



Some of What We Heard on March 31...

1. Adjust for Context? (Breaking Out Regulations for Urban and Transit-supportive Contexts)

- The expectation to be able to park right in front of your house is not universal in the city. We already regulate South Addition with the residential permit system.
- Breaking out by geography will add complexity to the code.
- Risks potential boundary effects if there are different regulations on properties across the street from each other in same zoning district.
- Natural breaks such as major roads and other existing strong edges can work as parking regulation boundaries.
- Neighborhood context matters. Current parking requirements applied across the city does lead to too many parking spaces.
- Development regulations should be more attuned to the “local” neighborhood environments because then better design solutions can happen.
- Is there truly too much parking for multifamily?
- Consider expanding the areas that will have lower parking requirements to include UMED District, Midtown, and the 2040 Town Centers.
- With increased bicycle parking requirements, why limit the transit-supportive development corridor to within just 1/4 mile of transit route?
- What if parking is reduced for a development, but then a transit route is changed or moved?
- No parking requirements Downtown! Too much parking Downtown. Appreciation for cities with walkable Downtowns—it’s worth paying to park.
- Some historic neighborhoods like Government Hill do not want a sidewalk requirement.
- Do we want spillover parking in the public realm, on streets the city maintains, builds sidewalks on, and clears snow from? That’s what it will take.

2. How Much Forward-Looking? (Regulations that Anticipate Forecast Lower Future Utilization)

- Anticipating 15 years ahead seems reasonable, but rapid pace of technology changes suggests the world may be changing faster than that.
- Significant increases in telecommuting (working remotely) is here to stay.
- Private vehicle ownership is on the way out, partly because of automated vehicles (AVs).

3. Tailor Residential Driveways for Urban Contexts? (Narrower Driveways in Urban Neighborhoods)

- Narrower driveways are a good idea.
- Reduce driveway width and on-site vehicle turnaround requirements on small multi-unit projects, as those requirements impede housing and affect neighborhood character.
- Need enough space between driveways to have on-street parking capacity.
- Narrower driveways reduce impervious surfaces and runoff; grassy area not covered with driveway can serve as snow storage.
- A safety concern with narrower driveways is fire and emergency access/egress.
- “Hammerhead” style turnaround designs can take less space while allowing turning for larger vehicles.
- Design places for people on a pedestrian scale. Pedestrian infrastructure is easier to maintain than parking.
- Context is critical!
- Narrower driveways would address older lots Downtown and help them have less paving.
- Support this. Appreciate the direction it is headed.
- Consider the snow storage issue.

For Next Steps & Upcoming Events:

www.muni.org/Departments/OCPC/Planning/Projects/AnchLandUse/Pages/Actions4-3%264-6.aspx

Thank you for your time
and your comments!

Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan
Implementation Actions 4-2 & 4-6

