

11-27-21 Draft Letter regarding Title 21, Parking and Site Access Amendments

Formatted: Font: 14 pt

Formatted: Font: 14 pt

The UAC is supportive of the objectives and related goals of the Amendments and is pleased that the Municipality of Anchorage Planning Department is exploring alternatives to incorporate stronger environmental values with regards to development in Anchorage. UACC encourages maintaining green space, promotion of walking and biking, moving parking costs to users, eliminating unneeded paving requirements and reducing on-street congestion.

Incentives already exist for reducing required on-site parking. UACC supports increasing the options for parking reductions. These options encourage alternative methods of transportation and the environmental values mentioned above.

Regarding the specific options for accommodating vehicular parking on page 8 of the power point presentation, UACC supports Options A (Match Peak Usage) and B (Match Average Usage). The current status quo is to require onsite parking, with some aspects of parking reductions taken into consideration. Title 21 underwent a complete rewriting in the last 7 years (January 1, 2014), a decade long process, and the parking requirements were changed in this edition of Title 21. Since January 1, 2014, Title 21 has been edited and updated. The parking requirement is typically based on land use and size of the facility, as described in Option A. The required parking burden is placed on the developer and passed along to the consumer. Option B would shift a portion of this burden into the public right-of-way (ROW), essentially publicly owned and maintained land. It can be argued this land is being paid for by the taxpayers. Option B appears to be appropriate in specific areas of the Municipality of Anchorage and may not be applicable everywhere. An average utilization requirement for on-site parking makes sense. Option B, specific to certain areas within Anchorage, in combination with the current Title 21 on-site parking requirements (Option A) appear to be an effective use of land.

Item 3. *Area-Specific, Lower Parking Requirements (Continued): Open Option Parking Areas* on p.8, is the least defined provision in the document regarding

what's actually being proposed, because instead of giving a description of the "Current" and "Proposed", it provides two ways to approach (and hopefully solve) on-street parking congestion: A) *Off street parking minimums* and B) *Street Management*. These options refer to future development rather than changes to existing conditions, which, in itself, makes change easier for people to accept.

UACC supports *Option B*. It would be more effective in meeting the three main goals of the Amendments. It more effectively supports environmental values. It assigns costs to users of parking spaces, not to property owners, and does not spread costs to everyone. *B* also directly and effectively solves on-street congestion, while *A* doesn't. Critically, *Option B* requires less land and lowers the cost of future development compared to *A*. Importantly, *B* doesn't apply to all private property regardless of need, while *Option A* does. *Option A* would be relatively easy to implement in the permitting process but, it would be difficult to guarantee that mandated parking space would be used as intended. Overall, *B* regulates public space whereas *A* regulates private property and would be perceived as infringing on landowners' property rights. If *Option B* is implemented, areas within the MOA will need to be identified as qualified areas. The UMED area does not have a lot of qualified areas based on the characteristics required for on-street parking. Piper Street accommodates on street parking, has sidewalks along both sides, and pedestrian crosswalks. A few blocks west, there are sidewalks on Laurel Street and "No Parking" signage. Perhaps this is a lost opportunity for on-street parking that the Muni should reconsider. Another concern regarding *Option B* is that the typical width of paved road will have to be around 30-32 feet for a single side of on-street parking. One last concern with *B* is snow storage. With on-street parking, snow storage will have to be considered. In downtown Anchorage, snow is hauled away.

One suggested text change for Option B, last bullet: "Some people may be uncomfortable losing subsidized storage" should be changed to "People purchasing a unit in a newly developed multi-family property may have less available space for free vehicular storage, but the property would be less cluttered." This change is needed because when buying into a new development people would not "lose" subsidized storage they didn't have.

