

Tue, Oct 20, 2020, 12:48 PM
Cammy Oechsli Taylor:

Thank you for all the work on this South Addition Plan.

1 - page 29 discussion of Parks doesn't include Kedaya Park off Virginia Court between 15th and 16th Aves

2 - on pages 15, 16, & 53 the numbered roads are labeled as "streets" and should be "avenues"

Thu, Oct 22, 2020, 11:53 AM
Karin Holser:

If I am not able to attend the meeting I would like for there to be some discussion about allowing Air B&B's or short term rentals in a residential district. With the new addition of condos on 8th ave by P & O street which have not sold and are being used as Air B&B's, we had to call the police several times because of loud unruly parties. We had a truck drive over our lawn and hit a parked car. It has totally ruined our nice quiet neighborhood.

It seems to me if Air B&B and short term rentals are allowed in a quiet neighborhood there should be a limit as to how many there can be in a given area, and there should be at least a three day stay. I live at P street and currently there are six condos listed on Air B&B in less than a square block - four in the new block ones on 8th Ave and two in the fourplex on O street. This is way too many in such a small area. There needs to be some regulations!!

Thanks karin

Thu, Oct 22, 2020, 12:41 PM
Sheree Warner:

Hi, We are experiencing real issues with Airbnbs in our corner of Bootleggers. I live at P and we have several around us. AB itself has in the covenants Airbnb have to be at least 30 days rental. On O Place in a 4-plex, (AB shares O Place with this 4-plex) 2 units are Airbnbs. Across on 8th in the new development I understand there are four, at least two are active.

We have strangers in and out all hours of the day and night. There are a lot of parties and noise with all the comings and goings. They take up the little parking we already have. Strange people hang out on O Place visiting while smoking and drinking. Same across the street in the summer. Traffic has increased dramatically as numerous people stay at the Airbnbs or have numerous visitors.

This is degrading the everyday livability of our neighborhood and diminished the peace and "neighborliness."

I have a friend who has an Airbnb and he simply does not rent to any locals. That would be one item to put into place as it is locals who are using Airbnb as party houses. The other issue are the Airbnbs that do not have an owner present. There is no oversight. But even then the owner of the new development lives their part of the time and there are still issues. I spoke to Airbnb and they have a policy that no more than 16 people are to be in an Airbnb. Seriously!

Our neighborhoods are being denigrated by Airbnbs. Please address this. Thank you.

Sheree Nyren

Fri, Oct 9, 2020, 7:13 PM

Dorne Hawxhurst

I can't download the plan. Please just check to make sure it's working properly. Thanks for all your hard work.

Dorne Hawxhurst

Fri, Oct 23, 2020, 10:06 AM

Dorne Hawxhurst

Thank you. I could not read the street names on a couple of the maps, even after magnifying on my computer. That made it hard to review and understand.

Thank you,
Dorne Hawxhurst

Oct 24, 2020, 4:31 PM

Nathan Brown:

I read through the draft plan and it lists Pilots' Row (aka block 13 Army housing) as only a potential historic area. It is actually currently listed on the NRHP (ref#100300171, listed Dec 2018).

<https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/database-research.htm>

Nathan Brown

Mon, Oct 26, 2020, 4:18 PM

Moira Smith:

Good afternoon, neighbors,

I am writing to express my support for the SACC draft plan. I was particularly happy with the traffic calming measures described in Section 8.4. I am seeing increasing numbers of kids in the Fire Island section of the neighborhood as the housing stock turns over to younger families. I myself have two kids, ages 6 and 12. My daughter was hit by a car while riding her bike on the corner of H & 13th last summer. I would like to see more traffic calming measures in this part of the South Addition neighborhood, at a minimum. I'm a fan of the fairly extensive measures that were taken in Fairview to mitigate through traffic. If that is deemed overly burdensome, I urge the SACC executive committee to work with the Municipality of Anchorage to expeditiously install extensive traffic mitigation measures throughout at least this portion of the neighborhood.

I am happy to lend my energy to this effort.

Thank you for the work you do,

Moira Smith

Oct 23, 2020, 3:26 PM

Sarah Schirack:

Hello,

Steve Rafuse at the Parks Dept. suggested I reach out to the South Addition Community Council about the potential for a covered pavilion near Westchester Lagoon. I hope we never have another pandemic that forces us to socialize exclusively outside, but if we do, having a covered pavilion near the Lagoon would be so lovely. My family often rides bikes to the ones at Valley of the Moon Park for potlucks with friends, but

we'd love to have an option closer to us. Is there potential for this in the planning document?

Kind thanks,
Sarah Schirack

Thu, Oct 29, 2020, 4:45 PM
Sheree Warner:

Hi.

I have a couple of comments regarding the plan:

Stoltz Avenue: the parking along Stoltz where it right before it transitions to 8th Avenue has become a place for marijuana smokers to hang out. It is also dangerous with traffic slowing down, speeding and pulling in and out from that area. Especially with the hard curve coming off of 9th. This entire area should be pedestrian friendly. Please do not pave or improve that area for vehicles. Please improve for the numerous pedestrians.

I sent comments earlier regarding Airbnbs but not to this email address. Airbnbs have become a problem in this area. We have 3-4 at 8th and P in the new development across (which units were to be sold as single family dwellings) across from Admiralty Bootleggers and 2 more on O Place in a 4-plex directly in back of Admiralty Bootleggers. It has increased traffic, taken up valuable parking and brought noisy parties in this area. It was a constant for the summer. Strangers come and go all hours of the night. For us residents, its disruptive and unpleasant. Thank you.

Sheree Warner Nyren

Nov 30, 2020, 1:10 PM:
Fran Durner:

Comments for Draft South Addition Neighborhood Plan

I appreciate the effort that has gone into compiling this document. While the Draft Plan borrows heavily from the Anchorage Original Neighborhoods Preservation Plan, it incorporates little from the work of the Neighborhood Plan Steering Committee recommendations, the SACC Goals and Objectives Chart for Development and New

Housing, the Character of the Neighborhood Planning Recommendations, or SACC Neighborhood Plan meetings in 2016 and 2017.

Because of the pandemic, the SACC has been unable to meet in person since the spring, and acceptance of this Draft Plan feels rushed. Adequate time has not been put aside to discuss the draft plan, answer questions, or make comments in the meetings.

South Addition values, purposes and goals omitted from, and not addressed in this draft with sufficient weight:

- A sense of close knit community and neighborliness.
- Traditional neighborhood character, and a small town feel.
- Low density housing and preservation of solar access.
- Design recommendations for new builds in keeping with surrounding houses, incorporating Northern Design standards.
- Appropriately scaled mixed-use development suitable to the unique character of the neighborhood.

Specific comments:

Pg. 23: I have owned a home in SA since 1994, and rented before that. In all the time I have lived here, the undergrounding of utilities has been a SA CIP priority, but we have gotten nothing but lip service from the utilities, and no explanations. We are way past due, and it's time for that to stop.

Pg. 30: Creating Historic Neighborhood overlays for SA is critical.

Pg. 39: Where is the "existing conditions analysis" mentioned here? Please post it to the SACC web page.

Pg. 42: I don't recall encouraging new commercial development in the neighborhood as being a priority.

Pg. 43 Table 10: See AMC 21.07.08, A, through H, for existing landscaping design requirements.

I believe a study of potential linkages to the Coastal Trail from South Addition has already been done.

Pgs. 44-54, Plan Implementation: 8.1 Develop Neighborhood Overlay Districts - Yes! 8.2 and 8.3 - No. Encouraging Accessory Dwelling Units, and Encouraging small-scale, commercial development, have never been at the top of a priority list for SACC.

Pg. 52: Are the residents of Park Place and surrounding homes aware their area is being considered for a neighborhood center site? Which Lutheran Church is being considered for the same? (Anchorage Lutheran or Central Lutheran?)

Pg. 54 Plan implementation 8.4: The proposed snow removal standards are practically speaking, unenforceable, and may pose an undue burden on some residents. Too much space is devoted to this and it should be removed. There are far more pressing subjects, such as the overlays, neighborhood character, and design standards, we should be focusing on.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Fran Durner

Mon, Nov 30, 2020, 1:24 PM:

Karin Holser:

Please do not include any type of parking on Stolts Ave by the railroad tracks! We need that to be made into a walk way so that we can walk safely from our homes in Bootleggers Cove to Westchester Lagoon and the coastal trail. Also when cars are parked there it is very dangerous because there is not enough room for cars to make the turn from 9th onto Stolts when there is an on coming car.

Thanks karin

Mon, Nov 30, 2020, 2:55 PM

Patrice Parker:

I have serious reservations about the draft neighborhood plan.

I oppose changing zoning for property north of 13th Avenue between I and L Streets to allow for commercial establishments. Downtown Anchorage, north of the Park Strip, is within walking distance of South Addition's neighborhoods. It is also struggling during the economic downturn and has plenty of available space for new businesses.

I oppose building 8-9 story buildings between A and C for the same reason. To revitalize Downtown Anchorage, SACC should be encouraging mixed-use density there. Elizabeth Place is a good example of that concept.

I object to waiting for Overlay Districts to establish detailed standards to protect neighborhood character. As I understood it at an earlier meeting, it could take 2-3 years to design and get approval for overlays. In the meantime, South Addition's historic character could be permanently altered. South Addition, almost in entirety, is known for small one and two-story homes, safe sidewalks, garages and parking relegated to existing alleys, and front yard landscaping allowing "eyes on the street" (front doors unobscured by double car garages). We also need sunlight standards - solar panels are being installed throughout the neighborhoods and sunlight penetration needs to be protected.

I object to the installation of parking meters on Stolt Lane. That parking area is used almost exclusively by people wanting to enjoy the view of the mountains and inlet. It's not a natural parking place for someone wanting to shop or work in the downtown

business area. Parking elsewhere in South Addition is free. Monthly permits are only needed in those areas of the Park Strip closer to downtown.

I also object to the above-decisions being made by the Executive Committee, without proper notice and without a proper presentation made to the SACC as a whole. Two of these decisions (the commercial area and the parking meters) would benefit members of the Executive Committee and should be considered a conflict-of-interest.

Finally, I request that all comments received on the draft plan be posted promptly on the SACC website.

Thank you.
Patrice Parker

Mon, Nov 30, 2020, 3:56 PM
Penny Cordes:

I own and live in my house at W. 10th. This house is in the Fire Island sub-area. Located between I and L sts, and 10th and 13th, it is designated R3, high intensity urban residential. Although this area includes a multi-story apartment bld., condominium complex, and the Pioneer Home, the majority of the houses fit the description of traditional neighborhood design and reflect the existing scale and character of So. Addition. From what I can tell from the map on page 31 of the Plan, there are at least 6 homes designated as Individual NRHP Eligible between 10 and 13th and I and L Sts, including my own home which was built in 1941.

I am very concerned to hear that the SACC Neighborhood Plan would encourage or sanction the construction of buildings higher than that allowed by the existing building code for R2 and R3 in the area circumscribed by 10th and 13th and I and L streets. This would seriously erode the traditional neighborhood scale and character, further transforming it into modern, expensive row housing as occurred at the corner of H and 10th as illustrated on pg 20 of the Plan. The contrast between the former historic dwelling and the new, as yet fully occupied, condos is stark. Is that the profile of the south side of the Park Strip we're striving for?

The sentence at the bottom of page 21 beginning with "Although..." seems to imply that every design is compatible with the existing buildings. It should in part indicate that certain designs are incompatible. Such is the case with the reconstructed house on the lot to the east of mine. It's height dwarfs the older homes on either side of it even though it is built to the maximum height of the current code for R3 and it's modern style and materials are out of place on the block. Why would we want any buildings higher than that?

7.3 on page 43 supports the value of preserving community green spaces and our urban forest, including on private property. That is precisely what the older homes like mine with large setbacks and front and back yards preserve. One need only look to the redo of the corner of H and 10th to note the death and removal of the mature birch and spruce that used to be there and the almost total absence of front and back lawns.

Page 41, Table 8, section 1.3 advocates for mixed-use development, the Fire Island Bakery being the exemplar. This statement should add the caveat "provided development fits existing neighborhood form and scale." A cafe in an older home a la Kobuk Coffee downtown, or an in-home business or attorney's office can be compatible provided that traffic and parking is carefully considered. But razing the older homes to build modern storefronts with condos above, such as suggested by photos in the Plan on pages 48 and 53, would forever change the tenor and residential flavor of the neighborhood. There is plenty of property on the north side of the Park Strip that could be developed in that manner.

I urge you to follow the philosophy of the Urban Design Committee Guidelines on page 47 of the Plan. "Ensure that new buildings are compatible in scale, massing, style, and/or architecture materials with existing structures on the street." Don't let development mean destruction.

Thank you for your efforts and consideration.
Penny Cordes

Nov 30, 2020, 5:16 PM
Sarah Kleedehn:

I am a resident of the South Addition. I am concerned with many of the recommendations that are being made for the South Addition neighborhood plan. Specifically, I believe the character of the neighborhood is being compromised. I am not against development but developers often do what is cost effective with no regard to curb appeal. Homeowners who purchase homes in the South Addition and remodel them do a much better job of matching the character of the neighborhood.

I am most concerned about home height and bulk. Builders are constructing homes that cover the maximum space allowed and putting driveways in the front of homes and completely paving yards. Garages and parking should be in alleys. Level sidewalks in the front of the house with front yard landscaping add to the neighborhood appeal. Builders are constructing homes in my neighborhood that have extensions taller than 30 feet. They are doing it legally but pushing the limits of "legal" as the regulation is currently written. The regulation needs to be rewritten and tightened up. Many homeowners are adding solar panels to their homes. Please allow sunlight protection for solar panels.

Would you want to live in a single-family home with a 30-foot building or condo next to you that takes up the maximum space allowed, has parts that extend over the 30-foot allowance, blocks your sun, and has no front yard appeal? Many residents of these complexes or condos end up parking on the street (as the residents have more cars than garage space allocated) and so snow removal becomes challenging. Snow removal needs to be addressed and enforced.

Overlay Districts need to be established now. Waiting 2-3 years to develop overlays will compromise the current neighborhood character. I live by Fire Island Bakery. If something is not done soon, my historic neighborhood will end up looking like Bootlegger's Cove as developers buy up old housing and build "box" condos with tall extensions. This is already happening and needs to stop.

I oppose changing zoning for property north of 13th Avenue between I and L Street to allow for commercial development. Downtown Anchorage is within walking distance of the South Addition. Downtown does NOT have a shortage of available space for new businesses. There is plenty of room for commercial development downtown. Downtown should be encouraging mixed use development such as Elizabeth Place. 8 or 9 story buildings between A and C Street are not needed in the South Addition.

Please preserve the South Addition's historic neighborhood with its charm, curb appeal, and character.

Sarah Kleedehn

Mon, Nov 30, 2020, 8:57 PM

Michael Teo:

Dear SACC:

I have read the neighborhood plan and agree with many parts. Walk-ability issues addressed in the document are important and could be emphasized as much as possible. One point that is not mentioned is buildings with so much of the lot taken by structure, there is no on site snow storage which often leads to snow displacement onto sidewalks.

I know issues with building height diminishing the neighborly atmosphere between properties and blocking sunlight exposure has been discussed at muni meetings about South Addition, but there are no comments of that nature in the document. I would like to see those added.

Sincerely,
Michael Teo

Tue, Dec 1, 2020, 5:26 PM

Sheree Warner:

Hi,

I sent comments earlier about parking on Stoltz and would like to add:

To reiterate there should be NO Parking on Stoltz

In the winter when turning right off 9th onto Stoltz it is very difficult. If someone is parked there it leaves barely one lane and if it is slick (it is easy to slide over) it's even more difficult. Additionally, if there are pedestrians, which is usually the case, they are endangered. People are always backing in and out of this area. And it invites partiers and hot rodders, etc. And as I stated before many who park there are smoking pot. I walk almost everyday and am always assaulted with the odor. And I understand the residents of Wells Manor have to close their windows due to the odor.

This corner of Bootleggers has become very transient as it is with 5-6 Airbnbs in operation. This parking area just increases that feeling of transiency.

That area should be for pedestrians only. With the vehicle busyness of the intersection of 9th and Stoltz that area would provide a safe walkway for the many pedestrians who also accompanied with children and pets. There are many designated parks for people to go park along the coast: Elderberry, Nulbay, Earthquake, Woronzof and a few others. This area on Stoltz should not be for parking at all, there is no park there.

Thank you again.

Sheree Warner Nyren

Mon, Dec 14, 2020, 1:06 PM

Dave Syren:

I was an early participant in the South Addition Neighborhood Plan.

Since that time I have heard rumors of prior recommendations and suggestions being changed or eliminated to accommodate higher density housing and other undesirable aspects not reflected in the original South Addition Neighborhood plan determined from community wide participants early on.

Why participate in any neighborhood plan if the results of that investment are ignored or altered later on?

Please postpone advancement of this plan until we can safely meet as a community to determine the facts of the current plan/recommendations and confirm its what the majority of South Addition Residents desire.

This Covid-19 pandemic will likely be behind us come spring/summer and we can re-engage in person as a neighborhood community to confirm our goals for this unique neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Dave Syren

Tue, Dec 15, 2020, 10:13 AM
Mary Hilcoske and Neal Fried

to SouthAdditionPlan Executive Committee:

We would like to strongly urge you to further extend the time period within which homeowners in South Addition may provide comments regarding this plan. We are in the middle of the holiday season and many are pressed for time. We would suggest extending the period until early February so that we will have the month of January after the holidays to review the plan in full and to put forth any questions we may have.

Thank you.

Mary Hilcoske and Neal Fried

Tue, Dec 15, 2020, 1:47 PM
Kathleen Weeks

South Addition CC and the Neighborhood Plan Committee:

I am a past president of SACC and I was among the original organizers of the neighborhood plan committee. I attended all of the public hearings. I assisted with the vote counts as each issue was raised. In some cases I photographed some of the presentations. Therefore it came as quite a surprise to me to read that the public had encouraged any sort of commercial use of land between 13th and 15th St. and A and C Streets and between I and L Streets.

At the same time that our neighborhood Plan public hearings occurred, at our monthly meetings we were having lengthy discussions on the Weidner and Associates proposed building at 14th and C Street. The consensus of all public comment on the Weidner apartment building was that it was not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. The structure was too tall. The first floor was largely a half-sunken parking lot so that pedestrians looked at the roofs of cars. There were no "eyes on the street" (meaning windows in living areas designed to prompt occupants to report problems they might see outside). The proposed 14th Ave. Weidner apartment building contained multiple stories and multiple units making it a much denser occupancy than the other homes and buildings in the area.

On the issue of any mixed **commercial** use between A and C streets, South Addition residents had always supported Fairview's efforts to develop a commercial and retail center between Gambell and Ingra and from Fifth Avenue through Midtown. South Addition residents and SACC (Community Council) had supported and helped Fairview to promote its "Cut and Cover" plan for the Gambell/Ingra highways.

We had experienced one commercial mining development at 13th and Cordova Street when Weidner and Associates begin extracting gravel to support the building of their apartment complex at 16th and A Street. When advised by the municipality that they could not mine gravel from a property zoned R-4, they abandoned that effort and enclosed the now pitted lot with a four foot tall chain-link fence which is an eyesore to this day.

15th Ave. at C St. Is the site of a small attractive Strip mall. That site would be grandfathered under any zoning ordinance. I cannot recall a single public comment — verbal or written --at any of our public meetings which requested or promoted any new commercial development in the area North or South of 13th Avenue or East or West of A street.

The overwhelming consensus was that the commercial developers and homebuilders had purchased lots which were zoned R-2M or R-3 and now that they were ready to build they wanted their land rezoned R-4 or some new "mixed residential and commercial" use. The existing neighbors were extremely anxious to preserve the quiet and the character of the neighborhood as much as possible despite the increasing traffic and the lack of traffic calming devices on SACC streets where it has become increasingly difficult for pedestrians to cross streets like A and C.

We have viable commercial districts from 1st Avenue to 9th Avenue and from I to L Street. Fireweed is all commercial as is Midtown, Gambell, Hyder and Ingra. The irony right now is that the downtown Area is largely deserted. Restaurants are closed. There is little or no pedestrian traffic. For a year the COVID-19 pandemic has largely shut down tourism and restaurants and shopping. At this critical time, with our economy shattered, it will be crucial that we revive the shuttered restaurants and stores

downtown before authorizing new development in areas where the residents do not even want it!

I have listened to the Zoom SACC meetings and I have noticed that, although the neighborhood plan has been listed as an agenda item, no discussion or public comment has occurred. In the 25 years that I have attended SACC meetings I have never seen the officers so adverse to hearing from their constituents. I would urge you to rewrite the unsupported sections of the neighborhood plan because SACC's public hearings never supported "mixed residential and commercial use" in areas of South Addition, except for the few grandfathered existing facilities. If you are unconvinced that the original public comments were as I described them above, then please reopen the public hearings for additional comments and clarifications.

Thank you,
Kathleen A. Weeks

Dec 15, 2020, 3:43 PM
Greg Curney:

To Whom it May Concern,

I oppose adding commercial "Neighborhood Centers" in the South Addition. I also oppose any rezone to R4 in the South Addition. Excessive development will destroy the character of the neighborhood, one of the oldest in Anchorage. The Central Business District of downtown offers more than enough commercial development opportunity. Please leave South Addition a residential neighborhood.

Thank you,
Greg Curney

Tue, Dec 15, 2020, 3:51 PM
Pam Tesche:

Hello,

My name is Pam Tesche. I have lived in SA for most of 45 years, in four different homes. One one was with my parents, and three I owned.

When I first moved to Anchorage, I lived with my parents at 644 W 10, on the corner of 10th Ave and G St. Their house was sold and moved, so that First Presbyterian Church

could expand. And by the way, that house was attached to another house on F St, to make a duplex.

The second house, 1111 W 12th, was a single family, converted to a duplex by the previous owner, across from Inlet View Elementary School.

The third house was a tiny single family at 1526 G Street. We hired an architect draw up plans for a remodel, but we decided to move instead.

The fourth house at G ST is where my family and I have lived since 1984. We did major remodeling to the 1 1/2 story house, although we did not increase the footprint. Some day I would like to add an ADU over the garage. Note: private homeowners do not have access to the beneficial funding or tax breaks as do developers, to expand our homes in order to add additional affordable dwelling places, even though we also employ trusted architects and contractors. My husband and I had to come up with the \$250,000 cash ourselves to upgrade our property. I would add, that, thankfully, a neighbor down the street had an ADU we could rent, for the 11 months it took for our house to be finished.

Our Architect designed the house so that it would not overwhelm the surrounding one , and 1-1/2, story homes on the block, and blend in harmoniously with the neighborhood.

I understand the concept of responsible development, building to scale, and healthy neighborhoods. I've had the privilege, years ago, to view one of the first lectures given by Andre Duany on building to scale, and have had coffee with Ross Chapin, the visionary Seattle architect who leads the movement for re-visioned older neighborhoods.

I have seen developments in California where the letter of good development has been met, but the spirit of it has not. Fresh new developments become dysfunctional crowded eyesores in under 15 years. I have also seen well done development where businesses and dwellings are in harmony, where infill is natural and pleasant, walkable, friendly.

Disturbing is the ill-formed conclusion that it is ok to tear down a small house for the purpose of designating the lot as infill. It is wrong to say that any scale or type of structure would do, no matter the cost to the health of the neighborhood, the people who live here, and the people in other parts of our city. We live, work, and play together.

I fully support the work and efforts that we citizens in South Addition Community Council have done since 2016 for our draft neighborhood plan. The specific recommendations, and more, are necessary if Anchorage itself is to develop in a manner responsive to the health of individuals and families. I do not support the lack of transparency in certain decisions. I do not support the neglectful lack of consideration for human needs, and human scale development.

The unique nature of South Addition is its walkability, friendliness, safe feeling. Young moms from other neighborhoods come here, unpack their strollers, and enjoy ambience, sharing the sidewalks with local seniors in wheel chairs and walkers. A neighbor on the porch or front lawn with a smile and friendly wave is welcome and satisfying.

Thank you for your time.

Pamela Dunham Tesche

December 15, 2020, 4:35 PM

Kathie Veltre

Comments for South Addition Community Council regarding the draft neighborhood plan:

Thank you for the work you have done putting this together. It seems like a good start. This current draft plan is attractively done and packed with information about the history and composition of our neighborhood. But as it stands it is far too general to be of real use.

My basic concern with this draft is that a builder picking it up would read through at least forty pages of well-written, interesting material, but find no specific direction about the real concerns and desires of the South Addition community.

On page 4 of the draft you outlined the purpose and goals of the SA neighborhood plan. They include:

- Identifying compatible infill housing that complements the neighborhood values.
- Enhancing and maintaining neighborhood character.

These goals, this purpose, and these values were stated as the reason for two community meetings that were held in the fall of 2016. These meetings were well-attended by enthusiastic neighbors who were asked for their opinions and were assured that their input would be respected. Participants were clear and adamant about what they like. Following these meetings, several committees were set up to study those values. Many neighbors worked for months – some years – with planners from the municipality and members of the Anchorage Historical Commission to analyze existing building codes and consider what action, if any, was needed to preserve the character so appreciated by the people who choose to live here. Each committee prepared a detailed report, which was presented to the South Addition Executive Committee and then to the Community Council as a whole, where the reports were accepted as a true representation of resident values.

It was understood by all the participants that the results of this work would be included in the neighborhood plan. This was to be the primary document that would inform homeowners, builders, and the municipal planning department of this community council's wishes. We were reminded again and again as we worked with planners, to make specific statements in this document, regarding, for instance, landscaping, use of sidewalks, placement of windows facing the street.

To address these issues, your draft proposes to develop overlay districts and to establish urban design committees. This seems logical. But the plan suggests this should happen in one to two years. This timeline, this delay, blatantly disregards the wishes of the residents at the 2016 meetings, jettisons the work of the committees following those meetings, ignores the results of the survey, and rejects the decision of South Addition Community Council to accept the resolution presented in the spring of 2019 which outlined the agreed-upon values and called for their implementation. Because of delays such as these, developers have been able to build without the guidance of a real neighborhood plan. Neighbors who enthusiastically participated in these meetings and these committees have quit in real disgust because they have seen that the promise of that early call to action, the call to write a plan that would be respected and followed, has been ignored.

This plan is a good start. The neighborhood can be brought together by including all results of the public process until now, broadcasting the need for more input and participation, promising those who participate in the future that their efforts matter by convincing them that it is worth their time and that we, as a neighborhood, are not simply at the mercy of the developers and the self-interest of a few people who are trying to maximize the monetary value of their property at the expense of the character issues that have made this such a desirable place to live.

One very specific concern I have with this draft is the inclusion of support for commercial establishments north of Park Place. It is true that this area is zoned for higher density, but to my knowledge residents of that neighborhood have not been informed of plans for commercial development. Why, if that has not happened, has this been included in the plan as a value of the residents? Where did this come from? It seems inappropriate.

Good luck as you continue with this very interesting process.

Tue, Dec 15, 2020, 5:00 PM
Cheryl Richardson

South Addition Community Council has been a significant influence in local government for decades, ever since being founded by Lanie Fleischer in the mid seventies. We have aworked for citywide policies and standards to protect neighborhoods from aggressive developers and from road builders who champion high speeds in the city. South Addition has advocated to keep downtown healthy, for public open space and parks, walkable, bikeable trails and roadways, and to maintain sunlight coming into homes and residential gardens. And of course, the council has focused on protecting South Addition's historic character in open and collaborative communications and public meetings.

The results of past discussions and neighborhood negotiations can be found in the repository of community council resolutions, the most recent of which can be found on South Addition's website at the Federation of Community Councils.

Unfortunately, those years of hard work are being carelessly tossed aside by the latest community council leadership who over the past couple of years have ignored neighborhood priorities and neglected to ask residents what they think about important issues such as

- new zoning standards that allow tall, bulky homes with even taller elevator shafts,
- developers' proposals to go further and allow 3 story homes here,
- policy and funding opportunities to reduce speeding on I and L, A and C,
- zoning changes to allow second homes in backyards.

Because different people have different opinions about these and other matters, it's up to the community council to facilitate fair and open discussion and potentially communicate neighborhood consensus to Anchorage's Assembly.

The latest example of neglect is the "Draft Neighborhood Plan," released by the council's Executive Committee, that substitutes personal opinion of unknown authors for two years of work on the Neighborhood Plan by well over 150 neighborhood volunteers, who produced an initial needs assessment and then specialized sub committee reports on key issues such as Neighborhood Character. Neither does the draft plan incorporate South Addition's years of consistent neighborhood opinion as expressed through published resolutions.

It's not clear why the Executive Committee has turned its back on all that work to make their own recommendations that have not been previously discussed or acted upon in open forums. But in any case the current draft plan is not up to South Addition's usual standards for consistency, quality or transparency.

While the first 40 pages of the plan, describing South Addition's characteristics are reasonably well done, the final 17 pages are surprisingly inadequate. Even worse, this leadership has not presented the plan's contents to the public, even during the one

zoom meeting that was held, where they allowed no questions, only comments. The meeting was over quickly with less than 10 comments received.

More recently, the council has not notified its members that its deadline for accepting comments had shifted from November 30 to December 15.

And this week, with all the controversy surrounding this "draft plan," the agenda for the monthly council meeting allows only 15 minutes available for a plan 'update,' and another 10 minutes to discuss zoom meeting procedures.

In order to overcome these problems, bypassing historic neighborhood opinion and organized Neighborhood Plan work products, making recommendations that have not been discussed or voted upon in open meetings, producing incomplete, hard to read and inconsistent recommendations and providing a totally inadequate public process, the Executive Committee should:

First, recommit to following the Neighborhood Plan planning process, laid out by Sheila Selkregg and approved by SACC and the Anchorage Assembly.

Secondly: Hire an experienced, professional planner to review past neighborhood resolutions and records, as well as the work of Neighborhood Plan Committees and develop a neighborhood plan that reflects South Addition's values and priorities.

Finally: Have the professional planner conduct a transparent planning process that provides the average neighbor a chance to learn about the neighborhood plan and how it would affect them.

Wed, Dec 16, 2020, 6:49 PM:
Tamas Deak:

To whom it may concern:

I am reaching out to offer comments/notes regarding the south addition neighborhood plan that is available for download on the website.
It is called South Addition Neighborhood Plan, but I trust this is intended to be the draft.
Thank you for the opportunity.

For some background I offer that I am an engaged South Addition resident and as such I was an active participant in the SANP process.

I am invested and interested in ensuring that the unique neighborhood we are lucky enough to call home maintains the characteristics that are the very reason why we live here.

My curiosity to review the documents stems from having put forth significant effort with many of my neighbors to advance the plan on a volunteer basis.

I participated in the initial large public meetings on September 22 and November 12, 2016. I followed up by leading the neighborhood character group work and provided its findings written work product to the SACC in February 2017.

Sandra Ramsey and I reported the same findings of the group first to the SACC ExCom in a closed meeting and then I reported to the full SACC in November 2017 in a public meeting.

Later next year Cheryl Richardson asked me to help the steering committee with my planning expertise to support the project especially in light of the ongoing redevelopment of larger parcels in the Fire Island Zone. It became apparent to me after months of work that the public process fizzled and leadership withered.

My hope was that by reviewing this document I would find that a robust public engagement reinvigorated the planning process and that the considerable work done by South Addition community members were professionally captured in a long awaited neighborhood plan proposal that represents the vision of the community.

I will defer on a technical review as it was neither my call nor my interest without addressing the singular and most serious concern I have after my read.

I am concerned that this plan carries a huge credibility problem regarding the public process associated with it.

The plan does not adequately represent the public views that were strongly expressed for what is called the Fire Island Zone on Figure 2.

In the plan implementation section in Chapter 8 this is most relevant and sadly most telling.

Statements about plan implementation strategies may either be attributed to a planning decision made by the SACC ExCom or a misrepresentation of the public process.

They cannot be both.

There was no consensus of any sort to include commercial development in the current R-3 zoned area north of 13th between I and L.

This singular shortcoming in itself is endangering the entire process and document without other points being able to be properly vetted and contemplated, however solid their rationale may be.

This is unfortunate, but not entirely unexpected based on the process to date.

Another statement that I found peculiar is the linear correlation of the ANC Housing Market Analysis and redevelopment in South Addition on page 11.

I picked this out as it - again - goes to the issue of credibility, however wonkish and technical it may be.

The housing market study was really searching for solutions for the - at the that time in 2012 – highly relevant problem of housing units vs. available land on which to place them in the bowl. However, nowhere it implied that redevelopment of existing neighborhoods with strongly guarded character were the cost of doing business to achieve increased number of housing units to reach our long term planning goals. I remember that as I was a member of the technical committee who worked on that study.

I looked it to see for a refresher. A link to the study is found below just in case I need to stay corrected.

<https://www.muni.org/departments/ocpd/planning/publications/documents/anchorage%20housing%20market%20analysis%20summary%20report.pdf>

Thanks.

Tamás Deák

Neighbor and Fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architects

Mon, Dec 28, 2020, 10:39 PM:

Pete Hjellen, Diane Holmstrom:

South Addition Neighborhood Plan

Section 8.3 talks about encouraging small-scale commercial development.

We have been South Addition residents since 1992, first at 12th and H, and now at Park Place Condos. We have read the Neighborhood Plan and find it insightful and well done but raises concerns.

We are opposed to developing something north of Park place for the following reasons:

1. The plan as presented is not detailed enough to understand the full impact of developing the area north of Park Place.
2. There are several diverse commercial businesses in the area already including an art boutique, physical therapy office, the Skhoop skirt company, law Office and real estate office
3. City Market already exists south of Park Place and has many of the amenities identified in the plan.
 - Restaurant, coffee shop, deli, grocery, and ample parking.
4. Inlet Tower Hotel
 - Has a fine dining restaurant able to serve alcohol, apartments, ample parking, meeting rooms, and hotel accommodations.
5. Fire Island Rustic Bakery
 - Has fresh baked goods, coffee, and sandwiches.
6. The above three food accommodations have both inside and outside eating.

7. Additional development north of Park Place will increase traffic, population density, need for additional parking and increase noise. The Anchorage Pioneer Home is especially vulnerable.

All these businesses are within easy walking distance of each other.

What we don't have and would not encourage are a Liquor store and a Pot shop

Tue, Dec 29, 2020, 10:56 PM

Laurie Wolf:

To: SouthAddition Executive Committee

From: 30+ resident of South Addition and lifelong Alaskan

RE: Neighborhood Plan

I write for the first time about this process, not because I have been unaware, but to the contrary, I have been following it for the five years that more than 150 volunteers of this part of town have been gathering to provide their perspective. Now however, I am truly concerned that the current process negates so much of the public process and deeply troubled to hear about the last few meetings and the lack of respect shown to residents who do not agree with the current path of the executive committee. More importantly I write today because I too do not agree with some of the current recommendations. I urge a return to the public process and I urge strong reconsideration to follow the guidance set forth by Sheila Selkregg and resident volunteers to protect South Addition's renowned historic character.

In the past process, the volunteers reached consensus on several standards they wanted included in the Plan. These include: limiting home heights in the old South Addition (zoned R2), and also limiting the height of elevator and stairwell shafts and rooftop walls; limiting the bulk of new homes; measuring home height from a lot's average height, not from the lot's highest point; notifying neighbors when a developer requests an exemption to the zoning laws; building garages on the alley where alleys exist; requiring level sidewalks, not slanted or sloping; and protecting solar access. Of course you can find the consistent, well-crafted resolutions and Neighborhood Plan Committee reports that should be the foundation for the plan at the SACC website (above) under "Neighborhood Plan."

Watching the recent developments in the neighborhood that replaces homes with yards, trees, and natural light with buildings that span the whole lot, no trees, and limits lights for other homes is deeply sad as it lets the desires of one developer overpower the character and living conditions of a whole neighborhood. As an Alaskan, natural habitat

and access to natural light is paramount and I am concerned that more of this kind of building is inevitable with the current suggestion to create Overlay Districts to "identify specific guidelines and standards for certain neighborhood zones," which will ignore the already agreed upon guidelines and standards and leave the neighborhood vulnerable to developers' excesses. Furthermore I understand that the current plan would delay the implementation of the most important standards for another two or three years as the Overlay Districts are designed and approved.

Additionally, the recommendations to commercialize key parts of South Addition including rezoning those areas to R4A, allowing up to 90-foot high buildings is antithetical to SouthAddtions character. If the desire is to have more people live downtown by creating commercial "Neighborhood Centers" then those kinds of plans should be outlined in the downtown core plan not in the SouthAddition plan. They are not interchangeable.

I urge the SACC's Executive Committee to incorporate the previous recommendations of so many in our neighborhood and I further urge you to return to a more meaningful public process that includes time for participants to ask questions and make comments without judgement. This Plan is far too important to let it happen without transparency and public participation.

Thank you for your consideration
Respectfully

Laurie Wolf

Dec 31, 2020, 10:30 AM

Bill Bernier:

My first comment is with regard to the process for this plan upgrade or update, whatever it is being called. I hope that the city government is contemplating a robust public process throughout this planned upgrade/update to downtown, neighborhood planning. There should be numerous public meetings, public hearings and input from residents and property owners who will be affected by any changes. Residents need the opportunity to participate and provide impact comments, suggest changes, object to specific proposals and work on a consensus built document.

There are lots of improvements to be made in downtown neighborhoods without taking a wrecking ball to the character and feel of neighborhoods. Upgrade alleyways and pave them, underground all the overhead utilities, remove derelict buildings and so on.

There should be no changes in the plan that would permit structures more than 3 stories tall for residential or 4 stories for a mixed use building with retail only allowed on the ground floor. Limited commercial business such as restaurants, cafe's, small retail or service types of business only. No big box, national chain stores with requirements for large public parking areas should be allowed. The Inlet Towers building should remain the only permitted tall building exception in the entire area. No residential building should be allowed that requires residents to park on the street or in the alley. Off street parking for residences should be a requirement. Enclosed, underground parking or garages should be mandatory. Carports should not be allowed.

Thu, Dec 31, 2020, 4:53 PM
Greg Curney:

As a 30-year resident of the South Addition, I object to both the commercialization to any parts of the South Addition and to the concept of "Neighborhood Centers" in the South Addition. I oppose any rezoning to R4A in the South Addition.

This pandemic has fundamentally changed the way we work and shop. Working from home has, and will continue to reduce the need for commercial office space. On-line shopping has, and will continue the need for brick and mortar stores. We don't need more land dedicated to these uses. The downtown central business district has been in decline for years and has more than enough vacant land zoned for these purposes for the foreseeable future.

The South Addition already has several "grandfathered" in commercial areas, such as New Sagaya, Fire Island Bakery and Inlet Tower Hotel and Restaurant. We don't need any more commercial in the South Addition Neighborhood. Any attempts at rezoning to any form of commercial or R4A is a blatant disregard for the strong historic residential character of this desirable and vital neighborhood.

Thank you,
Greg Curney

Thu, Dec 31, 2020, 10:14 PM

We are Neal Fried and Mary Hilcoske, at G St, where we will have lived for 40 years come April 2021.

We feel strongly that the standards arrived at by the Neighborhood Plan volunteers in their many years of work must be included in the final plan. We are particularly interested in assuring that home and commercial building heights in the old South Addition be limited such that sun is not blocked from neighbors. We support the resolutions and committee reports ideas which are contained in the Neighborhood Plan section of the SACC website.

We see no need for overlay districts. Very simply, we do not want to see the historical nature of all of South Addition ruined by cutting it up into pockets of different standards. Before long, the neighborhood would be compromised and will lose what we all enjoy about it now.

We strongly feel that all property owners of SACC should have the benefit of a thorough plan presentation with time to ask questions and make comments about the draft. What are we locking ourselves into and for what period of time? How binding is the plan on the MOA development efforts and that of private developers? Who is imposing the deadlines for developing the plan - the MOA or the Executive Committee alone? - and why? Development of a document this far reaching should be presented as stated above so that everyone gets to weigh in and understands the ramifications of the standards which will appear in the final version. Transparency is the key and it takes time to follow a process all are comfortable with.

Sun, Jan 24, 7:51 PM
Bryce Coryell

Hi,

Who would come up with the neighborhood design standards? South Addition has prospered with residents having freedom over their own piece of it. I see eroding that freedom as eroding what has been a force for good and self renewal in our community.

Thank you,

Tue, Mar 9, 2021 4:03 PM
John Thurber

Ladies and Gentleman,

There has been significant public participation in the South Addition Planning Process that is not documented in the Draft Plan.

Specifically, the following Community Council Resolutions are foundational documents for the Plan and should be included in Chapter 4. The title should be modified to "Existing Plans, Policies and Community Council Resolutions".

Date with Topics Addressed

02/16/2006

Building Heights, Sunlight Access and View Sheds

12/18/14

Building Heights, Building Compatibility, Density, Sunlight Access, On Site Parking

02/18/15

Compatible Development, Sunlight Access and Traffic Congestion

12/17/15

Compatible Development, Building Height, Scale, Density, Sunlight Access, Walkability, Sidewalks, Traffic Calming

04/21/16

Compatible Development, Height, Scale, Density, Size and Bulk of Buildings, Shadowing, Viewsheds, Streetscapes, Sidewalks, Bike Paths, Landscaping and Infill Housing

10/17/16

Compatible Development, Infill Development, Building Heights, Density, Sunlight Access, Landscaping, Traffic Calming, Alley Access, Compact Housing and Shared Design Principles

10/19/17

Utility Line Under Grounding

03/28/19

Building Heights, Rooftop Stairwells and Elevator Shafts

The Resolutions reflect thoughtful and deliberative discussions among the Residents of South Addition. The Resolutions also demonstrate a high level of consensus among the

Residents and the Executive Committee as all of the Resolutions passed with overwhelming support.

The Plan defers discussion and resolution of many critical planning issues to future Design Committees and/or Overlay Zone Exercises.

The following issues have already been vetted and broad agreement reached on applicable Standards for South Addition as a whole.

1. Compatible Development
2. Building Height, Scale & Bulk
3. Sunlight Access
4. Landscaping
5. Sidewalks
6. Density
7. Traffic Calming & Streetscapes
8. Bike Paths
9. Alley Access
10. Infill Housing

As the aforementioned topics are addressed in the Plan, corresponding Community Council Resolutions should be referenced to demonstrate that community consensus has already been reached on specific Design Standards for South Addition.

I believe that establishing the connection between the Community Council Resolutions and the Draft Plan will garner support from the Residents of South Addition for the Plan. This will also narrow down the remaining key critical issues that require additional attention.

Sincerely,
John Thurber

Wed, March 10, 10:50 AM
Mary Miller

I am attaching our letter of support for the South Addition Neighborhood Plan. If you have questions or concerns please let me know.

Thank You,

Mary Lee Miller

Municipal Planning Department
Anchorage, Alaska

March 10, 2021

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to support the South Addition Neighborhood Plan to keep the established standards and protect the historic character of the neighborhood. This is important not only for the neighborhood's character but for the health and enjoyment it brings to many individuals in our city.

Before living in Eagle River my husband and I lived in South Addition when we first came to Anchorage 40 years ago. After living in Eagle River for 34 years we wanted to come back to the area. We loved this neighborhood because of its traditional character and walkability. We were fortunate enough to find a lovely home. One downfall was the driveway out front. It was difficult to pull out safely and the concrete slab was unsightly. We tore out the slab and put grass in its place. This added peace of mind for us and safety for those using the sidewalk.

We feel strongly about the maintaining walkability of South Addition with its safe and connected streets. There are many individuals who benefit from the level sidewalks and lack of driveways from homes into the street. As a Teacher of the Blind and Visually Impaired for over 40 years in Anchorage I have watched young children grow into independent adults from learning the basics of travel in our neighborhood. South Addition is the only neighborhood in the Municipality of Anchorage that has a traditional grid for blind individuals to learn to orient and navigate independently. Since there aren't driveways in front of most houses it is safe for a beginning cane user to learn to walk down the sidewalk independently without the danger of a car randomly pulling out. Many of the crossways have stop signs which make it safer to learn to listen for traffic and cross the street safely. The level sidewalks have a grass edge which makes it possible for a blind individual to navigate down the street and not veer off course onto a driveway and into the street. An added bonus is many neighbors shovel the sidewalk or they are plowed by the Municipality throughout the winter which provides beginning cane users the opportunity to learn to travel outdoors while navigating in winter conditions. I have only listed a few of the numerous skills that are mastered in South Addition which provide the basis for more sophisticated travel throughout the community. Words can't express the confidence that is built from learning to travel independently for a blind child or a newly blinded adult. Losing the traditional layout of the neighborhood and the safety it provides would be a significant loss to this community.

Seniors, young children, dog walkers and others from the community enjoy the benefits of this traditional neighborhood as well. Residents of the Pioneer home are able to take advantage of the level sidewalks to get out with their walkers which opens up opportunities for much needed social interactions. We especially love watching young children ride their bikes up and down the street, and are delighted for them when they have been given the go ahead by their parent(s) to ride around the block. You can feel their joy and the confidence it provides. One of my favorite childhood memories is of finally being allowed to ride my bike around the block. There are too few neighborhoods in Anchorage that provide this rite of passage.

South Addition with its traditional neighborhood grid, inviting front yards, alley driveways and level sidewalks is a treasure that needs to be preserved for all to enjoy. We implore you to take to heart the needs of those that benefit from the neighborhood and adopt the recommendations of the South Addition Neighborhood Plan.

Sincerely,
Tom and Mary Miller

Wed, Mar 10, 12:57 PM
Kathy Doogan

To: South Addition Community Council
RE: South Addition Neighborhood Plan

My husband and I moved into Park Place Condominiums 8 years ago, drawn by the character of the neighborhood, the nearby amenities and the many downtown businesses, cultural attractions and restaurants, all within easy walking distance but far enough away that we were removed from the noise and dense congestion of downtown. Our home is on the top floor on the north side of Park Place's north building, the area identified in the SACC Neighborhood Plan as the "North face of Park Place." The area directly across the street from us, "11th and 12th Street, between L and I Street," is also identified. Most of our comments will focus on those two areas, both of which are included in the plan as the potential location of a "neighborhood center."

The purpose of this neighborhood center is explained as "to encourage small-scale commercial development that could provide services to the neighborhood." Such development already exists in this neighborhood — there is a grocery store with coffee stand and a large hotel with bar and restaurant within a block of Park Place, and within just 4 blocks, there are a bakery/café, hair and nail salon, commercial office space and 4 churches. The area is made up of many historic homes on quiet, narrow streets which create its character. More development and its accompanying noise, traffic and zoning changes would seriously detract from this character, which has drawn residents to this neighborhood for many years.

These are the main reasons for which we are opposed to this plan. Other concerns and questions we have are about the process, which to us has been very confusing. What exactly IS the process, and is there a timetable? Why were standards originally designed to preserve the character of the neighborhood not included in the current plan? We saw a 12/16/20 letter from the Muni Planning Department with many useful comments on the plan — will some or all those be incorporated? And who ultimately makes the final decision on if, when and how to move forward on this plan?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Kathy and Mike Doogan

Park Place Condominiums
Wed, Mar 10, 3:35 PM
David Ustick

My wife and I do have a opinion as to the plan for our neighborhood looking forward. We believe the park strip could be used as mixed business/ residential but the buildings should be in line with what is there now and not multi level buildings such as the area up by the Base.

Apartment Complexes/ Projects should not be allowed ... but Apartment living should be available such as in-law and second floor/ sublets.

The Apartment/ Duplex system on 15th by the Lagoon should not be allowed to be expanded.

Single family living in the area of 10th through 15th streets and 1st through U streets should be maintained excluding upgrades to properties. The markings for Stop Signs and trail markings at 13th and U streets should be more apparent due to the fact the Stop sign is mostly ignored by drivers and the whole area is traversed by walkers, runners, hikers and tourist whose easily get lost in the area.

The area of wetland (13th & U Streets) should stay as part of the park and never be developed, it should stay as a wetland preserve.

Lastly when there are large Events by and around the Westchester Lagoon maybe an overflow parking area at the park strip with shuttle services to help with traffic control and help relieve some pressure off the Police Force during these times.

Thank you for you time

Mar 10, 2021, 7:21 PM
Carol Butler

To: South Addition Community Council
From: Park Place Board of Directors
Subject: Draft Neighborhood Plan

Thank you for the efforts devoted to developing a cohesive plan for development of the South Addition. The demographics and history of the neighborhood are informative and well presented. Here are our primary concerns.

In 2015 a South Addition Community Council Neighborhood Plan Steering Committee was formed with the sole intent to produce a Neighborhood Plan. The current draft differs dramatically on substantive points to the March 28, 2019 resolution adopted by the council with an overwhelming majority vote of 16 – 2 although the current SACC board members are the same as in 2019.

How did this transpire?

The current draft proposes developing the area north of Park Place but provides insufficient detail other than "Neighborhood Centers." Commercial development raises concerns of increased density, more traffic, noise, building height and the need for additional parking as well as duplication of existing services. We strongly oppose marijuana or liquor stores to this development. Are they part of the plan?

Another recommendation is to rezone parts of South Addition to R4A which allows up to 90-foot buildings thereby substantially changing the character of this historic area and decimating a largely residential area.

It appears that recommendations have been amended without community input and discussion in an open and transparent public process. An explanation is needed especially as a courtesy to the dozens of volunteers who devoted time and talents to this effort.

Personal interests oftentimes supersede what is best for a neighborhood. Let this not be the case here.

Thank you.

Carol Butler, President Park Place Board of Directors

March 11, 2021 12:41 PM

Rachel Mills

to SouthAdditionPlan

Hello. I live downtown and would like to see small single family homes instead of large box houses like the one on 10th and denali. They are ugly and ruin the character of downtown. South addition should stay small. I hope that will help my cordova neighborhood keep its character as well.

Thanks,
Ravhe

March 11, 2021 1:05 PM
Jim Richardson

My name is Jim Richardson. I live in Rogers Park and am a frequent visitor to South Addition (via the Chester Creek Trail).

My comments below relate to the unrealistic future population growth data presented and summarized on the table on page 35. The source is listed as Anchorage Growth Forecasts 2015-2040. These population forecasts for the Municipality of Anchorage are based on outdated data and do not reflect current or likely trends in the economy of Anchorage and the population trends that are most likely to occur in the near-term future.

The basis for these future population forecasts represented in Table 35 do not account for:

- (a) The steady decline in the population in Anchorage from 2013 to the present (source: Alaska Department of Labor). There is no logical reason to assume that the recent trend will reverse in the near-term future.
- (b) The overall decline in total federal expenditures in Alaska in recent years that are a crucial component of the economy of Anchorage and the rest of Alaska.
- (c) The loss of a large portion of State oil revenues that resulted from State legislative decisions in 2014. This date marked a large structural change in Alaska's (and Anchorage's) economy and fiscal future. The revenues to the State from oil that have been foregone since 2014 have not been replaced from any other sources.
- (d) The Municipality of Anchorage, due to the diminishing economy in recent years, has lost a large number of jobs (e.g. BP Oil, decline in UAA, loss of many small businesses, etc. The Municipality has not addressed if, how and when these job losses might be reversed.
- (e) There are no factors current apparent that will change the trends of declining Alaska/Anchorage populations and the diminishing economy of the State.
- (f) The economic job losses and dislocation from covid-19 regulations and conditions have greatly exacerbated Municipality of Anchorage job and income losses over the past year. At this point, the likelihood and timing of any recovery is uncertain. This will result in additional downward pressure on the economy and populations in future years.

By misrepresenting expectations for both community growth and economic growth for the Municipality of Anchorage, the Neighborhood Plan anchors future expectations on economic conditions and population growth (including future demand for housing) that is

unrealistic. The Municipality of Anchorage is well aware of this shortcoming, but chooses not to recognize the actual current and most likely future conditions for the Municipality.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the South Addition Neighborhood Plan.
Jim Richardson

March 11, 2021 2:11 PM
Lisa J. Seifert

to SouthAdditionPlan

Hello, I am in fairview and feel that the south edition plans effect my neighborhood also. Those big box 3 story condos are Ugly and they block light and sight. Please do not let any more be built without community input. Keep it to 2 stories. Also those Tiny homes on Cordova & 11th are nice but leave no green space. In the future green space should be mandatory in building codes they should have not let them be packed in so tight there should have had only 4 built.

The big gray box on 10th between cordova & Denali has no green space. The Garage faces the street and looks ugly. Construction should be limited.
Lisa

March 11, 2021 6:41 PM
Mara Carnahan

Dear SA Neighborhood Plan Committee:

I want to begin by thanking the many volunteers for countless hours dedicated over many years to the creation of the draft South Addition Neighborhood Plan. And to the residents who have been advocating for livable and healthy neighborhoods decades before development of the SANP I am also thankful. Your service to our neighborhood is greatly appreciated.

I recognize the challenge of gaining public engagement and participation in planning efforts like this one. However, rigorous neighborhood participation is critical to the ultimate success of the Plan. If we do not engage our neighbors throughout this planning process, there will be opposition as the Plan progresses through the approval process which will slow or stop its advancement.

I believe SA would benefit from professional facilitation by an unbiased facilitator to help residents engage in healthy and rigorous discussion about the future of our neighborhood.

Neighborhood plans are complicated and require a certain level of comfort and knowledge of the municipal planning processes to understand. I believe SACC should endeavor to educate and engage neighbors on the particular complexities around zoning, Title 21 development specifications, winter design, etc. I would imagine most neighbors are not aware of the current zoning of their parcel, nor the development allowed under current municipal code.

I have loved living in South Addition for more than 30 years. Like I have heard so many of my neighbors declare, I too love the walkability offered by our sidewalks, our historic character, the one to two story buildings that preserve access to sunlight, beautiful mature trees, large setbacks from the street, alley access for vehicles and parking, proximity to the downtown business district and its commercial amenities, proximity to the Delaney Park Strip and Westchester Lagoon recreation areas and access to our amazing trail system. I passionately believe all of these characteristics should be protected by our neighborhood plan.

During a well-attended community gathering at Inlet View school several years ago, I heard my neighbors celebrate these and other wonderful characteristics of our beloved neighborhood. Please be sure to refer to that well-documented meeting in the creation of the Plan.

In particular, I would like the Plan to protect:

- restriction of height of development to no more than two stories. Recent development of three story plus stairwell housing has cast dramatic shadows on surrounding parcels, including shading the Park Strip for months during the winter.
- historic character and scale of SA. I am not opposed to smaller scale higher density development, but urge design standards to help the developments “fit in” to the neighborhood and respect the existing scale of surrounding homes.
- the use of alleys for vehicle access to parcels to prevent additional curb cuts/ driveways on sidewalks.
- the requirement to provide on-site parking for parcel residents. Anchorage is a winter community, and when cars are forced to park on the street, it prevents safe and prompt snow removal causing hazards for pedestrians and drivers alike. Many of us love to walk and bike, especially during the summer months. Every passionate walkers/bikers I know also own a vehicle to facilitate running of errands and excursions to the wonders that surround our great city. If we do not plan ahead to accommodate parking, we are creating potential conflict with neighbors and parking crises experienced by other cities who did not adequately plan for parking on-site.
- access to sunlight for all parcels to facilitate use of solar panels and growth of gardens to enhance food security and the beauty of our neighborhood.
- walkability/bikability by ensuring sidewalks are protected, bike lanes encouraged and traffic calmed by design.

I support the Plan's efforts to continue alley use, year-round walkability, and alternative energy like solar panels. I also support ADUs, as long as development standards require the scale of the ADU to fit with the existing home and on-site parking is required.

I oppose Table 9, 2.4 to reduce on-site parking requirements for the reasons stated above. This is a critical issue that needs to be taken very seriously. Municipal code prohibits overnight parking on city streets for a reason. The municipality retains the right to remove vehicles from city streets to preserve year-round access and safety. When we built our home twenty years ago, we were required to provide three parking spots. As a one car family, I found the requirement over-zealous. I couldn't imagine needing three parking spots. I was informed by a planner city streets are a shared community resource and it is not fair to allow one homeowner to utilize an unfair portion of that resource. Hence the requirement for three parking spots on our parcel. As our family grew, so did our need for on-site parking and I am grateful for the Municipality's foresight that prepared our home for parking needs we couldn't imagine 20 years ago.

I oppose section 8.3: Encourage small-scale commercial development

I do not support additional commercial development at this time in South Addition. Our neighbors in the Downtown Business District and Fairview have long-standing neighborhood plans encouraging commercial development in the downtown core and along the Gambell Corridor. SACC has long supported these plans. We should continue to support their efforts, not compete with them by opening South Addition up to additional commercial development. In addition, any proposal to increase commercial development in South Addition should be thoroughly discussed and vetted by the SA community. In particular, neighbors adjacent to any proposed new commercial development deserve to be contacted and engaged in the discussion.

I recognize the need for increased affordable housing in Anchorage. Over the years, there has been discussion of increasing density in South Addition to allow for the development of affordable housing close to downtown. The cost of land in South Addition and the market for high-end homes in this area will prevent the development of affordable housing in South Addition. Almost all development in recent years has been high end single family homes or high end townhomes. Even a Cook Inlet Housing project in our neighborhood became corporate rentals instead of community rentals.

I am so grateful to all of my neighbors engaged in this process. I look forward to continued welcoming, transparent conversation about the future of our beloved neighborhood.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,
Mara Carnahan

March 11, 2021 6:57 PM
Cheryl Richardson

South Addition Community Council's Executive Committee overreached their authority when they dismissed the South Addition Neighborhood Plan Steering Committee and took over preparation of the Neighborhood Plan in fall 2018.

Even worse, they wrongly stopped the Neighborhood Plan Committee from conducting its third public meeting that was designed to present sub-Committee Reports and collect opinion from the greater council membership. The results of that meeting would have paved the way for a third party, a contractor, to come in and produce a draft Neighborhood Plan.

Over two years later, the Executive Committee does not yet demonstrate that it understands how much public process and technical work is still needed to produce a Neighborhood Plan. There is no evidence that the Executive Committee reads or relies upon the years of zoning resolutions produced by its hard working volunteer members to protect South Addition's character, or the formal planning agreements South Addition made with the Anchorage Assembly.

Developers continue to demand ever taller and bulkier buildings that overwhelm the historic character of this still-desirable neighborhood. But the neighborhood is being left defenseless, without organized community council responses.

This Executive Committee should resign, and open the way for new leadership to reestablish South Addition's traditionally open communications and focus on defending our previously enviable neighborhood character.

March 11, 2021, 10:11 PM
David Evans

Hello,

My sister and I are co-owners of 1100 "I" Street in South Addition. Please include the following comments from me on the draft South Addition Neighborhood Plan in the public record. Please be sure that the format (numbering, bold text, indentation, italics, etc.) of my comments in the public record matches the format in this email, and please ensure that the photograph in my comments is included in the public record, at a legible scale.

Regarding Section 8.2 – Encourage Accessory Dwelling Units

1. Please fix the grammar problem in the third paragraph: "...should meet the following one of the criteria:" should probably be "...should meet the following criteria:"

2. Please add the following paragraph and photograph before the paragraph on page 51 that begins "Figure 13 provides a map...":

However, compliance with Municipal design requirements does not ensure that an ADU will be a "good neighbor." A recently constructed detached ADU in Rogers Park (see Figure xxx) illustrates some of the problems that can arise from a code-compliant but insensitively designed structure: it is completely out-of-character and scale, dramatically shades neighboring yards, and balcony and window placements violate neighbor's backyard privacy. To avoid such issues, the South Addition Community Council advocates for construction of more ADUs in its council area, provided that they are designed to be sensitive to adjacent owners and not infringe on their solar access and privacy.



3. Please append the following to the first sentence of the first paragraph of Section 8.2: "...provided they are designed to not infringe on neighbor's solar access or privacy."

I would appreciate a quick reply letting me know you received this.

Thank you,
David Evans
1100 "I" Street co-owner

March 11, 2021, 11:59 PM
Ashley Reed List

To whom it may concern:

The plan does not seem to address the main concerns I have heard in the neighborhood regarding bulk and height of new construction. I recommend the plan address this issue according to the current zoning in order to recognize that there are a variety of properties and uses in the neighborhood without reinventing the wheel. My own house was recently overshadowed by new construction to the south that eliminated winter direct sunlight under the existing MOA rules, and I am concerned that the plan does not consider how to keep the loss of daylight from becoming a greater problem as MOA rules change over the next 10 or more years.

It's unclear why or how the various Neighborhood Zones were drawn, and why there is an emphasis on Neighborhood Zones rather than the existing MOA zoning, e.g. R2M etc. The purpose of the Neighborhood Zones is unclear.

I do not support increased commercial development in South Addition; we are adjacent to downtown with abundant commercial development.

Some plan recommendations do not seem practical or are outside the scope of the plan. For example, it would be more practical to advocate for property tax breaks for ADUs rather than advocating for home improvement loans.

The plan refers to Chugach Optional as a neighborhood school, but it is a lottery school. The school provides playgrounds and basketball courts for neighborhood use, but neighborhood children have no preference in the lottery.

Thank you,
Ashley List