AN ORDINANCE OF THE ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL ASSEMBLY AMENDING
ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 21 CHAPTERS 21.04, ZONING
DISTRICTS; 21.07, DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN STANDARDS; 21.11,
DOWNTOWN; 21.15, RULES OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEFINITIONS, AND
AMENDING ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE OF REGULATIONS SECTION
21.20.007, SCHEDULE OF FEES, IN ORDER TO AMEND THE OFF-STREET
PARKING AND SITE ACCESS DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND ACHIEVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GOALS FOR INFILL AND REDEVELOPMENT,
HOUSING, AND ACCESSIBLE LAND USE.

(Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2022-0026)

WHEREAS, the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan (2040 Plan) assesses the
housing and employment needs of current and future Anchorage residents and
includes goals, policies, and actions to address these needs; and

WHEREAS, Goal 3 of the 2040 Plan establishes Anchorage’s commercial centers
and corridors as the places to accommodate new business growth and mixed-use
housing opportunities through infill and redevelopment in a more efficient, walkable
development pattern; and

WHEREAS, Goal 4 of the 2040 Plan establishes Anchorage’s neighborhoods as
the places to provide a range of additional housing opportunities, meeting the
housing needs of residents of all income levels and household types; and

WHEREAS, off-street parking and driveway access standards are often the
costliest and most land-consuming zoning requirements for multi-unit housing,
mixed-use, and business developments; and

WHEREAS, minimum parking requirements, where they exceed forecast parking
utilization, are a barrier to the development of a range of housing types and
businesses; and

WHEREAS, wider than necessary site access driveway and vehicle circulation
aisle requirements combined with inadequate treatment of pedestrian and bicyclist
site access needs also impact the cost and range of housing types and business
developments, and choices for travel mode; and

WHEREAS, Action 4-3 of the 2040 Plan calls for amendments to Title 21 to allow
parking reductions by right for residential uses and to offer greater parking
reductions in key development areas; and
WHEREAS, Action 4-6 of the 2040 Plan calls for amendments to Title 21 for internal site circulation for vehicles and private lanes for compact infill housing; and

WHEREAS, the 2040 Plan as well as neighborhood and district plans recognize traditional urban neighborhoods and transit-supportive development corridors in certain parts of the Anchorage Bowl as having stronger street grid patterns, greater access to public transit and sidewalks, lower rates of car ownership and parking utilization, and shorter distances between trip destinations, which merit alternative parking, driveway, and form-based regulations tailored to their urban contexts; and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (AMATS) 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan sets forth policies and actions under Goal 3 to develop an efficient multi-modal transportation system to reduce congestion, promote accessibility, and improve system reliability, including Action 3E-5 to pursue parking strategies that support multi-modal transportation options; and

WHEREAS, the AMATS Non-Motorized Plan (2022) calls for short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces and provides recommendations for their design and location; and

WHEREAS, neighborhood and district plans support amending Title 21 parking and site access regulations, including but not limited to the Spenard Corridor Plan Policies 5.28, 5.29, 5.30, and 5.32 for flexible parking requirements, compact parking design, parking management solutions, and shared parking to create efficiencies to further redevelopment and investment goals; and the Fairview Neighborhood Plan Strategy 3.2 to reduce required on-site parking; and

WHEREAS, amending Title 21 to streamline approvals for administrative parking reductions from the minimum number of required spaces and expand the menu of available parking reduction strategies, will provide more flexibility, reduce costs, and facilitate developments with efficient, compact site plans that balance site access for motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists in context with the surrounding neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, amending Title 21 to replace five existing area-specific administrative parking reductions with by-right lower minimum parking requirements in urban neighborhood contexts near Downtown and transit-supportive development corridors will allow for more efficient land use, more flexibility to meet market demand, and more choice for parking management strategies in these key areas; and
WHEREAS, amending multifamily residential driveway access and circulation requirements will facilitate development within urban contexts that is true to neighborhood character and desired outcomes; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department received and incorporated public comments on the policy direction before writing the proposed Title 21 text amendments, received and incorporated comments on the drafts of the proposed Title 21 amendments, maintained a webpage covering the proposed Title 21 amendments that included an online questionnaire, and project information and presentations; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department received and incorporated feedback from dozens of consultations and public meetings with the general public, private-sector development experts, design/architectural professionals, business organizations, neighborhoods, public agencies, and municipal committees and commissions; now, therefore,

THE ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY ORDAINS:

Section 1. Anchorage Municipal Code Chapter 21.04, Zoning Districts, is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the chapter is not affected and therefore not set out):

21.04.020 Residential Districts

H. R-3A: Residential Mixed-Use District.

2. District-Specific Standards

[E. REDUCED PARKING RATIOS. DEVELOPMENT IN THE R-3A DISTRICT SHALL BE ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES, AS PROVIDED IN SUBSECTION 21.07.090F.6.]

[f] Enhanced street sidewalk [OPTION]. An enhanced street sidewalk [ENVIRONMENT] may be provided in lieu of required sidewalks and side perimeter landscaping, as provided in 21.07.060G.19[F.17].

[g] Building height increases.

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

2. District-Specific Standards
[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 SUBSECTION 21.07.090F.6.]

[E. Building height increase.]

(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)

21.04.030 Commercial districts.

G. Standards for Mixed-Use Development in the B-1A and B-1B Districts.

[5. REDUCED PARKING RATIOS. THE DEVELOPMENT IS ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF UP TO FIVE PERCENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES, AS PROVIDED IN SUBSECTION 21.07.090F.6.]

[6. Enhanced street sidewalk [OPTION]. An enhanced street sidewalk [ENVIRONMENT] may be provided in lieu of required sidewalks and side perimeter landscaping, as provided in 21.07.060G.19(F.17).

[7. BUILDING PLACEMENT AND ORIENTATION. BUILDINGS SHOULD BE PLACED AND ORIENTED TO THE STREET, LINING SIDEWALKS AND PUBLIC SPACES WITH FREQUENT SHOPS, ENTRANCES, WINDOWS WITH INTERIOR VIEWS, AND ARTICULATED GROUND-LEVEL FACADES. THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS APPLY:

A. BUILDINGS SHALL HAVE VISUAL ACCESS WINDOWS AND/OR PRIMARY ENTRANCES ON STREET-FACING BUILDING ELEVATIONS (UP TO A MAXIMUM OF TWO ELEVATIONS) FOR AT LEAST 15 PERCENT OF THE NON-RESIDENTIAL GROUND FLOOR WALL AREA. QUALIFYING WINDOWS SHALL BE NO MORE THAN FOUR FEET ABOVE FINISHED GRADE. WINDOWS SHALL COMPRIZE AT LEAST TEN PERCENT OF THE WALL AREA OF THE UPPER FLOOR BUILDING ELEVATION (ABOVE THE GROUND FLOOR). EXTERIOR WALL AREAS OF BUILDING MECHANICAL ROOMS ARE EXEMPT. AN ELEVATION THAT IS MORE THAN 150 FEET AWAY FROM THE FACING STREET SHALL BE EXEMPT,
UNLESS IT IS THE ONLY APPLICABLE ELEVATION.

B. EITHER:
   I. PROVIDE AT LEAST ONE PRIMARY ENTRANCE WITHIN 60 FEET OF A STREET SIDEWALK, OR 90 FEET FOR BUILDINGS OVER 25,000 SQUARE FEET OF GROSS FLOOR AREA, AND CONNECTED TO THE STREET BY A CLEAR AND DIRECT WALKWAY; OR
   
   II. PROVIDE A PROMINENT AND INVITING PRIMARY ENTRANCE THAT IS VISIBLE FROM THE STREET, CONNECTED BY A DIRECT WALKWAY TO THE STREET, AND HIGHLIGHTED BY TWO OF THE FOLLOWING:

   (A) PORTICO, OVERHANG, CANOPY, OR SIMILAR PERMANENT FEATURE PROJECTING FROM THE WALL;
   (B) RECESSED AND/OR PROJECTED ENTRANCE THAT COVERS AT LEAST 80 SQUARE FEET;
   (C) ARCHES, PEAKED ROOF FORMS, TERRACING PARAPETS, OR OTHER CHANGE OF BUILDING ROOFLINE;
   (D) CHANGES IN SIDING MATERIAL, OR DETAIL FEATURES SUCH AS TILEWORK, TO SIGNIFY THE ENTRANCE; OR
   (E) ENTRANCE PLAZA, PATIO, OR SIMILAR COMMON PRIVATE OPEN SPACE.

C. BUILDINGS SHALL COMPLY WITH THE MAXIMUM SETBACKS ESTABLISHED IN SECTION 21.06.020, TABLES OF DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS, AND SUBSECTION 21.06.030C.5. THE MAXIMUM SETBACK MAY BE REDUCED OR ELIMINATED WITH THE CONCURRENCE OF THE DIRECTOR.

H. Standards for Mixed-Use Development in the B-3 District.

[3. BUILDING PLACEMENT AND ORIENTATION. BUILDINGS ARE SUBJECT TO THE BUILDING PLACEMENT AND ORIENTATION STANDARDS FOR MIXED-USE]
DEVELOPMENT IN THE B-1A/B-1B DISTRICTS IN SUBSECTION 21.04.030G.7. ABOVE.

4. REDUCED PARKING RATIOS. THE DEVELOPMENT IS ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF UP TO FIVE PERCENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES, AS PROVIDED IN SUBSECTION 21.07.090F.6.]

3[5]. Enhanced street sidewalk [OPTION]. An enhanced street sidewalk [ENVIRONMENT] may be provided in lieu of required sidewalks and side perimeter landscaping, as provided in 21.07.060G.19[F.17].

(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO No. 2017-58, § 1, 4-11-17; AO No. 2019-11, § 2, 2-12-19)


C. Commercial Center Overlay.

4[5]. Uses prohibited.

5[6]. Dimensional standards.

[A. THE MINIMUM FRONT SETBACK IS REDUCED TO FIVE FEET FOR BUILDING ELEVATIONS THAT COMPLY WITH 21.04.030G.7., BUILDING PLACEMENT AND ORIENTATION.]

[B.] Uses in the B-1B district are exempt from the gross floor area limitations of subsection 21.04.030C.2.b., provided that an individual use occupies no more than 60,000 square feet of gross floor area.

6[7]. Building entrances.

7[8]. Sidewalks and walkways.

(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13)
Section 2. Anchorage Municipal Code Chapter 21.07, Development and Design Standards, is hereby amended by adding a new Section 21.07.015, Neighborhood Development Context Areas, to read as follows (the remainder of the chapter is not affected and therefore not set out):

21.07 Development and Design Standards

21.07.015 Neighborhood Development Context Areas.

A. Purpose. This section establishes Neighborhood Development Context Areas that reflect the existing and desired characteristics of Anchorage’s older, urban neighborhoods as identified in the Comprehensive Plan. The Neighborhood Development Context Areas are distinguished from one another and suburban parts of the Anchorage Bowl by their physical and functional characteristics such as: street, alley, and block patterns; building placement; how buildings and structures relate to surrounding buildings and streets; the diversity, distribution, and intensity of land uses; and availability of transportation access alternatives such as pedestrian facilities and public transportation. The areas mapped in this section provide the basis for development regulations tailored to the unique characteristics and strengths of these neighborhoods and fulfills their role as recommended in the Comprehensive Plan. These areas are provided relief from some generally applicable development and design standards in this chapter 21.07 because of their unique characteristics.

B. Applicability

1. The neighborhood development context areas in this section apply as a basis for area-specific development standards in this chapter 21.07.

2. The neighborhood development context areas in this section shall not be used as a basis to change the allowed uses or review and approval procedures of the underlying zoning district, district-specific dimensional standards, or any other standards of this title besides the development and design standards of chapter 21.07.

3. The department shall provide and maintain maps showing the boundaries of the neighborhood development context areas at the parcel scale, in this title and in a publicly accessible location.

C. Neighborhood Development Context Areas Established. The following neighborhood development context areas are established and delineated in maps 21.07-1 through 21.07-4 in subsection
21.07.015D. Each subsection below is organized to describe
general character: street, block, and access patterns; building
placement and location; and mix of uses. The descriptions below
are intent statements providing a basis for area-specific development
standards elsewhere in this chapter 21.07.

1. **Traditional Urban Neighborhood Context.**
The traditional urban neighborhood context includes
Anchorage’s original urban neighborhoods, such as
Government Hill, South Addition, Fairview, and Mountain
View. These neighborhoods are identified by the
Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Plan Map as Traditional
Neighborhood Design areas. Properties within the Downtown
(DT) zoning districts are not included because they are
addressed in chapter 21.11. Traditional urban neighborhood
contexts feature a regular street grid of city blocks, which
provide pedestrian and vehicular connections at frequent,
regular intervals. Block and lot sizes are small and block
shapes are consistent and often the same size. Sidewalks
are present on most streets, with few exceptions such as in
western Government Hill. There is a consistent presence of
alleys. Buildings and residences typically have moderate
front setbacks and orient to the street, with landscaping or
pedestrian access comprising a majority of the frontage.
Parking tends to be located to the side or rear of buildings.
There is a balance of pedestrian, bicycle, public transit, and
automobile reliance.
2. **Edge Urban Neighborhood Context.**

The edge urban neighborhood context includes properties generally identified in the Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Plan Map, as traditional neighborhood design areas in Anchorage’s post-war era (1950s-1960s) neighborhoods, such as Spenard, North Star, Midtown, Rogers Park, Airport Heights, Russian Jack Park, and University Area. Parts of South Addition, Fairview, and other neighborhoods also match this context. Edge urban neighborhoods feature a variety of interconnected street systems with smaller lot and block sizes than later subdivisions in more suburban parts of the Anchorage Bowl. Some edge urban areas feature a regular street grid of city blocks and others have a more relaxed and irregular street grid. Some neighborhoods have alleys and sidewalks. Buildings typically have moderate to somewhat deeper front setbacks. Buildings tend to orient toward the public street, although some front setbacks are deep enough to allow for a mix of landscaping and parking. Some edge urban neighborhood context areas include transit-supportive development corridors with elevated levels of public transportation service and enhanced pedestrian facilities.

3. **Transit-Supportive Development Corridors.**

Transit-supportive development corridors designated by the Comprehensive Plan extend through and outward from the edge urban neighborhood contexts. Transit-supportive development corridors are a half-mile wide, extending ¼-mile (approximately 5 to 10 minutes walking distance) on each side of the public transit route. These corridors feature a compact, pedestrian-friendly pattern of land use development. These corridors have elevated levels of municipal public transportation service with frequent headways between buses and higher ridership demand. These transit routes connect local and regional town centers, city centers, and other service/employment centers, such as the UMED District.
D. Neighborhood Context Area Boundaries.

1. The boundaries of the neighborhood development context areas are established in maps 21.07-1 through 21.07-4.

2. The transit-supportive development corridors on maps 21.07-2, 21.07-3, and 21.07-4 shall include all properties wholly or partially within ¼ mile of the street right-of-way centerline of the linear transit corridor feature shown on the map, except that: where a transit-supportive development corridor overlaps with a traditional urban or edge urban neighborhood context area, the traditional urban or edge urban neighborhood regulations of this title shall govern.
Section 3.  Anchorage Municipal Code Chapter 21.07, Development and Design Standards, is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the chapter is not affected and therefore not set out):

21.07  Development and Design Standards

21.07.060  Transportation and Connectivity

E.  Standards for Pedestrian Facilities.

2.  Sidewalks.

a.  All sidewalks shall be designed to comply with the standards of the Design Criteria Manual (DCM) and Municipality of Anchorage Standard Specifications (MASS) and shall be improved in accordance with subsection 21.08.050H.

b.  Street improvement projects and new streets in subdivisions in all class A zoning districts except for industrial districts, shall install sidewalks [SHALL BE INSTALLED] on both sides of all streets (local, collector, arterial, public or private, including loop streets). Where indicated in the comprehensive plan, a pathway may replace a sidewalk on one side. Street improvement projects in industrial zoning districts shall install[,] a sidewalk [SHALL BE INSTALLED] on one side of all local streets, and on both sides of local streets if the new sidewalks would connect to existing sidewalks on both ends and the needed sidewalk length is no greater than one quarter mile.

f.  Development on lots along existing streets in class A zoning districts shall install sidewalks on all lot frontages abutting streets in the following situations:

   i.  In R-4, R-4A, commercial [DISTRICTS], and DT zoning districts.

4.  On-site pedestrian walkways.

b.  On-site pedestrian connections.

   ii.  All primary building entrances on a site shall be connected to the street by a convenient system of walkways. This includes multiple primary entrances into one building, and primary entrances in separate buildings on a site.
iv. The primary front entrance of a residential dwelling shall be connected to the street by a walkway as provided in i. through ii. above, or by the dwelling’s individual driveway, or by a shared parking courtyard meeting 21.07.060G.20.

c. Walkway clear width and improvements.

i. Walkway clear width. The minimum width of a required pedestrian walkway shall be five feet of unobstructed clear width, [EXCLUDING VEHICULAR OVERHANG.] except where otherwise stated in this title. A walkway that provides access to no more than four residential dwelling units may provide an unobstructed clear width of three feet.

ii. Walkways shall be improved in accordance with subsection 21.08.050H.
F. **Pedestrian frontage standard.**

1. **Purpose.** The pedestrian frontage standard promotes building placement and orientation toward neighborhood streets and sidewalks, facilitates pedestrian and bicycle access, supports lower parking utilization in urban neighborhood areas, and encourages alternative modes of transportation. Objectives include:

   a. Define public streets and their associated frontage spaces as positive, useful features around which to organize and orient buildings in a manner that promotes pedestrian activity and connects to multiple modes of transportation.

   b. Provide pedestrian access to building entries that is clearly defined, safe, and inviting for people of all abilities, and minimizes conflicts between pedestrians and vehicle parking.

   c. Place active living spaces, entrances, and windows on street-facing building facades to improve the physical and visual connection from residences to the street.

   d. Promote a safe, secure pedestrian and neighborhood environment through “eyes on the street” design elements, such as placement of windows, that foster opportunities for casual surveillance of the street and outwardly expressed proprietorship of the neighborhood.

2. **Applicability.** Subsection 3. applies to development in the traditional urban and edge urban neighborhood context areas established in 21.07.015. Subsection 4. applies to development in the other areas of the municipality. Exceptions and exemptions from this section 21.07.060F. include:

   a. Changes of use and other developments that comprise building modifications of less than 50 percent of the total improvement value of the building(s) on the site.

   b. Development in Girdwood, Downtown (DT), and Industrial zoning districts.
c. Single-family and two-family dwellings constructed prior to January 1, 2016, or on lots of 20,000 square feet or larger, or in Class B zoning districts.

d. Non-residential uses without habitable floor area, such as utility substations.

e. The director shall reduce the window area requirement by the amount the applicant demonstrates is needed to comply with a 5-star energy rating or an affordable housing (21.15.040) financing institution’s energy rating requirements.

f. The director shall approve administrative relief provided the applicant demonstrates the adjustment is necessary to compensate for some practical difficulty of the site. The department shall keep record of the approved exception with written findings supporting the approval on file.

g. The Alternative Equivalent Compliance procedure set forth in subsection 21.07.010D. may be used to propose alternative means of complying with the intent of this section.
3. **Standard for urban neighborhood contexts.** The standards of table 21.07-2 apply to the primary frontage and at least one secondary frontage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building and Parking Placement</th>
<th>Primary Frontage</th>
<th>Secondary Frontage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Maximum front setback (ground-floor only) in the R-4 and non-residential zoning districts</td>
<td>30 feet in Traditional Urban, and 60 feet in other areas</td>
<td>90 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Minimum percentage of the width of ground-floor street-facing building elevation(s) required to comply with max. setback in A</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Residential garage entrance as a percentage of ground-floor street-facing building elevation width (maximum allowed)</td>
<td>50% in Traditional Urban, and 67% in other areas</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Maximum distance a garage may project out in front of the rest of the street-facing residential building elevation</td>
<td>No more than the width of the non-garage portion of the street-facing building elevation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Orientation and Access</th>
<th>Primary Frontage</th>
<th>Secondary Frontage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Minimum percentage of a non-residential ground-floor, street-facing building elevation required to be windows or primary entrances</td>
<td>30% in Traditional Urban, and 20% in other areas</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Minimum percentage of residential and upper-floor non-residential street-facing elevation required to be windows or primary entrances</td>
<td>15% in Traditional Urban, and 10% in other areas</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. At least one primary entrance located within max. setback in A</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Front primary entrances for residential dwellings meet 21.07.060G.15, Covered, Visible Residential Entrance</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Minimum number of pedestrian amenities from 21.07.060G. in addition to 21.07.060G.15.</td>
<td>2 pedestrian amenities required per multifamily, mixed-use, townhouse, or group housing development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Generally applicable standards and exceptions for maximum setbacks are provided in 21.06.030C.5.
2. Non-residential ground-floor windows used to meet these percentages shall be visual access windows (21.15.040) and have a sill height of no more than four feet above finished grade. Ground-floor wall area is defined in 21.15.040.
3. Rules of measurement for calculating window area as a percentage of building wall area are provided in 21.15.020P.
4. **Standard for other areas and developments in the municipality.** The standards of table 21.07-3 apply to the primary frontage and at least one secondary frontage.

### Table 21.07-3: Pedestrian Frontage Standard – Other Areas and Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building and Parking Placement</th>
<th>Primary Frontage</th>
<th>Secondary Frontage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Residential garage entrance as a percentage of ground-floor street-facing building elevation width (maximum allowed)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Maximum distance a garage may project out in front of the rest of a street-facing residential building elevation</td>
<td>No more than the width of the non-garage portion of the street-facing building elevation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Orientation and Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Orientation and Access</th>
<th>Primary Frontage</th>
<th>Secondary Frontage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Minimum percentage of residential street-facing building elevation wall areas required to be windows or primary entrances</td>
<td>Window(s) required, with no minimum percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Front primary entrances to residential dwellings meet 21.07.060G.15., <strong>Covered, Visible Residential Entrance.</strong></td>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Minimum number of pedestrian amenities from 21.07.060G. in addition to 21.07.060G.15.</td>
<td>1 pedestrian amenity required per multifamily, mixed-use, townhouse, or group housing development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Rules of measurement for calculating window area as a percentage of building wall area are provided in 21.15.020P.
Purpose. The purpose of this section is to define and provide standards for pedestrian amenities that may be required, included in a menu of choices to meet a requirement, or listed as a special feature that can count toward a bonus incentive anywhere in this title. For example, another section of this title may list a pedestrian amenity as a special feature for which bonus floor area or a reduction in required parking may be granted. The standards contained in this section give predictability for applicants, decision-makers, and the community for the minimum acceptable standards for pedestrian amenities. It also ensures the amenities will improve and enhance the community to the benefit of all, and respond to the northern latitude climate. This title provides flexibility to encourage and allow for creativity and unique situations through the alternative equivalent compliance and minor modifications process.

2. Applicability. Pedestrian amenities shall meet the minimum standards of this section in order to be credited toward a requirement, menu choice, or incentive of this title, except where specifically provided otherwise in this title. The alternative equivalent compliance procedure set forth in subsection 21.07.010D may be used to propose alternative means of complying with the standards of this subsection 21.07.060G[F]. The standards of this section apply only to pedestrian amenities that are counted toward a requirement, menu choice, or incentive under this title. It does not apply to amenities that do not receive credit for requirements in title 21.

3. Walkway. A walkway is a surface that connects two points for pedestrian use, as defined in Chapter 21.15. A walkway may be in a publicly dedicated pedestrian easement. Examples include pedestrian connections within one development site, mid-block, between subdivisions, or leading from streets to public amenities, such as schools or parks.

A. A walkway shall have a minimum unobstructed clear width of five feet, except where otherwise stated in this title. A walkway that provides access to no more than four residential dwelling units may have an unobstructed clear width of three feet.
B. WALKWAYS SHALL BE IMPROVED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUBSECTION 21.08.050H.]

3[4]. Enhanced on-site [PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN] walkway. An enhanced on-site [A PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN] walkway is intended to provide an option for applicants to receive credit for exceeding the minimum development standards for walkways and improving pedestrian convenience, comfort, and safety on the site. Enhanced on-site walkways provide additional width [UNOBSTRUCTED CLEAR WIDTH OF AT LEAST EIGHT FEET] for pedestrian movement [WITH ADDITIONAL SPACE INCORPORATING FEATURES ALONG THE WALKWAY SUCH AS STOREFRONT SIDEWALK SPACE, ROOM FOR RESIDENTIAL STOOPS OR BUILDING FOUNDATION PLANTINGS] and peripheral space that accommodates landscaping, furniture, and utilities. [AS ESTABLISHED GENERALLY IN SUBSECTION F.1 AND F. 2 ABOVE, THE STANDARDS OF THIS SUBSECTION APPLY ONLY WHERE THE SPECIFIC TERM "PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY" IS LISTED AS A REQUIREMENT, MENU CHOICE, OR SPECIAL FEATURE THAT COUNTS TOWARD A BONUS. THIS SUBSECTION IS NOT A GENERALLY APPLICABLE REQUIREMENT FOR OTHER LARGE WALKWAYS.]

a. [A PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY SHALL BE DEVELOPED AS A CONTINUOUS PEDESTRIAN ROUTE EXTENDING FOR AT LEAST 50 FEET.]

[B.] An enhanced on-site [A PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN] walkway shall have a pedestrian movement zone with a continuous,[N] unobstructed walkway clear width of at least eight feet, or six feet where providing access only to four or fewer residential dwelling units. Where adjacent to a ground-floor building elevation it shall also have a [SIDEWALK STOREFRONT OR] building interface zone a minimum of two feet in width for building foundation landscaping or [THREE FEET IN WIDTH OF SIDEWALK] space for opening doors or seating and transition pedestrian spaces. In addition to the pedestrian movement zone and any building interface zone, the enhanced on-site walkway shall have a buffer space of at least two[FOUR] feet in width where abutting motor vehicle parking lots, circulation aisles, or driveways [SHALL BE INCORPORATED AS PART OF THE WALKWAY WHEN ABUTTING ANY STREET OR VEHICLE AREA.], The buffer space shall
[TO] accommodate [STREET TREES,] landscaping beds, fencing or bollards, light poles, utilities, benches, and other furnishings [OBJECTS TO BE KEPT CLEAR OF THE WALKWAY].

b[C]. A minimum of two pedestrian features as defined by this title (21.15.040) shall be provided along the enhanced walkway, with at least one for every 50 feet of the walkway length [AT LEAST ONE PEDESTRIAN FEATURE AS DEFINED BY THIS TITLE SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR EVERY 50 FEET OF LENGTH ALONG A PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY].

[D. A PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY SHALL BE ILLUMINATED WITH PEDESTRIAN SCALE LIGHTING.]

c[E]. Enhanced on-site [A PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN] walkways shall provide continuous, direct[LY] connections from building primary entrance(s) to surrounding public streets and sidewalks[,] and be publicly accessible or available to all residents of the development [AT ALL TIMES].

(Note to code revisor: renumber subsections 5-14 to subsections 4-13 accordingly.)

[15. BICYCLE PARKING FACILITIES.

A. REQUIRED BICYCLE PARKING OR A SIGN LEADING THERETO SHALL BE LOCATED IN AN AREA VISIBLE FROM A PRIMARY ENTRANCE AREA AND NO FARTHER FROM A PRIMARY ENTRANCE THAN THE CLOSEST MOTOR VEHICLE PARKING SPACE, NOT INCLUDING DESIGNATED ACCESSIBLE PARKING, CARPOOL, OR VANPOOL SPACES. IT MAY ALSO BE LOCATED INSIDE THE BUILDING SERVED, IN A LOCATION THAT IS EASILY ACCESSIBLE FOR BICYCLES.

B. A REQUIRED BICYCLE PARKING SPACE SHALL INCLUDE A SECURELY FIXED STRUCTURE THAT ALLOWS THE BICYCLE WHEEL AND FRAME TO BE LOCKED TO THE FACILITY, AND THAT SUPPORTS THE BICYCLE FRAME IN A STABLE POSITION WITHOUT DAMAGE TO THE BICYCLE, OR SHALL BE IN A BICYCLE LOCKER, LOCKABLE BICYCLE ENCLOSURE, OR LOCKABLE ROOM.)
C. A REQUIRED BICYCLE PARKING SPACE SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF SIX FEET LONG AND TWO FEET WIDE.

D. THE SURFACING OF BICYCLE PARKING FACILITIES SHALL BE DESIGNED AND MAINTAINED TO BE CLEAR OF MUD AND SNOW.

E. BICYCLE PARKING SHALL NOT OBSTRUCT PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS, BUILDING ACCESS, OR USE AREAS.]

14. **Separated walkway to the street.** The development shall connect the building primary entrances to the street with a clear and direct walkway that is not routed through a parking facility or across vehicle driveways or circulation aisles. The minimum clear width portion of the walkway shall be separated from the parking facility by at least five feet.

15. **Covered, visible residential entrance.** A porch, stoop, or landing sheltered by a roof is intended to give visual emphasis to the building entrance as an aid in wayfinding, and help provide safe, convenient access to residential buildings from the street. The entrance shall meet the following standards:

   a. The entrance shall incorporate a porch, stoop, or landing with an internal dimension of at least 16 square feet, and a permanent, sheltering roof covering at least 12 square feet.

   b. The porch, stoop, or landing shall be distinguished from adjoining areas and vehicle parking by vertical separation or a change in surfacing material.

   c. The building entrance shall also be visible (via an unobstructed line of sight) from a street or face a common private open space (21.07.030) that is visible from a street.

16. **Enhanced primary entrance.** An enhanced building entry is intended to provide an option for applicants to receive credit for a prominent and inviting primary pedestrian entrance. To receive credit, the enhanced primary entrance shall incorporate at least three of the following features:

   a. Outdoor sheltering roof feature projecting from the building façade such as an overhang, portico, canopy,
marquee with an inside dimension of at least 16 square feet;

b. Recessed and/or projected entrance or other building wall modulation with projections or recesses in the building wall plane;

c. Changes in the building’s main roofline such as arches, peaked roof forms, or terracing parapets;

d. Changes in siding material or exterior finishes, or façade detail features such as tilework that emphasize the entrance;

e. Entrance plaza, patio, or similar common private open space;

f. Landscaping not otherwise required by this title, such as integrated planters, landscape accent lighting, or special paving treatments; or

g. One or more pedestrian features (21.15.040) such as pedestrian-scale lighting or seating.

17. **Site Entry Feature.** Highlight and define a pedestrian entrance to a development site using three or more of the following elements:

a. Landscape treatment with seasonal color and trees, which clearly distinguishes and highlights the site entry.

b. Plaza or courtyard as described in subsection 21.07.060G.5.

c. Identifying building primary entrance form including a covered entry, when the primary entrance is within 50 feet of the site entrance.

d. Special paving, pedestrian scale lighting, and/or bollards.

e. Ornamental gate and/or fence.
18[16]. Pedestrian-interactive building [USE]. A pedestrian-interactive building [USE] is intended to provide interior [GROUND-FLOOR] spaces that [STRONGLY] engage the sidewalk with street-facing windows and entrances, and [FEATURE] activities and services that support neighborhood residents, and generally contribute to the activity level and quality of the pedestrian-[ORIENTED] environment of the neighborhood or district. The standards that follow apply where the term "pedestrian-interactive building [USE]" is listed in this title as a requirement, special feature for a bonus, or a menu choice.

[A. A PEDESTRIAN-INTERACTIVE USE SHALL BE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING USES THAT ARE PERMITTED IN THE DISTRICT: RETAIL AND PET SERVICES; FINANCIAL INSTITUTION PROVIDING BANKING SERVICES OPEN TO THE PUBLIC WITH AT LEAST ONE EMPLOYEE ON SITE; FOOD OR BEVERAGE SERVICE; PERSONAL SERVICE; CULTURAL FACILITY; OR THE FRONTAGE OF ENTRYWAYS OR STAIRWAYS THROUGH WHICH SUCH USES ARE PRINCIPALLY ACCESSED;]

B. RETAIL SALES USES THAT ARE PERMITTED IN THE DISTRICT SHALL BE CONSIDERED PEDESTRIAN-INTERACTIVE USES, EXCEPT FOR THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF RETAIL SALES USES: FUELING STATION; BUILDING MATERIALS STORE.

C. THE FOLLOWING USES SUPPORTING RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD AND HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ARE ALSO CONSIDERED PEDESTRIAN-INTERACTIVE USES WHEN PERMITTED IN THE DISTRICT: RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS WITH INDIVIDUAL FRONT ENTRIES ALONG THE STREET; ELEMENTARY SCHOOL; MIDDLE OR HIGH SCHOOL; HEALTH SERVICES; CHILD CARE CENTER.]

a[D]. A pedestrian-interactive building [USE] shall provide a primary entrance facing the street. Entrances at building corners facing a street may be used to satisfy this requirement.

b[E]. A pedestrian-interactive building [USE] shall contain habitable floor area at least 24 feet deep extending along a minimum of 50 percent of the [FULL] length of
the ground-floor, street-facing building elevation in Urban Neighborhood Contexts, and 30 percent elsewhere [ALLOWING FOR]. The habitable floor area may include pedestrian [AND VEHICLE] entrances, entry lobbies or atriums, and stairwells.

[F. A PEDESTRIAN-INTERACTIVE USE SHALL COMPLY WITH SUBSECTION 21.06.030C.5., MAXIMUM SETBACKS, BUT THE EXCEPTIONS OF SUBSECTION 21.06.030C.5.D. SHALL NOT BE AVAILABLE.]

c[G]. Street-facing [GROUND-FLOOR] wall areas of a non-residential [PEDESTRIAN-INTERACTIVE] use shall be 50[67] percent visual access windows or primary entrances on the ground floor, and 20 percent windows above the ground floor [, EXCEPT THAT SUCH]

d. Street-facing wall areas for residential uses [DWELLINGS] shall be at least 20 percent [VISUAL ACCESS] windows or primary entrances in Urban Neighborhood Contexts and 10 percent in other areas.

e[H]. Where a building has three or more street frontages, these criterial apply along only two of the frontages.

[1917]. Enhanced street sidewalk [OPTION].
An enhanced street sidewalk is intended to provide an option for applicants to receive credit for exceeding the minimum development standards for sidewalks. An enhanced street sidewalk promotes sidewalk widening and streetscape enhancements to support higher levels of pedestrian activity, comfort, and safety in the district [AND ACCESS IN MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENTS]. An enhanced street sidewalk [ENVIRONMENT] with “complete[MAIN] street” (21.15.040) style amenities may be provided in lieu of required site perimeter landscaping [WHERE IT IS LOGICAL TO SUPPORT A PEDESTRIAN ZONE] as determined through an administrative site plan review, and subject to the following:
a. The enhanced street sidewalk cross-section shall be at least 12 feet wide, and include a pedestrian movement zone, building interface zone, and street interface zone (21.15.040). The pedestrian movement zone shall have a clear width of at least six feet. The street interface zone shall be at least two feet wide from back-of-curb, and four feet wide along major arterials. Where a building adjoins the sidewalk, there shall be a building interface zone at least two feet wide [AT LEAST PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT’S FRONTAGE ALONG THE ENHANCED SIDEWALK SHALL FEATURE A PRINCIPAL BUILDING WITH A 20-FOOT MAXIMUM SETBACK IN COMPLIANCE WITH SUBSECTION 21.06.030C.5].

Enhanced Street Sidewalks in [A] Commercial and Residential Settings

(Note to code revisor: replace existing illustration with illustrations above.)

[I. A PUBLIC USE EASEMENT SHALL BE RECORDED FOR ANY PART OF THE DESIGNATED SIDEWALK TO BE LOCATED WITHIN THE SUBJECT PARCEL.

II. PHYSICAL OBSTRUCTIONS WITHIN THE SIDEWALK’S BUILDING INTERFACE ZONE, SUCH AS LANDSCAPING, ENTRY STOOPS, OR SEATING, SHALL EXTEND NO MORE THAN TWO FEET INTO THE MINIMUM REQUIRED 12 FOOT WIDTH, SO THAT AT LEAST TEN FEET REMAIN.]
b. The enhanced street sidewalk shall provide at least two-thirds the number of trees and shrubs that would otherwise have been required for site perimeter landscaping.

c. The enhanced street sidewalk may be placed wholly or in part within a right-of-way, subject to approval of the traffic engineer and municipal engineer.

i. The enhanced street sidewalk shall be subject to the applicable requirements of title 24, including sections 24.30.020., Permit to use Public Places, and 24.90, Encroachment Permit.

[II. IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE DCM AND MASS.]

ii. Existing improvements that meet the standards of the enhanced street sidewalk may be counted towards the requirements of this section, subject to approval by the director.

iii. The owner shall maintain landscaping and amenities for the enhanced street sidewalk within the right-of-way[AND COMPLY WITH THE PROVISIONS FOR REMOVAL OF SNOW AND ICE IN AMC 24.80.090, 100, AND 110].

iv. Where the right-of-way is not adequate or cannot be configured to accommodate the enhanced street sidewalk, then the development shall be set back from the street frontage as necessary to accommodate part of the improvements within the property. A public use easement shall be recorded for any part of the designated sidewalk width to be located within the subject parcel.

20[18]. Parking courtyard.

*** *** *** (AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO 2015-82, 7-28-15; AO 2015-100, 10-13-15; AO 2017-55, 4-11-17; AO 2020-38, 4-28-20)
21.07.090 Off-Street Parking and Loading

A. **Purpose.** This section establishes off-street parking and loading requirements to accommodate anticipated parking utilization in areas without public on-street parking management [AS A NECESSARY PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF LAND, TO ENSURE THE SAFE AND ADEQUATE FLOW OF TRAFFIC IN THE PUBLIC STREET SYSTEM], and to ensure that parking facilities[LOTS] are designed to perform in a safe, efficient manner. It is also the intent of this section to attenuate the adverse visual, environmental, and economic impacts of parking facilities [LOTS], and to balance the provision of adequate off-street parking with other modes of site access that promote [TO ACHIEVE] a compact and efficient land use pattern, affordable housing, pedestrian-friendly environments, and other area-wide objectives. Specific objectives of this section [PURPOSES] include to:

1. Ensure that off-street parking, loading, and access demands will be met without impacting adjoining and [ADVERSELY AFFECTING OTHER] nearby properties, land uses, and neighborhoods;

2. Ensure the safe and adequate flow of traffic, pedestrians, and service vehicles in adjoining streets;

3[2]. Provide for safe and orderly circulation and parking in parking and loading facilities, and minimize conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles;

4[3]. Encourage the efficient use of land and discourage [AVOID] the encumbrance of more space than is necessary for anticipated parking utilization;

5. Recognize, through parking reductions and lower parking requirements, the parking efficiencies of mixed-use development, mixed-income housing, pedestrian-friendly development patterns, proximity to public transportation, and other area-specific neighborhood characteristics;

6. Recognize, through area-specific exemptions from parking requirements, the parking efficiencies of public parking facilities, on-street parking management, and alternative travel mode incentives;

7[4]. Improve the visual appearance of public street corridors by encouraging buildings and other attractive site features to
become more prominent relative to parking facilities [LOTS] and driveways;

8. Manage the width and frequency of driveways along street frontages to provide adequate space for—and reduce conflicts with—snow clearing and snow storage in the right-of-way, on-street parking (where appropriate), and pedestrian facilities;

9[5]. Provide for better pedestrian movement and encourage alternative modes of transportation consistent with cleaner air and water, greater transportation choice, and efficient infill and redevelopment by reducing [THE] expanses of parking [THAT MUST BE TRAVERSED BETWEEN DESTINATIONS];

[6. SUPPORT A BALANCED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH CLEANER AIR AND WATER, GREATER TRANSPORTATION CHOICES, AND EFFICIENT INFILL AND REDEVELOPMENT; AND]

10. Facilitate bicycle use by providing safe, secure, and convenient bike parking through minimum requirements for the type of bike parking facilities and the amount of bicycle spaces; and

11[7]. Allow flexibility in addressing vehicle parking, loading, and access, including [PROVIDING FOR] reductions [AND ALTERNATIVES] to [MINIMUM] parking requirements and mechanisms to manage parking needs while promoting development, reinvestment, and other community goals.

B. Applicability.

1. Generally.

a. The off-street parking and loading standards of this section 21.07.090 shall apply to all development in the municipality, including changes of use.

b. Except for the off-street loading requirements of subsection 21.07.090G., all other requirements of this section shall apply to Girdwood, unless specifically preempted in chapter 21.09.
c. Except when specifically exempted, the requirements of this section shall apply to all temporary parking lots and parking facilities[LOTS] that are a principal use on a site.

2. **Expansions, Relocations, and Enlargements.** A site to which a building is relocated shall provide [THE] required parking and loading spaces per tables 21.07-7, 21.07-8, 21.07-11, and 21.07-14. An expansion or enlargement that is an increase in the floor area or other measure of off-street parking and loading requirements shall provide required parking and loading [SPACES AS REQUIRED] for the increase, except as provided otherwise in subsection 21.07.090F., Parking Reductions and Alternatives.

3. **Use of Required Parking Spaces.** Required parking spaces shall be available for the parking of passenger automobiles by residents, occupants, customers, visitors, or employees of the use. Required parking spaces shall [MAY] not be assigned, leased, or rented in any way to a use on another site, or to anyone who is not a resident, occupant, customer, guest, or employee, except for shared parking situations as provided in subsection 21.07.090F.5.[SEE SUBSECTION 21.07.090F.16. ALSO,] Required parking spaces shall not be used for the parking of equipment or for storage of goods or [INOPERABLE] vehicles.

4. **Regulation of Parking Space Use.** The providers of required off-street parking spaces may reasonably control the users thereof by means that may include, but are not limited to, restricting all parking to the users of the facility; parking lot attendants; control gates; tow-away areas; areas for exclusive use by employees, tenants or staff; areas restricted for use by customers or visitors; and imposing time limitations on users. Fees may be charged for the use of required parking, however required parking shall not in any way be made unavailable for the use served, except as provided otherwise in this title.[SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER, PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE PERMIT THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER MAY REVIEW ALL METHODS OF CONTROL AND MAY DISAPPROVE OF ANY RESTRICTION SUCH AS FEES THAT ADVERSELY AFFECTS THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION.] The municipality may enforce any approved parking plan or restrictions through any of the code enforcement provisions set forth in chapter 21.14, Enforcement.
5. **Parking Nonconformities.** When a site is out of compliance as to the number of required or allowed parking spaces, section 21.13.060, *Characteristics of Use*, applies.

C. **Computation of Parking and Loading Requirements.**

---

5. **Additional computation standards.**

---

c. **Areas that Count Toward Minimum but Not Maximum Parking Requirements.** For the purpose of calculating parking requirements, the following types of parking spaces shall not count against the maximum parking requirement, but shall count toward the minimum requirement:

i. Accessible parking spaces;

ii. Parking spaces set aside for passenger loading including taxicab stands and ride-hailing service spaces, provided that such spaces are not required by the traffic engineer pursuant to subsection 21.07.090I.;

iii. Vanpool and carpool parking spaces;

iv. Stacked, tandem, and full-time attendant (valet) parking spaces in conformance with subsection 21.07.090H.12.;

v. User-paid parking such as unbundled parking;

vi. Parking spaces with electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) for EV charging;

vii. Parking spaces provided as the required parking for a use on another parcel through a municipally approved shared parking or off-site parking agreement; and

viii. Parking structures, underground parking, and parking within, above, or beneath the building(s) it serves.

---

d. **Reductions to Required Parking Not Applicable to Accessible Parking Spaces or Passenger Loading.** The following types of parking spaces shall not be reduced by the area-specific parking requirements or
exemptions established in 21.07.090E.2, or the parking reductions and alternatives in 21.07.090F.:  

i. Required accessible (ADA) parking spaces pursuant to subsection 21.07.090J.

ii. Required passenger loading spaces pursuant to subsection 21.07.090L.

D. Parking Lot Layout and Design Plan.


a. The parking facility layout, circulation, and design plan shall be prepared by a design professional and stamped by a professional registered with the Alaska State Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers, and Land Surveyors, except that parking lots with fewer than 20 parking spaces shall be exempt.

b. The parking facility layout, circulation, and design plan shall include:

i. Location of permanent or temporary snow storage areas with calculations per 21.07.040F.;

ii. Location of required landscaping areas, refuse screening, and fences;

iii. Location of required pedestrian sidewalks and walkways per 21.07.060E. Show dimensions for sidewalk widths and grades with spot elevations;

iv. Off-street parking and loading calculation for all uses located on the site per tables 21.07-7[4] and 21.07-11[6];

v. Parking space and loading berth locations. Include number of spaces provided, typical space dimensions, and grades per 21.07.090H.;

vi. Where loading facilities or on-site refuse collection are provided, show commercial truck circulation and truck turning radii when required by the traffic engineer;
vii[VI]. Show all parking facility[AREA] circulation patterns including location of curbed end islands at end of parking rows. Provide dimensions for the width of the circulation aisles, and show grades with spot elevations per 21.07.090H.;

viii[VII]. Location of accessible parking spaces and access aisles per 21.07.090J.;

ix[VIII]. Location of passenger loading zones and spaces [IF REQUIRED per 21.07.090L.;

x. Emergency access, fire lanes, and refuse collection;

xi[X]. Vehicle drive-throughs, vehicle queueing spaces and dimensions including vehicle-to-vehicle separation if required per 21.07.090L.;

xii[X]. Number, location and dimensions of bicycle parking spaces if required per 21.07.090K.;

xiii[XI]. Driveways to streets and alleys. Provide dimensions for throat width/depth, landing grades, and driveway slope including spot elevations. Show sight distance triangles per the m[M]unicipal d[D]riveway s[S]tandards;

xiv[XII]. On site traffic control signage and locations. Provide a sign summary table that indicates Sign ID, MUTCD/ATMS sign designation, description, and the direction the sign is facing;

xv[XIII]. Required parking lot lighting locations, lighting calculations and glare statement, except that parking lots with fewer than 10 parking spaces serving three- and four-unit multifamily uses are exempt from providing a lighting engineering plan; and

xvi[XIV]. Location of significant drainage elements such as manholes, catch basin, and drainage swales.
c. The traffic engineer shall ensure that provisions have been made for minimum interference with street traffic flow and safe interior vehicular and pedestrian circulation, transit, and parking.

E. Off-Street Parking Requirements

1. Minimum Number of Spaces Required. Unless otherwise expressly stated in this title, off-street parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with this subsection 21.07.090E. Off-street parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with table 21.07-4, OFF- STREET PARKING SPACES REQUIRED, AND SUBSECTION E.2. BELOW. Reductions and exemptions and alternatives to the requirements of this subsection [REQUIRED MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES] are provided in subsection 21.07.090F., Parking Reductions and Alternatives [BELOW].


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Minimum Spaces Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown (DT) zoning districts</td>
<td>All Developments</td>
<td>No off-street parking is required, as provided in 21.11.070F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 21.07-7: AREA-SPECIFIC PARKING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Minimum Spaces Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Urban Neighborhood Context (Section 21.07.015D., Map 21.07-1.)</td>
<td>All Developments</td>
<td>65% of the minimum spaces required in table 21.07-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Urban Neighborhood Context (Section 21.07.015D., Maps 21.07-1 thru -3.)</td>
<td>All Developments</td>
<td>75% of the minimum spaces required in table 21.07-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-Supportive Development Corridors outside of Traditional Urban and Edge Urban Neighborhood Context areas (Section 21.07.015D., Maps 21.07-1 thru -4.)</td>
<td>All Developments</td>
<td>90% of the minimum spaces required in table 21.07-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Benefit Districts established pursuant to Title 9, Traffic</td>
<td>All Developments</td>
<td>No off-street parking is required, subject to subsection 21.07.090E.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girdwood</td>
<td>See section 21.09.070L. for area-specific parking requirements in Girdwood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Use-specific parking requirements. All development in the Municipality not addressed in the area-specific parking requirements in table 21.07-7 shall provide off-street parking spaces in accordance with table 21.07-8:

### TABLE 21.07-8[4]: OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS BY LAND USE [SPACES REQUIRED]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Minimum Spaces Required</th>
<th>See Loading Subsection 21.07.090G.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4[3]. Uses not listed or that have no specific requirement.

5[4]. Maximum number of spaces permitted.

6[5]. Parking location. Except as provided in subsection 21.07.090F., all required parking shall be on the same lot as the use served. [HOWEVER, REQUIRED PARKING MAY BE ON AN ABUTTING OR ADJACENT LOT PROVIDED THE ZONING DISTRICT IN WHICH THE LOT IS LOCATED ALLOWS FOR OFF-STREET PARKING AS A PERMITTED PRINCIPAL USE, SITE PLAN REVIEW USE, OR CONDITIONAL USE; IN WHICH CASE THERE SHALL BE A PARKING AGREEMENT WHICH MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF SUBSECTION F.1. BELOW.]

7. Requirements for Developments in Parking Benefit Districts
The following area-specific parking regulations apply to all developments located in parking benefit districts established pursuant to title 9:

a. No off-street parking is required, except that accessible (ADA) parking spaces required by 21.07.090J. shall be provided.

b. Development projects that result in 10 or more dwelling units, new construction of 10,000 or more square feet of gross floor area, or building renovations involving a change of use of 50,000 or more square feet of non-residential gross floor area, shall provide one or more parking reduction strategies from subsection 21.07.090F. Structured parking, industrial uses, and affordable housing units that meet 21.07.110F., are exempt from this requirement.

i. The applicant shall select parking reduction strategies from subsection 21.07.090F.1., Table 21.07-9 that amount to a total reduction of at least 10 percent using the "Reduction Amount" column in Table 21.07-9. The total reduction required shall increase an additional 1 percent for each 10 off-street parking spaces not used for a parking reduction strategy in the development. In no case shall the total reduction be required to exceed 25 percent.

ii. The requirements of 21.07.090F. for receiving parking reductions apply.

iii. The applicant may propose strategies not included in Table 21.07-9, subject to 21.07.090F.8, Discretionary Parking Reductions.

F. Parking reductions and alternatives.

1. Parking reductions allowed. This subsection 21.07.090F. allows administrative reductions to [THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND DIRECTOR MAY APPROVE REDUCTIONS AND ALTERNATIVES TO PROVIDING] the number of off-street parking spaces required by subsection 21.07.090E. [TABLE 21.07-4, AND/OR TO THE CIRCULATION AND DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS OF SUBSECTIONS H.8. AND H.9., IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS.] Developments are allowed
to apply the reductions shown in Table 21.07.-9, provided the following:

a. The development meets the additional requirements set forth in Table 21.07-9;

b. The property owner enters into a parking agreement with the Municipality of Anchorage as provided in 21.07.090F.2.;

c. Multiple parking reductions are calculated as provided in F.3.;

d. Pedestrian access improvements are provided as set forth in 21.07.090F.4.; and

e. Proposals for larger percentage reductions than shown, that modify any of the provisions for the reductions shown, or that propose other types of parking reductions from those in in table 21.07-9, may be approved subject to a discretionary review and approval by the traffic engineer and director as provided in subsection 21.07.090F.8., Discretionary Parking Reductions.

Table 21.07-9: Parking Reductions and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reduction</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Additional Requirements</th>
<th>Reduction Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Shared Vehicle Programs: Participation in one or more of the shared vehicle programs below may substitute for required parking spaces, provided that information about the programs is available in a location visible to all residents and employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool Program</td>
<td>Non-residential uses</td>
<td>The employer or property owner sponsors a carpool program that is available to all employees and provides designated carpool parking spaces signed for exclusive use by the carpool program.</td>
<td>Each carpool space may count as two spaces toward meeting the minimum number of required parking spaces, up to a 2% reduction in the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare Program</td>
<td>Non-residential uses</td>
<td>The employer or property owner participates in a rideshare program that is available to all employees at no cost and provides designated rideshare parking spaces that meet the passenger loading space dimensional standards of 21.07.090I.2. and are signed for exclusive use by the rideshare program.</td>
<td>Each rideshare space may count as six spaces toward meeting the minimum number of required parking spaces, up to a 5% reduction in the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car-Share Program</td>
<td>Residential development sites located in the Neighborhood Development Contexts or within ¼-mile of the centerline of a right-of-way of a public transit route</td>
<td>The property owner sponsors memberships to an active car-share program for all households or group living residents on the site and provides designated car-share spaces that are signed for exclusive use.</td>
<td>Each carshare space may count as five spaces toward meeting the minimum number of required parking spaces, up to a 10% reduction in the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Benefit Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Pass Benefits</td>
<td>Any development site in the Neighborhood Development Contexts^1 or within ¼-mile of the centerline of a right-of-way of a public transit route with frequent service mapped in 21.07.015D.</td>
<td>The property owner sponsors public transit passes cost-free to all employees or residents.</td>
<td>10% reduction in the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>Non-residential use, group living use, and any household living use with four or more dwelling units</td>
<td>The development provides more than the minimum number of required bicycle parking spaces. Each bicycle space meets the standards of 21.07.090K.4.</td>
<td>Each four bicycle parking spaces count as one automobile parking space, with a minimum allowed reduction of one space and a maximum of a 10% reduction in the number of required automobile parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced On-Site Walkway</td>
<td>Any development site in the Neighborhood Development Contexts^1 or within ¼-mile of the centerline of a right-of-way of a public transit route with frequent service mapped in 21.07.015D.</td>
<td>The development provides an enhanced on-site walkway per 21.07.060G.3.</td>
<td>2% reduction in the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Street Sidewalk</td>
<td>Any development site in the Neighborhood Development Contexts^1 or within ¼-mile of the centerline of a right-of-way of a public transit route with frequent service mapped in 21.07.015D.</td>
<td>The development provides an enhanced street sidewalk per 21.07.060G.19.</td>
<td>2% reduction in the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Stop or Shelter</td>
<td>Any use in the Neighborhood Development Contexts^1 or on a public transit route with frequent service mapped in 21.07.015D.</td>
<td>Based on a determination of need by the public transportation department, the development provides a public use easement or transit stop improvements per 21.07.060G.7.</td>
<td>2% reduction in the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby Public Transit Route with frequent Service to a Transit-Supportive Development Corridor</td>
<td>Development sites located within one-half mile from the centerline of a right-of-way of a transit-supportive development corridor or a public transit route with frequent service shown on maps 21.07-1 to 21.07-4 in section 21.07.015D. This distance shall be measured on publicly accessible streets or trails.</td>
<td>The development site is located outside of the ¼-mile radius of the Transit-Supportive Development Corridor and is not within any other Neighborhood Development Context1. The development meets the area-specific bicycle parking requirements in subsection 21.07.090K., Table 21.07-14.</td>
<td>10% reduction in the number of required parking spaces for sites located within 1,320 feet (1/4 mile) of the right-of-way centerline. 8% reduction for sites within 1,650 feet. 6% reduction for sites within 1,980 feet. 4% reduction for sites within 2,310 feet. 2% reduction for sites within 2,640 feet (half-mile).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pedestrian Amenities</td>
<td>Any development site in the Neighborhood Development Contexts^1 or within ¼-mile of the centerline of a right-of-way of a public transit route with frequent service mapped in 21.07.015D.</td>
<td>The development provides one or more additional pedestrian amenities from section 21.07.060G, not otherwise required by this title.</td>
<td>1% reduction in the number of required parking spaces for each pedestrian amenity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 21.07-9: Parking Reductions and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reduction</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Additional Requirements</th>
<th>Reduction Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Parking Pricing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Cash-out</td>
<td>Non-residential uses</td>
<td>The use implements a parking cash-out program as defined in 21.15.040 and informs all employees of the program. The cash-out value of the parking space is allowed to be up to one-year in duration.</td>
<td>10% reduction in the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbundled Parking</td>
<td>Household living uses and non-residential uses</td>
<td>All parking accessory to the use is unbundled parking as defined in 21.15.040, by which the parking spaces are leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for the dwelling units or building space.</td>
<td>10% reduction in the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Housing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rental Housing</td>
<td>Household living uses</td>
<td>Rental housing units that meet the standards of 21.07.110G. <strong>Standards for Affordable Housing</strong>, are rented at rates affordable to lower income households.</td>
<td>Each affordable dwelling unit is eligible for a 25% reduction in the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing</td>
<td>Residential uses</td>
<td>Housing that meets the definition of senior housing (21.15.040) and is solely occupied by persons 62 years or older.</td>
<td>Each senior housing unit is eligible for a 25% reduction in the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Shared and Off-site Parking Facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Parking</td>
<td>See section 21.07.090F.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site Parking</td>
<td>See section 21.07.090F.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby Public Parking</td>
<td>See section 21.07.090F.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Prioritization of Other Goals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Banking</td>
<td>Any development that sets aside an area to provide for the future construction of deferred parking spaces.</td>
<td>The area set aside is landscaped with site enhancement landscaping or pedestrian amenities. The applicant provides an alternate site plan for approval that accommodates the deferred parking, landscaping, pedestrian facilities, and other site elements that would be required by this title without the land banking.</td>
<td>The development may set aside the land area that would otherwise be needed in order to provide up to 25% of the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Reuse of Older Buildings</td>
<td>Any use located in the Neighborhood Development Contexts¹, except not drive-through service or vehicle-related uses.</td>
<td>The development is a building expansion, alteration, or change of use, in an existing building that was originally permitted prior to June 13, 1978. The development does not convert housing units to non-residential uses.</td>
<td>Exemption from the first 10 percent increase in the total number of spaces required on the development site, for a maximum allowed exemption of five parking spaces. A parking reduction for adaptive reuse shall be used only once per individual building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Cultural Landmark Preservation</td>
<td>Any use that involves preservation of a landmark listed in the Anchorage local landmarks register.</td>
<td>The development does not decrease the number of parking spaces that existed on the site as of [effective date of this ordinance] to less than the number otherwise required by this title.</td>
<td>25% reduction in the number of required parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Neighborhood Development Contexts include the Traditional Urban Neighborhood, Edge Urban Neighborhood, and Transit-Supportive Development Context areas delineated in section 21.15.015.
2[1]. **Parking agreements.** All parking reductions [OR ALTERNATIVE SHALL] require a written parking agreement between the property owner(s) and the municipality, subject to the following standards: [EXCEPT WHERE EXPRESSLY STATED OTHERWISE.]

a. **Recordation.** The municipality shall record the parking agreement at the district recorder’s office as a covenant that runs with the land and is binding on the owner and all successors and assigns for as long as the required number of off-street parking spaces is not provided [AS A RESULT OF THE PARKING REDUCTION OR ALTERNATIVE. ALL PARTIES INVOLVED IN THE PARKING REDUCTION OR ALTERNATIVE SHALL PARTICIPATE IN THE PARKING AGREEMENT]. Recordation of the agreement shall take place before issuance of an entitlement that is contingent upon [REQUIRING] a parking reduction[ OR ALTERNATIVE].

b. **Content.** The form (template) [AND CONTENT] of the parking agreement shall be provided by the municipality, as approved by the traffic engineer and director. The parking agreement [IT] shall guarantee installation and maintenance of any required improvements by the property owner, and [OR] the owner’s continued participation in any parking management strategy required for a parking reduction. The parking agreement shall be accompanied by a site plan showing the parking and facilities required for the parking reduction.

c. **Additional Content for Agreements Subject to Discretionary Review.** Discretionary parking reductions subject to 21.07.090F.8. shall be preceded by a formal letter requesting the reduction for concurrence by the traffic engineer and director. The letter shall include justification for the parking reduction, including any parking demand study if prescribed by the traffic engineer. The parking agreement shall include a contingency plan, and shall guarantee [ASSURE] future implementation of the [A] contingency plan by the property owner if so ordered by the traffic engineer. The contingency plan may include strategies such as:

i. A deferred parking site plan [INSTALLATION OF PARKING];
ii. Payment to the municipality for the full cost of providing the required parking;[.]

iii. Transportation demand management programs[.], or

iv. Other parking management strategies identified in the parking reductions or alternatives [OF THIS SECTION].

d[C]. Termination. The municipality may terminate the parking agreement if it is demonstrated that the parking reduction does not support the parking utilization for the site, or if the development is in violation of the parking agreement. The traffic engineer or planning director may require a contingency plan per AMC 21.07.090F.1.c. and a new parking agreement, or the site may be required to provide all parking per AMC 21.07.090E. If for any reason the parking agreement terminates, owners and all successors and assigns who are parties to the parking agreement shall comply with all provisions of this title governing the required number of off-street parking spaces.

3[2]. Calculation of parking reductions.

a. Calculation of multiple reductions. A development may be eligible for more than one parking reduction listed in this section 21.07.090F. [MULTIPLE REDUCTIONS FROM THE REQUIRED NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES.] The total impact of multiple parking reductions on a development’s parking requirement shall be the sum of the individual reductions [CALCULATED AS BEING MULTIPLICATIVE AND NOT ADDITIVE WHERE A DEVELOPMENT IS ELIGIBLE FOR MORE THAN ONE. FOR EXAMPLE, IF ONE REDUCTION IS 20 PERCENT, AND A SECOND REDUCTION IS AN ADDITIONAL 15 PERCENT, THEIR COMBINED REDUCTION SHALL BE CALCULATED AS 80 PERCENT TIMES 85 PERCENT EQUALS 68 PERCENT, FOR A 32 PERCENT AGE POINT TOTAL REDUCTION, RATHER THAN ADDING 20 PERCENT PLUS 15 PERCENT EQUALS 35 PERCENT. THIS IS BECAUSE THE 15 PERCENT REDUCTION APPLIES TO A BASE THAT IS ALREADY REDUCED 20 PERCENT].
b. **Maximum Nondiscretionary Reduction.** A request for a greater than 25 percent reduction in the required amount of parking from one or more reductions listed in table 21.07-9 shall be subject to discretionary review by the traffic engineer and director, except that the following reductions listed in table 21.07-9 are not subject to this percentage limitation:

1. Housing (Table 21.07-9).
2. Land Banking (Table 21.07-9).
3. Shared parking (21.07.090F.5.).

4[B]. **Rounding of Fractional Minimum Reductions.** Rounding of fractional numbers shall occur only after subtracting the parking reduction(s) from the minimum number of required parking spaces, as provided in 21.07.090C.1. If the total approved reduction from the required number of parking spaces for a development is calculated to be a reduction of less than one parking space, it shall be credited as a reduction of one parking space.

4[3]. **Pedestrian Access Improvements Required.** Developments shall improve pedestrian access as provided below, in order to be eligible for parking reductions. [Uses shall provide the following enhancements to be eligible for any reductions in the number of required parking spaces, except where stated otherwise. The qualifying site criteria shall not be required for the following parking reductions and alternatives in this subsection 21.07.090F: downtown anchorage parking exemption, land banking, stacked and tandem parking, or smaller parking spaces for low-turnover uses.] Industrial uses, public safety facilities, transportation facilities, and utility facilities are exempt from this subsection [the qualifying site development criteria].
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a. **Administrative Relief and Adjustment.**
   The traffic engineer and director may approve administrative relief or adjustments to the standards of this subsection F.4. for changes of use or modifications to existing buildings and sites, as part of the review and approval of a parking reduction, provided the applicant demonstrates the adjustment is necessary to compensate for some practical difficulty of the site, or some unusual aspect of the site not shared by landowners in general. The justification for the administrative adjustment shall be recorded as an appendix to the parking reduction agreement in 21.07.090F.2. [STREET ORIENTED BUILDING. FOR BUILDINGS CONSTRUCTED AFTER JANUARY 1, 2014, PRIMARY ENTRANCES AND/OR WINDOWS PROVIDING VISUAL ACCESS SHALL COMPRISE AT LEAST 15 PERCENT OF THE AREA OF ANY STREET FACING BUILDING ELEVATION. FOR NONRESIDENTIAL USES, WINDOWS PROVIDING VISUAL ACCESS AND/OR PRIMARY ENTRANCES SHALL COMPRISE AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF THE LENGTH AND 25 PERCENT OF THE GROUND- FLOOR WALL AREA OF ANY STREET FACING BUILDING ELEVATION.]

b. **Walkway and Sidewalk Access [TO THE STREET].**
   Developments shall comply with subsections 21.07.060E.2., Sidewalks if applicable, and 21.07.060E.4., On-Site Pedestrian Walkways. [A WALKWAY MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 21.07.060 SHALL CONNECT AT LEAST ONE PRIMARY ENTRANCE TO A STREET. THE DIRECTOR AND THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER MAY WAIVE THIS REQUIREMENT IN SITUATIONS WITH EXISTING STRUCTURES WHERE IT IS DEMONSTRATED THAT THE ADDITION OF A WALKWAY WILL CAUSE A REDUCTION IN PARKING AND/OR LANDSCAPING BELOW REQUIRED LEVELS, OR WHERE THE WORK REQUIRED TO ADD A WALKWAY IS OUT OF PROPORTION WITH THE WORK BEING DONE TO EFFECT A CHANGE OF USE.]

c. **Bicycle Parking [PARKING FACILITY LOCATION].**
   Developments shall comply with subsection 21.07.090K., Bicycle Parking Spaces. [FOR BUILDINGS CONSTRUCTED AFTER JANUARY 1, 2014, PARKING FACILITIES INCLUDING
DRIVEWAYS SHALL COMPRISE NO MORE THAN 50 PERCENT OF THE AREA BETWEEN THE STREET PROPERTY LINE AND THE STREET FACING BUILDING ELEVATION, AND GARAGE DOORS SHALL COMPRISE NO MORE THAN 50 PERCENT OF THE LENGTH OF THE STREET FACING BUILDING ELEVATION. THESE REQUIREMENTS APPLY TO NO MORE THAN TWO STREET FRONTAGES.]

[D. PRIVATE OPEN SPACE. FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS THAT ARE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE PRIVATE OPEN SPACE, AN ADDITIONAL 40 SQUARE FEET OF PRIVATE OPEN SPACE THAT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 21.07.030 SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR EACH REDUCTION OF ONE PARKING SPACE IN DEVELOPMENTS BUILT AFTER JANUARY 1, 2014. THIS SHALL BE COMMON PRIVATE OPEN SPACE IN THE CASE OF MULTIFAMILY AND MIXED-USE DWELLINGS.

E. CROSS-ACCESS TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES. THE DIRECTOR AND THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER MAY DETERMINE THERE IS POTENTIAL FOR DRIVEWAY OR WALKWAY CROSS-ACCESS TO ABUTTING PROPERTIES AND MAY REQUIRE A CROSS-ACCESS FACILITY AND/OR EASEMENT WITHIN THE SUBJECT PROPERTY TO THE SITE BOUNDARY. VEHICULAR CROSS-ACCESS MAY ONLY BE REQUIRED IN COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS.]

[4. DOWNTOWN. USES LOCATED IN DT DISTRICTS ARE EXEMPT FROM PROVIDING OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES. HOWEVER, IF PARKING IS PROVIDED, ALL OTHER STANDARDS OF THIS SECTION SHALL APPLY IN THE DT DISTRICTS, EXCEPT WHERE SPECIFICALLY STATED OTHERWISE. PARKING AGREEMENTS AND QUALIFYING SITE CRITERIA SHALL NOT BE REQUIRED FOR THIS EXEMPTION.

5. RESIDENCES IN WALKING DISTANCE TO DOWNTOWN. RESIDENTIAL HOUSEHOLD USES LOCATED NORTH OF 15TH AVENUE, WEST OF ORCA STREET, EAST OF L STREET, AND SOUTH OF SHIP CREEK ARE ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF UP TO 25 PERCENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES.
6. **DISTRICTS THAT PROMOTE A MIX OF USES.**

   A. USES LOCATED IN THE R-3A AND R-4A DISTRICTS ARE ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF UP TO 10 PERCENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES.

   B. USES LOCATED IN THE B-1A DISTRICT ARE ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF UP TO 10 PERCENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES, IF THE B-1A DISTRICT ABUTS RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS ON THE MAJORITY OF ITS PERIMETER, AND HAS A CONTIGUOUS AREA OF NO MORE THAN ONE ACRE, EXCLUDING RIGHTS-OF-WAY. IN ADDITION, CERTAIN DEVELOPMENTS IN THE B-1A DISTRICT ARE ELIGIBLE FOR A SEPARATE PARKING REDUCTION AS SPECIFIED IN THE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT OR OVERLAY DISTRICT STANDARDS OF CHAPTER 21.04. SUCH REDUCTIONS SHALL BE REVIEWED AND ADMINISTERED UNDER THIS SECTION 21.07.090F.

   C. CERTAIN DEVELOPMENTS IN THE B-1B AND B-3 DISTRICTS ARE ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES, AS SPECIFIED IN THE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OR OVERLAY DISTRICT STANDARDS OF CHAPTER 21.04. SUCH REDUCTIONS SHALL BE REVIEWED AND ADMINISTERED UNDER THIS SECTION 21.07.090F.]

7. **RESIDENCES IN CENTER CITY NEIGHBORHOODS.**

   A. RESIDENTIAL HOUSEHOLD USES LOCATED IN CENTER CITY NEIGHBORHOODS ARE ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF UP TO 10 PERCENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES.

   B. FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS PROVISION, THE CENTER CITY AREA IS BOUNDED TO THE NORTH BY JOINT BASE ELMENDORF-RICHARDSON, TO THE SOUTH BY TUDOR ROAD, TO THE EAST BY INGRA STREET AND THE SEWARD HIGHWAY, AND TO THE WEST BY MINNESOTA DRIVE. ANY
PART OF FAIRVIEW, SOUTH ADDITION,
GOVERNMENT HILL, OR MOUNTAIN VIEW
COMMUNITY COUNCIL IS ALSO IN THE ELIGIBLE
AREA.

C. THIS REDUCTION RECOGNIZES PROXIMITY TO
EMPLOYMENT CENTERS, CHARACTERISTICS
SUCH AS TRADITIONAL STREET GRIDS AND
DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS, HOUSEHOLD
CHARACTERISTICS, EMPHASIS ON WALKABLE
NORTHERN CITY ENVIRONMENTS, AND LOWER
PARKING DEMAND IN THESE AREAS.

8. USES ADJACENT TO TRANSIT SERVICE. A USE IS
ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF UP TO FIVE PERCENT
OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING
SPACES IF IT IS LOCATED WITHIN 800 FEET OF THE
STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY CENTERLINE OF ANY
MUNICIPAL PUBLIC TRANSIT ROUTE, SUBJECT TO
APPROVAL BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND THE
DIRECTOR. THE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION
DEPARTMENT MAY REQUIRE A PUBLIC USE EASEMENT
OR TRANSIT STOP AND/OR TRANSIT SHELTER
IMPROVEMENTS IF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY ABUTS
AN EXISTING OR PLANNED TRANSIT STOP. IF THE
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT REQUIRES
SUCH AN EASEMENT OR IMPROVEMENTS, THEN THE
USE IS ELIGIBLE FOR AN ADDITIONAL REDUCTION OF
TWO PERCENT OR ONE MORE PARKING SPACE,
WHICHEVER IS GREATER.

9. RIDESHARE PROGRAMS. A NONRESIDENTIAL USE IS
ELIGIBLE TO SUBSTITUTE PARTICIPATION IN
MUNICIPAL CARPOOL OR VANPOOL RIDESHARE
PROGRAM UP TO A MAXIMUM OF FIVE PERCENT OF
THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING
SPACES. [THE LAND AREA THAT WOULD OTHERWISE
BE NEEDED IN ORDER TO PROVIDE THE REQUIRED
NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES SHALL BE SET ASIDE ON
THE SITE TO PROVIDE FOR THE FUTURE
CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING LOT IN CONFORMANCE
WITH SUBSECTION 21.07.090F.12., LAND BANKING.

A. CARPOOL. EVERY DESIGNATED CARPOOL
SPACE MAY COUNT AS 1.8 SPACES TOWARD
MEETING THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED
PARKING SPACES. THE CARPOOL SPACES SHALL
BE THOSE CLOSEST TO THE PRIMARY
ENTRANCE OR ELEVATOR, BUT NOT CLOSER THAN ACCESSIBLE SPACES OR THOSE SIGNED FOR EXCLUSIVE CUSTOMER/VISITOR USE. SIGNS SHALL BE POSTED INDICATING THESE SPACES ARE RESERVED FOR CARPOOL USE. THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER SHALL CONSULT WITH THE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT IN PROVIDING CARPOOL SPACES AND THE LOCATION OF CARPOOL PARKING.

B. VANPOOL. FOR EVERY VANPOOL PURCHASED OR LEASED BY THE APPLICANT FOR EMPLOYEE USE OPERATED THROUGH THE MUNICIPAL RIDESHARE PROGRAM, THE NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES SHALL BE REDUCED BY UP TO SIX SPACES. THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER MAY REQUIRE A SAFE AND CONVENIENT DESIGNATED VANPOOL PASSENGER LOADING ZONE.

10. TRANSIT PASS BENEFITS. A USE IN WHICH THE OWNER OR EMPLOYER OFFERS TRANSIT PASSES COST-FREE TO ALL EMPLOYEES OR RESIDENTS IS ELIGIBLE FOR A PARKING REDUCTION OF UP TO 5 PERCENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES. THE USE SHALL BE LOCATED WITHIN 800 FEET OF THE STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY CENTERLINE OF ANY MUNICIPAL TRANSIT ROUTE. THE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT MAY REQUIRE A PUBLIC USE EASEMENT OR TRANSIT STOP AND/OR TRANSIT SHELTER IMPROVEMENTS IF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY ABUTS AN EXISTING OR PLANNED TRANSIT STOP. IF THE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT REQUIRES SUCH AN EASEMENT OR IMPROVEMENTS, THEN THE USE IS ELIGIBLE FOR AN ADDITIONAL REDUCTION OF TWO PERCENT OR ONE MORE PARKING SPACE, WHICHEVER IS GREATER.

11. PARKING CASH-OUTS. A USE IS ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF UP TO 10 PERCENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES IF IT IMPLEMENTS A PARKING CASH-OUT PROGRAM BY WHICH COMMUTERS ARE PROVIDED THE OPTION TO CHOOSE BETWEEN FREE PARKING AND ITS EQUIVALENT CASH VALUE FOR USING AN ALTERNATIVE MODE OF TRAVEL.
12. **LAND BANKING.** SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND THE DIRECTOR, THE LAND AREA THAT WOULD OTHERWISE BE NEEDED IN ORDER TO PROVIDE UP TO 25 PERCENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES MAY BE SET ASIDE ON THE SITE TO PROVIDE FOR THE FUTURE CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING FACILITY. THE APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT A PARKING DEMAND STUDY PREPARED IN A FORM AND MANNER PRESCRIBED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER THAT INDICATES THE REDUCED PARKING LOT WILL ACCOMMODATE EXPECTED PARKING NEEDS, AND AN ALTERNATE SITE PLAN TO BE APPROVED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER THAT ACCOMMODATES THE PARKING THAT WOULD BE REQUIRED WITHOUT THE LAND BANKED PARKING REDUCTION. THE AREA SET ASIDE SHALL BE LANDSCAPED WITH SITE ENHANCEMENT LANDSCAPING AND/OR PEDESTRIAN AMENITIES APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR. THE PARKING AGREEMENT SHALL GUARANTEE THAT, IF THE DIRECTOR AND THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER DETERMINE AT SOME POINT IN THE FUTURE THAT ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACES ARE NEEDED, THE OWNER SHALL CONSTRUCT PARKING ON THE LAND BANKED AREA IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE ALTERNATE SITE PLAN.

13. **AFFORDABLE HOUSING.** AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS THAT ARE DEED-RESTRICTED FOR HOUSEHOLDS HAVING AN INCOME AT THE TIME OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY OF 30 PERCENT OR LESS OF MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME ARE ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF UP TO 30 PERCENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES. AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS FOR LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLDS HAVING AN INCOME AT THE TIME OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY OF 60 PERCENT OR LESS OF MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME ARE ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF UP TO 15 OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES. THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STANDARDS OF SUBSECTION 21.07.110H., STANDARDS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

14. **SENIOR HOUSING.** DWELLING UNITS THAT MEET THE DEFINITION OF SENIOR HOUSING ARE ELIGIBLE FOR A REDUCTION OF UP TO 15 PERCENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES. DWELLING UNITS THAT MEET THE DEFINITION OF SENIOR HOUSING THAT IS INTENDED FOR, AND SOLELY
15. **HOUSING DENSITY.** Residential household uses are eligible for a reduction of one percent of the minimum number of required parking spaces for every four dwellings per acre above a net density of 40 dwellings per acre on the site, up to a maximum reduction of 20 percent of the minimum number of required parking spaces.]

5[16]. **Parking Reduction for Shared Parking.** Where two or more land uses that have different peak parking utilization time periods share the same parking facility, the total off-street parking required for those uses may be reduced, as provided below:[SHARED USE OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES MAY OCCUR WHERE TWO OR MORE USES ON THE SAME OR SEPARATE SITES ARE ABLE TO SHARE THE SAME PARKING SPACES BECAUSE THEIR PEAK PARKING DEMANDS OCCUR AT DIFFERENT TIMES THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND DIRECTOR MAY APPROVE SHARED PARKING FACILITIES FOR USES WITH DIFFERENT PEAK BUSINESS PERIODS IF THE SHARED PARKING COMPLIES WITH ALL OF THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS:]

a. **Shared Parking Standard Calculation[STUDY].** Where up to three separate land uses listed in Table 21.07-10, Shared Parking Credit, share a parking facility, the total off-street parking required for those uses is eligible to be reduced by the percentage factors shown in subsection b., Table 21.07-10, subject to the standards in subsections d. through j. Where four or more land uses listed in Table 21.07-10 share a parking facility, the shared parking reduction is subject to discretionary review and approval by the Traffic Engineer and Director as provided in 21.07.090F.8. [THE APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT A SHARED PARKING STUDY TO THE DIRECTOR THAT DEMONSTRATES THE FEASIBILITY OF SHARED PARKING. THE STUDY SHALL BE PROVIDED IN A FORM ESTABLISHED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND SHALL BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC. THE STUDY SHALL DEMONSTRATE THAT ANY PARKING REDUCTION REQUESTED WILL NOT

[B.  CALCULATION OF PARKING SPACES REQUIRED.]
The shared parking study shall one of the following procedures:

I. THE METHOD UNDER SUBSECTION 16.C.;

II. THE MOST CURRENT PUBLISHED PROCEDURES OF THE URBAN LAND INSTITUTE OR THE INSTITUTE OF TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS; OR

III. OTHER PROCEDURES BASED ON INDUSTRY DATA OR OTHER SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE AND ANALYSIS OF PEAK PARKING DEMAND, AS SPECIFICALLY APPROVED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER.]

b[C].  Computation of Shared Parking Standard
[ALTERNATIVE] Calculation Method. The following steps shall be used to calculate a shared parking reduction. The Planning Department shall maintain a publicly available worksheet form online that applicants may access and use to run calculations. Calculation steps:

i. Determine the minimum amount of parking required for each use, as set forth in subsection 21.07.090E., Off-street Parking Requirements, using the calculation rules established in subsection 21.07.090C., Computation of Parking and Loading Requirements.

ii. For each use, select the appropriate matching land use category in table 21.07-10, Shared Parking Credits.
iii. Multiply the minimum amount of required parking for each use, as set forth in subsection 21.07.090E., by the appropriate percentage shown in table 21.07-10, for each of the eight time periods in the table, to estimate the typical parking demand generated by that use during each of the eight time periods.

iv. Add the resulting products from the uses for each of the eight columns (time periods). Include each time period shown in the table, including during hours when the proposed business will be closed.

v. The highest sum among the eight columns becomes the shared parking requirement. This represents the time period that is expected to generate the highest total parking demand.

### TABLE 21.07-10[5]: SHARED PARKING CREDIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>7 am to 6 pm</th>
<th>6 pm to 1 am</th>
<th>1 am to 3 am</th>
<th>3 am to 7 am</th>
<th>7 am to 6 pm</th>
<th>6 pm to 1 am</th>
<th>1 am to 3 am</th>
<th>3 am to 7 am</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious assembly</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare; K-12 school</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness center</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25[60]%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25[80]%</td>
<td>60[80]%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie theater</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar or nightclub</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant – drive-through</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office or financial; or Government administr.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail sales [/]; Personal services</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor accommodations (guest rooms)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial service, manufacturing, or warehouse/storage</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

1[12] If one or more of the land uses proposed to make use of shared parking facilities do not conform to the land use classifications in this table, as determined by the director, then the applicant shall submit sufficient data to indicate the periods of peak parking demand for the uses. Based on this information, the traffic engineer shall determine the appropriate shared parking requirement.

### Alternative Shared Parking Calculation

The applicant may request a greater reduction in the total number of spaces required for two or more land uses where Table 21.07-10 does not adequately account for circumstances or mix of use types specific to the development, subject to review and approval by the traffic engineer and director as provided in 21.07.090F.8. The applicant shall submit a shared parking study following 21.07.090F.8.c. and:

1. The most current published procedures of the Urban Land Institute or the Institute of Transportation Engineers; or
2. Other procedures based on industry data or other sufficient evidence and analysis of peak parking demand, as specifically approved by the traffic engineer.
d. **Distance to Parking Spaces.** Shared parking spaces may be located off-site, subject to the standards in this subsection 21.07.090F.5. Shared parking spaces for residential units shall be located within 500 feet of the dwelling unit entrance they serve. Shared spaces for other uses shall be within 800 feet of a primary entrance of the uses served. **Distance shall be measured along the pedestrian connection required in subsection 21.07.090F.5.e.**

THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND THE DIRECTOR MAY APPROVE A PORTION OF SHARED PARKING SPACES AT A GREATER DISTANCE BASED ON FACTORS SUCH AS THE PEDESTRIAN ENVIRONMENT, AVAILABILITY OF ATTENDANT PARKING, WEATHER PROTECTION, AND THE TYPE OF USE SERVED.

e. **Pedestrian Connection.** Clear and safe pedestrian walkways conforming to the standards of 21.07.060E. shall connect the shared parking facility and the primary entrances of the uses it serves. The traffic engineer may require sidewalk or pedestrian street crossing improvements.

f. **Separation by Streets.** Separation of a use and its shared parking facility by a local street is allowed, subject to discretionary review and approval by the traffic engineer in 21.07.090F.8. Shared parking spaces shall not be separated from the served use by a collector or greater classification street, unless approved by the traffic engineer with consideration of the ease and safety of pedestrian access, or as [SPECIFICALLY ]allowed by a comprehensive plan element specific to an area or district.

g. **Residential Neighborhoods.** A nonresidential use shall not participate in a shared parking facility [THAT IS] located in a residential district, if the use [ITSELF] is not permitted in the residential district.

h. **Instructional Signs.** The shared parking facility shall provide instructional signs on the premises indicating the availability of the facility for patrons of the uses it serves.

i. **Shared Parking Plan.** A shared parking plan shall be submitted for review and approval [BY THE TRAFFIC
ENGINEER AND THE DIRECTOR]. The shared parking plan may be combined with other parking plans required by this title.

j. Changes in Use or Shared Parking Facility. Any subsequent change to the shared parking facility or any [IN] use type in the building(s) shall require a review [BY THE DEPARTMENT AND THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER] for compliance with this section, including proof that sufficient parking will be available. Any change shall be approved and if necessary a modification to the existing shared parking agreement shall be made prior to the change being implemented.

K. EXPIRATION. NOTWITHSTANDING F.1.A. ABOVE, A SHARED PARKING AGREEMENT MAY BE RECORDED FOR A TIME CERTAIN PERIOD, NOT TO BE LESS THAN TEN YEARS. AT THE END OF THE LIFE OF THE AGREEMENT, PROPERTY OWNERS WHO ARE PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS OF THIS CODE GOVERNING THE REQUIRED NUMBER OF OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES.]

Parking reductions for off-site parking. A use's required parking may be located on a lot different from the lot containing the use, as provided below. [THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND THE DIRECTOR MAY APPROVE THE LOCATION OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES ON A SEPARATE LOT FROM THE PRINCIPAL USE IF THE OFF-SITE PARKING COMPLIES WITH ALL OF THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS:]

a. Off-site Parking – Nondiscretionary Approval [ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACES]. A principal use is eligible for a non-discretionary parking reduction for off-site parking, provided the off-site required parking for the use is off-street, located on a lot not separated by a street from the principal use and in conformance with the standards below. [REQUIRED ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACES SHALL NOT BE LOCATED OFF-SITE.]

b. Distance to Off-site Spaces [LOCATION]. Off-site parking spaces for residential units shall be located within 500 feet of the dwelling unit entrance they serve. Off-site spaces for other uses shall be within 800 feet

c. **Pedestrian Connection.** Clear and safe pedestrian walkways conforming to the standards of 21.07.060E. shall connect the off-site parking facility and the primary entrance(s) of the uses served. The traffic engineer may require sidewalk or pedestrian crossing improvements to enhance pedestrian safety or mobility to and from the off-site parking.

d. **Separation by Streets.** Separation of a use and its off-site parking spaces by a local street is allowed, subject to discretionary review and approval by the traffic engineer in 21.07.090F.8. Off-site parking spaces shall not be separated from the served use by a collector or greater classification street, unless approved by the traffic engineer with consideration of the ease and safety of pedestrian access, or as specifically allowed by an area-specific element of the comprehensive plan.

e[D]. **Instructional Signs.** Instructional signs shall be posted on the principal site providing notice of the availability and location of additional parking. The off-site parking facility shall provide instructional signs indicating the availability of the facility for patrons of the uses it serves.

f[E]. **Residential Neighborhoods.** A nonresidential use shall not participate in an off-site parking facility [THAT IS located in a residential district, if the use [ITSELF ]is not permitted in the residential district.

g. **Required Off-site Spaces to be Counted for One Use Only.** The off-site vehicle parking spaces shall not be required parking spaces for any other use, except as provided in 21.07.090F.5. (Shared Parking) or F.7. (District Parking).
Parking Reduction for Nearby Public [DISTRICT] Parking. The traffic engineer may reduce the minimum number of required off-street parking spaces for uses near a public parking facility where the parking spaces are managed and maintained for shared public use [WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF A MUNICIPALLY RECOGNIZED PUBLIC PARKING DISTRICT THAT PROVIDES OFF-SITE PARKING FACILITIES TO SERVE AN AREA]. To determine eligibility for this reduction or the size of the reduction to be allowed, the traffic engineer shall consider the relative distance to the use from the district parking facility and the factors listed in 21.07.090F.8.b. [FACTORS SUCH AS:]

A. PEAK HOURS OF USE AND TURNOVER RATE;
B. THE ABILITY OF THE USE TO MEET THE PARKING REQUIREMENT THROUGH OTHER MEANS;
C. THE AVAILABILITY OF SPACES IN THE NEARBY DISTRICT PARKING FACILITY;
D. THE RELATIVE DISTANCE TO THE USE FROM THE DISTRICT PARKING FACILITY; AND
E. MEASURES PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE EMPLOYEE AND PATRON USE OF THE DISTRICT PARKING FACILITY, AND EASE AND SAFETY OF PEDESTRIAN ACCESS.

Discretionary Parking Reductions. Subject to discretionary review and approval by the traffic engineer and director, applicants may request greater percentage reductions than shown in Table 21.07-9 and subsections F.5. through F.7., propose other types of parking reduction strategies besides those listed, or request departures from the specific standards for the parking reductions in F.5. through F.7. The applicant shall demonstrate the proposed reduction is appropriate based on the expected parking utilization rate of the development and the factors below.

a. Examples of Discretionary Parking Reductions. Examples of other parking reduction strategies besides those listed that may be proposed include other shared vehicle programs (e.g., bike-share), other parking pricing strategies, other uses that have low parking utilization, or other transportation demand management (TDM) programs.
b. **Discretionary Approval Criteria.** To determine eligibility for a discretionary reduction or the size of the reduction to be allowed, the traffic engineer and director shall consider factors such as:

i. The characteristics of the proposed use, travel behavior and anticipated peak parking utilization by users, peak hours of use, and parking turnover rate;

ii. The ability of the use to meet the parking requirement through other means, such as existing or potential shared parking agreements or other parking strategies;

iii. Availability, proximity, and accessibility of alternative parking, such as any proposed shared, off-site, or district parking;

iv. Impacts from users and employees on adjacent neighborhoods, properties, and streets;

v. Strategies provided by the applicant to ensure employee and patron use of any shared, off-site, or district parking or parking demand management program;

vi. The surrounding area’s parking needs and parking availability; and

vii. The surrounding area’s availability of pedestrian facilities and alternative modes of transportation.

c. **Parking Demand Study.** The traffic engineer may require the applicant to provide a parking demand study for discretionary reductions. The parking demand study shall be prepared in a form and manner prescribed by the traffic engineer, and meet the following standards:

i. The parking study shall demonstrate that any parking reduction requested will not result in users parking on surrounding properties or streets;
ii. The parking study shall demonstrate that the drivers accessing the use will be adequately served by the proposed parking due to project location, transportation characteristics of the persons residing, working, or visiting the site; and

iii. The parking study shall consider the type, intensity, and characteristics of each use and projected peak parking and traffic demand of drivers, including the use's hours of operation.


20. STACKED AND TANDEM PARKING.

A. NONRESIDENTIAL USES. STACKED AND TANDEM PARKING SPACES FOR NONRESIDENTIAL USES ARE ALLOWED TO COUNT TOWARD THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED SPACES IF THE OWNER ENSURES THROUGH THE PARKING
AGREEMENT THAT ATTENDANT PARKING IS PROVIDED FOR SUCH SPACES, AN ACCESSIBLE PASSENGER LOADING ZONE SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH ATTENDANT PARKING SERVICES AT OR NEAR A PRIMARY ENTRANCE. AVAILABILITY OF THIS SERVICE SHALL BE CONSPICUOUSLY POSTED INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE PRIMARY ENTRANCE. THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER MAY WAIVE THE PARKING ATTENDANT REQUIREMENT FOR AUTOMATED PARKING STRUCTURES.

B. RESIDENTIAL USES. TWO REQUIRED PARKING SPACES FOR ANY RESIDENTIAL DWELLING MAY BE ARRANGED IN TANDEM OR STACKED ONE ABOVE THE OTHER USING A CAR STACKER, SO LONG AS PARKING REQUIRED FOR THE DWELLING UNIT IS ARRANGED INDEPENDENTLY FROM PARKING SERVING ANY OTHER DWELLING UNIT, WITH UNOBSTRUCTED VEHICLE ACCESS FOR AT LEAST ONE OF THE SPACES REQUIRED FOR EACH DWELLING UNIT, AND THE OWNER ASSIGN THE TWO SPACES TOWARD THE SAME DWELLING AND ENFORCES THEIR ASSIGNED USE.

21. SMALLER PARKING SPACES FOR PARKING STRUCTURES AND LOW-TURNOVER USES. IF APPROVED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER, UP TO 20 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF REQUIRED PARKING SPACES LOCATED IN A PARKING STRUCTURE AND/OR DESIGNATED FOR EMPLOYEE OR RESIDENT PARKING ONLY MAY BE EIGHT FEET SIX INCHES WIDE, SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF TABLE 21.07-7, PARKING SPACE AND AISLE DIMENSIONS. SUCH SPACES SHALL BE SIGNED FOR EMPLOYEE OR RESIDENT PARKING ONLY.

22. BICYCLE PARKING. A USE IS ELIGIBLE TO PERMANENTLY OR SEASONALLY SUBSTITUTE BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED AUTOMOBILE PARKING SPACES. EACH AUTOMOBILE PARKING SPACE SHALL BE REPLACED BY A MINIMUM OF SIX BICYCLE PARKING SPACES NOT REQUIRED BY THIS TITLE. BICYCLE PARKING SPACES SHALL COMPLY WITH THE STANDARDS OF SUBSECTION 21.07.060F.15. AND BE SEPARATED FROM MOTOR VEHICLE AREAS BY
23. **OTHER ELIGIBLE REDUCTIONS OR ALTERNATIVES.** THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND THE DIRECTOR MAY APPROVE ANY PARKING REDUCTION OR OTHER ALTERNATIVE IN ADDITION TO THE CHOICES ABOVE, OR THAT INCREASES THE PERCENTAGE REDUCTION IN ANY OF THE CHOICES ABOVE, IF THE APPLICANT DEMONSTRATES TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND THE DIRECTOR THAT THE PROPOSED PARKING MANAGEMENT STRATEGY WILL PROTECT SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOODS, AND MAINTAIN TRAFFIC CIRCULATION PATTERNS AT LEAST THE SAME EXTENT AS WOULD STRICT COMPLIANCE WITH OTHERWISE APPLICABLE OFF-STREET PARKING STANDARDS. ADDITIONAL PARKING MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES MAY INCLUDE, FOR EXAMPLE, TRANSPORTATION DEMAND PROGRAMS, CAR SHARING, UNBUNDLED PARKING, OR A COMBINATION OF STRATEGIES. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A PARKING DEMAND STUDY PREPARED IN A FORM AND MANNER PRESCRIBED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER THAT DEMONSTRATES A REDUCTION IS APPROPRIATE BASED ON THE EXPECTED PARKING NEEDS OF THE DEVELOPMENT, AVAILABILITY OF TRANSIT, AND SIMILAR FACTORS. IT SHALL BE DETERMINED THAT:

A. THE USE WILL BE ADEQUATELY SERVED BY THE PROPOSED PARKING DUE TO PROJECT LOCATION, TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PERSONS RESIDING, WORKING, OR VISITING THE SITE, OR BECAUSE THE APPLICANT HAS UNDERTAKEN A PROGRAM OR STRATEGY THAT WILL REDUCE PARKING DEMAND AT THE SITE; AND

B. PARKING DEMAND GENERATED BY THE PROJECT WILL NOT EXCEED THE CAPACITY OF OR HAVE A DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON THE SUPPLY OF ON-STREET PARKING IN THE SURROUNDING AREA.]

(Note to code revisor: Re-number existing table 21.07-6 to 21.07-11.)

H. **Parking and loading facility design standards.**
8. **Vehicular Access and Circulation – General.** Parking lots and structures access, layout, and dimensions shall be designed for a safe and orderly flow of traffic throughout the site, as provided in [THE] subsections 8. through 11. that follow.

   a. **[KEY ELEMENTS.** THE PARKING FACILITY LAYOUT, CIRCULATION, AND DESIGN PLAN SHALL ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS AS THEY RELATE TO PARKING LOTS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: FIRE LANES, EMERGENCY ACCESS, DRIVE-THROUGHS, QUEUING SPACES, PASSENGER LOADING ZONES, PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION, AND LOADING BERTHS.]**

   b. **Circulation Patterns.** Internal circulation patterns and the location and traffic direction of all circulation aisles, driveways, and queuing lanes shall be designed and maintained in accordance with the municipal driveway standards currently established by the traffic engineer, and with accepted principles of traffic engineering and safety, per the traffic engineer’s review based on the current manuals of the Institute of Transportation Engineers and the Urban Land Institute, and the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices or the successor documents. Circulation patterns within parking facilities shall be well defined with pavement marking and signage, curbs, landscaping, landscaped islands, and/or other similar features. [IN ORDER TO DEFINE CIRCULATION AND PROVIDE BETTER SIGHT DISTANCE, CURBED END ISLANDS SHALL BE REQUIRED AT THE END OF EACH ROW OF PARKING SPACES. WHERE LOADING FACILITIES OR ON-SITE REFUSE COLLECTION ARE PROVIDED, COMMERCIAL TRUCK CIRCULATION SHALL BE CONSIDERED, AND TRUCK TURNING RADIi SHALL BE SHOWN ON THE PARKING FACILITY LAYOUT, CIRCULATION, AND DESIGN PLAN WHEN REQUIRED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER.]

b. **Administrative Adjustments and Exceptions.** The traffic engineer and director may approve modifications from the standards of this section, provided documentation prepared by a licensed professional in the state of Alaska registered with the Alaska State Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors demonstrates the parking facility or driveway meets the intent of this section and the
municipal driveway standards and that the change is appropriate. Approval shall be contingent on factors such as street classification, street typology, urban context, traffic volume and speed, curb return radii, street travel lane offset from face of curb, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, snow storage, driveway configuration and length, site and project characteristics, number of vehicles expected to use the driveway, and comprehensive plan policies.

[C. PARKING SPACES ALONG MAJOR SITE ENTRANCE DRIVES. THE PROVISION, LOCATION, DESIGN, AND DIMENSIONS OF PARKING SPACES ON A MAJOR ACCESS DRIVEWAY THAT SERVES AS AN ENTRY OR EXIT FOR A LARGE ESTABLISHMENT WITH MULTIPLE LOTS, TRACTS, OR BUSINESSES, SHALL CONFORM TO MUNICIPAL STANDARDS FOR ON-STREET PARKING AND BE SUBJECT TO REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER.]

9. Vehicular Access and Parking Location

a. Street Access Location. The number and spacing of driveways, including minimum distance from street intersections, shall be as provided in the Municipal Driveways Standards and this section. Access to streets owned by the state of Alaska requires compliance with state driveway standards, department of transportation and public facilities approval and driveway permit.

b. Alley Access Requirement (in Urban Neighborhood Context Areas). Where a residential use is served by an alley in a Traditional Urban or Edge Urban Neighborhood Context (21.07.015), direct vehicle access to the street shall be limited to the following:

i. Residential driveway access not exceeding one driveway no wider than 12 feet at any point, except that lot frontages 100 feet or wider on a primary street frontage may have one driveway per 50 feet of lot frontage on that street.

ii. One additional driveway no wider than 12 feet providing access to the secondary street frontage on corner lots for multifamily, townhouse, or two-family developments.
iii. Additional driveway access to the primary street frontage for multifamily or townhouse developments may be allowed if the alley is unimproved (i.e., vegetated, no build accessway), unmaintained, or inaccessible, and the traffic engineer determines that improvement and vehicle access is not feasible, or that use of the alley for access would create a substantial traffic impact or safety hazard. The additional driveway access shall be the minimum the traffic engineer determines is necessary to provide access for the development. The Planning Department shall keep record of the approved additional driveway access with written findings supporting the approval on file and available for public inspection.

c. Cross-Access and Shared Access with Adjacent Sites. Parking facilities serving a site, whether located on that same lot or on an adjacent lot, may be connected by means of a common access driveway within or between the interior of such lots. Where a property receives its access to the street through a shared driveway with another lot, a shared access easement shall be provided on the plat, or a shared access agreement running with the land shall be recorded by the municipality, as approved and executed by the director, guaranteeing the continued availability of the shared access between the properties.

d. Paired Residential Driveways Allowed. Driveways for two single-family, two-family, or townhouse units may be attached side-by-side across a property line, provided the maximum combined width of the paved area is 24 feet in the Urban Neighborhood Development Context Areas (21.07.015), and 32 feet otherwise (16 feet maximum on each lot), without a landscaped break.

e. Access and Parking Location in Urban Neighborhood Context Areas. In the Traditional and Edge Urban Neighborhood Contexts established in 21.07.015, the maximum percentage of the front setback area on a property that may be paved for vehicle access and parking shall be as shown in Table 21.07-12, provided that:
i. Secondary frontages on lots with more than one street frontage are exempt;

ii. Shared parking courtyards meeting 21.07.060G.20. are exempt;

iii. Minimum driveway widths per subsection 21.07.090H.11.d. are allowed; and

iv. Administrative adjustments may be approved as provided in 21.07.090H.8.b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>Traditional Urban Neighborhood Context</th>
<th>Edge Urban Neighborhood Context with Alley Access (per 21.07.090H.9.b)</th>
<th>without Alley Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family, Two-family and Mobile-Home Uses</td>
<td>50% max.</td>
<td>50% max.</td>
<td>75% max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses</td>
<td>50% max.</td>
<td>50% max.</td>
<td>65% max.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Access to Parking Spaces.**

a. **Access to Parking Spaces.** Each parking space shall open to a parking aisle or driveway of such width and design as provided in subsection 21.07.090H.12. to provide safe and efficient means of vehicular access with no more than a standard two-movement entrance or exit from the parking space and without having to move another vehicle. Stacked and tandem parking spaces are allowed exceptions as provided in 21.07.090H.12.

b. **Backing Distances.** Adequate ingress and egress to each parking space shall be provided without backing more than 25 feet.

c. **Dead-End Parking Aisles.** Any parking bay that does not provide two means of vehicle egress shall provide, at the closed end, an extension of the parking aisle at least nine feet in depth, designated and signed as a "No Parking" turn-around area. Dead-end parking bays longer than 100 feet shall be subject to discretionary review and approval by the traffic engineer.
d. **Vehicle Maneuvering.** Off-street parking facilities shall be designed so that all vehicle maneuvers occur on the development site and not in the public right-of-way, and vehicles enter and exit the right-of-way in a forward motion, except the following are exempt:

i. Parking for single-family, two-family, and mobile home dwellings on individual lots, accessing a local street.

ii. For other developments, parking areas comprising only one or two parking spaces whose only access is to a local street, provided that the paved vehicle area(s) occupy no more than 20 feet of the lot frontage in the front setback. The number of spaces may be increased to four spaces if arranged in tandem for residential dwellings as provided in 21.07.090K.12.k. Additional spaces for multifamily developments with up to four dwelling units may be approved by the traffic engineer in appropriate circumstances such as lots on dead-end streets, cul-de-sacs, or other local streets with low traffic volumes.

iii. The usable portion of an alley may be credited as circulation and/or parking aisle space for parking areas with up to 4 spaces, provided there is at least 24 feet of maneuvering area between the end of each parking space and the
opposite side of the improved alley. Additional parking spaces may be designed so that vehicles back out into an alley, subject to approval by the traffic engineer.

11. Driveway Design and Dimensions

a[D]. Parking Lot Entries/Driveway Approaches. Entries and driveway approaches providing access from the street edge to the front property line [TO PARKING LOTS] shall conform to the municipal driveway standards [CURRENTLY ESTABLISHED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER] and this subsection 21.07.090H.11. Access to streets owned by the state of Alaska requires compliance with state driveway standards, as provided in 21.07.090H.8. [DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES APPROVAL, AND A CURRENT VALID STATE OF ALASKA DRIVEWAY PERMIT. INGRESS AND EGRESS TO PARKING FACILITIES SHALL BE DESIGNED TO MAINTAIN ADEQUATE SIGHT DISTANCE AND SAFETY AND AS PRESCRIBED IN THE MUNICIPAL DRIVEWAY STANDARDS.]

b. Curb Openings and Public Walkway Crossings.

i. Curb cut and curb returns at driveway openings to the street shall be provided as prescribed in the municipal driveway standards.

ii. Public walkways shall be maintained or restored to the maximum running slope and cross-slope prescribed by M.A.S.S. and A.D.A., except that in the traditional urban neighborhood contexts (21.07.015), public walkways on local streets
shall be restored to as close to a level running grade as practical.

c. Driveway Approach (in ROW) as a Percentage of Lot Frontage Width.

I. RESIDENTIAL USES. RESIDENTIAL DRIVEWAY ENTRANCES SHALL COMPLY WITH SUBSECTION 21.07.110F.3., DRIVEWAY WIDTH.

II. NONRESIDENTIAL USES.

The total width of the driveway approach [ENTRANCES TO A NONRESIDENTIAL LOT] from a street shall not exceed 40 percent of the frontage of the lot, or 33 percent of the frontage if the platting authority or traffic engineer finds that conditions warrant it, provided the following: [UNLESS THE APPLICANT PROVIDES FOR SNOW STORAGE IN A MANNER APPROVED BY THE DECISION-MAKING BODY.]

i. The driveway approach is always allowed to have the minimum driveway width provided by subsection d. The traffic engineer may approve more than the minimum driveway width, provided the traffic engineer determines that snow storage, traffic flow and safety, and the neighborhood context are addressed.

ii. The driveway approach shall not exceed the maximum driveway width established in the municipal driveway standards.

iii. Flag lots are exempt from the percentage limitations but shall have a maximum driveway approach width of 20 feet. Abutting flag lots may share a driveway approach up to 24 feet wide (12 feet per lot).

d. Minimum Driveway Width. The minimum required width of driveways, including both the driveway approach within the street ROW and the portion of the driveway on the development property, shall be the minimum widths established in the municipal driveway standards, as modified and clarified by the following:

i. The minimum width of a driveway providing access to a single-family, two-family,
townhouse, or mobile home dwelling from a local street or alley is 12 feet.

ii. The minimum width of a driveway providing access for up to 10 parking spaces serving a townhouse or multifamily residential use from a local street or alley is 12 feet (e.g., one lane for two-way traffic), except that straight (non-curving) driveway segments on the development property (i.e., not in the driveway approach) may be 10 feet.

iii. The minimum width of a driveway providing access for more than 10 parking spaces serving a townhouse or multifamily use from a local street or alley is 12 feet for one-way traffic and 20 feet for two-way traffic.

e. Driveway Throat Length. The driveway throat shall be of sufficient length to enable the street and walkways in the ROW and the circulation, parking, and walkways in the development site to function without interfering with each other, as provided in the municipal driveway standards.

f. Sight Distance. Ingress and egress to parking facilities shall be designed as prescribed in the municipal driveway standards to maintain adequate sight distance and safety.

g. Circulation Definition. Curbed end islands shall be provided at the end of each row of parking spaces to define circulation and provide sight distance at internal intersections of parking aisles, driveways, and/or on-site roadways. Shared parking courtyards meeting 21.07.060G.20. may depart from this requirement.

[E. PARKING AND MANEUVERING. ALL CIRCULATION AISLES, DRIVEWAYS, AND VEHICLE MANEUVERING AREAS REQUIRED BY THIS SECTION SHALL BE LOCATED ENTIRELY OFF-STREET AND ON THE PROPERTY UNLESS SPECIFICALLY PROVIDED OTHERWISE BY THIS SECTION.

I. ACCESS TO PARKING SPACES. TO ENSURE SAFE AND EFFICIENT VEHICULAR ACCESS TO PARKING SPACES, EACH OFF-STREET
PARKING SPACE SHALL OPEN DIRECTLY ON A PARKING AISLE OR DRIVEWAY OF SUCH WIDTH AND DESIGN AS PROVIDED IN TABLE 21.07-7 AND THE ILLUSTRATIONS THAT FOLLOW THE TABLE. ADEQUATE INGRESS AND EGRESS TO EACH PARKING SPACE SHALL BE PROVIDED WITHOUT BACKING MORE THAN 25 FEET.

II. MANEUVERING AREA. OFF-STREET PARKING FACILITIES SHALL BE DESIGNED WITH SUFFICIENT MANEUVERING ROOM SO THAT ALL MANEUVERS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PARKING SHALL OCCUR IN THE OFF-STREET PARKING FACILITY, AND THAT ALL VEHICLES ENTER THE ABUTTING STREET IN A FORWARD MOTION.

III. SOME DWELLINGS EXEMPTED. SINGLE-FAMILY, TWO-FAMILY, TOWNHOUSE, AND MOBILE HOME DWELLINGS ON INDIVIDUAL LOTS SHALL BE EXEMPTED FROM THIS SUBSECTION. MULTIFAMILY DWELLINGS WITH UP TO FOUR UNITS SHALL BE EXEMPTED FROM THIS SUBSECTION IN APPROPRIATE CIRCUMSTANCES IF APPROVED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER. APPROPRIATE CIRCUMSTANCES MAY INCLUDE LOTS WITH ALLEY ACCESS, LOTS LOCATED ON LOW-VOLUME STREETS, AND LOTS LOCATED ON DEAD-END STREETS OR CUL-DE-SACS.

F. DEAD-END PARKING AISLES. DEAD-END PARKING AISLES MAY BE ALLOWED ONLY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER.

G. ALLEYS. SUBJECT TO SAFETY APPROVAL BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER, THE USABLE PORTION OF AN ALLEY MAY BE CREDITED AS CIRCULATION AND/OR PARKING AISLE SPACE.

H. CROSS ACCESS AND JOINT ACCESS WITH ADJACENT SITES. THE PLAN SHALL SHOW EXISTING PARKING AND CIRCULATION PATTERNS ON ADJACENT PROPERTIES AND POTENTIAL CONNECTIONS. REQUIRED PARKING Lots SERVING A SITE, WHETHER LOCATED ON
THAT SAME LOT OR ON AN ADJACENT LOT, MAY BE CONNECTED BY MEANS OF A COMMON ACCESS DRIVEWAY WITHIN OR BETWEEN THE INTERIOR OF SUCH LOTS. APPLICANTS ARE ENCOURAGED TO PROVIDE SHARED VEHICLE AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES FOR CONVENIENCE, SAFETY, AND EFFICIENT CIRCULATION. AN ACCESS EASEMENT SHALL BE PROVIDED ON THE PLAT, OR A SHARED ACCESS AGREEMENT RUNNING WITH THE LAND SHALL BE RECORDED BY THE MUNICIPALITY, AS APPROVED AND EXECUTED BY THE DIRECTOR, GUARANTEING THE CONTINUED AVAILABILITY OF THE SHARED ACCESS BETWEEN THE PROPERTIES.]

12[9]. Dimensions of Parking Spaces and Aisles. The parking space and aisle dimensional standards of this subsection 21.07.090H.12. shall apply to all parking except as stated otherwise in subsections 21.07.090I., passenger loading zones and 21.07.090J., accessible parking spaces. Parking dimensions and layout shall be as provided in subsection a., including Table 21.07-13 and the figures that follow the table, with the additions and exceptions provided in subsections b. through m. [THE MINIMUM DIMENSIONS FOR PARKING SPACES AND PARKING AISLES SHALL BE AS PROVIDED IN TABLE 21.07-7, AND CALCULATED AS DEPICTED IN THE FIGURES THAT FOLLOW THE TABLE. THE MINIMUM PARKING SPACE WIDTH SHALL BE 9’0” EXCEPT AS PROVIDED ELSEWHERE IN THIS SECTION. THE PARKING CONFIGURATION STATED IN THE FOLLOWING TABLES AND FIGURES SHALL APPLY TO ALL OFF-STREET PARKING, EXCEPT AS STATED ELSEWHERE IN THIS SECTION.]

a. Minimum Dimensions for Required Parking. Parking shall meet or exceed the STANDARD parking space and aisle dimensions set forth in Table 21.07-13, except as follows:

i. Parking facilities in the Downtown (DT) zoning districts, and in the Traditional Urban Neighborhood Contexts delineated in 21.07.015, may meet the SMALL parking space and aisle dimensions in Table 21.07-13. Up to 30% percent of parking in the Downtown (DT) zoning districts may meet the COMPACT
parking dimensions, if signed for compact vehicles only.

**ii.** In all other areas of the municipality, up to 50 percent of employee-only parking, structured parking facilities, or parking for uses with a low parking turnover rate may meet the SMALL parking space and aisle dimensions in Table 21.07-13. Uses with a low parking turnover rate are multifamily and mixed-use household living uses, office uses, and educational facility uses other than instructional services. Required parking shared between low-turnover and non-low-turnover uses shall meet STANDARD dimensions.

**iii.** Any use that involves the preservation of a landmark listed in the Anchorage local landmarks register may also meet the SMALL parking space and aisle dimensions in Table 21.07-13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Angle (Degrees)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** *** *** (table continued…)


### TABLE 21.07-13 PARKING ANGLE, STALL, AND AISLE DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Angle (Degrees)</th>
<th>Parking Space Type</th>
<th>Space Width</th>
<th>Curb Length (Width Projection)</th>
<th>Space Depth (Vehicle Projection)</th>
<th>Aisle Width 1-way</th>
<th>Aisle Width 2-way</th>
<th>Typical Parking Bay Width (Module)</th>
<th>Interlock Reduction</th>
<th>Overhang Allowance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td>9' 0&quot;</td>
<td>12' 0&quot;</td>
<td>20' 6&quot;</td>
<td>12' 0&quot;</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>65' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1' 5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>8' 6&quot;</td>
<td>12' 0&quot;</td>
<td>18' 9&quot;</td>
<td>12' 0&quot;</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>61' 6&quot;</td>
<td>3' 0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMPACT</td>
<td>8' 0&quot;</td>
<td>11' 4&quot;</td>
<td>16' 12&quot;</td>
<td>12' 0&quot;</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>57' 11&quot;</td>
<td>1' 5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (parallel)</td>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td>9' 0&quot;</td>
<td>23' 0&quot;</td>
<td>9' 0&quot;</td>
<td>12' 0&quot;</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>42' 0&quot;</td>
<td>0' 0&quot;</td>
<td>0' 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>8' 6&quot;</td>
<td>23' 0&quot;</td>
<td>8' 0&quot;</td>
<td>12' 6&quot;</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>41' 0&quot;</td>
<td>0' 0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMPACT</td>
<td>8' 0&quot;</td>
<td>23' 0&quot;</td>
<td>8' 0&quot;</td>
<td>12' 6&quot;</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>40' 0&quot;</td>
<td>0' 0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[9' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[23' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[9' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[12' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[42' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[0' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[0' 0&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[9' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[23' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[9' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[12' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[43' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[0' 0&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[10' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[23' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[10' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[12' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[44' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[0' 0&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[8' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[12' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 9&quot;]</td>
<td>[12' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[61' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[3' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[1' 5&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[9' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[12' 9&quot;]</td>
<td>[20' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[12' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[65' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[3' 2&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[9' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[13' 5&quot;]</td>
<td>[20' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[12' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[65' 9&quot;]</td>
<td>[3' 4&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[10' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[14' 2&quot;]</td>
<td>[21' 3&quot;]</td>
<td>[12' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[66' 5&quot;]</td>
<td>[3' 6&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[8' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[10' 5&quot;]</td>
<td>[21' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[67' 8&quot;]</td>
<td>[2' 3&quot;]</td>
<td>[1' 8&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[9' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[10' 5&quot;]</td>
<td>[21' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[67' 8&quot;]</td>
<td>[2' 3&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[9' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[10' 12&quot;]</td>
<td>[22' 1&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[68' 2&quot;]</td>
<td>[2' 5&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[10' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[11' 7&quot;]</td>
<td>[22' 4&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[68' 8&quot;]</td>
<td>[2' 6&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[8' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[8' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[19' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[63' 8&quot;]</td>
<td>[2' 2&quot;]</td>
<td>[1' 11&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[9' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[8' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[19' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[63' 2&quot;]</td>
<td>[1' 1&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[9' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[9' 4&quot;]</td>
<td>[24' 8&quot;]</td>
<td>[19' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[67' 4&quot;]</td>
<td>[1' 2&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[9' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[9' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[21' 9&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[67' 7&quot;]</td>
<td>[1' 3&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[10' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[10' 4&quot;]</td>
<td>[21' 11&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[67' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[1' 5&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[8' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[8' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[23' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[60' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[0' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[2' 0&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[9' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[8' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[20' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[23' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[64' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[0' 0&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[9' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[9' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[20' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[22' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[64' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[0' 0&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[10' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[10' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[20' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[22' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[24']</td>
<td>[64' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[0' 0&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Developments in the Traditional Urban and Edge Urban Neighborhood Development Context Areas may use the following alternative STANDARD parking space depth (Vehicle Projection): 19' 0" for 90-degree parking angle; 20' 8" for 75-degree parking angle; 20' 11" for 60-degree parking angle, and 19' 6" for 45-degree parking angle. Parking bay width may decrease as a result.

**Structural Columns.** A structural column may encroach into the width of a parking space by up to one foot, provided the remaining parking space width is no less than eight feet. Such structural column shall be located within four feet of either end of the parking bay.
space depth. Such column shall not be located within one foot of the drive aisle.

h.[G.] Minimum Vertical Clearance

*** *** ***

[H. SMALLER PARKING SPACES FOR LOW TURNOVER USES. REDUCED PARKING SPACE DIMENSIONS MAY BE APPROVED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION F.21. ABOVE.]

i. Recreational Vehicle Spaces. Parking spaces for recreational vehicles, if provided and delineated, shall be a minimum of 10 feet wide by 40 feet long.

j. Stacked [, AUTOMATED,] or Tandem Spaces with Attendant Parking. The traffic engineer may approve reduced parking space dimensions for stacked parking spaces[,] and/or tandem spaces in an attendant (valet) parking facility. An accessible passenger loading zone shall be provided with attendant (valet) parking services at or near a primary entrance. Notice of availability of valet service shall be conspicuously posted inside and outside the primary entrance. The business owner shall enter into a parking agreement with the municipality guaranteeing continuation of the valet service.

k. Stacked or Tandem Spaces for a Residential Dwelling. Two required parking spaces for any residential dwelling may be arranged in tandem with a combined space depth (vehicle projection length) of 38 feet, or stacked one above the other using a car stacker, subject to the following:

i. The parking required for the dwelling unit is arranged independently from parking serving any other dwelling unit; and

ii. The owner assigns the two spaces to the same dwelling.

l. Automated Parking Structures. Automated parking structures are exempt from the parking space and aisle dimensions and vertical clearance requirements of this section 21.07.090H.12. They are instead subject to section 21.07.090M.10.
Administrative Adjustments. The traffic engineer may approve a lesser parking dimension than set forth in this subsection 21.07.090H.12., due to site topography, existing structures, lot configuration, or preservation of trees and vegetation, subject to a recorded parking agreement complying with 21.07.090F.2.

(Note to code revisor: Re-number existing table 21.07-8 to 21.07-14. in section 21.07.090J., Accessible Parking Spaces.)

Passenger Loading Zones. All institutional, entertainment, and commercial uses such as schools/daycare, stadiums, and theaters that have high-volume peak traffic volumes shall provide an area for drop-offs and pick-ups that meets the following requirements:

1. Passenger Loading Zone. In addition to the required minimum number of parking spaces established in subsection 21.07.090E., the traffic engineer may require one or more passenger loading zone spaces, depending on the type, intensity, and traffic patterns of the proposed use. The passenger loading zone for large commercial establishments or other intensive uses may be required by the traffic engineer to include one or more spaces dedicated to taxi cabs, ride hailing services, and/or other specialized high occupancy vehicles.

2. Passenger Loading Zone Dimensions. Any passenger loading zone that is provided for a development shall consist of one or more passenger drop-off/pick-up spaces parallel to the driveway or circulation aisle adjacent to the building. Each space shall be a minimum of 20 feet in length and eight or more feet in width, with an access aisle at least five feet wide abutting the full length of the space. As an alternative, subject to approval of the traffic engineer, a passenger loading zone may consist of one or more parking spaces that meets the accessible parking space dimensional standards of subsection 21.07.090J.7. However, designated passenger loading zone spaces shall not count towards the accessible parking space requirement.

3. Plan. The parking facility layout, circulation, and design plan shall show the location and design of proposed passenger loading zones. For certain intensive uses, the traffic engineer may require the plan to include a traffic control plan addressing projected usage, hours of operation, peak loading/unloading time, plans for directing traffic, safety
measures, and other information deemed necessary by the traffic engineer to designing a safe and well-functioning drop-off area.

4. **Accessible Route.** An accessible pedestrian route to the building or facility entrance shall be provided pursuant to subsection 21.07.090J.9., *Accessible Routes*.

5. **Schools.** Passenger loading zones shall be required for schools (public or private). Length, location, and design of the passenger loading zones shall be approved by the traffic engineer.

---

**K. Bicycle Parking [SPACES].**

1. **Bicycle Parking Required.** [ALL NONRESIDENTIAL, MULTIFAMILY, AND MIXED-USE DWELLING DEVELOPMENTS WITH MORE THAN 40 PARKING SPACES REQUIRED IN TABLE 21.07-4 SHALL PROVIDE AT LEAST FOUR BICYCLE PARKING SPACES, OR A NUMBER OF BICYCLE PARKING SPACES EQUAL TO THREE PERCENT OF THE NUMBER OF REQUIRED AUTOMOBILE PARKING SPACES, WHICHEVER IS GREATER.]

Table 21.07-14 establishes the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces required per principal use, and the percentage of these spaces required to be developed as long-term bicycle parking, versus short-term spaces. The required minimum number of spaces is calculated as follows:

a. A minimum of two bicycle parking spaces shall be provided for each use in Table 21.07-14. For commercial and community uses, group living uses with 10 or more beds, and household living uses with 10 or more dwellings, the two spaces shall be located outdoors and publicly accessible for customers and short-term visitors.

b. After the first 40 bicycle parking spaces, no additional bicycle parking is required for any individual non-residential use.

c. Subsection 21.07.090C., Computation of Parking and Loading Requirements, applies with respect to fractions, multiple uses, and building floor area measurements.
### TABLE 21.07-14: Bicycle Parking Spaces Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Category/Type</th>
<th>Minimum Number of Bicycle Spaces Areas with Area-specific Parking Requirements in Table 21.07-7</th>
<th>Minimum Number of Bicycle Spaces All Other Areas</th>
<th>Minimum Percentage for Long-Term Spaces (for required bicycle parking in excess of 2 spaces)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily and mixed-use dwellings</td>
<td>1 space per two dwellings</td>
<td>1 space per 10 dwellings</td>
<td>90 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group living uses, Roominghouses, Homeless and transient shelters,</td>
<td>1 space per 5 beds</td>
<td>1 space per 5 beds</td>
<td>90 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government administration &amp; civic facility, Offices, Hospitals/Healthcare facilities,</td>
<td>1 space per 5,000 sf gfa</td>
<td>1 space per 10,000 sf gfa</td>
<td>75 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Facilities, Entertainment &amp; Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>1 space per 10,000 sf gfa</td>
<td>1 space per 20,000 sf gfa</td>
<td>10 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Colleges,</td>
<td>4 spaces per classroom</td>
<td>2 spaces per classroom</td>
<td>25 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants, Bars</td>
<td>1 space per 3,000 sf gfa</td>
<td>1 space per 10,000 sf gfa</td>
<td>10 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sales, Personal Service, Repair &amp; Rental.</td>
<td>1 space per 12,000 sf gfa</td>
<td>1 space per 24,000 sf gfa</td>
<td>10 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial uses</td>
<td>1 space per 25,000 sf gfa</td>
<td>1 space per 50,000</td>
<td>75 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Accommodations</td>
<td>1 space per 23,000 sf gfa</td>
<td>1 space per 23,000 sf gfa</td>
<td>75 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses not included above, except as provided in subsection K.2. below</td>
<td>Minimum of 2 spaces</td>
<td>Minimum of 2 spaces</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Exemptions.** The bicycle parking requirements in subsection 1. shall not apply to:

   a. Household living dwelling units with their own individual garages [BUILDINGS IN MULTIFAMILY OR MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENTS THAT ARE SINGLE-FAMILY, TWO-FAMILY, OR TOWNHOUSE STYLE STRUCTURES].

   b. Airstrips.

   c. Utility Substations, Telecommunication facilities, and WECS.

   e. Natural resource extraction.

   f. Impound yards and storage yards.

   g. Any other non-residential use which has no regular employees or people on premises.
3. **Administrative Adjustments.** The director may approve administrative relief or adjustments to the bicycle parking requirement for changes of use or modifications to existing buildings and site, provided the applicant demonstrates the adjustment is necessary to compensate for a practical difficulty of the site. The department shall keep record of the approved adjustment with written findings supporting the adjustment on file and available for public inspection.

4. **Bicycle Parking Facility Development Standards.** These requirements shall apply to all required bicycle parking spaces, except as specifically provided otherwise. Only long-term parking spaces required by table 21.07-14 (in right-hand column) shall follow the requirements of subsection g.  

[BICYCLE PARKING SPACES SHALL MEET THE STANDARDS OF SUBSECTION 21.07.060F.15.]

   a. Required bicycle parking or a sign leading thereto shall be located in an area visible from a primary entrance area. Required bicycle parking other than long-term bicycle parking shall be located within 50 feet of a primary entrance as measured along an accessible pedestrian route.

   b. A required bicycle parking space shall be either a bike rack or bike locker. Each shall be a securely anchored, tamper-resistant structure. Bike racks shall allow the bike frame and one wheel to be locked to the rack with a standard U-type lock when both wheels are left on the bicycle. Bike racks shall support the bicycle frame in a stable position without damage to the bicycle. Horizontal bike racks (i.e., racks not mounted to walls) shall support the bicycle at two or more points.

      i. Bicycle rack tubing shall be a minimum of ¼ inch diameter and maximum of 3-inch diameter.

      ii. The topmost attachable portion of bicycle racks shall be 25 inches to 40 inches in height.

   c. A required bicycle parking space shall be a minimum of six feet long and two feet wide, with the following exceptions:

      i. Vertical bicycle parking spaces (securing the bicycle perpendicular to the ground) shall be a minimum of three feet six inches deep measured from the wall and six feet six inches
tall. Vertical parking spaces placed side-by-side shall be a minimum of one foot six inches wide, with a vertical stagger of one foot between side-by-side spaces, as shown in the first set of figures below.

ii. Triangle bike locker layouts are exempt from the two-foot minimum width however shall have a minimum length of six feet six inches and access doors at least two feet six inches wide.

iii. Stacked bike parking spaces (stacking bicycles one tier on top of another) may meet the alternative stacked dimensions in the bottom figures provided there is a mechanically assisted lifting mechanism for mounting the bicycle on the upper tier.

iv. Other deviations are permitted, per director approval, provided the applicant demonstrates the spaces meet the intent of the standard.

d. Bicycle parking spaces shall be designed so that the bicycle may be added or removed without having to move another bicycle.
i. There shall be a minimum of five feet of clear space inclusive of a walkway, behind the parking space to allow room for bicycle maneuvering.

ii. There shall be a minimum of two-foot six-inch clearance from all sides of the bicycle rack to walls, fences, curbs, and vehicle parking and circulation areas, or other obstructions, except for racks provided in iii.

iii. Horizontal bike parking spaces (securing the bicycle horizontal to the ground) with racks attached to walls shall have a minimum one-foot clearance from the rack to the wall, as shown in the second figure below. Vertical and stacked spaces have no required wall clearance.

e. Areas devoted to bicycle parking facilities shall be hard-surfaced and designed and maintained to be clear of mud and snow.

f. Bicycle parking shall not obstruct pedestrian walkways, building access, or other use areas.

g. Long-term bicycle parking spaces are intended to accommodate residents, students, employees, and commuters who typically need to store a bicycle overnight or for an entire work shift or school day. Required long-term spaces shall comply with the following additional standards:

i. Long-term bicycle parking shall be located in well-lit, restricted access, lockable rooms or enclosures providing protection from theft, vandalism, and weather. Bicycle lockers, covered bicycle cages, or a secure room inside a building are common examples.
ii. Long-term bicycle parking spaces shall be located where bicyclists are not required to carry bicycles on stairs to access the parking.

iii. Long-term bicycle parking spaces for residential uses with fewer than five dwellings may be located within dwelling units, provided each dwelling unit has at least one bike parking space. Bicycle parking in the dwelling shall be located within 15 feet of the dwelling’s primary entrance and in a closet or three-sided alcove which includes a rack and meets the development standards of this subsection 21.07.090K.4. Long-term spaces shall not be located on a balcony, deck, or patio area accessory to an individual dwelling unit.

iv. A minimum of 30 percent of long-term spaces shall be ground-level, horizontal spaces.

(Note to code revisor: Re-number table 21.07-9 to 21.07-15 in section 21.07.090L., Vehicle Queuing Spaces.)

21.07.110 Residential Design Standards.

A. Purpose.

[4. ENHANCE PUBLIC SAFETY BY PROMOTING LINES OF SIGHT TO RESIDENTIAL ENTRIES, CLEARLY DEFINING TRANSITIONS FROM PUBLIC TO MORE PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL OUTDOOR SPACES, AND DESIGNING ENTRANCES TO BE PROMINENT.

5. LOCATE ACTIVE LIVING SPACES, ENTRANCES, AND WINDOWS TO IMPROVE THE PHYSICAL AND VISUAL CONNECTION FROM RESIDENCES TO THE STREET, AND FOSTER OPPORTUNITIES FOR CASUAL SURVEILLANCE OF THE STREET AND OUTWARDLY EXPRESSED PROPRIETORSHIP OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.]

(Note to code revisor: Re-number subsequent subsections.)
C. Standards for Multifamily and Townhouse Residential.

1. Purpose.

   [C. PROMOTE BUILDING PLACEMENT AND ORIENTATION THAT INTERFACES WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD STREET AND ENGAGES THE PEDESTRIAN, TO CONTRIBUTE TO PUBLIC SAFETY, ATTRACTIVE STREET FRONTAGES, PEDESTRIAN ACCESS, AND A SENSE OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY.]


(Note to code revisor: Re-number remaining subsections.)

3. WINDOWS FACING THE STREET.

   A. WINDOWS. WINDOWS OR PRIMARY ENTRANCE DOORS SHALL BE PROVIDED ON EACH BUILDING ELEVATION FACING A STREET OR THAT HAS PRIMARY ENTRANCES TO DWELLINGS (UP TO A MAXIMUM OF TWO ELEVATIONS). AT LEAST 10 PERCENT OF THE WALL AREA OF THE BUILDING ELEVATION SHALL BE WINDOWS OR PRIMARY ENTRANCE DOORS. THE DIRECTOR MAY ELIMINATE OR REDUCE THE REQUIREMENT ON ONE ELEVATION (IN INSTANCE WHERE UP TO TWO APPLY) BASED ON SITE SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES (SUCH AS INFILL PROJECTS WHERE AN ENTRY FACES AN ADJACENT PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE STREET).

   B. WALL AREA CALCULATION. THE AREA OF VERTICAL WALL SURFACE MEASURED FROM FINISHED FLOOR OF EACH LEVEL, INCLUDING GARAGES TO TOP OF TOP PLATE. IN THE CASE OF A BASEMENT WALL, CALCULATE THE AREA OF VERTICAL WALL SURFACE MEASURED FROM FINISHED GRADE TO THE TOP OF THE FINISHED FLOOR ABOVE OR TOP OF TOP PLATE, WHICHEVER IS APPLICABLE. ANY WALL AREA
ABOVE THE TOP PLATE SHALL NOT APPLY, INCLUDING ANY GABLE ENDS. THE FACADE WALL AREA OF STORIES BELOW GRADE PLANE, SUCH AS BELOW GRADE PARKING, ARE EXEMPT FROM THE MEASUREMENT OF WALL AREA. THE ROOF, INCLUDING EAVES, FASCIA, AND VENT STACKS, IS ALSO EXEMPT, AS ILLUSTRATED BELOW.]  

(Note to code revisor: Delete the following illustration.)

[C. ENERGY EFFICIENCY EXCEPTION. A REDUCTION IN REQUIRED WINDOW AREA IS PERMITTED IF DEMONSTRATED BY CALCULATION BY AN ENERGY RATER CERTIFIED BY THE STATE OF ALASKA THAT INSTALLING THE REQUIRED WINDOW AREA WILL REDUCE THE ENERGY RATING BELOW A 5-STAR ENERGY RATING.

D. ADDITIONS AND RENOVATIONS. ONLY THE WALL AREA AFFECTED BY EITHER AN ADDITION OR A RENOVATION SHALL BE REQUIRED TO COMPLY WITH THE OPENING REQUIREMENTS. UNAFFECTED WALL AREAS NEED NOT COMPLY. GARAGE ADDITIONS ARE EXEMPT FROM OPENING REQUIREMENTS. THE DIRECTOR MAY ELIMINATE OR REDUCE THE REQUIREMENT FOR WINDOW OPENINGS ON ADDITIONS/RENOVATIONS BASED ON PROJECT SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES (SUCH AS THE NATURE OF THE SPACES BEING ADDED, BUILDING ORIENTATION, OR STRUCTURAL REQUIREMENTS).]
[5. PEDESTRIAN ACCESS. WALKWAY CONNECTIONS FROM PRIMARY FRONT ENTRANCES TO THE STREET ARE REQUIRED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUBSECTION 21.07.060E.4., EXCEPT THAT DEVELOPMENTS MAY PROVIDE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING ALTERNATIVES INSTEAD:

A. PRIMARY FRONT ENTRANCES FOR INDIVIDUAL DWELLINGS MAY CONNECT TO THE STREET BY THE DWELLING UNIT’S INDIVIDUAL DRIVEWAY IF SUCH IS PROVIDED;

B. A PARKING COURTYARD MAY BE PROVIDED IN CONFORMANCE WITH SUBSECTION 21.07.060F.18., OR

C. OTHER METHODS, AS APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR, THAT PROVIDE SAFE, CONVENIENT, AND ADEQUATE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS.


A. COURTYARD HOUSING. ARRANGE OR CONFIGURE THE BUILDING(S) TO ENCLOSE AND FRAME A HOUSING COURTYARD AS DESCRIBED IN SUBSECTION 21.07.060F.7.

B. ORIENTATION OF LIVING SPACES AND WINDOWS—GROUND FLOOR. PROVIDE WINDOWS AND/OR ENTRANCES TO HABITABLE LIVING SPACES COMPRISING, AT LEAST 10 PERCENT OF THE GROUND-FLOOR WALL AREA OF UP TO TWO BUILDING ELEVATIONS FACING A STREET OR HAVING A PRIMARY FRONT ENTRANCE. WINDOWS IN A GARAGE DOOR DO NOT COUNT TOWARDS THE MINIMUM AREA IN THIS SECTION.
C. **ORIENTATION OF LIVING SPACES AND WINDOWS—OVERALL DEVELOPMENT.** PROVIDE WINDOWS AND/OR ENTRANCES TO HABITABLE LIVING SPACES, COMPRISING AT LEAST 10 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL WALL AREA OF UP TO TWO BUILDING ELEVATIONS FACING A STREET OR HAVING A PRIMARY FRONT ENTRANCE. WINDOWS IN A GARAGE DOOR DO NOT COUNT TOWARDS THE MINIMUM AREA OF THIS SECTION.

D. **ORIENTATION OF LIVING SPACES AND WINDOWS—ADDITIONAL TRANSPARENCY.** INCREASE THE PERCENTAGE OF THE WALL AREA COMPRISED OF WINDOWS AND/OR PEDESTRIAN ENTRANCES TO 20 PERCENT IN SUBSECTIONS 6.B. AND/OR 6.C. ABOVE.

E. **STREET FRONTAGE – PARKING BESIDE OR BEHIND THE BUILDING.** NO MORE THAN 70 PERCENT OF A STREET-FACING BUILDING ELEVATION SHALL HAVE PARKING FACILITIES (INCLUDING GARAGES) BETWEEN IT AND THE STREET.

*(Note to code revisor: Delete the following illustration.)*

![Diagram](image)

F. **STREET FRONTAGE – LIMITED PARKING WIDTH.** AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO 6.E. ABOVE, LIMIT DRIVEWAYS AND PARKING FACILITIES TO NO MORE THAN 50 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL SITE
AREA BETWEEN THE BUILDING AND A STREET, AND GARAGES TO NO MORE THAN 50 PERCENT OF THE STREET FACING BUILDING ELEVATION.

G. STREET CORNER BUILDING. ON A CORNER LOT, PROVIDE CHOICES 6.E. AND 6.F. ON BOTH STREET FRONTAGES, SUCH THAT THE BUILDING (INCLUDING ITS HABITABLE FLOOR AREA WITH WINDOWS) IS PLACED NEAREST THE CORNER, AND ANY PARKING FACILITIES ARE LOCATED BESIDE OR BEHIND THE BUILDING AWAY FROM THE STREET CORNER. COMPLIANCE WITH THIS FEATURE COUNTS FOR MEETING TWO.]

(Note to code revisor: Delete the following illustration.)

[H. LIMITED FRONT-FACING GARAGE WIDTH FOR TOWNHOUSES. WHERE GARAGES FOR INDIVIDUAL TOWNHOUSE-STYLE DWELLING UNITS FACE THE STREET OR ARE ON THE SAME BUILDING ELEVATION AS THE PRIMARY FRONT ENTRY TO THE DWELLINGS, LIMIT THE GARAGE DOOR WIDTH TO NO MORE THAN 50 PERCENT OF THE WIDTH OF EACH DWELLING, OR UP TO 67 PERCENT PROVIDED THE BUILDING FAÇADE ACHIEVES ONE MORE FEATURE THAN REQUIRED IN SUBSECTION C.7., BUILDING ARTICULATION MENU.

I. ENHANCED SIDEWALK. PROVIDE AN ENHANCED SIDEWALK CONFORMING TO SUBSECTION 21.07.060F.17. ON AT LEAST ONE STREET FRONTAGE THAT IS NOT LESS THAN 100 LINEAR FEET.

J. SEPARATED WALKWAY TO THE STREET. CONNECT ALL PRIMARY ENTRANCES TO THE
K. VISIBLE FRONT ENTRIES.

I. PLACE THE PRIMARY FRONT ENTRANCE(S) (AT LEAST ONE SHARED PRIMARY FRONT ENTRANCE FOR A MULTIFAMILY STRUCTURE OR AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF INDIVIDUAL UNIT ENTRANCES) ON A STREET-FACING BUILDING ELEVATION, OR FACING A COMMON PRIVATE OPEN SPACE THAT IS VISIBLE FROM AND HAS DIRECT ACCESS TO THE STREET.

II. AS AN ALTERNATIVE, PLACE THE PRIMARY FRONT ENTRANCE(S) ON A FAÇADE AT AN ANGLE OF UP TO 90 DEGREES FROM THE STREET, WHERE THERE IS AN UNOBSTRUCTED LINE OF SIGHT FROM THE STREET OR SIDEWALK EDGE (ABUTTING THE SITE) TO THE ENTRY DOOR, AND A SHELTERING ROOF STRUCTURE NO MORE THAN 12 FEET ABOVE THE FLOOR OF THE ENTRY AS A PERMANENT ARCHITECTURAL FEATURE PROJECTING FROM THE FAÇADE.

L. ENHANCED FRONT YARD LANDSCAPING. PROVIDE ONE LEVEL HIGHER OF SITE OR PARKING LOT PERIMETER LANDSCAPING ALONG THE STREET FRONTAGES (UP TO A MAXIMUM OF TWO FRONTAGES) THAN OTHERWISE REQUIRED BY THIS TITLE. FOR EXAMPLE, IF L1 LANDSCAPING IS REQUIRED, PROVIDE L2 LANDSCAPING.

M. SITE ENTRY FEATURE. HIGHLIGHT AND DEFINE A PEDESTRIAN AND/OR VEHICLE ENTRANCE TO A DEVELOPMENT SITE USING THREE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS:

I. LANDSCAPE TREATMENT WITH SEASONAL COLOR AND TREES, WHICH CLEARLY DISTINGUISHES AND HIGHLIGHTS THE SITE ENTRY.
II. PLAZA OR COURTYARD AS DESCRIBED IN SUBSECTION 21.07.060F6. OR 7.

III. IDENTIFYING BUILDING PRIMARY ENTRANCE FORM INCLUDING A COVERED ENTRY, WHEN THE PRIMARY ENTRANCE IS WITHIN 40 FEET OF THE SITE ENTRANCE.

IV. SPECIAL PAVING, PEDESTRIAN SCALE LIGHTING, AND/OR BOLLARDS.

V. ORNAMENTAL GATE AND/OR FENCE.

N. DIRECTOR APPROVAL. OTHER METHODS, AS APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR, THAT PROVIDE APPROPRIATE BUILDING AND SITE LAYOUTS RELATIVE TO THE SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOOD AND STREETS.]

4[7]. Building Articulation Menu.
5[8]. Northern Climate Weather Protection and Sunlight Menu.

9. ENTRYWAY TREATMENT. PRIMARY FRONT ENTRANCES SHALL BE GIVEN EMPHASIS AND PHYSICAL ACCESS AS follows. A PORCH, LANDING, PATIO, OR OTHER SEMI-PRIVATE OUTDOOR ENTRYWAY SPACE WITH A MINIMUM DIMENSION OF FOUR FEET SHALL BE PROVIDED THAT IS DISTINGUISHED FROM ADJACENT AREAS AND VEHICULAR PARKING BY A VERTICAL SEPARATION OR CHANGE IN SURFACE MATERIAL. EXAMPLES OF FEATURES THAT MEET THE INTENT OF THE SECTION INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

A. OUTDOOR SHELTERING ROOF STRUCTURE SUCH AS AN OVERHANG, RECESS, PORTICO, OR OTHER PERMANENT ARCHITECTURAL FEATURE COVERING AT LEAST 12 SQUARE FEET.

B. FAÇADE VARIATION THROUGH WALL MODULATION (CHANGES IN WALL PLANE) OR CHANGES IN EXTERIOR FINISHES (COLOR OR MATERIALS) THAT RELATE TO AND EMPHASIZE THE ENTRY.
C. ENTRY DETAIL ELEMENTS SUCH AS DOUBLE DOORS, ENTRY SIDE LIGHT OR TRANSOM WINDOWS, OR PLANTER BOXES.

D. FRONT STEPS CREATING A VERTICAL SEPARATION, AND/OR VERTICAL VEGETATION OR LOW FRONT FENCING, TO DEFINE THE TRANSITION FROM PUBLIC TO MORE PRIVATE OUTDOOR ENTRYWAY SPACE.

E. LANDSCAPING AND PEDESTRIAN FEATURES, NOT OTHERWISE REQUIRED BY THIS TITLE, SUCH AS INTEGRATED PLANTERS, PEDESTRIAN-SCALE LIGHTING OR ACCENT LIGHTING, OR SPECIAL PAVING TREATMENTS.

F. OTHER METHODS AS APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR THAT EMPHASIZE PRIMARY FRONT ENTRANCES.

(Note to code revisor: Re-number remaining subsections.)

***  ***  ***

D. Standards for some single-family and two-family residential structures.

***  ***  ***

(Note to code revisor: Re-number table 21.07-10 to become table 21.07-16.)

***  ***  ***

[3. PRIMARY ENTRANCE.

A. A PORCH OR LANDING WITH AT LEAST 16 SQUARE FEET SHALL BE PROVIDED AT THE PRIMARY ENTRANCE. THE PORCH OR LANDING SHALL BE COVERED BY A ROOF OF AT LEAST 16 SQUARE FEET.

B. THE PRIMARY ENTRANCE OF EACH RESIDENCE AND THE WALKWAY TO THAT ENTRANCE SHALL BE CLEARLY VISIBLE FROM THE STREET. PRIMARY ENTRANCES SHALL NOT BE LOCATED ON THE REAR OF THE STRUCTURE.

C. A HARD-SURFACED PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY SHALL BE PROVIDED FROM THE STREET, SIDEWALK, OR DRIVEWAY TO THE PRIMARY ENTRANCE. ROOF DRAINAGE SHALL NOT FALL UPON THE WALKWAY.
4. **GARAGES.**


   B. GARAGE DOORS FACING THE STREET SHALL COMPRISE NO MORE THAN 67 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL WIDTH OF A DWELLING’S BUILDING ELEVATION.

   C. DWELLING UNITS WITH A STREET-FACING BUILDING ELEVATION THAT IS 40 FEET WIDE OR NARROWER AND WITH GARAGE DOORS THAT FACE THE STREET SHALL FEATURE AT LEAST ONE DESIGN ELEMENT FROM EACH OF THE THREE LISTS BELOW.

   I. **LIST A:**

      (A) AT LEAST ONE DORMER THAT IS ORIENTED TOWARD THE STREET.

      (B) THE FRONT BUILDING ELEVATION HAS TWO OR MORE FAÇADES THAT ARE OFFSET BY AT LEAST 16 INCHES. EACH FAÇADE OR A COMBINATION OF OFFSET FAÇADES SHALL BE AT LEAST ONE THIRD OF THE AREA OF THE BUILDING ELEVATION.

      (C) FRONT-FACING BALCONY, ACCESSIBLE FROM A HABITABLE ROOM, AT LEAST SIX FEET WIDE, THAT PROJECTS FROM A FAÇADE AT LEAST TWO FEET AND IS ENCLOSED BY AN OPEN RAILING.

   II. **LIST B:**

      (A) A PRIMARY ENTRANCE AREA WITH A COVERED PORCH OR LANDING AT LEAST EIGHT FEET WIDE,
INTEGRATING VISUAL ENHANCEMENTS SUCH AS GABLED ROOF FORMS, ROOF BRACKETS, FASCIA BOARDS, SIDE LIGHTS, AND/OR ORNAMENTAL COLUMNS DIVIDED VISUALLY INTO TOP, MIDDLE, AND BOTTOM.

(B) A BAY WINDOW ON THE FRONT ELEVATION AT LEAST SIX FEET WIDE THAT EXTENDS A MINIMUM OF 12 INCHES OUTWARD FROM A FAÇADE, FORMING A BAY OR ALCOVE IN THE ROOM WITHIN.

(C) IF THE GARAGE IS MORE THAN ONE CAR WIDE, MULTIPLE GARAGE DOORS ARE USED.

III. LIST C:

(A) WINDOWS AND PRIMARY ENTRANCE DOOR(S) THAT OCCUPY A MINIMUM OF 25 PERCENT OF THE WALL AREA OF THE FRONT ELEVATION. WINDOWS IN THE GARAGE DOOR DO NOT COUNT TOWARDS THE 25 PERCENT.

(B) TRIM (MINIMUM THREE AND ONE HALF INCHES WIDE) OF A DIFFERENT COLOR FROM THE PRIMARY SIDING COLOR, SHALL OUTLINE ALL WINDOWS, DOORS, AND ROOF EDGES ON THE FRONT BUILDING ELEVATION, AND MAY OUTLINE CORNERS AND PROJECTIONS/RECESSES ON THE FRONT BUILDING ELEVATION.

(C) A MINIMUM OF TWO DIFFERENT SIDING MATERIALS AND/OR PATTERNS ARE USED ON THE FRONT BUILDING ELEVATION. DOORS AND TRIM DO NOT QUALIFY AS A TYPE OF SIDING MATERIAL.
D. THE HOUSE MAY ENCROACH INTO THE PRIMARY FRONT SETBACK BY UP TO FIVE FEET WHEN THERE IS NO GARAGE, OR WHERE THERE IS A GARAGE (ATTACHED OR DETACHED) WHERE THE FRONT WALL OF THE GARAGE IS LOCATED AT LEAST 8 FEET BEHIND THE FRONT FAÇADE OF THE HOUSE.

5. WINDOWS.

A. MINIMUM WINDOW AREA REQUIREMENT. WINDOWS AND PRIMARY ENTRANCE DOOR(S) SHALL OCCUPY A MINIMUM OF 10 PERCENT OF THE WALL AREA OF A BUILDING ELEVATION FACING A STREET OR REQUIRED PRIVATE COMMON OPEN SPACE (UP TO A MAXIMUM OF TWO ELEVATIONS). THE DIRECTOR MAY ELIMINATE OR REDUCE THE REQUIREMENT ON ONE ELEVATION (IN INSTANCES WHERE UP TO TWO APPLY) BASED ON SITE SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES, STRUCTURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SHEAR, AND ORGANIZATION OF SPACES IN THE HOME (WINDOWS ARE NOT REQUIRED IN ROOMS NOT NORMALLY INHABITED OR IN GARAGES).

B. WALL AREA CALCULATION. WALL AREA CALCULATION SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUBSECTION 21.07.110C.3.B.

C. AN OVERALL REDUCTION IN REQUIRED WINDOW AREA MAY BE APPROVED IF DEMONSTRATED BY CALCULATION BY AN ENERGY RATER CERTIFIED BY THE STATE OF ALASKA THAT INSTALLING THE REQUIRED WINDOW AREA WILL REDUCE THE ENERGY RATING BELOW A 5-STAR ENERGY RATING.

D. NARROW LOT/SMALL HOME REDUCTION. AN OVERALL REDUCTION IN REQUIRED WINDOW AND PRIMARY ENTRANCE DOOR AREA TO 7% MAY BE APPROVED WHEN THE CALCULATED WALL AREA IS UNDER 500 SQUARE FEET. UNITS USING THIS REDUCTION SHALL COMPLY WITH SUBSECTION 21.07.110D.4.C.

E. ADDITIONS AND RENOVATIONS. ON EXISTING STRUCTURES, ONLY THE WALL AREA AFFECTED
BY EITHER AN ADDITION OR A RENOVATION SHALL BE REQUIRED TO COMPLY WITH THE OPENING REQUIREMENTS. UNAFFECTED WALL AREAS NEED NOT COMPLY. GARAGE ADDITIONS ARE EXEMPT FROM OPENING REQUIREMENTS. THE DIRECTOR MAY ELIMINATE OR REDUCE THE REQUIREMENT FOR WINDOW OPENINGS ON ADDITIONS/RENOVATIONS BASED ON PROJECT-SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES (SUCH AS THE NATURE OF THE SPACES BEING ADDED, BUILDING ORIENTATION, OR STRUCTURAL REQUIREMENTS).]

[E. PROHIBITED STRUCTURES. [RESERVED]]

[F. Site Design.

3. DRIVEWAY WIDTH.

A. PURPOSE. THIS SECTION LIMITS THE WIDTH OF A DRIVEWAY AT THE PROPERTY LINE AND AT THE STREET CURB. THE INTENT OF THESE LIMITATIONS IS TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SPACE FOR SNOW STORAGE WITHIN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY, TO HAVE SPACE FOR ON-STREET PARKING WHERE APPROPRIATE, AND TO DISCOURAGE THE MAJORITY OF THE FRONT AREA OF A LOT FROM BEING PAVED AND/OR USED FOR VEHICLE PARKING.

B. APPLICABILITY.

I. THIS SECTION APPLIES TO DRIVEWAY THROAT WIDTH AT THE PROPERTY LINE AND STREET CURB.

II. RESIDENTIAL DRIVEWAYS ARE ALSO SUBJECT TO THE MUNICIPAL DRIVEWAY STANDARDS CURRENTLY ESTABLISHED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER. WHERE THERE IS A CONFLICT, THIS SECTION SHALL GOVERN. ACCESS TO STREETS OWNED BY THE STATE OF ALASKA REQUIRES COMPLIANCE WITH STATE DRIVEWAY STANDARDS, AS PROVIDED IN SUBSECTION 21.07.090H.8.D.

III. WHEN A DRIVEWAY SERVES BOTH RESIDENTIAL AND NONRESIDENTIAL
PRINCIPAL USES, THE DRIVEWAY DIMENSIONS SHALL BE AS REQUIRED FOR THE NONRESIDENTIAL USE, UNLESS APPROVED OTHERWISE BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER.

C. PERCENT OF LOT FRONTAGE. THE TOTAL WIDTH OF DRIVEWAY ENTRANCES TO A RESIDENTIAL LOT FROM A STREET SHALL NOT EXCEED 40 PERCENT OF THE FRONTAGE OF THE LOT, OR 33 PERCENT OF THE FRONTAGE IF THE PLATTING AUTHORITY OR TRAFFIC ENGINEER FINDS THAT CONDITIONS WARRANT IT.

I. A DRIVEWAY FOR MULTIFAMILY DWELLINGS, MIXED-USE DWELLINGS, OR A GROUP LIVING USE MAY ALWAYS BE AT LEAST 14 FEET WIDE.

II. A DRIVEWAY FOR A SINGLE-FAMILY, TWO-FAMILY, OR TOWNHOUSE DWELLING MAY ALWAYS BE AT LEAST TEN FEET WIDE, PROVIDED THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER DETERMINES SNOW STORAGE, TRAFFIC FLOW AND SAFETY, AND THE URBAN CONTEXT ARE ADDRESSED, AND PROVIDED TOWNHOUSE DRIVEWAYS ARE ATTACHED IN PAIRS TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT FEASIBLE.

III. FLAG LOTS ARE EXEMPT FROM THE PERCENTAGE LIMITATIONS, BUT SHALL HAVE A MAXIMUM DRIVEWAY WIDTH OF 20 FEET. ABUTTING FLAG LOTS MAY SHARE A DRIVEWAY UP TO 24 FEET WIDE (12 FEET PER LOT).

D. EXCEPTIONS. THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND THE PLANNING DIRECTOR MAY APPROVE A DEPARTURE FROM THE STANDARDS OF THIS SECTION, SUCH AS A NARROWER DRIVEWAY, IF DOCUMENTATION PREPARED BY A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL IN THE STATE OF ALASKA REGISTERED WITH THE ALASKA STATE BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS DEMONSTRATES THE DRIVEWAY STILL MEETS THIS CHAPTER’S STANDARDS AND THE
MUNICIPAL DRIVEWAY STANDARDS MEMO
ISSUED BY THE MUNICIPAL TRAFFIC ENGINEER, AND THAT CHANGE IS APPROPRIATE. APPROVAL SHALL BE CONTINGENT ON FACTORS SUCH AS STREET CLASSIFICATION, STREET TYPOLOGY, URBAN CONTEXT, TRAFFIC VOLUME AND SPEED, CURB RETURN RADI, STREET TRAVEL LANE OFFSET FROM FACE OF CURB, PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FACILITIES, SNOW STORAGE, DRIVEWAY CONFIGURATION AND LENGTH, SITE AND PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS, NUMBER OF VEHICLES EXPECTED TO USE THE DRIVEWAY, AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICIES. THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND PLANNING DIRECTOR MAY ALSO BE MORE RESTRICTIVE THAN THE STANDARDS OF THIS SECTION, PROVIDED THEY DOCUMENT THE RATIONALE.

4. **ALLEYS.**
   A. ACCESS TO PARKING FOR RESIDENTIAL USES SHALL BE FROM THE ALLEY WHEN THE SITE ABUTS AN ALLEY, EXCEPT THAT STREET ACCESS IS PERMITTED IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING SITUATIONS:

   I. ACCESS TO A TOWNHOUSE DWELLING ON A CORNER LOT MAY BE FROM THE STREET FRONTAGE HAVING THE SECONDARY FRONT SETBACK OR THE ALLEY.

   II. DUE TO THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALLEY TO THE STREET SYSTEM AND/OR THE PROPOSED HOUSING DENSITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT, THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER DETERMINES THAT USE OF THE ALLEY FOR PARKING ACCESS WOULD BE A SIGNIFICANT TRAFFIC IMPACT OR SAFETY HAZARD.

   III. THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER DETERMINES THAT TOPOGRAPHY OR OTHER NATURAL FEATURE OR PHYSICAL BARRIER MAKES ALLEY ACCESS INFEASIBLE.

   IV. THE ALLEY IS NOT IMPROVED AND TRAFFIC ENGINEER DETERMINES THAT IMPROVEMENT IS NOT FEASIBLE.
V. A SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING, TWO-FAMILY
DWELLING, OR TOWNHOUSE DWELLING
WITH TWO UNITS, WITH ALLEY ACCESS
MAY HAVE A GARAGE OR DRIVEWAY THAT
FACES THE STREET IF THE GARAGE DOOR
IS NO WIDER THAN 10 FEET AND THE
DRIVEWAY NO WIDER THAN 12 FEET AT
ANY POINT.

B. IN SITUATION WHERE A GROUP OF LOTS FRONT
AN ENTIRE BLOCK ON ONE SIDE OF A STREET
BETWEEN TWO INTERSECTIONS, ABUT A MID-
BLOCK ALLEY, AND ARE BEING DEVELOPED
TOGETHER, THEN PARKING ACCESS TO THE
STRUCTURES SHALL BE FROM THE ALLEY, AND
BUILDING(S) MAY ENCROACH INTO THE FRONT
SETBACK BY UP TO FIVE FEET.

C. IF A NEW DEVELOPMENT INCLUDES ALLEYS, THE
LOT DEPTH REQUIREMENT IS REDUCED BY HALF
THE WIDTH OF THE ALLEY AND THE LOT AREA
REQUIREMENT IS REDUCED BY 12 PERCENT FOR
THOSE LOTS THAT ABUT AN ALLEY. VEHICULAR
ACCESS TO ALL DWELLING UNITS ON LOTS
AButting ALLEYS SHALL BE FROM THE ALLEY,
AND VEHICULAR ACCESS TO SUCH UNITS FROM
THE STREET IS PROHIBITED.]

(Note to code revisor: Re-number subsequent subsections in section
21.07.110, and re-number tables 21.07-11 and 21.07-12. Re-
number table 21.07-13 in chapter 21.07 section 21.07.115.)

(AO 2012-124(S), 2-26-13; AO 2013-117, 12-3-13; AO 2014-132, 11-5-
14; AO 2015-36, 5-14-15; AO 2015-100, 10-13-15; AO 2016-34(S), 4-12-
16; AO 2016-136, 11-15-16; AO 2017-160, 12-19-17; AO 2018-59. 7-31-
2018; AO 2019-132, 12-3-19; AO 2020-38, 4-28-20)

Section 4. Anchorage Municipal Code Section 21.11.070, Development and
Design Standards, is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the
chapter is not affected and therefore not set out):

21.11.070 Development and Design Standards.

F. Off-Street Parking and Loading.

3. Off-street parking loading design standards. If off-street
parking and/or loading is provided, it shall comply with all
standards for off-street parking and loading in section
21.07.090. [, EXCEPT THAT:] Small and compact parking space dimensions specific to the DT districts are provided in section 21.07.090H.12.


B. PERMANENT PARKING NOT LOCATED WITHIN A SETBACK FROM PROJECTED RIGHTS OF WAY MAY UTILIZE THE COMPACT PARKING ANGLE, STALL, AND AISLE DIMENSIONS OUTLINED IN TABLE 21.11-10, PROVIDED THE PARKING AREA IS USED EXCLUSIVELY FOR EMPLOYEE PARKING FOR PERIODS IN EXCESS OF FOUR CONSECUTIVE HOURS, AND NO MORE THAN 30 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF SPACES IS DESIGNED FOR COMPACT CARS. AN ALTERNATIVE PARKING SITE PLAN SHALL BE SUBMITTED AND APPROVED AS PART OF THE APPLICABLE LAND USE PERMIT PROCESS.]

(Note to code revisor: Delete the following tables 21.11-9 and 21.11-10.)

[TABLE 21.11-9: ALTERNATIVE PARKING ANGLE, STALL, AND AISLE DIMENSIONS]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[PARKING ANGLE (DEGREES)]</th>
<th>[SPACE WIDTH]</th>
<th>[SPACE DEPTH (VEHICLE PROJECTION)]</th>
<th>[AISLE WIDTH 1-WAY]</th>
<th>[TYPICAL PARKING BAY WIDTH (MODULE)]</th>
<th>[INTERLOCK REDUCTION]</th>
<th>[OVERHANG ALLOWANCE]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[45]</td>
<td>[8' 4&quot;]</td>
<td>[17' 4&quot;]</td>
<td>[12' 3&quot;]</td>
<td>[46' 11&quot;]</td>
<td>[2' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[2' 0&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[50]</td>
<td>[8' 4&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[12' 9&quot;]</td>
<td>[48' 9&quot;]</td>
<td>[1' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[2' 1&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[60]</td>
<td>[8' 4&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[14' 3&quot;]</td>
<td>[51' 11&quot;]</td>
<td>[0' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[2' 5&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[70]</td>
<td>[8' 4&quot;]</td>
<td>[19' 2&quot;]</td>
<td>[16' 1&quot;]</td>
<td>[54' 5&quot;]</td>
<td>[0' 10&quot;]</td>
<td>[2' 5&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[75]</td>
<td>[8' 4&quot;]</td>
<td>[19' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[17' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[55' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[0' 8&quot;]</td>
<td>[2' 6&quot;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[90]</td>
<td>[8' 4&quot;]</td>
<td>[18' 0&quot;]</td>
<td>[22' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[58' 6&quot;]</td>
<td>[N/A]</td>
<td>[2' 8&quot;]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[*THE 90-DEGREE PARKING ANGLE DIMENSIONS ASSUME A TWO-WAY TRAFFIC FLOW.*]
### [TABLE 21.11-10: COMPACT PARKING ANGLE, STALL, AND AISLE DIMENSIONS]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING ANGLE (DEGREES)</th>
<th>SPACE TYPE</th>
<th>SPACE WIDTH</th>
<th>SPACE DEPTH (VEHICLE PROJECTION)</th>
<th>AISLE WIDTH 1-WAY</th>
<th>TYPICAL PARKING BAY WIDTH (MODULE)</th>
<th>INTERLOCK REDUCTION</th>
<th>OVERHANG ALLOWANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[45]</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>7' 7&quot;</td>
<td>15' 2&quot;</td>
<td>10' 9&quot;</td>
<td>41' 1&quot;</td>
<td>1' 6&quot;</td>
<td>1' 6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>8' 4&quot;</td>
<td>18' 4&quot;</td>
<td>13' 0&quot;</td>
<td>49' 8&quot;</td>
<td>2' 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' 3&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[50]</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>7' 7&quot;</td>
<td>15' 8&quot;</td>
<td>11' 2&quot;</td>
<td>42' 6&quot;</td>
<td>1' 4&quot;</td>
<td>1' 7&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>8' 4&quot;</td>
<td>19' 2&quot;</td>
<td>13' 6&quot;</td>
<td>51' 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' 4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[60]</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>7' 7&quot;</td>
<td>16' 4&quot;</td>
<td>12' 6&quot;</td>
<td>45' 2&quot;</td>
<td>1' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1' 8&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>8' 4&quot;</td>
<td>20' 0&quot;</td>
<td>15' 0&quot;</td>
<td>55' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1' 6&quot;</td>
<td>2' 6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[70]</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>7' 7&quot;</td>
<td>16' 5&quot;</td>
<td>14' 1&quot;</td>
<td>46' 11&quot;</td>
<td>0' 8&quot;</td>
<td>1' 10&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>8' 4&quot;</td>
<td>20' 4&quot;</td>
<td>17' 0&quot;</td>
<td>57' 8&quot;</td>
<td>1' 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' 8&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[75]</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>7' 7&quot;</td>
<td>16' 6&quot;</td>
<td>16' 4&quot;</td>
<td>49' 11&quot;</td>
<td>0' 9&quot;</td>
<td>1' 10&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>8' 4&quot;</td>
<td>20' 2&quot;</td>
<td>18' 0&quot;</td>
<td>58' 4&quot;</td>
<td>0' 9&quot;</td>
<td>2' 9&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[90*]</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>7' 7&quot;</td>
<td>15' 6&quot;</td>
<td>19' 0&quot;</td>
<td>50' 0&quot;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2' 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>8' 4&quot;</td>
<td>19' 0&quot;</td>
<td>23' 0&quot;</td>
<td>61' 0&quot;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3' 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CO: COMPACT CAR.*  
*STD: STANDARD CAR.*  
*THE 90-DEGREE PARKING ANGLE DIMENSIONS ASSUME A TWO-WAY TRAFFIC FLOW.*

(AO 2020-38, 4-28-20; AO 2020-93, 10-1-20)

### Section 5.  Anchorage Municipal Code Chapter 21.15, Rules of Construction and Definitions, is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the chapter is not affected and therefore not set out):

#### 21.15.020 Rules of Construction and Interpretation.

**P. Measurement of Windows and Entrances as a Percentage of Building Wall Area.** The percentage of building elevation wall area that is window and entrance openings is determined by dividing the total square footage of the windows and primary entrances on the building elevation by the gross square footage of the building elevation wall area (except for parts of the building exempted in 3.), and then multiplying the resulting quotient by 100.
1. **Illustrated Example.** In the illustration, the building elevation wall area is 20 feet of height x 24 feet of length = 480 square feet. The window and primary entrance area is the area of the two windows (5 x 5 feet x 2) plus the area of the primary entrance and its sidelight (4 x 7 feet) = 78 square feet. The percentage of the building elevation wall area is found by dividing 78 by 480 then multiplying by 100, to yield 16%.

2. **Measuring Window and Primary Entrance Area.** “Window area” is defined in section 21.15.040, Definitions. Primary entrance area includes the entrance opening and door frame but excludes trim, molding, and other features beyond the door frame. “Primary entrance” is defined in 21.15.040, Definitions.

3. **Exempt Parts of the Building Elevation Wall Area.** The building elevation wall area is measured as the exterior wall plane surface area from finished grade to the top of the wall on the building except that, for the purposes of measuring windows and entrances as a percentage of building wall area, the following parts of the building are not included in the wall area calculation:

   a. Wall area above the topmost story’s top plate, such as gable ends of a roof enclosing a cold attic, or parapet walls.

   b. Roof surfaces, eaves, fascia, vent stacks, mechanical equipment and rooms, rooftop access enclosures, and other roof appurtenances.

   c. Wall area of stories below grade plane, such as below grade parking, up to the finished floor of the story above grade plane.

   d. Parts of a street-facing building elevation below the grade plane of the abutting sidewalk (or edge of street pavement where there is no sidewalk).
21.15.040 Definitions.

** Car Share Program **
A membership program that offers an alternative to car ownership under which persons or entities that become members are permitted to use vehicles from a fleet on an hourly basis, or in smaller intervals. Vehicles are available for pick-up by eligible members 24 hours per day. Automobile insurance and maintenance are covered by the car share program and individual members pay for usage and mileage fees.

** Complete Street **
See Street, Complete.

** Driveway Approach **
The portion of a driveway providing direct vehicle ingress and egress over public right-of-way to a property. The driveway approach extends from the street edge to the front property line.

** Parking Cash-Out **
A program offered by an employer that provides employees with a choice of foregoing any subsidized/free parking for a cash payment equivalent to the cost of the parking space to the employer [ALLOWING COMMUTERS...]
TO CHOOSE CASH INSTEAD OF A FREE PARKING SPACE. FOR EXAMPLE, A COMMUTER WHO IS OFFERED A PARKING CASH-OUT MIGHT BE ABLE TO CHOOSE TO RECEIVE $50 PER MONTH IN CASH IF THEY USE AN ALTERNATIVE MODE BESIDES A SINGLE-OCCUPANCY VEHICLE].

[PARKING DISTRICT, MUNICIPALLY RECOGNIZED]
[AN AREA RECOGNIZED OR DESIGNATED BY THE MUNICIPAL ASSEMBLY IN WHICH A CENTRAL AUTHORITY SUCH AS AN AREA IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT OR A PARKING AUTHORITY SUPPLIES ONE OR MORE CENTRALIZED PARKING FACILITIES, MANAGES THE PARKING SUPPLY AND/OR IMPLEMENTS OTHER PARKING MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES TO SERVE THE AREA, RATHER THAN EACH INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT SITE HAVING TO SUPPLY ALL OF ITS OWN PARKING.]

*** *** ***

Parking, Unbundled
Parking spaces that are leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for the dwelling units or building floor area rather than included in the rental or purchase fees, such that potential tenants or buyers have the option of renting or buying a dwelling unit or building floor area at a lower price with fewer or no parking spaces. The rental or purchase of a parking space is at the discretion and direct cost of the tenant or buyer [PARKING RENTED AND SOLD SEPARATELY FROM BUILDING SPACE, SO OCCUPANTS ONLY PAY FOR THE AMOUNT OF PARKING THEY WANT].

*** *** ***

Pedestrian Feature
A permanent object that provides pedestrians with increased convenience, comfort, and utility, and which is publicly accessible and not limited to a tenant or establishment such as seating for a restaurant. Pedestrian features include:

• Seating such as benches accommodating several people;
• Secondary/informal seating opportunities such as steps, pedestals, low walls, or edges of fountains, accommodating several people;
• A space for standing with objects to lean against, such as bollards, short fences, or irregular building facades, accommodating several people;
• A tree or raised planter;
• A work of art such as a water feature, sculpture, cultural exhibit, or clock feature;
• Pedestrian-scale lighting;
• A cross-country ski rack that can accommodate a ski lock and is located at building entrances within 500 feet of a ski trailhead;
• A winter city urban design feature such as a wind screen, or outdoor stove or space heater; or
• Other object supporting pedestrian utility, such as a gazebo or kiosk.
Pedestrian Movement Zone
The middle portion of an enhanced street sidewalk (21.07.060G.19.), comprising its walkway clear width located between the sidewalk’s street interface and building interface zones. The pedestrian movement zone provides for the primary function of sidewalks[,] and is kept clear of any obstructions to pedestrian movement.

*** *** ***

Ride Hailing Services
A business that matches passengers with for-hire personal vehicles with drivers using software applications. Ride hailing services are different from other for-hire vehicles with drivers, such as taxicabs, in that they are not hailed from the street.

*** *** ***

[PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY
A WALKWAY MEETING THE STANDARDS OF SUBSECTION 21.07.060F.4.]

*** *** ***

Street, Complete
A street that is designed, used, and operated to enable safe access for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and public transportation users of all ages and abilities, and for all users to safely move through the transportation network. For example, Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (AMATS) adopted a complete streets policy in 2018 for its urbanized planning area. The AMATS Complete Streets Policy is available on the municipal website.

*** *** ***

Walkway Clear Width
That portion of the total width of a walkway, trail, pathway, or sidewalk cross-section which is unobstructed, continuous (i.e., without interruption or being split by obstructions), and kept clear for pedestrian movement.

*** *** ***

[WALKWAY, PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN
SEE PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY.]

*** *** ***


Section 6. Anchorage Municipal Code of Regulations Section 21.20.007, Schedule of Fees - Miscellaneous Fees, is hereby amended to read as follows (the remainder of the chapter is not affected and therefore not set out):
## 21.20.007 Schedule of Fees – Miscellaneous Fees

The following fees shall be paid for the services described:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. New and revised parking layouts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Site plan review only</td>
<td>$415.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Complete site plan review:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 1-10 spaces</td>
<td>$415.00 plus $16.50 per space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 11—50 spaces</td>
<td>$515.00 plus $12.50 per space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 51—200 spaces</td>
<td>$620.00 plus $8.25 per space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 201—1,000 spaces</td>
<td>$1,035.00 plus $2.05 per space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 1,001 + spaces</td>
<td>$1,240.00 plus $1.05 per space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Agreements with the Municipality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking or access agreement[S]</td>
<td>$235.00 per agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary parking reductions review by Traffic Engineer</td>
<td>$135.00/hour (two-hour minimum fee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(This fee does not apply to non-discretionary parking reductions listed in table 21.07-9.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H[I]. Sign permits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Section 7. This ordinance shall become effective 60 calendar days after passage and approval by the Assembly.
PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Assembly this _____ day of __________________ , 2022.

____________________________
Chair

ATTEST:

____________________________
Municipal Clerk

(Planning and Zoning Commission Case No. 2022-0026)
MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE
Summary of Economic Effects -- General Government

AO Number: 2022-80
Title: AN ORDINANCE OF THE ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL ASSEMBLY AMENDING ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 21 CHAPTERS 21.04, ZONING DISTRICTS; 21.07, DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN STANDARDS; 21.11, DOWNTOWN; 21.15, RULES OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEFINITIONS, AND AMENDING ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE OF REGULATIONS SECTION 21.20.007, SCHEDULE OF FEES, IN ORDER TO AMEND THE OFF-STREET PARKING AND SITE ACCESS DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND ACHIEVE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GOALS FOR INFILL AND REDEVELOPMENT, HOUSING, AND ACCESSIBLE LAND USE.

Sponsor: MAYOR
Preparing Agency: Planning Department
Others Impacted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANGES IN EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES:</th>
<th>(In Thousands of Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY22</td>
<td>FY23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 Personal Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Non-Labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3900 Contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS:</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: 6000 Charges from Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: 7000 Charges to Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNCTION COST:</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIONS: FT/PT and Temp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC SECTOR ECONOMIC EFFECTS:

This Title 21 amendment is anticipated to streamline and ease municipal administration of the Title 21 Zoning Ordinance parking, driveway, and other site access regulations. Review and approval procedures are clarified and made non-discretionary ("by-right") for administrative parking reductions. Lower minimum parking requirements and additional opportunities for administrative parking reductions will reduce the need for variance cases that require a public hearing. Clear parking, driveway, and pedestrian-related site standards are anticipated to reduce municipal staff time and resources in responding to property owner and developer questions, and in administering reviews and approvals of developments.

PRIVATE SECTOR ECONOMIC EFFECTS:

This Title 21 amendment is anticipated to reduce site development costs, enable more efficient land use, facilitate new development projects including multi-unit housing, and increase site design flexibility to meet market demand for housing and businesses. The amendment achieves these effects by removing identified regulatory barriers to construction that would be otherwise entitled by Title 21 in urban neighborhood contexts, transit-supportive development corridors, and other developments that provide features such as affordable housing, additional bicycle parking, or parking management strategies.

Although land use regulations are only one factor in the development process, these changes could have significant ripple effects through the local economy over time. The increase in the amount of housing is anticipated to support the business economy with additional workforce and customer markets. The increase in development patterns that support alternative transportation and access is anticipated to reduce transportation and housing costs for households.

Prepared by: Tom Davis
Telephone: 343-7916
On April 11, 2022, the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) held a public hearing for Case No. 2022-0026, the Public Hearing Draft of the Title 21 Text Amendments to Parking and Site Access Regulations. Based on its review and findings on June 6, the Commission recommended approval of the Title 21 Parking and Site Access Amendments, as stated in PZC Resolution No. 2022-021 (Exhibit A).

OVERVIEW

The Title 21 Parking and Site Access Amendments reduces parking requirements for developments and neighborhoods where people drive less. It reduces excess driveway and parking dimensional requirements for multi-unit housing. It strengthens bicycle parking requirements and simplifies and clarifies pedestrian access standards. The amendments also tailor these regulations for urban neighborhood contexts, such as in Fairview, South Addition, and Spenard.

This Title 21 text amendment is intended to reduce site development costs, enable more efficient land use, and support additional housing and business opportunities. Its strategy is to rightsize off-street parking and driveways while improving site access for pedestrians and other transportation alternatives. It also seeks to facilitate infill and redevelopment projects that fit in older, urban neighborhoods.

This project implements Actions 4-3 and 4-6 of Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan Goal 4: Neighborhood Housing. It implements other goals of the Comprehensive Plan and neighborhood and district plans, and policies and actions of the AMATS 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Non-Motorized Plan (Exhibit C, pages 8-14 of Staff Memorandum).

An overview of the proposed Title 21 text amendments, as provided in the draft AO and shown with annotation in Exhibit B, includes seven main recommendations:

1. Streamlines approvals of administrative parking reductions to become non-discretionary (i.e., “by-right”), up to a certain percentage reduction in the
number of required parking spaces, without need for parking studies from the applicant or discretionary approval by department directors.

2. Adds seven new parking management strategies and eligible project characteristics to the menu of parking reductions available to developers.

3. Replaces four area-specific administrative parking reductions with by-right lower, area-specific minimum parking requirements in delineated traditional urban neighborhoods and transit-supportive development corridors. Tailors these lower requirements to meet forecast parking utilization in these areas.

4. Revises site access standards to be more inclusive of alternative modes of transportation—walking, bicycling, rideshare, ride-hailing, and public transit. Consolidates/simplifies standards and incentives for pedestrian-oriented frontages. Tailors bike and pedestrian standards to urban neighborhoods.

5. Consolidates/clarifies Title 21 site access driveway standards. Reduces excess driveway width and vehicle turnaround requirements for multi-unit housing projects. Focuses existing alley access requirements on urban neighborhoods and limits driveway width in front yards in those areas.

6. Allows parking spaces to have smaller dimensions in urban neighborhoods and for uses like housing that experience lower-turnover parking utilization.

7. Consolidates, simplifies, and clarifies many development standards.

Exhibit B, pages ii-iii, outlines these changes in more detail and provides cross-references to the specific code text amendment language.

BACKGROUND

Off-street parking and driveway access standards are often the costliest and most land-consum ing zoning requirements for multiple-dwelling, mixed-use, and commercial developments. When more off-street parking spaces are required than used, excessive parking can result in loss of housing unit construction, increased rents on remaining units to pay for building the parking, stymied economic reinvestment, discouragement of transportation alternatives, increased road congestion, constraints on good urban design, degraded quality of life, and lost small business opportunities. In addition, when cities’ zoning regulations do not accommodate the needs of walking and bicycling, they can further depress the public’s access to convenient, economical, equitable, healthy, and sustainable transportation alternatives.

Current Title 21 requires more parking than drivers use in some parts of Anchorage, and in developments with certain kinds of characteristics. To compensate, Title 21 gives the Traffic Engineer and Director discretionary authority to approve administrative parking reductions. However, it is still more difficult than necessary for the developments that attract people who drive less (e.g., affordable housing) to receive approval for the reductions. Also, newer, potentially effective parking management strategies are absent from the Title 21 list of parking reductions.

Current Title 21 also de-emphasizes pedestrian and bicyclist access needs while requiring wide driveways and on-site vehicle circulation turnarounds, particularly for housing. Often there is not enough secure bike parking to meet identified needs.
To resolve these issues, an interagency project team reviewed the current code language, studied data on parking utilization rates, and researched household vehicle ownership patterns. It evaluated the effectiveness of various parking demand reduction strategies. It found that a low percentage of eligible development projects take advantage of the available reductions. As-of-right parking reductions would make the parking requirements easier to understand, provide certainty, and reduce cost barriers for applicants considering reductions.

The project team found urban neighborhoods near Downtown and Midtown have lower car ownership and parking utilization rates and a compact, pedestrian-friendly development pattern that predates the imposition of suburban parking requirements. Suburban parking requirements overpark urban neighborhoods. Title 21 could instead allow construction that retains and restores these desirable traditional urban development patterns.

The team also sought feedback from agencies, developers, design professionals, businesses, community organizations, and residents regarding general policy options for area-specific parking reductions (Exhibit C, Attachment 1, pages 9-10 of Project Information Summary). Agency and expert consultations helped evaluate driveway and bicycle parking standards. Exhibit C, pages 4-5 of the Staff Memorandum, provides the project needs assessment, and methods, in more detail.

PROJECT SCOPE

The project scope focuses on carrying out specific actions adopted in the Comprehensive Plan. The public process has targeted strategic, relatively easy changes to Title 21 that can yield significant gains for development and the public, at low cost. Following is a list of parking-related items this amendment does NOT do:

- Does NOT reduce minimum parking requirements in suburban Anchorage Bowl (outside of Transit-supportive Development Corridors) or in Chugiak-Eagle River, Turnagain Arm, or Girdwood.
- Does NOT attempt a comprehensive reassessment of minimum parking requirements by individual use type.
- Does NOT increase spillover parking or necessitate new investments in street infrastructure or changes to street management and maintenance.

Concerns about spillover parking effects were addressed by use of forecast parking utilization rates. Also, most areas to receive lower parking requirements are developed neighborhoods where infill projects occur piecemeal with gradual effects by new drivers on parking patterns (Exhibit A, Attachment B of PZC Resolution, Issue-Response #10, pages 10-12).

The recommended parking ratios are low enough to enable the infill, redevelopment, and adaptive reuse the Comprehensive Plan calls for in urban neighborhoods (Site examples in Exhibit C, Attachment 6.1, the PZC work session slides 20-29). In general, the recommended amendments will make significant and positive impacts. They also set up a regulatory framework that supports future improvements. Exhibit C, Attachment 1, page 4 of the Project Information Summary, lists positive outcomes.
Public Participation

Public engagement for this code amendment began with dozens of pre-consultations, public meetings, and an online questionnaire in 2021. After receiving guidance on the general direction of the amendments, the project team incorporated further public comments on the October 29, 2021, Community Discussion Draft of the ordinance.

Exhibit C summarizes the public process and organizations consulted (Staff Memorandum pages 5-6) and lists 124 public and stakeholder meetings (Attachment 6.2, pages 1-5). Exhibit C (Attachment 5, page 1 of Comments Received), and Exhibit D (Attachment 6.3, pages A-10 through A-13 in Background Research) show resolutions by the (1) Public Transit Advisory Board (PTAB), (2) Housing, Homeless, and Neighborhood Development Commission (HHAND), and (3) AMATS Policy Committee.

The Public Hearing Draft was released for agency and public review and comment on February 7, 2022, for the April 11, 2022, PZC public hearing. The document was posted on the Planning Department website and distributed for review and comment to community councils, agencies, and other stakeholders and interested parties. The public hearing schedule was announced on the municipal Public Notices web page. Comments received were included in the PZC case packet as provided in Exhibit C. An issue-response table with recommended amendments to the public hearing draft ordinance was provided to the PZC with responses to all comments from the public, agencies, and commissioners (Exhibit D). The issue-response table was updated to reflect PZC action and is Attachment B to the PZC Resolution (Exhibit A).

On-Street Parking Management Strategies That Can Eliminate Off-Street Parking Requirements

A growing number of U.S. cities are removing minimum parking requirements in favor of more efficient and effective means of managing their street rights-of-way and parking. In Anchorage, only developments in the Downtown central business district are currently exempt from off-street parking minimums. The Title 21 Parking and Site Access Amendments would also exempt development from off-street parking requirements, within parking benefit districts. However, the amendments do not create parking benefit districts. They are proposed to be delineated in the future, in areas that have sufficient on-street parking management, pricing, and enforcement to merit the removal of off-street parking requirements. Essential features of parking benefit districts are envisioned in Exhibit C, Attachment 6.1, slides 30-37.

During the public process, some participants advocated for removing parking minimums completely. Others did not support reducing or allowing by-right reductions. Even participants in urban neighborhoods like South Addition and Fairview expressed concerns about eliminating off-street parking requirements in their residential areas.

Issues of concern included: unmanaged on-street parking, poor sidewalks, piles of plowed snow on streets and sidewalks, wide front yard driveways taking away curb parking, and worries that developers (and new resident drivers) would take advantage of public street space. Municipal right-of-way agencies, such as Street Maintenance, warned that eliminating parking requirements or reducing them too far could add unmanaged on-street parking and substantially increase snow removal times. These challenges are visualized in Exhibit C, Attachment 6.1, slides 31-34. They are addressed by the targeted scope of the amendments discussed at end of page 3 of this memorandum.
Most cities that remove parking requirements have right-of-way management like on-street parking enforcement, more sidewalks, more public transit, stricter controls on front yard driveway widths, and fewer challenges with winter maintenance. These advantages allow their streets to accommodate more parked cars and pedestrian travel.

In Anchorage, strategic management of rights-of-way and on-street parking is an important next step before removing off-street parking requirements completely.

Changes to Title 9 (Traffic) and other regulations of the Anchorage Municipal Code could enable parking benefit districts and other right-of-way management strategies that can yield efficiencies in parking utilization, snow management, and street design. PZC Resolution No. 2022-021 (Exhibit A) concludes by recommending that the Municipality prepare such changes as a separate ordinance that would be a subsequent companion to the Title 21 Parking and Site Access Amendments.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Assembly approval is requested of the Public Hearing Draft ordinance, which reflects the recommendations in the April 11, 2022, PZC Staff Packet (Exhibit C) and the June 6, 2022, Issue-Response Packet (Exhibit D), as adopted in Planning and Zoning Commission Resolution No. 2022-021 (Exhibit A).

THE ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDS APPROVAL.

Prepared by: Tom Davis, Senior Planner, Planning Department
Approved by: Craig H. Lyon, Planning Director
Concur: Adam Trombley, Community Development Director
Concur: Courtney Petersen, OMB Director
Concur: Mario Bird, Acting Municipal Attorney
Concur: Amy Demboski, Municipal Manager
Respectfully submitted: Dave Bronson, Mayor
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Planning and Zoning Commission

Resolution No. 2022-021

Title 21 Text Amendment to Off-Street Parking and Site Access Regulations

PZC Case No. 2022-0026

- Resolution
  - Attachment A, Pages 17 & 18 from April 11, 2022 Staff Memo
  - Attachment B, Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary Reflecting June 6, 2022, Deliberations and Approval
WHEREAS, the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan (2040 Plan) assesses the housing and employment needs of current and future Anchorage residents and includes goals, policies, and actions to address these needs; and

WHEREAS, the 2040 Plan calls for Anchorage’s neighborhoods and commercial districts to accommodate a range of additional housing opportunities and new business growth, through infill and redevelopment, in a more efficient, accessible development pattern; and

WHEREAS, off-street parking and driveway access standards are often the costliest and most land-consuming zoning requirements for multi-unit housing, mixed-use, and business developments; and

WHEREAS, minimum parking requirements, where they exceed forecast parking utilization, are a barrier to the development of housing and businesses; and

WHEREAS, wide site access driveway and vehicle circulation aisle requirements, combined with inadequate treatment of pedestrian and bicyclist access needs, impact the cost and range of housing, business developments, and choices for travel mode; and

WHEREAS, Action 4-3 of the 2040 Plan calls for amendments to Title 21 to allow parking reductions by right for residential uses and to offer greater parking reductions in key development areas; and

WHEREAS, Action 4-6 of the 2040 Plan calls for amendments to Title 21 for internal site circulation for vehicles and private lanes for compact infill housing; and

WHEREAS, the 2040 Plan and area-specific plans like the Spenard Corridor Plan and Fairview Neighborhood Plan recognize traditional urban neighborhoods and transit-supportive development corridors in certain parts of the Anchorage Bowl as having greater street grid connectivity, smaller block and lot sizes, and better access to public transit and sidewalks, which merit alternative parking, driveway, and form-based regulations tailored to their urban contexts; and

WHEREAS, the Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (AMATS) 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan sets forth policies and actions under Goal 3 to develop an efficient multi-modal transportation system to reduce congestion, promote accessibility, and improve system reliability, including Action 3E-5 to pursue parking strategies that support multi-modal transportation options; and

WHEREAS, the AMATS Non-Motorized Plan (2022) calls for short- and long-term bicycle parking spaces and provides recommendations for their design and location; and
WHEREAS, amending Title 21 to (1) streamline approvals for administrative parking reductions; (2) expand the menu of parking reduction strategies; (3) convert four area-specific parking reductions into by-right, area-specific lower minimum parking requirements; (4) reform residential site circulation driveway requirements; and (5) improve pedestrian and bicycle access provisions will reduce costs, enable more efficient land use, increase flexibility to meet market demand, and facilitate development that balances site access for motorists and pedestrians, in context with urban neighborhood character and desired outcomes; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department received and incorporated public comments on the policy direction before writing the proposed Title 21 text amendments, and incorporated comments on the drafts of the proposed Title 21 amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department received and incorporated feedback from dozens of stakeholder consultations and public meetings with the general public, private-sector development experts, design/architectural professionals, business organizations, neighborhoods, public agencies, and municipal committees and commissions; and

WHEREAS, following an eight-week review period, two work sessions were held on March 14 and April 11, 2022, with the Anchorage Planning and Zoning Commission, a public hearing was held on April 11, 2022, and a comment-and-issue-response summary was prepared and presented for deliberation at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on June 6, 2022.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Anchorage Planning and Zoning Commission that:

A. The Commission makes the following findings of fact:

1. The proposed Title 21 text amendments respond to forecast housing needs and Goal 4: Neighborhood Housing in the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan to accommodate the housing needs of Anchorage residents through infill and redevelopment that is compatible with the neighborhood.

2. The proposed Title 21 text amendments respond to forecast employment growth and 2040 Goals 2 and 3 for growth through infill, redevelopment, and mixed-use centers and corridors in the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan.

3. The proposed Title 21 text amendments respond to the unique development characteristics of urban neighborhoods and identifies these neighborhoods in a manner that enables appropriate, contextual development standards in Title 21.
4. Areas identified in the proposed neighborhood context maps for lower area-specific parking requirements and tailored site access standards correspond to areas that the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan designates with growth-supporting features, including Traditional Neighborhood Development areas, Transit-Supportive Development Corridors, and Reinvestment Focus Areas (RFAs).

5. The proposed Title 21 text amendments to the parking and site access standards respond to AMATS transportation planning policies and strategies for automobile and bicycle parking and pedestrian access as important components of transportation infrastructure and factors in congestion management and equitable access between land uses.

6. The proposed Title 21 text amendments are consistent with district and area-specific plans, including the Spenard Corridor Plan and the Fairview Neighborhood Plan.

7. The proposed Title 21 text amendments meet the approval criteria in 21.03.210C. for Title 21 text amendments.

8. The proposed Title 21 text amendments to the parking and site access standards reflect a significant public involvement effort to inform, engage, and incorporate input from stakeholders, experts, and the public to develop and revise the ordinance. The proposed Title 21 amendments has come before the Commission for several meetings, and there has been a robust public process with opportunities for the public to testify, as well as deliberation by the Commission.

9. The recommendations of the staff packet incorporated significant input from the community. The additional recommended amendments of the Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary, as approved by the Commission, respond to the many points of feedback, questions, and concerns voiced by members of the public.

10. The reductions in the minimum parking requirements are not intended to change the maximum amount of parking allowed.

11. The proposed Title 21 amendments are a relatively narrow, targeted change that are a step toward reducing the overall parking in the city, getting away from relying on automobiles, and making it easier for pedestrians.
12. The Title 21 text amendments to the parking and site access standards enable future improvements and innovations in municipal on-street parking management that could, in the future, yield further efficiencies in parking utilization, off-street parking reductions, street and sidewalk snow management, and improved street and sidewalk design.

B. The Commission recommends to the Anchorage Assembly approval of the Title 21 text amendments to the off-street parking and site access standards as provided in:

1. The draft ordinance in the April 11, 2022, case packet.

2. The Planning Department’s recommended amendments 1 and 3 on pages 17 and 18 of the April 11, 2022, staff memorandum, included as Attachment A.

3. The additional amendments recommended in the Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary table, as updated to reflect the Commission’s deliberations and actions, included as Attachment B.

C. The Commission recommends to the Anchorage Assembly that the Municipality prepare an amendment to Title 9, Traffic, to modify existing parking permit district provisions and other on-street parking regulations in the Anchorage Municipal Code, to allow for Parking Benefit Districts, as an improved kind of parking management district, as discussed in the April 11 staff memorandum and modified by the Commission’s action in Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary item #19 (pages 18-19) in Attachment B. The Title 9 amendment text should be prepared for Assembly review and action as a separate ordinance that would be a subsequent companion to the Title 21 off-street parking and site access amendments.

PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Planning and Zoning Commission on the 6th day of June 2022.

ADOPTED by the Anchorage Planning and Zoning Commission this 21st day of June 2022.

Craig H. Lyon
Secretary

Jared Gardner
Chair

Attachments: A—Pages 17 & 18 from April 11, 2022, Staff Memo
B—Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary
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Title 21 Text Amendment to Off-Street Parking and Site Access Regulations

Public Hearing Draft
PZC Case No. 2022-0026

Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan
Implementation Actions 4-3 and 4-6
This page intentionally left blank.
DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

The Department recommends **APPROVAL** of the Public Hearing Draft Title 21 Text Amendment to the Parking and Site Access Regulations, with the following amendments:

1. Amend proposed section 21.07.090E.7., *Open Option Parking District*, and all other sections that refer to Open Option Parking Districts, as follows:
   a) Delete proposed subsections 21.07.090E.7.a. through e. (Attachment 3, pages 29 - 31) from the public hearing draft amendments.
   b) Re-number proposed subsection 21.07.090E.7.f. (Attachment 3, page 31) to become a stand-alone subsection, and amend it for clarity and simplicity, as follows:

   **7[F]: Requirements for Developments in [OPEN OPTION] Parking Benefit Districts**
   The following area-specific parking regulations apply to all developments located in parking benefit districts established pursuant to title 9:

   **a[II].** No off-street parking is required [FOR ANY DEVELOPMENT], except that accessible (ADA) parking spaces required by 21.07.090J. shall be provided.

   **b[II].** Development projects that result in 10 or more dwelling units, [10 OR MORE BEDROOMS OF GROUP LIVING,] new construction of 10,000 or more square feet of [NON-RESIDENTIAL] gross floor area, or [SUBSTANTIAL] building renovations involving a change of use of 50,000 or more square feet of non-residential gross floor area, shall provide one or more [DISINCENTIVES FOR OFF-STREET PARKING UTILIZATION AND INCENTIVES FOR ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF SITE ACCESS, BY PROVIDING] parking reduction strategies from section 21.07.090F., [TABLE 21.07-9]. Structured parking, industrial uses, and affordable housing units that meet 21.07.110F., are exempt from this requirement.

   **(A)** The applicant shall select parking reduction strategies [SELECTED] from section 21.07.090F.1., Table 21.07-9 that[SHALL] amount to a total reduction of at least 10 percent [FROM WHAT WOULD OTHERWISE BE THE MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENT WERE IT NOT FOR THE OPEN OPTION PARKING DISTRICT,] using the “Reduction Amount” column in Table 21.07-9. The total reduction required shall increase an additional 1 percent for each 10 off-street parking spaces [ABOVE 20 PARKING SPACES] not used for a parking reduction strategy in the development. In no case shall the total reduction be required to exceed 25 percent.

   **(B)** The requirements of 21.07.090F. for receiving parking reductions apply.

   **(C)** The [PARKING REDUCTIONS IN SECTION F. OF TABLE 21.07-9 DO NOT COUNT. HOWEVER, THE] applicant may propose strategies not included in Table 21.07-9, subject to 21.07.090F.8, Discretionary Parking Reductions.
c) Replace all references to “Open Option Parking Districts” in the public hearing draft Title 21 text amendments with a more generic reference to “parking benefit districts established pursuant to Title 9, Traffic”.

2. Replace the Open Option Parking District content of the deleted proposed subsections 21.07.090E.7.a. through e. with a proposed amendment to AMC Title 9 modifying existing parking permit district to accommodate a new kind of street/parking management district called a parking benefit district. The Planning Department should work with other municipal agencies to prepare the Title 9 amendment text for Assembly review and action as a separate ordinance alongside the Title 21 Parking and Site Access Amendments ordinance recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The Title 9 amendment should address:
   - A clear public approval process for creating parking benefit districts.
   - An available supply of on-street public parking in the parking benefit district.
   - Enforcement of time limits, fees, and no-parking periods (such as for plowing).
   - Drivers paying market prices for use of parking spaces, such as through permits.
   - Prices that vary and are adjusted as needed to produce a target occupancy rate.
   - Parking revenues paying for on-street parking management and enforcement.
   - Reinvestment of any excess revenue directly back into the parking district neighborhood for public services such as improving streets and sidewalks, planting street trees or snow storage spaces, or clearing snow from sidewalks.

3. Amend Section 21.07.090F.7., Parking Reduction for District Parking, and all other sections that refer to this parking reduction, as follows:
   a. Modify proposed subsection 21.07.090F.1., Table 21.07-9, in the third row of Table Section E. (page 47 in Attachment 3) by changing “District Parking” to read “Nearby Public Parking.”
   b. Modify proposed subsection 21.07.090F.7. (page 34 in Attachment 3) as follows:
      The traffic engineer may reduce the minimum number of required off-street parking spaces for uses near a public parking facility where the parking spaces are managed and maintained for shared public use [WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF A MUNICIPALLY RECOGNIZED PARKING DISTRICT (AS DEFINED IN 21.15.040) THAT PROVIDES OFF-SITE PARKING FACILITIES TO SERVE AN AREA]. To determine eligibility for this reduction or the size of the reduction to be allowed, the traffic engineer shall consider the relative distance to the public parking facility [THE USE FROM THE DISTRICT PARKING FACILITY] and the factors listed in 21.07.090F.8.b.
   c. In Section 21.15.040, Definitions, delete the term and definition for “Parking District, Municipally Recognized” (Attachment 3, page 83, lines 9-13).
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Purpose

This Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary provides Planning Department responses to comments and questions raised by the public and Planning and Zoning Commissioners regarding the Public Hearing Draft amendments to the parking and site access regulations in Title 21. These include:

- The comments received by March 31, as provided in Attachment 5 in the April 11 case packet;
- The comments provided to the Commission in Supplementary Packet #2 on April 11;
- The April 11 public hearing testimony; and
- Commissioners’ questions at the March 14 and April 11 work sessions and the April 11 meeting.

The issue-response table on the following pages summarizes each issue raised, provides the staff response and recommendations for each issue, and documents the action by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). For each issue, the table references the source of the comment/issue by the name of the commenter. An index to commenters appears on the next page.

Organization

The issue–response table is organized by topic into the seven main proposals of the public hearing draft amendments outlined on page 2 of the April 11 staff memorandum. These include:

A. Streamlined Approvals for Administrative Parking Reductions Issues #1-3 pages 1-3
B. More Complete Menu of Parking Reduction Strategies Issues #4-6 pages 4-6
C. Area-Specific, Lower Minimum Parking Requirements Issues #7-19 pages 6-20
D. Improved Site Access for Pedestrians, Bicyclists, and Transit Issues #20-26 pages 20-26
E. Reforms to Driveway Standards Issue #27 pages 26-28
F. Provisions for Smaller Parking Dimensions Issues #28-30 pages 29-31
G. Consolidated, Simpler Regulations Issues #27-33 pages 32-38

A detailed table of contents for the 38 issues begins on page iii.

The issues and responses in the issue-response table reference the Public Hearing Draft code amendment text in Attachment 3: Annotated Zoning Code Amendment Language, as provided in the April 11 packet for this Case 2022-0026.

Recommended Additional Code Text Changes

Some Issue Responses recommend additional changes to the public hearing draft code amendments. These changes in the issue-response table approved by the PZC provide the basis for the PZC’s recommended draft Title 21 amendments to be forwarded to the Assembly. These changes are formatted in the issue-response table as “tracked changes” text with a shaded background:

- Code language recommended to be added to the public hearing draft is underlined.
- Code language recommended to be deleted from the public hearing draft is in [ALL-CAPITALIZED TEXT IN BRACKETS].
- Code language without tracked-changes/shaded background is public hearing draft code language not being changed by the issue-response.
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### Issue–Response Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part A: Streamlined Approvals for Administrative Parking Reductions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Current Title 21 parking and driveway reductions are approved by the Traffic Engineer and Planning Director through an administrative approval process. No public notice or public comment opportunity would be taken away by the proposed amendments that streamline this administrative approval process. Applicants periodically request a parking requirement Variance, which is heard by a municipal board. The Variance process is not proposed to change. The administrative parking reductions currently done by discretionary review by the Traffic Engineer and Planning Director will become nondiscretionary, or “as-of-right,” up to a certain percentage reduction in parking spaces. As-of-right approvals make it easier for developers, property owners, and municipal zoning administrators to understand the parking requirement. This provides certainty and reduces cost in the process, especially for applicants who may be considering whether to ask for parking reductions in return for development characteristics that reduce parking utilization rates. For all administrative parking reductions, Title 21 will continue to require the property owner and Municipality to enter into a recorded Parking Agreement. The proposed amendments to the Parking Agreement in 21.07.090F.2.d. (page 35, lines 38-46, in Attachment 3) will strengthen the ability of the Municipality to go back, reevaluate, and require changes to the Parking Agreement and reduction strategy if a parking problem emerges later. The Municipality could require the applicant to undertake additional parking reduction strategies that do necessarily include adding more parking supply. Reduction strategies such as those listed in proposed Table 21.07-9 (pages 32-34 in Attachment 3) are less costly that parking facilities and take little or no site area.</td>
<td><strong>Approved the Recommendation</strong> Commissioners discussed that this is a primary issue that gets to the core of the main motion, to allow less parking by-right. A commissioner raised the concern that by-right reductions would have unintended consequences of spillover parking, like at the Rustic Goat. Dense infill projects with fewer parking spaces could push their parked cars into the street or to other lots, leaving no parking for other developments. A commissioner asked and received from staff an assurance that the Municipality will have the ability to come back after a parking reduction is approved and require a development to employ additional parking management strategies if there are parking spillover problems.</td>
<td><strong>Approved the Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>As-of-Right Approval Process for Parking Reductions.</strong> | If public input is removed from the approval process for reduced parking and driveways and modified site access, it puts the burden on neighbors, community councils, and municipal enforcement to address parking violations. The proposed Title 21 changes to eliminate public notice/input and allow administrative and by-right approvals should be delayed for further public discussion. <em>(Turnagain Community Council)</em> If a discretionary, case-by-case review by the municipal Traffic Engineer is no longer required, and the property owner can get a parking reduction by right, what if members of the public later report parking problems after the development has been built? Even if the Municipality has the authority to review the development’s parking after the fact, what good will that do? There will not be enough space on a built-out site to install more off-street parking spaces to resolve a parking problem. <em>(Cathy Gleason for Turnagain Community Council)</em> Traffic Engineering supports the amendments that clarify the level of reduction that can be granted without requiring approval by the Planning Director and Traffic Engineer. Defining which reductions are “by-right” and which require additional staff time to review and approve should improve the process and reduce costs. <em>(Traffic Engineering Department)</em> UACC supports the new neighborhood context areas and by-right parking reductions. These amendments simplify permitting, maintain green space, and encourage alternative modes of access. <em>(University Area Community Council)</em> | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A commissioner said that many older buildings and streets are not built to current code standards, so the proposed reductions do not necessarily mean there will be less parking than is out there today. Ride-hail and other tech will reduce parking needs. Developers provide as much parking as they need, even if more than required by code. Commissioners found the premise, evidence, and resolution of public comments in the packet support by-right parking reductions. It matches a personal observation that many developments are overparked. A commissioner appreciated the approach to add incentives to move away from a car-first city, while limiting the scope and geography of the reforms—i.e., avoiding eliminating parking requirements—in recognition of Anchorage’s context and history.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Comment/Question</td>
<td>Response and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.     | Alternative, Case-by-Case Approval Procedure for Large Reductions.                                          | **Response:** The proposed amendments clarify and consolidate the existing discretionary review and approval process for large parking reductions, in 21.07.090F.8., *Discretionary Parking Reductions* (page 48 of Attachment 3). Through this reformatted section, the applicant may still request a bigger percentage reduction than will be allowed through a non-discretionary (as-of-right) approval. Title 21 does not limit to the size of the percentage reduction that may be granted through the discretionary approval process. The applicant may also propose a different kind of parking reduction strategy than those listed in the proposed table of parking reductions (Table 21.07-9 on pages 32-34 in Attachment 3). The applicant will be subject to the same discretionary review and approval involving the Traffic Engineer and Planning Director as under the current Title 21 parking reductions. Title 21 also provides procedures for obtaining relief from parking requirements which involve going to a board or commission and providing for public comment, such as the Variance, the Small Area Implementation Plan (SAIP) master planning process, and the Institutional Master Plan process.  
**RECOMMENDATION:** No changes.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Approved the Recommendation |
| 3.     | Effectiveness of Parking Reduction Strategies in Reducing Parking Utilization Rates.                       | **Response:** Rideshare programs, parking pricing (i.e., unbundled parking), and free public transit pass programs have been used and continue to be in use today in Anchorage (Attachment 6.3, Section 2.1). The Public Transportation Department can track and document continued compliance with any Title 21 Parking Agreement with employers participating in its rideshare program and “U-Pass” free transit pass program. Bicycle parking has been one of the more popular Title 21 parking reductions and is rated highly in the research literature as among the most effective kinds of parking reduction strategies. Some sources indicate a direct correlation between perceived availability of bike parking and the likelihood of bicycling for trips. The *Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan* calls for the Municipality to, “Amend Title 21 to allow parking reductions by right for residential uses; offer greater reductions in RFAs and other key development areas.” Developments that employ parking reduction strategies tend to experience lower parking utilization rates. For such developments, the as-of-right percentage reductions yield a more accurate parking requirement. The parking reduction strategies in Table 21.07-9 (pages 32–34 in Attachment 3) refine the existing set of strategies for which applicants receive percentage reductions in required parking under current Title 21. The revised slate of strategies reflects updated research and recent trends and experiences, as documented in Attachment 6.3: Background Research (Section 2.1).  
**RECOMMENDATION:** No change.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Approved the Recommendation |
### Part B: More Complete Menu of Parking Reduction Strategies

| Item # | Comment/Question                                                                                       | Response and Recommendation                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | PZC Action (6-6-2022) |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Approved the Recommended Change |
| 4.     | **Parking Reductions for Shared Vehicle Programs.**  
Traffic Engineering is supportive of the revised menu of available parking alternative strategies to include the addition of newer rideshare programs. (MOA Traffic Engineering Department)  
Whereas the amendments propose a 5% reduction in parking minimums if the property owner participates in a rideshare program, a 10% reduction if the owner includes free transit passes, and a 2% reduction if the owner provides a public transit stop or shelter, and whereas the Public Transportation Department offers rideshare and free transit pass programs for organizations to offer to their constituents, the Anchorage Public Transit Advisory Board supports the amendments as written. (Anchorage Public Transit Advisory Board) | Response: The project team appreciates these comments, resolution of support, and multiple consultations with Traffic Engineering and Public Transportation Departments that informed the updated menu of parking reductions in Table 21.07-9 for shared vehicle and high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) programs.  
Public Transportation staff has requested that the Title 21 parking reduction for rideshare programs be offered to property owners and employers who participate in the program but may only partially subsidize the cost.  
Of the approximately 18 employers that participate in the municipal rideshare (vanpool) program, only one fully covers the cost for its employees to participate. Other employers partially subsidize, and the remainder is grant funded by the rideshare program.  
RECOMMENDATION: Amend Table 21.07-9, Rideshare Program, (page 32 in Attachment 3) as follows:  
| Table 21.07-9: Parking Reductions and Alternatives                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
### Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Elimination of Parking Reduction for On-Street Parking. The proposed parking reduction code changes in 21.07.090F do not pose a significant concern for the SACC neighborhood. One comment is the proposed elimination of the existing Title 21 parking reduction for on-street parking. Currently, on-street parking may be counted toward the parking requirement. SACC committee wants to encourage Parking Reductions while also ensuring that the by-right reduction of off-street parking can be absorbed on surrounding streets. Additional reduction considered on a case-by-case basis to use on-street parking should still be available. New developments should not rely on the on-street spaces granted to another parcel. <em>(South Addition Community Council Planning Subcommittee)</em></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The deletion of the current Title 21 parking reduction for on-street parking appears on page 49, lines 5-21, in Attachment 3. The annotation for page 49 in Attachment 3 provides the reasons for the recommended deletion of the parking reduction. In addition, there have been only two parking reductions approved for on-street parking since this option became available in 2014. Under the proposed amendments, if a future applicant wishes to propose counting nearby on-street parking (or any other strategy not listed in the proposed table of parking reductions) toward getting a reduction in the off-street parking requirement, the discretionary administrative approval process will remain available for the applicant to propose such under 21.07.090F.8. <strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> No change. Approved the Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Applicability of Parking Reduction for Transit Pass Benefits in Girdwood. Free transit passes are currently a parking reduction option enjoyed by Girdwood. Girdwood Valley Transit is a free shuttle bus providing public transportation throughout the Girdwood Valley. Limiting the Transit Pass Benefits parking reduction to only the Neighborhood Development Context Areas in the Bowl would take this away, which would be unfortunate. There are at least three properties that have used this parking reduction in Title 21. Suggest changing the applicability to &quot;Any use located in the Neighborhood Development Contexts or Girdwood.&quot; <em>(Connor Scher)</em></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Staff finds no evidence of any recorded parking agreement for the Title 21 Transit Pass Benefits parking reduction (21.07.090F.10.) in Girdwood. There have been parking reductions for using the public parking in the Girdwood Town Center (GC-7 district). There are several pending parking agreements for off-site parking, reduced parking space dimensions, and other reduction strategies as conditions of approval for two development master plans and an amendment to a conditional use. <em>(See Attachment 6.3.)</em> Limiting the non-discretionary Parking Reduction for Transit Pass Benefits to the Urban Neighborhood Development Context Areas in Anchorage will not impact any current zoning entitlements, programs, or public transit shuttles in Girdwood. A property owner could propose a parking reduction to reflect fare-less public transit in Girdwood through the same process of discretionary approval under the current Title 21 parking reduction. It could be helpful to clarify that administrative parking reductions will be available through the discretionary approval process for parking reduction strategies not listed in Table 21.07-9. <strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> Clarify section 21.07.090F.1.e. <em>(page 32, line 18, in Attachment 3)</em> as follows: e. Proposals for larger percentage reductions than shown, that modify any of the provisions for the reductions shown, or that propose other types of parking reductions from those in table 21.07-9 may be approved subject to a discretionary review and approval by the traffic engineer and director as provided in subsection 21.07.090F.8., <em>Discretionary Parking Reductions.</em> Approved the Recommended Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part C: Area-Specific, Lower Minimum Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>Map 21.07-1 of Traditional Urban Neighborhood Areas.</strong> SACC Planning Committee appreciates the amendments that establish the Traditional Urban Neighborhood Context Area to address the characteristics and context of older neighborhoods like South Addition, and the proposed boundaries generally define the subject area properly for South Addition, a few adjustments are necessary. The map should be revised to include all blocks north of Westchester Lagoon or at least the gridded blocks with alleys in the Traditional Urban Context Area. These are established, fully developed neighborhoods with characteristics more akin to that Context Area. (South Addition Community Council Planning Subcommittee) The Neighborhood Context Area maps are great; however, a specific comment that everything south of 15th Avenue should be &quot;Edge Urban.&quot; Breaking out only the Eastchester Flats neighborhood (east of the Seward Highway) as &quot;Edge Urban&quot; recalls the tragic history of Urban Renewal in that area. Graphically it may improve the perception of these Edge Urban areas if there was a continuous &quot;Edge Urban&quot; area instead. (Connor Scher) Shouldn’t the parts of the Edge Urban Neighborhoods from Map 21.07-2 that extend northward show up as Edge Urban in Map 21.07-1 too? Also, where does the E St./Arctic Transit-Supportive Development Corridor (dotted line) from Map 21.07-2 begin in Map 21.07-1? In Downtown? (Connor Scher) <strong>Response:</strong> No objection to extending the boundaries of South Addition’s Traditional Urban Neighborhood Context Area westward to include the regular gridded blocks with alleys west of L Street. Staff surveyed potential revised boundaries. The traditional urban neighborhood pattern with regular gridded blocks and maintained alleys, shaded purple in the map below, extends as far west as P Street. The grid/alley system breaks up west of P Street into irregular street patterns and individual subdivisions, with more changes in topography. This matches in the “Edge Urban” definition. Areas south of 15th Avenue west of L Street, including the Coffey Subdivision, also match the “Edge Urban” character. See map below. In Fairview, the public hearing draft boundaries on Map 21.07-1 reflect the development pattern of Eastchester (east of Seward Highway, south of 15th Avenue), both historically and currently. Even prior to the 1960s Urban Renewal, Eastchester had a much more informal grid layout than Fairview’s strict grid block pattern with alleys on the plateau north of 16th Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Approved the Recommended Changes**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | No objection to depicting the Transit-Supportive Development Corridor (TSDC) from Map 21.07-2 on E Street/Arctic Boulevard in Map 21.07-1. Per the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan, the TSDC begins at E Street’s intersection with 10th Avenue. The Anchorage 2040 TSDC on DeBarr Road/15th Avenue could also be extended into Map 21.07-1 to its western termination at 15th Avenue’s intersection with I Street. | **RECOMMENDATION:** Amend Map 21.07-1 (Section 21.07.015D., page 7 of Attachment 3) as follows:  
   a. Transfer the area between 11th and 15th Avenues and L and P Streets, shown in purple in the map below, from the Edge Urban to the Traditional Urban Neighborhood.  
   b. South of 15th Avenue, designate Coffey Subdivision east of Minnesota Drive and west of L Street, shown in the small yellow polygon below, as Edge Urban Neighborhood.  
   c. Clarify that parts of South Addition and Fairview may be in the Edge Urban Neighborhood Context Area recommendation, as proposed in issue #32 recommendation b.  
   d. Clarify that the portion of North Star Community Council south of Chester Creek Greenbelt is designated as Edge Urban Neighborhood, as shown in yellow below.  
   e. Depict the Transit-Supportive Development Corridor on Arctic Boulevard/16th Avenue/E Street north to 10th Avenue, and on 15th Avenue east of I Street, as shown in the dotted lines in the map below. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8.    | **Map 21.07-3 of Edge Urban Neighborhood Areas.**  
On Map 21.07-3 (Section 21.07.01SD.2., on page 9 of Attachment 3, include the southern portion of the Anchor Park subdivision (on the northeast corner of Northern Lights Blvd. and Lake Otis Parkway) in the "Edge Urban Neighborhood" area. This area has the same development pattern as the northern portion of the same subdivision that is now part of Airport Heights north of the Chester Creek Greenbelt. Relatedly, the Transit-Supportive Development Corridor on Lake Otis Parkway should extend north from 36th up to the intersection with 15th/DeBarr Road. (Connor Scher) | **Response:** No objection to including the southern portion of the Anchor Park Subdivision (on northeast corner of Northern Lights Boulevard and Lake Otis Parkway) in the Edge Urban Neighborhood Context Area. It has the same Edge Urban development pattern as Airport Heights neighborhood north of Chester Creek Greenbelt: a grid pattern of streets, sidewalks, small driveways, and postwar era homes. The Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan provides the basis for the Transit-supportive Development Corridors (TSDCs) in the proposed Title 21 amendments. TSDCs are land use corridors with compact development and redevelopment potential. Anchorage 2040 does not extend the Lake Otis TSDC north of the 36th Avenue intersection; the uses along Lake Otis north of 36th Avenue are either schools or have low transit ridership and redevelopment potential. There is no transit service on Lake Otis north of Northern Lights Boulevard. However, recommendation c. in issue #9 below adds a parking reduction for properties within a half-mile of high-frequency bus routes that serve Transit-Supportive Development Corridors to address the comment.  
**RECOMMENDATION:** Amend Map 21.07-2 (in Section 21.07.01SD.2., page 9 of Attachment 3) to include the Anchor Park Subdivision on the northeast corner of Northern Lights and Lake Otis, highlighted in yellow in the map at right, in the Edge Urban Neighborhood. | Approved the Recommended Changes |

See also the recommendations in issue #9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9.    | Can All Areas Currently Eligible for Area-Specific Reductions Still Get Them? | **Response:** Staff has not heard concerns from developers or property owners. All properties in the Bowl will still have access to the same administrative parking reduction approval process as they do today. The current administrative parking reduction, including the area-specific reductions shown on the upper left map, is a discretionary approval process. Because of the uncertainty involved and other factors, few property owners have used the existing area-specific administrative parking reductions.  

The proposed amendment replaces area-specific parking reductions with by-right lower parking requirements for the areas shown in the lower right map (page 8 of Attachment 1). The rest of the properties will continue to be eligible to ask for discretionary approval of administrative parking reductions using locational rationale.  

The proposed slate of as-of-right parking reductions will also be available. In review of the comments in this issue and issue #8, staff finds that making more of the reductions available along entire transit routes with higher-frequency service (30-min. or better service) beyond the Transit-Supportive Development Corridors (TSDCs) that they serve would be more equitable, recognize lots near high levels of transit service, and respond to the concerns.  

In addition, developments located just outside a ¼-mile-wide TSDC but still within 10-minutes (1/2-mile) walking distance of the transit route line should be entitled to at least some parking reduction. This would be more consistent with the treatment of properties located just inside the ¼-mile TSDCs entitled to a 10% lower parking requirement. (See recommendation c. below.)  

**RECOMMENDATION:** Move forward with the clarification recommended in issue #6. Amend the maps in section 21.07.015D. and the Table 21.07-9 menu of parking reductions in 21.07.090F.1. as follows:  
a. Amend Maps 21.07-1 through 21.07-4 (pages 7-10 of Attachment 3), by adding a linear feature “Public transit routes with frequent service,” to include the portions of People Mover Routes 10, 20, 30, 40, and 25 that extend beyond the Transit-Supportive Development Corridors that they serve.  
b. Amend section 21.07.090F.1., Table 21.07-9. (pages 32-33 of Attachment 3), by amending the “Applicability” column for the Car-Share Program, Transit Pass Benefits, Enhanced On-Site Walkway, Enhanced Street Sidewalk, and Other Pedestrian Amenities parking reductions as follows:  

Any development site in the Neighborhood Development Contexts or within ¼-mile of the centerline of a right-of-way of a public transit route with frequent service mapped in 21.07.015D. | Approved the Recommended Changes, with an additional edit:  

The PZC recommended a correction be made to a typo in the amendment text in recommendation c. (shown on next page) in Table 21.07-9, bottom row, second column (under “Applicability”), to add the word “of” after the word “centerline” in the first sentence. This additional edit is highlighted in yellow and double-underlined in the amendment text in recommendation c. shown on next page. |
c. Amend section 21.07.090F.1., Table 21.07-9., in part B of the table (page 33 of Attachment 3) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reduction</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Additional Requirements</th>
<th>Reduction Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Pedestrian and Transit Amenities:</td>
<td>Any use in the Neighborhood Development Contexts</td>
<td>Based on a determination of need by the public transportation department, the development provides a public use easement or transit stop improvements per 21.07.090K.7.</td>
<td>2% reduction in the number of required parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Stop or Shelter</td>
<td>Development sites located within one-half mile from the centerline of a right-of-way of a transit supportive development corridor or a public transit route with frequent service shown on maps 21.07-1 to 21.07-4 in section 21.07.015D.</td>
<td>The development site is located outside of the ¼-mile radius of the Transit-Supportive Development Corridor and is not within any other Neighborhood Development Context. The development meets the area-specific bicycle parking requirements in subsection 21.07.090K. Table 21.07-14.</td>
<td>10% reduction in the number of required parking spaces for sites located within 1,320 feet (¼ mile) of the right-of-way centerline. 8% reduction for sites within 1,650 feet. 6% reduction for sites within 1,980 feet. 4% reduction for sites within 2,310 feet. 2% reduction for sites located within 2,310 feet (half-mile).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Response:** This Title 21 amendment is intended to reduce the costs of construction, support housing and economic development, improve opportunities for good site design and pedestrian access, and reflect the character and aspirations of urban neighborhoods like South Addition, Fairview, and Spenard per adopted neighborhood and district plans. It is not set to increase spillover parking or require new investments in street maintenance. It does not change minimum parking requirements in suburban Anchorage.

The scope of changes in this amendment respects the commenters’ concerns, and the intent of the current off-street parking regulations, to minimize spillover parking onto public streets and ensure the movement of traffic and service vehicles. It does so using the Current Title 21 method of requiring a supply of parking on...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        | parking utilization. *(South Addition Community Council Planning Subcommittee)* Turnagain Community Council is concerned that some of the proposed changes could create additional on-street parking. Anchorage should delay the adoption of the proposed amendments to assess the potential to apply these code changes on a case-by-case basis; some situations, such as commercial parking, may have a clear excess of parking, whereas some residential situations may create safety issues without site-specific consideration. Or it should pick some target areas for initial implementation of these changes, where existing on-street parking problems are minimal, and the effects of implementation can be monitored. The consequences of the proposed code amendment to allow for increased housing density include that it creates additional on-street parking problems without regard to safety and snow removal. In many of our older residential neighborhoods, narrow streets are not built to accommodate on-street parking and do not have pedestrian amenities. There are already safety and snow removal issues where inadequate on-site parking has led to unsafe on-street parking, with ramifications for vehicle safety, emergency vehicle access, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and snow removal. This past winter has exemplified challenges with snow removal and on-street parking. In some of the older, narrower streets in Turnagain there were snow piles this past winter that reduced the travel way down to one lane. There would be no space for on-street parking if there are fewer off-street parking spaces required and more housing units developed. There is no way to get around Anchorage's winter snow conditions in relation to these changes increasing the demand for on-street parking. We have yet to find a solution to keeping sidewalks clear during the winter for safe pedestrian travel. Each development site to meet anticipated parking utilization. This reasoning assumes that some developers would supply insufficient parking if not regulated. The proposed parking requirements are set to match forecast parking utilization in the Urban Neighborhood Contexts. If we reduce the parking requirement for urban neighborhoods where the parking utilization rate is lower, then the lower parking requirement should be able to accommodate the lower peak period parking demand in those neighborhoods. There will be less parking utilization on fewer parking spaces. These urban neighborhoods have lower automobile ownership rates, lower parking utilization rates, and a more compact and pedestrian-friendly urban development pattern that predates the imposition of suburban zoning requirements for off-street parking. Suburban parking requirements hamper investment in infill development and adaptive reuse of older buildings on the small sites and awkward lots that characterize the urban neighborhood contexts. These reforms move Title 21 toward once again allowing construction that retains and restores this desirable traditional urban development pattern. The vehicle ownership and parking utilization research that provided the technical basis for the recommended Title 21 area-specific urban parking ratios is provided in Attachment 6.3: Background Research (Section 1). The local parking utilization studies used followed the parking field survey methodology of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The ITE method factors in the occupancy/vacancy rate of the survey sites. The area-specific parking requirements is based on this empirical data, a forward-looking orientation to forecast parking utilization during the life span of development projects, and linkages to the community goals in the Comprehensive Plan and neighborhood and district plans for the Urban Neighborhood Contexts. This information indicates that parking requirements should be responsive to the physical characteristics, transportation conditions, and preferences that vary across different neighborhoods. Title 21 should not apply suburban parking standards that induce higher parking utilization by overparking urban neighborhoods. Overparked site development induces more driving and depresses alternative transportation modes like walking, bicycling, and public transit. It spreads places further apart to increase vehicle miles travelled (VMT). Suburban zoning standards for parking increase housing costs and housing unit size. Wide front driveways take curb space away from on-street parking, pedestrian walkways, and street snow storage. In short, high parking requirements contribute to the problems that the commenters at left are concerned about. High off-street parking requirements that overpark most developments do not address the root cause of on-street parking behavior problems or street maintenance problems, nor are they the most effective treatment of the symptoms. On-street automobile parking (and storage) is going to occur even if there is enough off-street parking.
## Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access. <em>(Turnagain Community Council; Cathy Gleason in public testimony representing Turnagain Community Council)</em></td>
<td>I am concerned that area-specific lower parking requirements will create hardship on persons with disabilities and households with large families that rely on multiple cars because the primary caregivers work jobs that do not allow them to transport other household members. <em>(Connor Scher)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned that if a development’s parking requirement is reduced to below how much parking is needed by a development--i.e., to below current parking utilization levels, there are fewer off-street parking spaces than cars, and where do those cars go? They will go to park on-street or in some other location. Has the department has done a sensitivity analysis to ensure that, within the areas to receive lower, area-specific parking requirements, there is enough parking on-street or elsewhere to accommodate the flow of that parking from one area to another? <em>(Commissioner Raun, April 11 work session)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the proposed amendments push parking utilization onto the street, it will create on-street parking problems. <em>(Commissioner Strike, March 14 work session)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the parking survey measurement of actual parking utilization rates for developments, which was used to gauge the average parking utilization rate in urban neighborhoods, were those average utilization rates that we observed in the field predicated on an assumption that every dwelling unit or tenant space in the developments was fully occupied? If the local parking utilization survey assumed that every site tested was fully occupied, then it would not have considered vacancy rates and essentially undercounted potential parking utilization rate for a development. Apartment vacancy rates have been increasing, and occupancy rates falling, in the past two years, due to the economy. <em>(Commissioner Strike, March 14 work session)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parking. Some people prefer to park, store, or abandon vehicles in the street. Local field studies and observations indicate they do so even where off-street parking facilities have many empty parking spaces. <strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> No change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved the Recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11. Parking Impacts of Increasing the Number of Dwellings.**

If we reduce the parking requirement, there will be more buildable area on the lot to increase the number of dwelling units. Won’t increasing the number of dwelling units also increase parking demand and where will that go? *(Commissioner Strike, March 14 work session)*

More people tend to live in rental housing units than originally intended when the units were built, which generates more parked cars than one might think, even if the residents of the rental unit own fewer cars per person or household, with associated larger numbers of vehicles being parked along streets. *(Turnagain Community Council)*

**Response:** The parking requirement accommodates the parking utilization regardless the size (or density) of a development. If the number of dwellings increases, the number of required parking spaces increases too.

If we reduce the parking requirement for urban neighborhoods where the parking utilization rate is lower, the lower parking requirement should be able to accommodate the lower parking demand in those neighborhoods. There will be less parking utilization for fewer parking spaces.

If high housing costs push more people to live in the same unit, the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan recommends strategies to reduce housing costs, rather than double-down on high parking requirements that contribute to the high housing costs.

Anchorage parking studies indicate that some parkers prefer to park on the street, even when off-street parking is available. There may be a moderate increase in on-street parkers if there is a substantial increase in the number of housing units, but not because of a lack of off-street parking due to these amendments.

**RECOMMENDATION:** No change.

**12. Parking Impacts of Accessory Uses.**

Changes to increase housing density through Accessory Dwelling Units further restrict the ability to provide adequate residential on-site parking. *(Turnagain Community Council)*

Also concerned about the on-street parking impacts of specific uses like short-term rentals (e.g., VRBOs, AirBnBs), such as in the Bootleggers Cove next to Downtown, especially during the snowy season. *(Commissioner Strike, April 11 work session)*

**Response:** This ordinance does not amend the parking requirements for specific use types or accessory use types. If the parking requirement for a specific use is found to be either excessive or inadequate, other ordinances can be brought forward to address use-specific problems.

The on-street parking problem is not use-specific to VRBOs or other particular use or accessory use type. A single-family household with more household members of driving age might park more vehicles than a smaller household with an ADU. On-street parking behavior problems or a lack of on-street parking can be addressed through on-street parking management and enforcement, as recommended in issues 18 and 19.

**RECOMMENDATION:** No change.

**13. Estimated Development Cost of Parking Spaces.**

Regarding the Planning Department’s estimate of the cost of a parking space (e.g., $10,000 per surface space) in Attachment 6.1, page 9, bullet item #2 on slide 9), does that represent just the direct development construction costs or does that include other costs on the site including stormwater management for the impervious pavement and other externalities mitigating the parking space? *(Commissioner Raun, March 14 work session)*

**Response:** This is a general rule of thumb for the hard cost of developing a parking space. It does not include the peripheral environmental costs not directly a part of the parking facility, such as stormwater management, landscaping, snow storage areas. It does not include soft costs, such as design or permitting. It also does not include land costs or the broader impacts of parking on a city’s transportation system.

**RECOMMENDATION:** No changes.
## Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Development Size Threshold for Applying the Lower, Area-Specific Parking Requirements. Is there a minimum size of building or number of dwelling units that the area-specific lower parking requirements would apply to in the urban neighborhoods? (Chair Gardner, March 14 work session)</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> There is no minimum or maximum development size, or limitation on use type. The area-specific lower parking requirements would apply to all development regardless of building size, use, or number of dwellings. The proposed applicability of the area-specific parking requirements is set forth in section 21.07.090E.2., Table 21.07-1, second column, as shown on page 27 of Attachment 3. It is important for small infill development projects to be eligible for the lower area-specific parking requirements in urban areas because so much of it occurs on small lots or in small existing buildings in which the development project involves renovations and additions with relatively little floor area. <strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> No change.</td>
<td>Approved the Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Providing Excess Off-Street Parking Spaces as Snow Storage Areas. What impacts will the lower parking requirement have on on-site snow storage? On many properties the excess parking spaces required by Title 21 today tend to be used for snow storage in the wintertime. That is evident around town where some of the parking spaces are being used to store plowed snow from the rest of the parking lot. Would each proposed development need to demonstrate where the snow will go? (Commissioner Strike, March 14 work session)</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The snow storage area required by current Title 21 Section 21.07.040F., Snow Storage and Disposal, will still be required. The size of the required snow storage area is proportionate to the size of the parking lot surface area to be plowed. Applicants may provide extra parking spaces beyond the minimum number of required parking spaces and designate those extra spaces to be used as snow storage. Or the applicant may instead designate landscaped areas for snow storage. Developments with lower minimum parking requirements will continue to be required to identify on-site snow storage. Developments with fewer parking spaces and narrower driveways will have less paved area that needs to be plowed, and therefore need less snow storage area. <strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> No change.</td>
<td>Approved the Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Removing Minimum Off-Street Parking Requirements Consider removing Title 21 car-parking minimums entirely. By continuing to set minimum car-parking requirements for new development, the revised Title 21 Parking and Site Access Regulations still prioritize car parking over housing, businesses, or community services. This prioritization increases housing and development costs, reduces the supply of housing, limiting small businesses, and leads to a car-centric way of life in our city. Eliminating car-parking requirements would be a simpler and more effective approach than just decreasing the parking requirements. Eliminating the requirements and has been supported throughout the comment process by a broad</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The project team appreciates these comments and has heard similar from several developers and others. A growing number of North American cities are removing or severely reducing parking requirements. A combination of feedback from many participants during the public process, the analysis of local parking utilization trends and Anchorage’s urban context, and the assessment of current limitations in Anchorage’s right-of-way management capabilities have directed this amendment project toward a strategic, stepped approach; to tailor lower, area-specific parking requirements for urban neighborhoods, allow by-right site-specific parking reductions area-wide, and establish regulatory foundations for future reforms. This project carries out specific action items adopted in the Comprehensive Plan. The scope of its public process focuses on relatively easy code changes which yield significant gains for developments and the public, at low cost. The proposed code changes do not necessitate additional investments in public</td>
<td>Approved the Recommended Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Comment/Question</td>
<td>Response and Recommendation</td>
<td>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>range of Anchorage residents, from housing advocates to developers. A major argument that has been presented for maintaining car-parking minimums is that on-street parking can interfere with snow clearing. However, effective management of on-street parking (e.g., alternate-side parking, as implemented by many other winter cities) would be a more effective solution than to continue requiring off-street parking, as street management would improve the current effectiveness of snow clearing as well as preventing additional problems in the future. Eliminating car-parking minimums would make snow removal more affordable by increasing tax revenue per foot of road. In addition, while entirely removing parking requirements may seem dramatic, the revision would apply only to new development or redevelopment, not for most existing development. So changes in car-parking patterns would occur gradually, piecemeal, and in sparse locations over time. Anchorage will have time to figure out how to best manage on-street parking and snow removal. The gradual, piecemeal rate of the effects is a reason to make sure these amendments are forward-looking to reflect what our city will need decades from now in the future when the effects of these changes will finally be realized. If car-parking minimums are carried forward in the Title 21 revision, we support the proposed reductions in the minimum requirements for car parking. <em>Bike Anchorage; Donovan Camp; Emily Weter for Bike Anchorage</em></td>
<td>infrastructure or changes to municipal street management or on-street parking enforcement operations. These amendments create a regulatory framework to enable further efficiencies in parking utilization. These amendments do eliminate minimum parking requirements wherever the Municipality manages and prices on-street parking in parking benefit districts (see issues #18 and #19 below). Even outside of parking benefit districts, the proposed amendments will have significant, immediate, positive impacts. They yield a by-right parking ratio low enough to enable infill development, adaptive reuse, and redevelopment that elements of the Comprehensive Plan call for. <em>(See site examples in Attachment 6.2, slides 19-25.)</em> Most public feedback from public meetings and consultations, as documented in Attachment 6.3, supported reducing urban neighborhood parking requirements to either (a) match average peak-hour parking usage rates or (b) somewhat lower than average peak-hour parking utilization levels to allow a shift in new development toward community goals <em>(Attachment 1, page 14 of 360 in April 11 case packet).</em> Some participants called for eliminating parking requirements. Others did not support reducing or allowing by-right reductions. Even participants in urban neighborhoods like South Addition and Fairview expressed concerns about reducing parking requirements in context of unmanaged on-street parking, poor sidewalk facilities, wide driveways, snow storage, and worries that some developers would take advantage of public street space. Consultations with municipal Street Maintenance and other ROW agencies document (in Attachment 6.3) problems with removing parking requirements in context of unmanaged on-street parking, poor sidewalk facilities, wide driveways, snow storage, and worries that some developers would take advantage of public street space. Consultations with municipal Street Maintenance and other ROW agencies document (in Attachment 6.3) problems with unmanaged on-street parking, limited operational resources, zoning entitlements that allow wide driveways, balkanized ROW agency management responsibilities, and street facilities configured without space for winter snow storage or separated sidewalks. Most cities that remove parking requirements have more sidewalks, public transit, neighborhoods that predate automobiles, on-street parking enforcement, stricter controls on front yard driveways, and fewer challenges with seasonal street maintenance. Few cities have the length and severity Anchorage’s winter with snow accumulating or glaciating in freeze-thaw cycles for the duration the season. These challenges are visualized on slides 31 through 34 in Attachment 6.1. These challenges constrain how low this amendment project could propose to reduce urban neighborhood parking requirements while still having a response with operational solutions to concerns such as those raised in issue #10 above. Strategic management of public ROWs and on-street parking appears to be essential before removing off-street parking requirements. In response to the commenters at left, staff has re-examined the draft amendments for further opportunities to reduce, simplify, and support forward-looking parking regulations. Staff finds there is empirical and forecast data in Attachment 6.3 (Section 1), adopted policies, and documented public feedback to support adjusting the area-specific parking requirements. First, parking utilization data and forecasts indicate that the proposed area-specific residential parking requirements could be decreased 5-10%. This would reflect public support to walk the Commission through these further decreases. The verbal summary the Commission received in response referenced Tables 1-7 and 1-8 on page 16 of Attachment 6.3: Background Research, which summarized the analytical findings supporting the further decreases. Staff’s summary also discussed how the decreases respond to feedback from the public process advocating the project objective to create forward-looking parking requirements that reflect the city’s future needs. A commissioner noted that Title 21 currently also has a maximum parking requirement—set to 125% of the minimum parking requirement—and asked for and received from staff assurance that the lower parking requirements in Table 21.07-7 would avoid the unintended consequence of also reducing the maximum allowed parking for businesses in...</td>
<td>to walk the Commission through these further decreases. The verbal summary the Commission received in response referenced Tables 1-7 and 1-8 on page 16 of Attachment 6.3: Background Research, which summarized the analytical findings supporting the further decreases. Staff’s summary also discussed how the decreases respond to feedback from the public process advocating the project objective to create forward-looking parking requirements that reflect the city’s future needs. A commissioner noted that Title 21 currently also has a maximum parking requirement—set to 125% of the minimum parking requirement—and asked for and received from staff assurance that the lower parking requirements in Table 21.07-7 would avoid the unintended consequence of also reducing the maximum allowed parking for businesses in...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recent personal experience moving to Anchorage and finding housing, I looked for a year before finding an affordable place by chance. My experience is not unique, as an article published in tonight's Alaska Public Media about the housing market documents. Had there never been parking minimums there might be more housing available and my long search would not have occurred. If we remove minimum parking requirements, we will still have parking—but that which is determined by the real estate professionals and businesses that are building on our finite land.  

(S Steven Bridwell)

I support the public hearing draft recommendations to reduce and, in some cases, eliminate the parking requirements, and the idea of going further by eliminating parking requirements. I support the overall goals of the amendments as stated in the materials. Within my neighborhood of Spenard and in other neighborhoods, citizens have been working hard to create neighborhoods that are easier to navigate on foot, with transit, or by bicycle. In Spenard we are working to promote reinvestment and redevelopment. I want to see people-focused instead of car-focused developments in my neighborhood.

Much of Spenard is along a Transit-Supportive Development Corridor, where we seek less single-occupancy vehicle use by promoting alternatives. Reducing parking requirements encourages people to use other forms of transportation and reduces the footprint of parking lots. As a result parking will not go away, but it will better meet the needs of the property and the community. These changes support a more resilient community in the face of climate change, and since they will take effect over a long period of time it is important to start making them now.  

(L Lindsey Hajduk)

To acknowledge all the testimony the Commission has heard asking to do away with off-street parking minimums, I would like to enable the Planning Department to continue moving in for forward-looking requirements that reflect forecast parking utilization. South Addition’s residential parking requirement could also be decreased to match the rest of the Traditional Urban Neighborhood. Secondly, non-residential parking requirements could be decreased in the Traditional Urban and Edge Urban Neighborhoods. The Fairview Neighborhood Plan and Spenard Corridor Plan envision reducing and eliminating parking requirements in their mixed-use corridors. Attachment 6.3: Background Research (Section 1) provides the analysis and references public feedback. These changes could simplify the parking requirements for all development in the urban neighborhood contexts in Table 21.07-7 to the following:

- Traditional Urban Neighborhoods: 65% of the area-wide parking requirement
- Edge Urban Neighborhoods: 75% of the area-wide parking requirement
- Transit-Supportive Corridors: 90% of the area-wide parking requirement

RECOMMENDATION: Amend proposed subsection 21.07.090E.2., Table 21.07-7 (Page 27, lines 10-14, in Attachment 3) as follows:

**TABLE 21.07-7: AREA-SPECIFIC PARKING REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Minimum Spaces Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown (DT) zoning districts</td>
<td>All Developments</td>
<td>No off-street parking is required, as provided in 21.11.070F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Urban Neighborhood Context (Section 21.07.015D., Map 21.07-1.)</td>
<td>All Developments</td>
<td>65% of the minimum spaces required in table 21.07-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Urban Neighborhood Context (Section 21.07.015D., Maps 21.07-1 thru -3.)</td>
<td>All Developments</td>
<td>75% of the minimum spaces required in table 21.07-8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** *** *** (No further changes)
## Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 17.    | Additional Information Resources Regarding Reforming Minimum Off-street Parking Requirements. | Footnote 7 on page 15 of the April 11 staff report memorandum for this case references some articles on www.planning.org, the website of the American Planning Association. The reference is made from a statement in the staff memorandum indicating there is a growing number of reports, articles, and other information from the American Planning Association and other organizations regarding the problems with off-street minimum parking requirements. However, it looks like an account is required to retrieve the articles. Does the public and Planning and Zoning Commission have access to an account or, alternatively, can the Planning Department make available particularly relevant articles contemplated by the footnote? (Commissioner Gardner) | **Response:** The referenced web page highlights four resources:  
- Two are PDF articles that are provided in Attachment 6.3: Research (Appendices).  
- The third resource is a web article that should be accessible at https://www.planning.org/planning/2021/winter/3-zoning-changes-that-make-residential-neighborhoods-more-affordable/.  
- The fourth resource is a webinar called “From the Trenches: Abolishing Parking Minimums” that costs $15 or $30 depending on APA membership status. A free (no cost) alternative/equivalent webinar is “Parking Reform Made Easy,” which may be accessible at either https://smartgrowth.org/parking-reform-made-easy/ or https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tRXk9JEjwH8.  
**RECOMMENDATION:** No change. | Approved the Recommendation |
<p>| 18.    | Clarification of the Creation of On-Street Parking Management Districts.         | The proposed Open Option Parking District (21.07.090E.7.) may need modifications to other municipal code sections, such as Title 9, to develop a more comprehensive process of establishing and defining a district within the Municipality, identifying the responsible agency for managing and enforcing | <strong>Response:</strong> As discussed on pages 15 and 16 of the April 11 staff report memorandum, staff reevaluated the public hearing draft Open Option Parking District in 21.07.090E.7, and determined that changes should be made to clarify the code amendments. The public hearing draft provisions in 21.07.090E.7, for establishing new parking districts should be moved to AMC Title 9, Traffic. Instead of creating new regulations in Title 21 to manage street rights-of-way, it is better to revise and improve the street management regulations that already exist in Title 9. For more information, see pages 15 and 16 of the April 11 staff report memorandum. | Approved the Recommendation to Move Forward with Recommended Amendments #1 and #2 in Staff Report Memorandum |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Timing of Amending Title 9 On-Street Parking Management Regulations. The April 11 staff memorandum recommended edit #2 (page 18) regarding amending Title 9 to create on-street parking management districts, does not seem to have enough teeth. The second sentence, which states that, &quot;The Planning Department should work with other municipal departments to prepare the Title 9 amendment text for Assembly review and action...&quot;</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Title 21 off-street parking amendments and Title 9 parking district amendments are independent of each other. There is no harm in moving forward with adopting the draft Title 21 amendments, before a Title 9 amendment is completed. The Title 21 amendments provide significant public benefit on their own. Parking management districts can help build the institutional capacity to manage and enforce parking in more public ROWs. If the community aspires to eliminate off-street parking requirements, it should first figure out appropriate street design, on-street parking management, and ROW maintenance/management. Agencies like EasyPark (ACDA) would be candidate institutions for running manage on-street parking districts.</td>
<td><strong>Approved the Recommendation to Move Forward with Recommended Amendment #3 in Staff Memorandum, per April 11 PZC Deliberations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

regulations within these specific districts, and determining the cost and impact to operations and management of street maintenance due to implementing these proposed parking reduction strategies. *(MOA Traffic Engineering)*

Clarify the proposed one new district that would eliminate required off-street parking, the Open Option Parking District. Its proposed Section 21.07.090E.7 establishes two options for creating an Open Option Parking District. However, the process does not clearly identify the conditions for approval. It is unclear how on-street parking would be managed and/or enforced in these Open Option Parking Districts, including measures for street maintenance and snow removal. The amendments to Section 21.07.090E7 should include specific criteria that would be used to evaluate the adequacy of the on-street parking management and ROW maintenance plans. *(University Area Community Council)*

The most effective strategy is to make it more expensive and less convenient to own or drive a car, prohibit on-street parking, and provide higher levels of public transit service. For example, off Pembroke Street(?) there is a PUD where residents shut down Pembroke because residents parking their cars on the road instead of parking in garages and driveways. *(Marc Grober)*

RECOMMENDATION: Move forward with the recommended additional amendments #1 and #2 on pages 17 and 18 of the April 11 staff report memorandum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>could be strengthened by changing the word &quot;should&quot; to &quot;shall.&quot; (Commissioner Raun, April 11 PZC meeting)</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION: Move forward with the recommended additional amendments #1 and #2 on pages 17 and 18 of the April 11 staff report memorandum, per the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) deliberations at the April 11 PZC meeting. Note: The Commission’s deliberations at the April 11 PZC meeting supported the following tracked changes edits to amendment #2 on page 18 of the staff report memorandum: 2. Replace the Open Option Parking District content of the deleted proposed subsections 21.07.090E.7.a. through e. with a proposed amendment to AMC Title 9 modifying existing parking permit district to accommodate a new kind of street/parking management district called a parking benefit district. The Planning Department shall[SHOULD] work with other municipal agencies to prepare the Title 9 amendment text for Assembly review and action as a separate ordinance alongside the Title 21 Parking and Site Access Amendments ordinance recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The Planning Department should also move forward with an evaluation of the removal of off-street parking minimums. The Title 9 amendment should address:  - A clear public approval process for creating parking benefit districts.  - An available supply of on-street public parking in the parking benefit district.  - Enforcement of time limits, fees, and no-parking periods (such as for plowing).  - Drivers paying market prices for use of parking spaces, such as through permits.  - Prices that vary and are adjusted as needed to produce a target occupancy rate.  - Parking revenues paying for on-street parking management and enforcement.  - Reinvestment of any excess revenue directly back into the parking district neighborhood for public services such as improving streets and sidewalks, planting street trees or snow storage spaces, or clearing snow from sidewalks.</td>
<td>Note: The PZC deliberations at the April 11 PZC meeting included recommending to modify the language in amendment #2 on page 18 of the April 11 staff memorandum to include more directive language for the municipal departments to work together on an amendment to Title 9 and to add a sentence that the Planning Department should move forward with an evaluation of the removal of off-street parking minimums. The PZC’s April 11 modifications to the language in amendment #2 is provided in tracked changes at left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since Title 9 is not under the purview of PZC, is PZC just recommending that the Title 9 amendment process be put into place so that those change in Title 9 can be made? My concern is that in the meantime until Title 9 is amended to provide on street parking management that there will be on-street parking problems. What is going on with management of the public street ROW? Some areas that either TCC or the public hearing draft urban neighborhoods are already under-parked, the street infrastructure is not up to current code, and there is no on-street parking enforcement. Curb spaces are being rented by property owners for vans and motor homes, and other cars are abandoned in street. Is Planning Department discussing the on-street parking management problem with the municipal ROW agencies? What organization would be responsible for operating a parking management district, would it be like a LRSA Board or a Community Council? (Commissioner Spinelli, April 11 work session) If the parking management district is an important part of the equation for reducing or eliminating parking requirements, then why is the parking management district part of all this not as evolved as the rest of the draft Title 21 amendments? Do we need to act on Title 21 amendments before the Title 9 parking management districts are realized, or should one wait for the other? (Commissioner Raun, April 11 work session) The adoption of the proposed code changes to Title 21 should be delayed to assess the needed companion Title 9 changes to on-street parking management and enforcement regulations, among other reasons. Or the companion amendments to Title 9 should get underway now to reduce the duration of unresolved on-street parking problems. The concern is about when, and if,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These companion changes to the code will occur, and what sort of parking problems will be created by the proposed Title 21 text amendments to parking and site access standards in the meantime. <em>(Turnagain Community Council)</em> TCC is concerned that the proposed amendments to Title 9 to improve Anchorage's on-street parking management are not being prepared concurrently with the Title 21 parking amendments and encourages the Title 9 amendments to be done concurrently. <em>(Cathy Gleason for Turnagain Community Council)</em></td>
<td>Staff appreciates the comments of support. These comments are consistent with feedback in staff heard at public meetings and consultations support of improving pedestrian facilities. <strong>RECOMMENDATIONS:</strong> No changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part D: Improved Site Access for Pedestrians and Bicyclists

20. **General Support for Pedestrian Provisions.**

Traffic Engineering concurs with the proposed amendments that support non-motorized modes of transportation. These amendments will provide greater assurance that developments have all required amenities to support these alternative transportation strategies. *(Traffic Engineering Department)*

Bike Anchorage strongly supports the proposed code changes to increase the baseline requirements for bike parking in new development, require secure parking for long-term bike storage, and ensure usability of bike parking facilities, as well as the option to replace required car-parking with additional bike parking. *(Bike Anchorage)*

Support for the proposed updates that clarify and consolidate design standards for sidewalks and on-site pedestrian walkways, increasing bicycle parking space requirements. *(Anchorage Public Transit Advisory Board)*

The bicycle parking requirement changes are exciting, and I look forward to implementing them. *(Connor Scher)*

**Response:** Staff appreciates the comments of support. These comments are consistent with feedback in staff heard at public meetings and consultations support of improving pedestrian facilities.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** No changes.

**Approved the Recommendation**
Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 21.    | **Maximum Front Setbacks.**  
Table 21.07-2 sets the proposed Pedestrian Frontage Standards for Traditional Urban Neighborhood Contexts including South Addition. The maximum setback in the table is a tenuous concept for South Addition, for several reasons. It does not provide specific exemptions for properties. It does not address existing, older residential buildings that may be remodeled. It does not address lots that are located along the Chester Creek bluff in South Addition and Fairview, especially lots without alley access. Similar cliff conditions exist in Mountain View and Government Hill as well. The lots in Traditional Urban Neighborhoods are smaller and need to allow the designers to use their best judgment to locate buildings on the lot. For example, a west or south facing frontage may want to pull the building back all the way towards the back where garage access exists from the alley. Such building can still have “eyes on the street” (i.e., street-facing windows, entries) and living spaces) even if it is set back farther. The most important feature to avoid on the street is large garage frontages. (South Addition Community Council Planning Subcommittee)  
Will a porch, stoop, or landing sheltered by a roof count towards meeting the maximum front setback requirements?  
Will the porch be allowed to project into the minimum front setback?  (Connor Scher) | No objection to removing the maximum setback from the low- to medium-density residential zoning districts. The maximum setback is more important in the urban commercial districts, mixed-use corridors, and high-density R-4 residential district. (Maximum setbacks in the R-4A district are addressed in the R-4A district-specific standards.) The proposed maximum setbacks are carried over from current code for mixed-use development in the commercial districts, as well as from the current Title 21 approval criteria for area-specific parking reductions. Fairview Community Council in consultations emphasized that buildings should be required to be set close to the street, as called for in the *Fairview Neighborhood Plan*. The *Spenard Corridor Plan* also calls for pedestrian-oriented building placement.  
Maximum setback regulations in Title 21 address existing buildings. The general provisions for maximum setbacks in Section 21.06.030C.5. recognize that existing buildings may remain legally out of compliance. The maximum front setback applies to the building elevation wall. Covered entry porches but not stoops or landings may also count toward meeting a maximum front setback. Because the maximum front setback is 10 to 20 feet larger than the minimum front setback and applies to no more than 50% of the building façade width, there is plenty of space between the max. and min. to avoid a “catch-22” situation for front stoops.  
**RECOMMENDATION:** Amend Section 21.07.060F.3, Table 21.07-2 (page 14 of Attachment 3), in row “A,” and delete footnote 4, as shown below. (Also delete the references to footnote 4 from rows B and G.) | Approved the Recommended Changes  
Commissioners requested an overview of how maximum setbacks are changing, and of the issue-response. Does limiting them to just the R-4 and commercial zones in older urban neighborhoods make it restrictive for a small number of neighborhoods, and not effective overall?  
Commissioners asked if a maximum setback creates an unusable front yard open space, which would be a concern on small R-4 lots.  
Commissioners did not believe they had enough information to decide the appropriate area of applicability and discussed a finding. |
| 22.    | **Bike Parking Requirements for Existing Developments and Changes of Use.**  
Bike Anchorage supports the proposed changes to Title 21 that will increase availability of bicycle parking, including secure long-stem parking. However, because the revised requirements would apply only to new development, the availability of bike parking will increase slowly and may not be balanced across | A requirement for bike parking in Title 21 ensures that future developments will consistently add bike parking. Not all property owners would take advantage of grant funding or tax exemptions for bike parking facilities to build the bike parking if there was no Title 21 requirement.  
Bicycle parking requirements for changes of use or building expansions on existing sites will apply the same way that automobile parking requirements apply to such developments. Per Title 21 section 21.13.060B., *Parking Out of Compliance*, if a change of use or a building expansion does not result in an increase in the bike parking requirement, then no new bike spaces will be required, provided the lot has legal nonconforming | Approved the Recommended Changes |

---

Table 21.07-2: Pedestrian Frontage Standard for Urban Neighborhood Contexts and Parking Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building and Parking Placement</th>
<th>Primary Frontage</th>
<th>Secondary Frontage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Maximum front setback (ground-floor only) in the R-4 and non-residential zoning districts</td>
<td>30 feet in Traditional Urban, and 60 feet in other areas</td>
<td>90 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* DEVELOPMENT IN THE R-4A ZONING DISTRICT IS EXEMPT FROM THE MAXIMUM SETBACK RELATED STANDARDS A, B, AND G.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 23.   | **Requiring at least Two Short-Term Bike Parking Spaces.** Add a minimum requirement for outdoor (non-secure) bike parking. For development where most parking is required to be secure (e.g., multifamily housing), it may become more cost-effective to implement the full bike-parking requirement as secure parking. However, limited-access parking would not be available to guests or customers, or residents making a quick stop at home. Requiring a minimum of 2 bike parking spaces outdoors (unsecured) per developed property would provide the best flexibility for all those traveling by bike. *(Bike Anchorage)* | **Response:** No objection to the commenter’s suggestion or rationale. The AMATS Nonmotorized Transportation Plan supports ensuring that developments include accessible short-term bike parking (e.g., a U-rack outside a main building entrance) for building and site visitors, customers, and others who intend only a brief stay.

Some cities specify a portion of required bike parking be short-term spaces *(Attachment 6.3, Section 3).*

**Short-term spaces are generally not required for industrial uses or for residential 3- or 4-plexes.**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Amend section 21.07.090K.1.a. *(page 62, line 13, in Attachment 3)* as follows:

a. A minimum of two bicycle parking spaces shall be provided for each use in Table 21.07-14. For commercial and community uses, group living uses with 10 or more beds, and household living uses with 10 or more dwellings, the two spaces shall be located outdoors and publicly accessible for customers and short-term visitors. | Approved the Recommended Change

A commissioner asked for clarification on what “non-secure” means in the left column, what is considered, “secure,” and discussed labelling the 2 required outdoor bike spaces as “seasonal,” to be removable in winter, as many buildings do today. |

---

the city. Directly funding bicycle parking would be more effective than making bike parking a part of the complex car-parking regulations. Funding would encourage developers to add bike parking to current development. *(Bike Anchorage)*

Traffic Engineering supports the changes to the bicycle parking requirements which address both long and short terms needs for non-motorized users. Traffic Engineering has some concerns on how this will be implemented and managed on some developments that are changing the use but are modifying only the building and not the site. An example of this would be a change of use with strip mall type developments where the new use will trigger improvements, but the site has inadequate space to support the requirement. *(MOA Traffic Engineering)*

A bike space is easier to add to an existing site than a car parking space. Proposed section 21.07.090K.3., *Administrative Adjustments* *(page 63, line 15 in Attachment 3)* provides relief if adding a bike space is a practical difficulty on an existing site. This administrative relief provision could be clarified. *(See below.)*

**RECOMMENDATION:**

a. Amend the first sentence in Section 21.07.090B.2. *(page 24, lines 12-13, in Attachment 3)* as follows:

2. **Expansions, Relocations, and Enlargements**

*A site to which a building is relocated shall provide required parking and loading spaces per tables 21.07-7, 21.07-8, [and 21.07-11] and 21.07-14.*

b. Amend Section 21.07.090K.3. *(page 63, line 15, in Attachment 3)* as follows:

3. **Administrative Adjustments**

*The director may approve administrative relief or adjustments to the bicycle parking requirement for changes of use or modifications to existing developments, provided the applicant demonstrates the adjustment is necessary to compensate for a practical difficulty of the site. The department shall keep record of the approved adjustment with written findings supporting the adjustment on file and available for public inspection.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Effectiveness of Required Bike Parking Facilities for Increasing Bicycling.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The Title 21 amendments seek to provide reasonable bicycle parking accommodation without excessive cost, and U-racks meet this objective. The priority is to ensure access to a variety of modes of transportation. Beyond that it is impossible to eliminate all risk of loss of personal property. Although secure compartments within a secure bike storage room and/or video surveillance monitoring could be encouraged, it would be difficult to enforce continued maintenance and operation of security cameras or personnel. Staff reexamined the draft bicycle parking design standards for security, accessibility, and usability, using information from field visits, and other experts, relative to bikes commonly used for commuting in Anchorage and the practicality of getting a bicycle into and out of a space, or fitting the bike in the space. The staff found that several of the draft design standards should be adjusted. A field visit to a local bicycle store provided information on real-world conditions; The store hangs bikes vertically with wall hooks spaced about 19 inches apart with a 12-inch vertical stagger, placed at 6’ 5” or 7’ 5” height on the wall. <strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> Amend proposed subsection 21.07.090K.4.c. as follows:</td>
<td>Approved the Recommended Changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **c.** A required bicycle parking space shall be a minimum of six feet long and two feet wide, with the following exceptions:
  - **i.** Vertical bicycle parking spaces (securing the bicycle perpendicular to the ground) shall be a minimum of three feet six inches deep measured from the wall and six feet six inches tall. Vertical parking spaces placed side-by-side shall be a minimum of one foot six inches wide, with a vertical stagger of one foot (EIGHT INCHES) between side-by-side spaces, as shown in the first set of figures below.

***     ***    ***

**Dimensions for Horizontal/ Side-by-Side and Vertical/ Wall-Mounted Bicycle Spaces:** *(Note to PZC: The two figures below include changes to the dimensional standards from the public hearing draft figures. No other figures from the public hearing draft are changed.)*

![Bicycle parking spaces diagram](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25.    | **Long-Term Bike Spaces Located inside Dwelling Units.** Do not allow in-dwelling parking to count toward the parking minimum in 21.07.090K4.g.ii. (page 65, lines 27-32, in Attachment 3). Residents will likely prefer to use space inside a dwelling unit as living space or to store other belongings and may not want to deal with the mess or hassle of moving a bike. | **Response:** In reexamining this issue, staff mostly agrees. Requirements for long-term bike parking should:  
- Ensure that residents in all dwelling units will have access to the bike parking in a secure, accessible room or enclosure.  
- Accommodate bicyclists who prefer to park their bikes in a secure common bike parking room outside the dwelling unit, understanding that the most bicyclists who prefer to store their bikes in their dwelling will do so anyway, with or without a designated alcove space. | **Approved the Recommended Changes** |

**d.** Bicycle parking spaces shall be designed so that the bicycle may be added or removed without having to move another bicycle.

i. There shall be a minimum of five feet of clear space inclusive of a walkway, behind the [TWO-BY-SIX-FOOT (OR ALTERNATIVE DIMENSIONED)] parking space to allow room for bicycle maneuvering.

ii. There shall be a minimum of two-foot six-inch clearance from all sides of the bicycle rack to walls, fences, curbs, and vehicle parking and circulation areas, or other obstructions, except [THAT] for racks provided in iii.

iii. Horizontal bike parking spaces (securing the bicycle horizontal to the ground) with racks attached to walls shall have a minimum one-foot clearance from the rack to the wall, as shown in the second figure below. Vertical and stacked spaces have no required wall clearance.

*(Note to PZC: The right-hand figure below is proposed to be added. It was not in the public hearing draft. The left-hand figure is in the public hearing draft and is not changed.)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        | indoors after every use. Instead, requiring bike parking to be provided in a dedicated communal space will make it most usable and accessible for most residents. In-dwelling bike storage could be provided but should not count toward the bike parking minimum requirement. *(Bike Anchorage)* | - Ensure that all long-term bike parking is in an accessible location without need to navigate stairs. In-dwelling bicycle parking is a challenging issue. It is often awkwardly located and easily removed by building managers. Many people end up storing other belongings in the in-dwelling designated bike space. Many people prefer to park their bikes in a secure bicycle parking room when they have a choice. Common, dedicated, secure bike rooms or enclosures are more likely to remain utilized for bike parking. Common use parking areas allow more efficient use of the pool of bike parking spaces, because when a space is not being used by one resident, it is available for use by another. As a result, most cities do not allow required bicycle parking spaces to be located within an apartment unit or on a unit’s balcony. The public hearing draft provision to allow required bike spaces within the dwelling unit living space was intended to provide flexibility, accommodate different user preferences, and reduce development costs. However, because the public hearing draft requires only one bike space per two dwelling units at best, there will not be enough bike spaces for in-dwelling bike spaces to be distributed fairly. The residents of the units without bike spaces will not have access to bike parking at all. Developments up to a four-plex in size can probably get by with in-dwelling bike parking and no common bike room, without taking away from what bike parking other residents will have available—but only if each unit has at least one in-dwelling bike space, and there are standards that ensure the designated bike space is functional, including a bike rack for holding the bicycle. **RECOMMENDATION:** Amend Section 21.07.090K.4.g.ii. (page 65, lines 27-32, in Attachment 3) as follows:  
ii. Long-term bicycle parking spaces shall be located where bicyclists are not required to carry bicycles on stairs to access the parking.  
iii. Long-term bicycle parking spaces for residential uses with fewer than five dwellings may be located within dwelling units, provided each dwelling unit has at least one bike parking space *(FOR FIRST-FLOOR DWELLING UNITS ONLY UNLESS THE UNIT IS ON A FLOOR WITH AN ACCESSIBLE ELEVATOR).* Bicycle parking in the dwelling shall be located within 15 feet of the dwelling’s primary entrance and in a closet or three-sided alcove which includes a rack and meets the development standards of this subsection 21.07.090K.4. *(ALLOWS A SPACE 2 FEET WIDE AND 6 FEET LONG).* Long-term spaces shall not be located on a balcony, deck, or patio area accessory to an individual dwelling unit. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Bicycle Parking Access Route. What does a &quot;bicycle parking access route&quot; look like on the parking facility layout and design plan, in section 21.07.090D.2.b.xii. (Page 26, lines 27-28, in Attachment 3)? What are its development standards? The section makes it seem like these need to be painted or separated, which should not be necessary. Is the intent in Title 21 is to have the bicyclist remain in the vehicle circulation lane as they enter the property and find the bicycle parking, or is it to have the bicyclist move onto the site's pedestrian circulation system?</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The intent of “bicycle parking access routes” mentioned in 21.07.090D.2.b.xii. would be that a bicycle parking access route is the same as any accessible walkway, and that cyclists and pedestrians may mix around destinations. There shouldn’t be any need for additional striping or delineation. Therefore, the public hearing draft addition of “bicycle parking access route” in the submittal requirements in 21.07.090D.2.b.xii. is probably unnecessary and confusing and could be deleted. Staff recommends retaining the standard for an accessible pedestrian route from the bike parking to the primary entrance in section 21.07.0909K.4.a. (page 63, lines 24-27, in Attachment 3), to reduce barriers for all bicycle users including both those able to walk or carry belongings up flights of stairs and those who cannot. Accessibility standards should serve both those with mobility needs who are able to drive and those with mobility needs who are not able to drive.</td>
<td>Approved the Recommended Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the intent of section 21.07.0909K.4.a. to have the bicycle parking on an accessible pedestrian route? Bike parking should not need to be on an accessible (ADA) pedestrian route to the building entrance. This has a specific definition in the Building Code and may become a hindrance to some development. Most people who bicycle do not have accessibility issues and could navigate stairs.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> No other changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part E: Reforms to Driveway Standards

| 27.   | Driveway Width and Alley Access in Traditional Urban Neighborhoods. SACC has expressed its concerns regarding how its neighborhood character relates to the regulation of driveways. There have been problems with developments that have been granted wide front driveways that access double-wide garages that take up the frontage of the redeveloped lots, instead of providing driveway access from the alley. Such developments have completely changed the streetscape and character of their area. The proposed amendments make improvements to existing code under 21.07.090H.9.b.ii. especially by setting a | **Response:** Staff acknowledges the importance of requiring site access to be from the rear alley in the Traditional Urban Neighborhoods. Fairview Community Council has also emphasized the need for alley access and to prohibit driveways from breaking up block frontages. Driveways take away from on-street parking, street snow storage, separated sidewalks, and the ability to reduce off-street parking requirements. No objection to tightening up the entitlement for a second driveway on the secondary street frontage of corner lots (Subsections 21.07.090H.9.b.i. and ii., page 52, lines 15-19, in Attachment 3). The provisions could clarify that the second driveway be no wider than 12 feet, and that the entitlement is for multi-unit development (i.e., more than just a homeowner who wants two driveways to their house). The administrative relief provision in 21.07.090H.9.b.iii. (page 52, lines 20-26, in Attachment 3) revises the current Title 21 alley access exception (in 21.07.110F.4., being deleted on page 78 of Attachment 3). Title 21 | Approved the Recommended Changes |

PZC Case 2022-0026: Title 21 Parking and Site Access Amendments
Municipality of Anchorage Planning Department. June 21, 2022
## Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maximum 12-foot width for front driveways in Traditional Urban Neighborhoods. However, it does not make sense to allow wider than 12-foot driveways on both frontages on a corner lot. Both frontages area on a street and have the same neighborhood character issue. In addition, the proposed inclusion of the exception to the alley access requirement in traditional urban neighborhoods (in 21.07.090H.9.b.iii.) ignores the issue that SACC has been raising for years. This exception relies on the discretion of the municipal Traffic Engineer to allow projects to deviate from the proposed rules for properties that have alley access but choose to pursue an alternative driveway configuration from the street for any reason. SACC committee recommends there be a higher bar by requiring a public process, like a Variance. There should be no circumstance where a multi-family or townhouse development in South Addition is exempted from alley access or driveway width requirements, except that perhaps in the R-3 or R-4 districts such exemption could be more easily warranted. (South Addition Community Council Planning Subcommittee)</td>
<td>gives the Traffic Engineer administrative authority to grant exceptions where the alley is unimproved, unmaintained, or physically inaccessible, or if use of the alley would create a traffic hazard on the streets. (For reference, the Title 21 definition for “alley” is provided on page 82, line 4, in Attachment 3. A 20-foot-wide right-of-way meeting this definition is generally considered to be an alley instead of a street.) The public hearing draft amendment tightens up the administrative relief provision. It restricts availability to multifamily and townhouse developments because homes and duplexes can more easily use a single 12-foot-wide front driveway. It clarifies that the alley must be unmaintained or impassable AND the Traffic Engineer determines that improvement and vehicle access is not feasible. This change prioritizes alley access in urban neighborhoods. The draft provision could be made clearer by adding wording to explain that “unimproved” means unbuilt (e.g., still vegetated) and does not refer to the unpaved gravel alleys that are in use. The commenter advocates for using Variance process instead to provide transparency, public input, and stronger approval criteria. The commenter opposes the neighborhood impacts of allowing a low bar for relief just for an occasional exception in the Traditional Urban Context Area. However, the proposed amendments tighten up the exception limiting it to multifamily projects on impassable alleys. Requiring a Variance just to recognize that an alley is impassable and unbuildable seems like an unnecessary level of process and a barrier for infill projects. However, a requirement for documentation of the administrative approval would improve transparency. Staff has also found another administrative approval from pedestrian-oriented frontage standards, in public hearing draft section 21.07.060F., Pedestrian Frontage Standard, that would similarly benefit from documentation, per recommendation a. below. <strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> Amend the public hearing draft as follows: a. Amend 21.07.060F.2.f. (page 13, lines 35-36, in Attachment 3) as follows: f. The director shall approve administrative relief provided the applicant demonstrates it is necessary to compensate for some practical difficulty of the site. The department shall keep record of the approved exception with written findings supporting the approval on file. b. Amend 21.07.090H.9.b. (page 52, lines 11-26, in Attachment 3) as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item #  
#### Comment/Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td><strong>Alley Access Requirement (in Urban Neighborhood Context Areas)</strong> Where a residential use is served by an alley in a Traditional Urban or Edge Urban Neighborhood Context (21.07.015), direct vehicle access to the street shall be limited to the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td><strong>[DRIVEWAY ACCESS TO THE SECONDARY STREET FRONTAGE ON CORNER LOTS, PROVIDED THE DRIVEWAY IS NOT LOCATED WITHIN THE PRIMARY FRONT SETBACK]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[II.]</td>
<td>Residential driveway access <strong>[TO THE PRIMARY STREET FRONTAGE]</strong> not exceeding one driveway no wider than 12 feet at any point <strong>[THAT 12 FEET]</strong>, except that lot frontages 100 feet or wider on a primary street frontage may have one driveway per 50 feet of lot frontage on that street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>One additional driveway no wider than 12 feet providing access to the secondary street frontage on corner lots for multifamily, townhouse, or two-family developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Additional driveway access to the primary street frontage for multifamily or townhouse developments may be allowed if the alley is unimproved <strong>[i.e., vegetated, no built accessway]</strong>, unmaintained, or <strong>[PHYSICALLY] inaccessible</strong>, and the traffic engineer determines that improvement and vehicle access is not feasible, or that use of the alley for access would create a substantial traffic impact or safety hazard. The additional driveway access shall be the minimum the traffic engineer determines is necessary to provide access for the development. The Planning Department shall keep record of the approved additional driveway access with written findings supporting the approval on file and available for public inspection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Comment/Question</td>
<td>Response and Recommendation</td>
<td>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allowing Compact-Car-Only Parking Spaces in Traditional Urban Neighborhoods.</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Consider including Traditional Neighborhood Context Areas in the entitlement for up to 30% of parking spaces to be &quot;Compact&quot; size parking spaces. <em>(Connor Scher)</em></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The draft Title 21 amendments reformat and carry forward the current Title 21 provision for compact-car-only spaces in Downtown Anchorage. The compact space entitlement is limited to Downtown and dates from the 1970s. The amendments avoid expanding the entitlement for compact spaces because of problems with modern-size vehicles and enforcement of the compact-only rules, as reported by ACDA.&lt;br/&gt;<em>The Dimensions of Parking</em> (5th Ed., 2010) by the Urban Land Institute (ULI) establishes recommendations for parking geometrics, including for smaller-than-standard parking spaces. ULI recommends against installing compact-car-only spaces. When the small-vehicle-only parking space was introduced in the 1970s, the car fleet consisted of very large and very small cars, and the &quot;compact only&quot; rule was self-enforcing. Since then, however, the size of smaller vehicles has increased, and some of the medium-size vehicles has decreased. The boundary between small and large cars has blurred and more large cars can be shoe-horned into compact spaces. Larger vehicles parked in compact spaces sometimes encroach into the adjacent spaces, which negates the improved efficiency offered by compact-car-only spaces.&lt;br/&gt;<strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> No change.</td>
<td>Approved the Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allow Historic Landmarks to Have Small Parking Spaces.</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Consider allowing a historic Landmark property to use the &quot;Small&quot; parking space dimensions, like in the Downtown zoning districts and Traditional Neighborhood areas. The intent of the Anchorage Local Landmarks Register is to protect and encourage use of historic properties. Even historic properties located outside Downtown and the traditional urban neighborhoods have small parking lots that do not easily accommodate the &quot;Standard&quot; parking space size. Many of these older properties have had their parking areas reduced over time with the widening of road rights-of-way. The smaller parking space dimensions would allow their parking areas to function safely. Requiring such spaces to be Landmarks would highlight the Local Landmarks Register. <em>(Connor Scher)</em></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> No objection to allowing historic properties on the Municipality’s Local Landmarks Register to use the “Small” parking space and aisle dimensions. Before the current Title 21 standard parking space dimensions were established in the late 1970s, most developments used a smaller parking space dimension. As a result, properties eligible for listing on local, state, or national historic registers tend to have grandfathered, legally nonconforming parking space sizes.&lt;br/&gt;<strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> Amend proposed subsection 21.07.090H.12.a., (page 58, after line 31, in Attachment 3), by adding a subsection iii. just above Table 21.07-13, to read as follows:&lt;br/&gt;iii. Any use that involves the preservation of a landmark listed in the Anchorage local landmarks register may also meet the SMALL parking space and aisle dimensions in table 21.07-13.</td>
<td>Approved the Recommended Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Reducing the Minimum Standard Parking Space Length. In Table 21.07-13, reduce the Standard 90-degree parking space depth to 19’0” and track that change down through the other angles (75, 60, and 45 degrees) for the Standard parking space size. For example, the City of Homer requires a 9-foot by 19-foot parking space size (essentially), and this is adequate for most cars. Further down in the table, parallel parking spaces are 9-feet by 23 feet, which accommodates 19 feet plus 4 feet for maneuvering, so it seems logical to change the Standard 90-degree parking space depth to 19 feet. Later in the section, the proposed tandem parking space depth is 38 feet, which is twice 19 feet. (Connor Scher)</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> No objection to reducing the minimum length to 19 feet—at least in the urban contexts, where space is at a premium and the Comprehensive Plan calls for compact, pedestrian-oriented redevelopment. Engineering publications and zoning codes historically recommended an 18-foot parking stall length. The 18-foot standard was based on the dimensions of design vehicles, such as the Ford Expedition, a large SUV which was 17 feet, 3 inches long in the 2010 model year. Research of three dozen zoning ordinances finds that most cities (including Fairbanks, AK) have a minimum standard parking stall length of 18 feet or less. Only two of the cities require a 20-foot stall, and two others (including Homer, AK) require a 19-foot stall. Vehicle sizes have grown since most of these standards were written. According to a J.D. Power website, the average new large pickup is 18 feet 4 inches long. The 2022 Ford Expedition SUV is 18 feet 6 inches long. Even a 19-foot minimum stall length would leave less-than-optimal extra space for large vehicles. It would result in more vehicles overhanging into the drive aisle, particularly in the wintertime. On the other hand, a 19-foot minimum length would provide ample space for most of the automobile fleet. Medium-size SUVs and small-to-medium-size pickups range from 15 to 17 feet in length. The extra foot for 20-foot spaces comes at a cost, as the Urban Land Institute states: Parking ordinances that require excessively generous parking geometrics waste land and other resources, and stymie development. Such ordinances are also often in conflict with other community goals, such as green space and reducing stormwater runoff. (<a href="https://www.urbanlandinstitute.org">The Dimensions of Parking, ULI, 5th Ed., page 64</a>) Choosing a 19-foot or 20-foot minimum parking stall length seems to come down to policy priorities. This Title 21 amendment project creates the Urban Neighborhood Development Contexts to allow tailoring zoning regulations to reflect differing priorities across neighborhoods. Prioritizing compact, pedestrian-friendly development with less impervious paved area seems appropriate in the urban neighborhoods seeking to redevelop in a way that is consistent with their historical development pattern. For the Traditional and Edge Urban Neighborhood Contexts, staff has recalculated the geometric formulae for all angles of Standard parking space based on a 19-foot vehicle projection length for the 90-degree angle. <strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> Amend Section 21.07.090H.12.a., Table 21.07-13 space depths (pages 58-59 of Attachment 3) as follows:</td>
<td>Approved the Recommended Changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*PZC Case 2022-0026: Title 21 Parking and Site Access Amendments  
Municipality of Anchorage Planning Department. June 21, 2022*
### TABLE 21.07-13: PARKING ANGLE, STALL, AND AISLE DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Angle (Degrees)</th>
<th>Space Width</th>
<th>Curb Length (Vehicle Projection)</th>
<th>Space Depth (Vehicle Projection)</th>
<th>Aisle Width 1-way</th>
<th>Aisle Width 2-way</th>
<th>Typical Parking Bay Width (Module)</th>
<th>Interlock Reduction</th>
<th>Overhang Allowance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>9'0'</td>
<td>20'0'</td>
<td>23'0'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>64'0'</td>
<td></td>
<td>2'0'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>8'6'</td>
<td>18'0'</td>
<td>23'6'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>60'0'</td>
<td></td>
<td>0'0'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPACT</td>
<td>8'0'</td>
<td>16'0'</td>
<td>23'6'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>56'0'</td>
<td></td>
<td>0'0'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>9'0'</td>
<td>21'8'</td>
<td>19'0'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>67'4'</td>
<td></td>
<td>1'2'</td>
<td>1'11'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>8'10'</td>
<td>19'7'</td>
<td>19'6'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>63'2'</td>
<td></td>
<td>1'11'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPACT</td>
<td>8'3'</td>
<td>19'5'</td>
<td>19'6'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>62'11'</td>
<td></td>
<td>0'6'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>9'0'</td>
<td>21'10'</td>
<td>18'0'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>67'8'</td>
<td></td>
<td>2'3'</td>
<td>1'8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>8'10'</td>
<td>19'10'</td>
<td>18'6'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>63'8'</td>
<td></td>
<td>2'2'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPACT</td>
<td>8'3'</td>
<td>17'10'</td>
<td>18'6'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>59'9'</td>
<td></td>
<td>1'0'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>9'0'</td>
<td>20'6'</td>
<td>12'0'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>65'0'</td>
<td></td>
<td>3'2'</td>
<td>1'5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>8'6'</td>
<td>18'9'</td>
<td>12'6'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>61'6'</td>
<td></td>
<td>3'0'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPACT</td>
<td>8'4'</td>
<td>16'12'</td>
<td>12'6'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>57'11'</td>
<td></td>
<td>1'5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (parallel)</td>
<td>9'0'</td>
<td>9'0'</td>
<td>12'0'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>42'0'</td>
<td></td>
<td>0'0'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>8'6'</td>
<td>8'6'</td>
<td>12'6'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>41'0'</td>
<td></td>
<td>0'0'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPACT</td>
<td>8'0'</td>
<td>8'0'</td>
<td>12'6'</td>
<td>24'0'</td>
<td>40'0'</td>
<td></td>
<td>0'0'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Developments in the Traditional Urban and Edge Urban Neighborhood Development Context Areas may use the following alternative STANDARD parking space depth (Vehicle Projection): 19'0' for 90-degree parking angle, 20'8' for 75-degree parking angle, 20'11' for 60-degree parking angle, and 19'6' for 45-degree parking angle. Parking bay width may decrease as a result.
### Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part G: Consolidated, Simpler Regulations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31. Clarification of Mixed-use Design Standards Amendments.</strong></td>
<td>Is this amendment removing all mixed-use design standards from Chapter 21.04, or just replacing and combining those related to pedestrian amenities into a new section? (Connor Scher)</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> It is primarily doing the latter: replacing, simplifying, and consolidating the district-specific standards for mixed-use developments (being deleted on pages 1-3 of Attachment 3). The references to reduced parking ratios on pages 1 and 3 are being deleted because these parking reductions are being replaced by lower, area-specific parking requirements in 21.07.090E.2. (page 27 of Attachment 3). The mixed-use development standards on pages 2 and 3 are replaced by proposed Section 21.07.060E., Pedestrian Frontage Standards (pages 13-15). See the annotation for pages 1-3, 13-15, and 27 in Attachment 3 for more details.</td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> No change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **32. Descriptions of the Neighborhood Development Contexts.** | Generally supportive of the proposed section establishing Neighborhood Development Context areas, however the paragraphs describing each of the three proposed neighborhood development contexts areas seem wordy and include repeated phrases and commentary. The function of these paragraphs in the code is unclear. Specific comments follow:  
- Traditional Urban Neighborhood Context: Suggested edit to reword the paragraph: “Traditional urban neighborhood contexts feature development features including a regular street grid, sidewalks, buildings with moderate front setbacks oriented toward the street, and parking located to the side or rear of principal buildings. There is a balance of pedestrian, bicycle, public transit, and automobile reliance.”  
- Edge Urban Neighborhood Context: Rephrase “early post-war” to “post-war”. The second paragraph is unnecessary commentary. These areas were originally homestead plats of 5 to 160 acres instead of being based on strict street grids. As a result, they were subdivided and sold at various times with various development patterns that remained consistent within original parcels (frequently). Applying | **Response:** The draft provision in 21.07.015C.1. (page 5, line 9, in Attachment 3) explains that the Neighborhood Context descriptions are intent statements providing a basis for area-specific development standards elsewhere in this chapter 21.07. This should resolve most of the commenter’s concerns. Statements of purpose or intent in Title 21 are provided to guide interpretation and understanding of the legislative intent behind the substantive regulations of the code. Intent statements are not substantive, regulatory requirements for developments. They instead provide a context whereby the regulations are understood. Intent statements may have additional wording not included in the regulations (21.15.020B.). In addition, some of the content in these draft descriptions is informed by public comments from the public process (e.g., Government Hill residents emphasized that western Government Hill neither has nor should have sidewalks). However, staff reexamination of the Neighborhood Context descriptions wording does find opportunities for simplification and clarification, including some edits suggested by the commenter. | **RECOMMENDATION:** Clarify the last sentence of 21.07.015C.1. (page 5, line 9, in Attachment 3) to read, “The descriptions below are intent statements...” Then edit the individual descriptions as follows:  
- a. Edit the fourth, fifth and sixth sentences of proposed subsection 21.07.015C.2. (page 5, lines 17-21, in Attachment 3) as follows:  
  Traditional urban neighborhood contexts feature a regular street grid [DEVELOPMENT PATTERN] of city blocks [SURROUNDED BY STREETS], which provide pedestrian and vehicular connections at frequent, regular intervals. Block and lot sizes are small and block shapes are consistent and often the same size. Sidewalks are present on most streets, with few exceptions such as [EXCEPT IN LIMITED PARTS OF SOUTHERN SOUTH ADDITION AND] in western Government Hill. | **Approved the Recommended Changes** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>these general statements to these areas is not an effective means of describing them. These areas share a period of development, and perhaps defining them by the period or plat number versus the improved infrastructure is more effective. Alternatively, describing the infrastructure allows a more comprehensive and fluid understanding of subject area. Suggested edit to reword the description: “Edge urban neighborhoods feature smaller lot and block sizes than later subdivisions with a mix of street grids and development patterns. Some areas have alleys and sidewalks. Generally, the edge urban areas support transit and enhanced pedestrian facilities.”</td>
<td>b. Edit proposed subsection 21.07.015C.3. (page 6, lines 8–18, in Attachment 3) as follows: The edge urban neighborhood context includes properties generally identified in the Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Plan Map, as traditional neighborhood design areas in Anchorage’s [EARLY] post-war era (1950s-1960s) neighborhoods, such as Spenard, North Star, Midtown, Rogers Park, Airport Heights, Russian Jack Park, and University Area. Parts of South Addition, Fairview, and other neighborhoods also match this context. Edge urban neighborhoods feature a variety of interconnected street systems with smaller lot and block sizes than later subdivisions in [THE] more suburban parts of the Anchorage Bowl. Some edge urban areas feature a regular street grid [DEVELOPMENT PATTERN] of city blocks and others have [PROVIDE] a more relaxed and irregular street grid. Some neighborhoods have [THERE IS AN INCONSISTENT PRESENCE OF] alleys and [LOCAL STREET] sidewalks. Buildings typically have moderate to somewhat deeper front setbacks. Buildings tend to orient toward the public street, although some front setbacks are deep enough to allow for a mix of landscaping and parking. Some edge urban neighborhood context areas include transit-supportive development corridors with [WHERE THE MUNICIPALITY HAS INVESTED IN] elevated levels of public transportation service and enhanced pedestrian facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Trans-Supportive Development Corridors: This paragraph is also slightly wordy. Suggest moving the last sentence to the second sentence and leaving only those first three sentences. (Connor Scher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 33. Clarity of Maps and Graphics for the Neighborhood Development Context Areas.

Traffic Engineering recommends the geographical areas defined in the new maps (in Section 21.07.015) be added to the online, user-interactive map layers on the municipal Geographic Information Systems (GIS) so that code users can readily identify if a proposed development site is within these defined areas. *(Traffic Engineering Department)*

In the graphics comprising a set of 3 images below the descriptions of each of the Neighborhood Development Context Areas, add a call-out to the middle image to clarify that the right-most image is a blown-up (larger scale) version of the other two images. *(Connor Scher)*

**Response:** No objection to the suggested clarifications. The project objectives include to provide the online, user-interactive map layers for the public as part of implementing the amendments. Arrangements have been made with municipal GIS staff to create, post, and maintain these upon adoption of the Title 21 amendments.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Amend proposed subsection 21.07.015 as follows:

- **a.** Subsections 21.07.015C.1. and C.2. (pages 5 and 6 of Attachment 3), in the graphics comprising a set of 3 images below the descriptions of each of the Traditional and Edge Urban Neighborhood Development Context Areas, add a call-out to the middle image to clarify that the right-most image is a blown-up (larger scale) version of the other two images.
- **b.** Subsection 21.07.015D.2., Neighborhood Context Area Boundaries, in each of the Maps 21.07-1 through 21.07-4 (pages 7-10 of Attachment 3), include a disclaimer that online interactive maps are available.

**PZC Action (6-6-2022):** Approved the Recommended Changes

### 34. Clarity of Off-Street Parking Section’s Purpose Statement.

In subsection 21.07.090A.4. of the purpose statement for the Title 21 parking requirements, rephrase to eliminate "walkable" as an ableist term. *(Connor Scher)*

**Response:** No objection to replacing “walkable” with a more generic term. In reexamining the purpose language, staff has identified additional clarifications to suggest regarding the following:

- Minimum parking requirements are intended only for areas that do not have adequate on-street parking supply in parking management districts (e.g., Downtown) with on-street parking enforcement.
- The primary impacts to nearby streets that are of concern include the flow of vehicle traffic, pedestrians, and service vehicles such as street maintenance, public transit, and emergency services.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Amend proposed subsection 21.07.090A., *Off-Street Parking and Loading—Purpose*, (page 23 in Attachment 3) as follows:

**A. Purpose**

This section establishes off-street parking and loading requirements to accommodate anticipated parking utilization in areas without public on-street parking management, and to ensure that parking facilities are designed to perform in a safe, efficient manner. It is also the intent of this section to attenuate the adverse visual, environmental, and economic impacts of parking lots, and to balance the provision of adequate off-street parking with other modes of site access that promote area-wide objectives for] a compact and efficient land use pattern, affordable housing, pedestrian-friendly environments, and [use of multiple modes of transportation]. Specific objectives of this section include:

**PZC Action (6-6-2022):** Approved the Recommended Changes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ensure that off-street parking, loading, and access demands will be met without impacting adjoining and nearby [STREETS] properties, land uses, and neighborhoods;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Ensure the safe and adequate flow of traffic, pedestrians, and service vehicles in adjoining streets;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Recognize, through parking reductions and lower parking requirements, the parking efficiencies of mixed-use development, mixed-income housing, pedestrian-friendly [WALKABLE] development patterns, proximity to public transportation, and other area-specific neighborhood characteristics;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Clarity of Regulation of Parking Space Usage. Support the amendment to 21.07.090B.4. (page 24, lines 29-34 in Attachment 3) to allow for private sector decisions to charge for parking spaces. Would it be helpful to add a provision that maintains a certain minimum number of parking spaces for a single use in a mixed-use development? For example, if a restaurant and apartments are in the same building, the restaurant will have higher parking turnover, but will need fewer parking spaces. If there is a parking reduction applied to the property, whose parking gets reduced? (Connor Scher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Determining which Parking Spaces on a Site Plan are Eligible for Small Dimensions. Traffic Engineering is appreciative of the changes made to the parking angle, stall, and aisle dimensions, however has concerns with proposed exception 21.07.090H12.a.ii. (Page 58 in Attachment 3) that allows for 50% of spaces to be smaller dimensions for employee only, structured parking facilities, and low parking uses. This provision may need additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Title 21 requires only that the total number of parking spaces on a mixed-use development site be equal to the sum of the number of parking spaces required for each use. The Municipality avoids regulating how property owners assign individual parking spaces on the site to the individual uses. Doing so would be unnecessary to carry out the objectives of the zoning regulations. It would complicate matters for applicants and property managers, and involve Municipal staff in private matters involving internal parking agreements, etc. It would also complicate changes of use and the expansion or contraction of business tenants. Parking reductions for a mixed-use development are applied to each use individually, and then aggregated into a total combined parking reduction. In doing so the parking reduction operates the same way as the basic minimum parking requirement: the parking requirement for each individual use is aggregated to yield the total parking requirement for the site. RECOMMENDATION: No change. |

Approved the Recommended Change

Approved the Recommendation
### Comment-and-Issue-Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
<th>Response and Recommendation</th>
<th>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Clarity of Exempted Use Types.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> This exemption is for a variety of uses, such as unstaffed utility substations that will have no on-site employees, users, or visitors. Title 21 Land Use Review staff with experience in zoning plan review and land use enforcement find that this language does not seem vague or hard to define for Title 21. During plan review the zoning plan reviewer would ask for a statement from the applicant about the employees or people on the premises. That statement would be used if needed for enforcement. <strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> No change.</td>
<td>Approved the Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Ordinance Length, Complexity, and Transparency Regarding its Effects on Development Projects.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> In response to this comment, staff reviewed the entire amendment and a checklist of the proposed changes to development standards for residential projects. This review re-confirmed that the nearly all the public hearing draft changes will relax, simplify, or clarify development standards and approval processes for development projects. A few changes increased a pedestrian-oriented standard in the urban neighborhood contexts however these were paired with reductions in required car parking or driveway width to ultimately reduce development costs and land needs by supporting more efficient transportation alternatives. Staff did find several of the draft amendments that did not reduce or simplify an entitlement enough to meet the project objectives. These could be simplified or made more flexible as follows: - The Pedestrian Frontage Standard for Urban Neighborhood Contexts in 21.07.060F.3, should not be a pre-requisite for receiving an administrative parking reduction. This standard goes beyond the basic pedestrian access facilities needed to justify a parking reduction and could deter applicants from seeking reductions. (See recommendations a, b, and c. below.)</td>
<td>Approved the Recommended Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Comment/Question</td>
<td>Response and Recommendation</td>
<td>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The minimum walkway clear width of an <em>Enhanced On-Site Walkway</em> (a menu choice in section 21.07.060G., <em>Pedestrian Amenities</em>) should be reduced from 8 to 6 feet for 3- and 4-plex developments, to be more in scale with these developments. (See recommendation d. below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In subsection 21.07.090H.10.d.ii., <em>Vehicle Maneuvering</em>, the exception allowing one or two parking spaces to back out into the street should allow for additional tandem spaces and Traffic Engineer discretionary approval of further exceptions for 3- and 4-plexes. (See recommendation e. below.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In subsection 21.07.090H.11.d.ii., the Minimum driveway width for small multifamily projects should be 10 feet not 12 feet on straight driveway segments. (See recommendation f. below.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION:</strong> Amend the public hearing draft as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Amend subsection 21.07.060F.2. (page 13, lines 23-24, in Attachment 3) as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Applicability</strong> Subsection 3. applies to development in the traditional urban and edge urban neighborhood context areas established in 21.07.015[. AND TO DEVELOPMENTS THAT RECEIVE REDUCTIONS TO REQUIRED PARKING IN 21.07.090F]. Subsection 4. applies to development in the other areas of the municipality. Exceptions and exemptions from this section 21.07.090F. include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. *** 3. ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Amend subsection 21.07.060F.3. (page 14, line 6, in Attachment 3) by deleting the words &quot;[AND PARKING REDUCTIONS]&quot; from the header of subsection 21.07.060F.3. and title of Table 21.07-2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Amend the first sentence of 21.07.060G.3.a. (page 17, lines 23-25, in Attachment 3) as follows: An enhanced on-site walkway shall have a pedestrian movement zone with a continuous, unobstructed walkway clear width of at least eight feet or six feet where providing access only to four or fewer residential dwelling units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Comment/Question</td>
<td>Response and Recommendation</td>
<td>PZC Action (6-6-2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |                 | e. Amend and illustrate subsection 21.07.090H.9.d.ii. (page 54, line 13, in Attachment 3) as follows:  
ii. For other developments, parking areas comprising only one or two parking spaces whose only access is to a local street, provided that the paved vehicle area(s) occupy no more than 20 feet of the width of the lot frontage in the front setback. The number of spaces may be increased to four spaces if arranged in tandem for residential dwellings as provided in 21.07.090K.12.k. Additional spaces for multifamily developments with up to four dwelling units may be approved by the Traffic Engineer in appropriate circumstances such as lots on dead-end streets, cul-de-sacs, or other local streets with low traffic volumes.  
|       |                 | f. Amend subsection 21.07.090H.11.d.ii. (page 56, line 14, in Attachment 3) as follows:  
ii. The minimum width of a driveway providing access for up to 10 parking spaces serving a townhouse or multifamily residential use from a local street or alley is 12 feet (e.g., one lane for two-way traffic), except that straight (non-curving) driveway segments on the development property (i.e., not in the driveway approach) may be 10 feet. |