

## Attendees

Attendee	Affiliation
1. Graham Downey	(Anchorage Mayor's Office)
2. Jason Norris	(Huffman O'Malley CC)
3. Jon Isaacs	(Turnagain CC)
4. Erin Baldwin Day	(Assembly Member)
5. Allen Kemplen	(Fairview)
6. Devin Kelly	(Cook Inlet Housing)
7. Kathleen Mccoy	(League of Women Voters)
8. Daniel Mckenna-Foster	(MOA Long Range Planning)
9. Melisa Babb	(MOA Planning Director)
10. Phil Cannon	(Mountain View)
11. Bart Rudolph,	(Transit Director)
12. Anna Bosin	(South Addition resident)
13. Alexa Dobson	(Fairview Resident, Bike Anchorage)
14. Lizzie Newell	(President of Cambell Creek CC)
15. Lisa Keller	(Office of Alyse Galvin)
16. Seth Anderson	(Developer)
17. Shaun Debenham	(Debenham LLC)
18. Arianna Bellizzi	(FCC)
19. Duane Heyman	(St Mary's Church)

## Agenda

1. Welcoming, re-introductions.
2. Summary of what we heard last time.
3. Discussion of uses.
4. Discussion of "neighborhood character."
5. Next steps: Timeline from here.

## Introduction by Graham Downey

Graham outlined the agenda, rules of discussion, and general agreements for this focus group.

## Introduction by Assembly Member Baldwin Day

- The goal of this is more attainable housing for more people
- The goal is for more housing for more people and do it in an equitable way.
- There are all sorts of negative impacts of people living adjacent to huge roads. Make sure our housing supports our transportation and vice versa. We sort of have these two

perspectives--some folks who want to create a legislative fix for every possible negative impact, and others who want to allow an opportunity for every positive impact.

- We heard a lot of discussions about what heights make sense. More limits, stepwise limits, fewer limits. Concerns about how lot coverage and setbacks affect R1. Parking, snow storage, quarter mile, etc

## Group Discussion

---

### Housing and Equity Goals

- Increase access to attainable housing across Anchorage, especially for returning residents and service industry workers.
  - Promote equitable density throughout the city, avoiding concentration of housing near major roads.
  - Align housing development with transportation planning to ensure mutual support.
- 

### Zoning, Height, and Lot Coverage

- Ongoing discussion around building height limits: stepwise vs. fewer restrictions.
  - Concerns about how lot coverage and setbacks affect single-family zones (R1).
  - Parking, snow storage, and walkability within a quarter-mile radius are key considerations.
- 

### Car-Centric vs. Mixed-Use Development

- Strong consensus against car-centric uses, especially in town centers.
  - Desire for walkable access to markets, childcare, personal services, and neighborhood amenities.
  - Electric vehicle charging stations raise concerns due to space consumption and road impact.
  - Mixed-use development is supported but also discussions that it should be related to what's around it and not too tall.
- 

### Use Flexibility vs. Prescriptive Zoning

- Tension between encouraging innovation and avoiding unintended consequences (e.g., grandfathered car washes becoming more valuable).

## TSDO Collaborative Conversation 2 (Focus Group)

### Meeting Notes

2025-08-18

- Calls for flexible zoning to accommodate evolving digital economies and community needs.
  - Emphasis on encouraging positive development rather than prohibiting specific uses.
  - You can't legislate "cute"
- 

### Interaction Over Use Type

- Focus on how car-centric uses interact with motorized traffic and pedestrian infrastructure.
  - Suggestion to address these issues through site access planning and road design rather than zoning alone.
- 

### Balancing Risk and Opportunity

- Framework proposed: “What’s the worst that could happen?” vs. “What’s the best that could happen?”
  - Need for compromise between enabling positive outcomes and mitigating negative impacts.
  - Example: controversial road investments that led to unintended consequences like displaced parking.
- 

### Neighborhood Character and Design

- Mixed views on enforcing neighborhood character—some see it as fluid and evolving, others as a design anchor.
  - Visual tools and imagery suggested to help define and communicate character expectations.
  - Caution against freezing character in time, which may stifle adaptability and inclusivity.
- 

### Regulatory Simplicity and Accessibility

- Concerns that current land use codes resemble complex tax regulations, making them inaccessible to the public.
- Advocacy for clearer entry points and guidance for users navigating the permitting process.
- Proposal for a “permit navigator” role to assist applicants and improve user experience.

## Mixed-Use Implementation Challenges

- Mixed-use enthusiasm tempered by concerns about unintended zoning impacts in specific neighborhoods.
  - Preference for targeted investment in existing commercial corridors rather than diffuse expansion.
- 

## Walkability and Unexpected Successes

- Despite major roads, some areas are surprisingly walkable and support local businesses.
  - Examples of pedestrian activity and thriving small shops challenge assumptions about car-centric corridors.
- 

## Discouraging Car-Centric Development

- Calls to examine the economic incentives that drive car-oriented land use.
  - Recognition that transportation planning must be integrated with land use reform.
  - Concern that transportation agencies often prioritize vehicle flow over pedestrian access.
- 

## Housing Supply and Urban Density

- Emphasis on increasing residential development to support desired commercial and community uses.
  - Noted lack of new housing in key areas like Midtown over the past several decades.
  - Counterpoint: some believe transportation improvements are more critical than increasing density.
- 

## Zoning as a Transportation Tool

- Zoning code seen as a mechanism to address transportation challenges, even though it may not be the most appropriate tool.
  - Recent desired transportation projects have resulted in community frustration because of minor delays, highlighting the tension between convenience and planning goals.
-

### Lifestyle Diversity and Land Use

- Acknowledgment that some residents prioritize vehicle storage and recreational gear (“trucks and toys”), but also that much of the Municipality is like this and will always be like this.
  - Suggestion to concentrate density in areas already accustomed to it, while preserving flexibility for other lifestyle preferences.
  - Concern that alternative, less car-dependent lifestyles lack adequate space and support.
- 

### Outreach and Engagement Strategies

- Current efforts include focus groups, newsletters, and coordination with community councils.
  - Suggestions for improvement: a centralized, user-friendly website and broad email outreach.
  - Desire for more inclusive and accessible public engagement to shape neighborhood evolution.
- 

### Neighborhood Visioning

- Encouragement to ask residents how they envision their neighborhoods adapting to meet broader goals.
  - Recognition of extensive historical public input and planning groundwork—over 25 years of process to develop and bring forward the Transit Supportive Corridor/Overlay concept.
- 

### Next Steps

- Proposal to focus a subsequent meeting on land use specifics, with an emphasis on clarity and precision.
- Continued emphasis on outreach and refining engagement tools to ensure community voices are heard.

## Specific Comments

TSDO Collaborative Conversation 2 (Focus Group)

Meeting Notes

2025-08-18

Positive things people want to see	Risks People are worried about
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No car-centered uses</li> <li>• Market/Groceries without driving</li> <li>• Childcare</li> <li>• Personal services</li> <li>• Neighborhood dentist</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicle charging (electric fuel)</li> </ul>

One thing I'd love	One thing I'm afraid of
Mixed use goes hand in hand with walkability	3-4 blocks off the corridor in a single family neighborhood, not the best place to introduce 5/1s without some contextual plan
I'm excited about some small childcare options that maybe reuse some other building next door.	My next door neighbor starts their own business of changing out car tires in their driveway.
A coffee shop that I can walk to	I'd hate to see nothing happening. What would really suck the most for Fairview is if it doesn't progress and doesn't develop
A nice place we can gather in the neighborhood that we can walk to safely. I would be really excited if I could actually use the bus. It doesn't go enough places.	What I'm afraid of is that instead of reducing sidewalks, we will reduce sidewalks. We must make sure that neighborhoods are walkable and pleasant.
I love the coffee shop thing. Protection for walking and biking	Recollection of a convenience store next to a bar door.
Neighborhood-serving commercial use: dental office, café	10,000 SF restaurant
I want to be able to walk to a commercial development--you have to walk miles to get anywhere	My fear is that this ordinance is so narrow and say this didn't do much
I agree with what everyone has said	-

## TSDO Collaborative Conversation 2 (Focus Group)

### Meeting Notes

2025-08-18

The biggest need and what I hope for is that we can have a lot more affordable housing. Keep the eye on the ball for housing.	-
Agree with what everyone has said. I'm interested in seeing more pockets around town. Something to find/discover	-
Expand options for people that don't have or don't want cars	Worried people are going to throw the baby out with the bathwater
I like the potential for people using mixed use, small scale, and scale-appropriate commercial. And denser housing.	I share Jason's fear in creating something where a lot of people will appropriate. Also afraid of things 4 blocks back. I would be interested in hearing a position paper from the development community. What makes that work, and what considerations, would be great to hear.
Implement successful mixed use development. Something we are working on with Fairview	Fears: I've seen a disconnect. I hear people talk about walkability. Development occurs on private land, it doesn't occur on the public right of way. SUB ARCTIC Community, the code doesn't acknowledge the duality of our existence here.
Who doesn't want sweet commercial uses--a lot of people conceptually support the concept	It feels like we're fitting in a lot of things under very jargony language . If your neighborhood is next to a 4 lane road that kills people, that's the problem. What are we going to do with that? Especially when we have to deal with different road ownership
I hear the need for innovation and change and need.	It seems really hard