I am thinking about adding a garage off the alleyway and thought it might be a good idea to add a small apartment above the garage to accommodate an older relative. Is this currently permitted?

Regards,

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hi Daniel,

Thank you for answering my questions so thoroughly—I’m glad I could help. This revision to the code, if achieved, would probably make the ADU go from a dream to wish, to actually feasible for my own property, so I’m grateful that this administration and the planning department are entertaining this line of thinking. Thank you for your work on this.

My case is one where I have a 16,500sf lot in a dense R2M area. It was two lots that were replatted into one about 60 years ago and the house was built across them both, with what was once just a single family home, but became a freight-house triplex over the years. The result is underutilization of the lot, and no real functional garage. The adjacent lot next door of roughly the same size has a 2-plex with a garage on it, for comparison, and it fits well. So, this code change would allow me to in theory pursue a shop-garage with an ADU on top, allowing for the increased density contemplated by the existing zoning (R2M is based on lot-size), and compatible with the neighborhood character.
Questions?
Thank you!