

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>"In our existing zoning code, city planners use a calculation (the number of units divided by the size of the lot) to set a maximum limit on how many residential units can be built on a single piece of property. The Module 2 draft proposes removing the density calculation requirement of dwelling units per acre in residential zones to focus on design criteria, like maximum height, required parking, minimum lot sizes and setbacks to limit the impact of development.</p> <p>These changes are proposed because physical dimensions are often a better way to make sure new development "fits in" with existing neighborhoods, and because arbitrary dwelling unit/acre requirements often prevent the construction of innovative and new types of housing. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-03.2.A.</p> <p>Do you feel this proposed change will help encourage creative housing design and various housing types? Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?"</p>	Removing density calculations will overcrowd and destroy the city. Boise does not want to become Portland. Leave the code as is.
	I like the creativity in this idea! Will there be minimum requirements for the interior? Such as minimum 1 full bath for a studio, minimum kitchen size, etc.?
	Higher density, multi family buildings are not the answer. Boise needs to quit trying to develop every inch of undeveloped land to accommodate more residents. Everything that was desirable about Boise is quickly going away. More residents via higher density complexes is ruining our city.
	A requirement that larger builders develop a certain % of build jobs to be for quality affordable housing. An incentive for alternative, sustainable building materials
	Concentrate new apartment buildings in decaying commercially zoned areas
	Limit building height in residential areas
	It shouldn't be either/or. Both sets of components are important.
	Whatever the change, we HAVE to ensure developers pay impact fees for schools and roads. Our basic infrastructure is NOT keeping up with the growth. We need to grow in a measured way to ensure our kids are not crammed in overcrowded classrooms. We also need to ensure the roads can accommodate the increased number of people using them.
	yes, quit letting people tear down a small house and build monstrous ones. Make the new home have to be close to the same size as what you purchase. Our town is being ruined and you are letting it happen for money.
	There are too many houses "squished" into small spaces. That has got to stop. It's unsightly.
	Require a calculated amount of outdoor green spaces to be created per residential areas. A required proportion of open park area per certain residential areas so land is not only houses, but parks and open areas are also created in subdivisions.
	Hopefully creative design can make a housing unit fit the feel of the neighborhood rather than just maximizing the amount of units per lot and profits by developers.
	Developers will work the system to choose the easiest options that produce the highest return.
	Require variety of architectural type/design instead of continuing with modernism to the exclusion of all other forms.
	My general concern is that these proposed changes will result in greater unit density and a more congested Boise
	Use improved outside exterior with balconies, etc
	City council do their jobs for the people rather than just for developers.
	New homes, apartments, duplexes and commercial buildings should be designed and modeled to match what is existing. Not tear down and build a bunch of skinny row houses, no infills!
	Do not increase housing density
	I agree this could be beneficial. My only reservation is that, as written, this appears to be a shift from "strict limits" to "no limits," which could, theoretically, be problematic in some cases.
	Include multi use zoning
	I think there is still an important factor of transition spaces, historic surroundings and maintaining lot coverage % as a factor of mental health and quality of life. There are numerous studies that demonstrate mental health benefits from access to green space and nature. It is imperative that is considered in the rewrite
	Traffic study should be completed any time 1 lot becomes many lots. Any new neighborhood over 10 houses should require a small park area of at least the same size as the new homes. Houses should not be built on the lot line especially in neighborhoods where bigger yards are the norm.
	Reduce parking spot requirements and allow for other types of transportation access such as bikes.
	Architects can be creative and include density calculation. The two new homes on Castle adjacent from the Mormon Church are hideous. They completely disregard Collister Neighborhood Objectives in Chapter 8 objective 5..mixture of housing..that is compatible with existing character..there are no two story homes on that street. Taking a single lot and putting 2 story homes with a million windows and one entrance is too much. The house on the corner of Bluegrass now has absolutely no privacy in their back yard as well as the home on the other side of the 2nd home on one lot. 2. Scale..really read the above 9) Overall quality of life of existing folks should be considered.obviously you did not or you not have given permission to build two Mc Mansions in a single level neighborhood.
	These density changes are going to encourage developers to build high rise buildings that block natural sun light. While density can prevent sprawl, natural light and green spaces need to be a priority.
Require that investors have local partners and cap the ownership % of each partner.	
I'm not sure, sorry.	
It will encourage more housing and help ruin existing single family neighborhoods and degrade quality of life in the long term.	
This proposed change would not help creative housing design but encourage developers to build higher density housing to increase their profits while not addressing the infrastructure problems it would create.	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Require some open space
	I am concerning about the reduction of minimum parking requirements with only one (1) parking space instead of two (2). It is idealistic that we require less parking and every-one is going to bike everywhere; however, that is not realistic in most Boise neighborhoods. With people taking on roomates or two (2) families living in the same dwelling due to lack of affordable housing. We are going to have households that have cars and there needs to be a place for them to be parked.
	Removing the density calculation requirement of dwelling units per acre in residential zones is just granting carte blanche to developers to place as much housing as possible into the smallest lot size.
	Retain Dwelling Unit per Acre. Changing to using dimensional stds to predict density will result in neighbors fighting neighbors and everything being escalated to the City Council. We need to retain the 'simpler' method of DU/A.
	Stop the "cookie-cutter" look without sacrificing creativity and affordability, please!
	There needs to be more consideration for infrastructure, roads ,traffic.
	While I love design it's important also to consider the existing developments and how they effect those already in occupied spaces vs just the future of new designs
	make sure there is a result
	I don't want to look into my neighbor's bathroom if it's one yard away. There's enough space in Idaho. Don't cramp everybody together.
	I don't like seeing the largest possible house on existing lots that are built as close as possible to streets and property boundaries. I'm seeing this all over NW Boise and these monster houses are crowing out surrounding small and short houses.
	Include mixed occupancy levels. Single to groups. Have smaller personal space to shared community spaces such as co-housing provides.
	Keep the current R1A designation for larger lots. Neighborhoods should have more input into how the zoning changes will impact them. Current rewrite has a negative impact on many neighborhoods. Increased density is not always appropriate and more emphasis should be on the overall look and feel of a neighborhood.
	This proposed change will work the opposite as intended. You will get a more random mix of designs that detracts, rather than "fits in", with existing neighborhoods.
	Not necessarily. Perhaps consider percentage standards for adjacent/surrounding uses regarding building heights. Note 2 of Table 11-04.2 is an example of this. The more intense use tapering down is a great idea. The percentage approach could allow for more tapered development. Some residential properties could technically be allowed to be taller when adjacent to existing, more intensive uses. Perhaps this is not equitable though, and the onus should be on the more intensive use. Also consider, the effect of smaller lot widths in R1-C... We will continue to see the development of skinny lots and long, linear homes. I do not think this improves the character of a neighborhood. Visual continuity into other yards and the ability to build wider homes is important. These proposed changes does not prohibit this of course, but they do incentivize the splitting of lots, likely to be done by developers, that once done, are difficult to aggregate again. There are other forms of affordable housing that can make up for this. Please, consider the character of neighborhoods. Historic neighborhoods have smaller homes, but not the long skinny mass market homes built by developers.
	Use the lands that are empty. Expanding is better and having a better public transportation also fly overs can help drive fast from far away. Congestion is not good for people's health so there should be limit on how many people can build in one property.
	Concern that the "creative" housing will be in the form of high density urban designs.
	A neighborhood vote should be required to make sure neighborhood development is acceptable.
	This is a sad yes.. we desperately need to focus on reducing density. With global warming a reality we are already a fire disaster waiting to happen. More housing units per acre caters to developers and is destroying the look and feel of Boise.
	I think the updates are the strike the right balance to allow more variety of housing while maintaining desirable neighborhood attributes.
	Define minimum square footage of residential units to avoid developers creating tiny living spaces that are not pleasant to live in.
	No. I'm concerned about current density of residents with the many massive apartment complexes going up. Creative housing and design is its own motivation as people are drawn to live in authentically pleasing, unique l, and well maintained places. I think the city should be more concerned with limiting density than encouraging creative design.
	not that i know of
	Regulation seldom makes housing affordable.
	I get people need places to live. But if we could stop just cramming so much in to a tiny space. Even viewing space. I use to drive everywhere and you could always seethe mountains but not anymore all the buildings are to tall.
	Ore condos around 1500 to 2100 square feet 2,3 bedrooms with two baths. Owners have a vested interest in the building and neighborhood. Apartments attract transitory people, less concerned about the long term quality and health of the building and neighborhood.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>It seems to me the intended result here is to make it even easier for developers to cram even more people into a smaller area per square mile. We should be making it harder to do this, not easier. Boise's growth has been among the highest, if not THE highest, for the past few years now. Yet, there's still plenty of space to grow out, not up. I see apartments pop up like wildfire all around where I live in 83704, in areas they should have no business being zoned that way. Traffic continues to get worse, the wait times for restaurants get longer... the quality of life overall is going down. Please don't push our transportation system and the availability of our venues even further to their limits by adding even more people per square mile. Thank you.</p>
<p>Roads in and out of areas need better planning.</p>
<p>Incentive for actual creative design and deterrent for those looking to profit off loose regulations</p>
<p>With regard to design, Boise homes were unique now they lol like every city's mass production.</p>
<p>Neighboring residents of a zone under consideration of development need to know how many units a nearby parcel a developer is entitled to build. The proposed Section 11-04-03 Zoning Rewrite does NOT allow zoning to be easily understood.</p>
<p>allow builders and architects to have free reign of the process with permits for safety and parking are included. If the project didn't fit the area it wouldn't have been proposed. people don't look at new york, Dallas, Austin, and San Francisco with scorn for their tall buildings but for some reason we do that needs to change.</p>
<p>No required parking, focus on walkability</p>
<p>Although in theory these proposed changes to shift from density calculations to other requirements could be helpful, as written these other requirements make too large a change. The regulation allows too high density housing and too few off street parking spaces, which will both change the character of neighborhoods and make it difficult to find parking for many new dwellings. An intermediate change between the current zoning regulations and what is being proposed, to allow some denser urban infill without completely changing neighborhoods, would be better.</p>
<p>Form based zoning makes a whole heck of a lot of sense, and could really help drive some cool neighborhoods!</p>
<p>Require empty lots maintain the same codes/space allocation of surrounding lots, such as set back and space usage. Ex, do not allow 2 duplexes to be built on a on a single lot where the surrounding lots are single family homes with deeper setback and 3 off street parking spaces. See Castle Road.</p>
<p>If there was a way to maintain the integrity of the North End homes so as to not have massive homes built on lots that stand out this not fitting in with the overall look of a North End neighborhood or street.</p>
<p>Allow mother in law & other alternative dwellings to promote more affordable housing</p>
<p>Density matters more than design. Too high of density under existing rules is making traffic in West Boise unbearable.</p>
<p>No—this change will lead to apartment buildings next to single family homes</p>
<p>Density and size should be geared toward creating more affordable house options for average citizens.</p>
<p>n/a</p>
<p>Size and density matters. The more you add the less people feel like individuals. Boise is not part of the collective.</p>
<p>Less multi-unit buildings around neighborhood</p>
<p>Continue to remove zoning laws. Houston has very few zoning laws, is getting a similar influx of population and has 30% cheaper housing. You are keeping poor Idahoans from ever owning a home, mostly to protect rich peoples property values. It's insanely regressive.</p>
<p>I don't know about a "regulation" but I don't believe a one answer works for all areas. Established neighborhoods should be able to stay how they were intended. No infill housing (skinny houses) and no sudden apartment buildings in neighborhoods. New developments way from existing can be changed to new designs.</p>
<p>It would be great if there was a way to incorporate some education/considerations for trees, birds, bees, etc.</p>
<p>I don't have the answers to this, as I am not an expert in this area. My concern is whatever the future process or calculation for this will slow down the process for planning, permitting and building. It should be somewhat predictable and and not create a backlog.</p>
<p>do not allow any subdivisions with lot sizes less than 1/2 acre. too many small lots are getting developed and it looks stupid and encourages poor people to move here. no one wants to live next to subdivisions with lots less than 1/2 acre.</p>
<p>Drainage considerations and impervious cover should be the primary determination for lot sizes, setbacks, and density. Also, density is obviously needed for affordability, but it is difficult to do without realistic transit or pedestrian options.</p>
<p>I think Boise is trying to allow for increase of density in neighborhoods and that is going to decrease quality of life overall.</p>
<p>Make sure the change doesn't encourage cookie cutter designs that optimize meeting the criteria over maintaining the character of our neighborhoods</p>
<p>when the projects are being proposed the final dollar amount that they can be sold or rented for should be regulated. we just had a perfectly good home torn down and then two built and they are going for over 700,000 each. how is this affordable?</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Parking requirements need to be updated based on use. For example, 1 car per apartment/unit is outdated because housing costs are so high! You need two working adults or more to afford rent do perhaps updating to 1 space per bedroom makes more sense.
Leave it size
Remove parking requirements. Excessive parking is an eyesore, poor use of land, and makes neighborhoods less walkable/bikeable.
just not too dense- feel this is the way the city feels. Some improvement in density Ok but limited
My critical issue is that new buildings use green materials and are very energy and water efficient with access to public transportation. Denser is better. Also, we need to build to encourage the access to or use of renewable energy like solar.
Provide incentives for maximizing the number of units on each parcel
The lot sizes have gotten so small it's starting to feel claustrophobic. Being a Boise native we've started looking at how we can move out. No thought is being given to quality of life.
I think it's important to consider aspects of the prevailing architecture of an area and to try and respect it with new construction. New buildings that have alternate facings (cottage clusters that don't face the street in an older neighborhood where other houses do, for instance) or that are considerably taller or larger than the structures around them seem, to me, disrespectful of the neighborhood.
No change the zoning code
Is the intended result to "fit in"? Or is the intended result to provide "innovative" housing? Ask a better question
Define "Fits in" with existing neighborhood to avoid issues. Answer to resolve issues with neighborhoods in transition or mixed housing types.
Stop putting so many units on a small lot. Allow people space. Currently several homes are being built on a lot taking all space and blocking any views or sun from neighbors!
Developers will cease to be more creative and things will look even more cookie cutter than they currently do.
Keep the maximum limit AND consider physical dimensions. New homes should be similar to surrounding neighborhood homes in design style, square footage and height.
from what I see now they are allowing many units on a small piece of property. Looking very dense. Would like to see less density.
This regulation should be modified for housing located on a through street like Division in Southeast. Major thoroughfares should not be clogged with parked vehicles that constrict passage and driver visibility.
Neighborhoods need to maintain a uniform style. 2 story homes block views of older single level homes closing them in. Should be consistent to fit the existing neighborhood.
Stop changing Boise , outlaw Airbnb TVRs , stop turning our motorcycle trails into walking trails. Outlaw rainbow flags in school zones, stop development in the foothills.
Don't set it in stone, allow for intelligent review.
Higher density housing will result in more traffic and noise. Higher building heights and denser housing will result in the city being overcrowded. It will change the feel of The city
Save older trees and ensure lots of trees of planted.
Create a framework that encourages ADUs in a thoughtful manner.
Encourage ADUs; encourage downtown condos so people who want to live downtown (and limit how much they drive) can have OWNERSHIP and build equity. It's great density is beginning to happen but I'm worried the focus on higher priced rentals in downtown will keep me from ever being able to own a home and live a low carbon footprint lifestyle downtown/near downtown.
I do not want my neighborhood to turn into a low income housing area and degrade the quality and safety for my family and our standard of living
Allow creative options like tiny houses.
The current zoning allows too many buildings to be built on large lots, such as building a new house behind an existing one. This has allowed the neighborhood to look crappy.
You need to stop cramming in as many people as possible. Single family homes with large lots, at least .25 acres are the best use of the land. No more high density construction (apt and condo's) in single family home neighborhoods. They're unattractive and cause traffic congestion.
Stop building so close together. Too much high density housing. Roads not designed to handle the massive traffic.
No. I do not want apartments , duplexes, or multi family homes in my single family home neighborhood.
My answers to your questions in the last form dissappeared when I entered the next one! YOUR FORM DOESN'T WORK!! How am I to take this process seriously?
Density is important. Height of buildings vs surrounding neighbors should be flexible and taller buildings should be considered.
There needs to be ample ground between houses so you are not looking into other peoples houses from your own.
I like the idea of design criteria, AND I see a need to limit the number of units per acre. The number of units per acre in Boise is way too high. Is there a reason both (units per acre and design criteria) cannot exist together?

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Increased setbacks and limits on height will help new development fit in with existing single family homes. Also be realistic and study how much parking that new apartment building will need and make the builders provide those spaces. Also have the builders pay for new street lights and crosswalks to mitigate increased traffic.
Instead of focus solely on density, require investment into community resources that will be taxed by more residents. For example, grocery stores, parks, schools, restaurants etc.
Strong emphasis on building design and infrastructure improvements for pedestrians and transit users.
The current minimum parking requirements does not translate well in practical manner. Many driveways that can adequately handle parked cars are not counted as a parking space due to a minimum setback requirement, and therefore limits the number of units that can be built on one lot.
Builders could spend more money for creative housing. I have worked for contractors. The problem is the expense, not lack of creativity.
There would have to be other parameters put in place to ensure that humans can live in these places with happiness and dignity.
This blanket up zone is not in the best interest of the city in any way shape or form
Stop making houses on tiny lots and screwing over the density to an unhealthy, crammed environment! Give people reasonable lot sizes.
https://www.prageru.com/video/homelessness-the-reality-and-the-solution?utm_source=lterable&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=campaign_3911858 Stop Housing First that Mayor Mclean started, or we will end up like Seattle, San Francisco, Portland, and Los Angeles.
Would still like a minimum number of dwellings that are reasonable based on existing I infrastructure. We have exploded and need roads, bikeways, walkways, parks, open spaces, etc.
It seems like here some regulations are being lifted. So I am wondering what are the limits of allowing anyone to do what they want with their zone.
There has to be calculations to prevent over-development. It's not just the aesthetics here that matters.
There should still be a reasonable upper limit on the amount of residential units that are allowed per a certain property size. I don't want a bunch of high crime "low income housing" built around me. I like Boise because it's NOT like the larger cities that have everyone living shoulder-to-shoulder and have crime left and right. Boise is generally a very safe place. If high crime "low income housing" was to vastly increase, I'd probably move. I'm a much larger fan of single-family homes with at least 1/4 acre, and up to 1 acre of land. I would refuse to live on anything else. We don't need to increase the population density in Boise; we have plenty of unused space surrounding it to expand to.
Fill in property density should match adjoining neighborhood density
Dont over build
Yes by speaking and listening to the public
Require transitional lot size and density to reduce impact on existing homes around the development.
Don't know.
Include both old and new criteria. This reads like a stealth way for developers to ease restrictions.
I feel that creating dwellings should be aesthetically pleasing and blend with the environment that they will encompass. BE SMART!!!
Make apartments more affordable.
Noting where new development should fit neighborhood aesthetics and where aesthetics or new/unique designs are allowed or even encouraged
You can create innovated designs within these perimeters. Plenty of countries do.
why not do both
We are losing trees at an alarming pace due to greed. The lots are being razed and filled with massive homes at minimum setbacks to maximize profits.
Throwing more "homes" onto lots is not going to create more affordable housing. The market is the market. It will just allow people to charge more rent for multiple rentals. To create "affordable" housing you have to move the lines outside of Boise. Quit making more and more homes on less land. That is not a win except for developers and landlords pockets. Oh and I guess yours as you get more property tax \$. Not a win.
The more people we pack into a space the lower mental, emotional and physical health become. It is important to give space for nature (I.e. grass, trees, plants) to be everyone's view and immediate access.
Building over two stories should be kept on main thoroughfares and not allowed in neighborhoods with all single-family housing. Density is important but there is an appropriate place for it.
Public comment from a readonly area of potential impact.
Consider density as it relates to parking provisions
Stop selling out. People love Idaho because of space and less people. Stop making it LA. 2 story height limits. Stop dividing land up. Support the locals and the natives
Keeping the density calculation requirement is important so houses/units are not stuffed onto existing lots to the detriment of other homeowners.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Current height restrictions assume gables are used for 1.5 story maximums.
	Seems to me this code change will allow developers to be way more creative to get more units per lot.... They will use it to their advantage.... Not taking into consideration current neighborhood style unless p&z enforces-- and we all know how great P&z is at enforcement and helping the existing neighborhood!! Need to define infrastructure improvement costs and green space costs per unit and force developers to create roads, bike paths and parks
	They should conform to existing homes
	Parking and making sure that density doesn't 'spill out' to parking problems for the surroundings is important. Also, developers are willing to design partial underground (garden style or subgrade apartments/parking), but they won't do it unless zoning or building codes require them to. We must make the developer work to fit the code, not adjust the code to make it easy/cheap for the developer.
	Eliminate parking space requirements. Design our city so that we don't need to drive a car for every single trip.
	Remove minimum and maximum density altogether. Approve the project based on design and impact to adjacent properties. And/or make it a much easier/ fluid process to go through a rezone.
	Only have calculations for safe egress. "Fit in" is just another way to limit housing density and protect personal property investment at the expense of the community at large.
	The proposed dimensions reduce density in our higher density districts. Instead of capping what we do want (housing), let's limit what we don't want (i.e. Require minimum open space). It should make the code easier to understand and uphold too.
	There already exists setbacks, height restrictions, minimum lot sizes, and parking limits in addition to the density or units/ac. limit. Maybe go back to neighborhoods that have already seen development (in-fill/condo/townhouse/apartment complex) and ask those residents. More specifically, residents that were originally sent the required development notices and then we would have a vision as to what the neighbors do and don't like.
	The proposal will lead to less creativity and more uniformity because it will lead to common design approaches to "fit in." The best way to avoid inappropriately increasing density and limiting neighborhood impact is to maintain the current "unit per property" standard.
	Keep focus on parking requirements.
	If you quit letting Corey Barton pull all the permits. Limit building permits annually by developer.
	Neighborhoods are way to crowded as it is. New development should be confined to large lots, not in already established neighborhoods. When building the small cracker-box housing is established it seems traffic concerns are overlooked.
	Some flexibility on minimum lot size to allow for things like tiny homes would be helpful
	We need more larger building and apartment complexes. Right now it seems the highest they can go is 3 stories. With more people moving to Idaho we need more stories added in other areas besides downtown.
	I don't think you care about me or what I think.
	Developers are concerned with the bottom-line, profit margins. They'll find a loophole to build squeeze as many units as possible on any amount of acreage.
	Not necessarily a positive. Questions should not be biased to give you the results that you seek.
	Houses are being built to close together. Kids don't have backyards to grow up and play in, apartments have people living on top of eachother with no personal space. We need bigger back yards and more parks.
	I think it needs to be a combination of the two. Allowing for a cap on number of residences to keep that in check, but also allowing for creativity and innovative design to keep it affordable
	Leave the lot size calculation in place. All these proposed changes do is increase housing density from 8.8 units per acre to 11. This increased density has a dark side such as increased traffic congestion, lack of green space and higher pollution. The only ones who truly benefit are the city in taxation and the developers.
	Include a requirement or regulatory allowance for non-standard building designs if 'creativity' is the goal. Such as expert testimony that the design is safe even if it breaks normal regulations.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>When there is a community park in a residential area then the curb side of the parks should have no parking at the curb from dusk to dawn. There is too many people parking on these curbs and living on these curbs.</p>
<p>You don't always need to build up. A builder can create half basements, to keep within the height requirement. Most of Boise's water table allows this type of building. Builders already have a required parking minimum (very important),. I'm not sure how allowing a builder to go taller, in a smaller area, would make them more creative? Sounds like they already got the whole cake already. Being creative would be taking a hill, and building a three level house on it, where each level has its own housing unit. And two of the three floors on the house, actually don't involve stairs. Saw the design in Europe. Now that was a creative design/builder. And perhaps not focusing so much on a builder? There are plenty of older homes(tri-level), that could be made into three home units, where the retired parent lives on the main floor and the kids live in the other floors. Some Folks or builders might make use of existing structures, if they had an incentive. Just make sure driveway can be extended.</p>
<p>Do not get rid of density standards.</p>
<p>Refine the existing reg. Right now, what we are seeing built are 4,000sf single family houses with 800sf ADU over the garage.</p>
<p>more stucco and brick. Less exterior lights. Less grass and landscape!</p>
<p>I believe ending single-family zoning would be a great step forward to increasing innovative housing designs, as well as encouraging more affordable housing.</p>
<p>Less regulation of development will produce less expensive housing and more creative design.</p>
<p>High density, mixed living areas (akin to many European cities) allow for more people to live in a smaller space without compromising access to essentials. It also promotes eco-friendly means of living, such as walking to the store rather than driving. Essentially, the removal of restrictions on being able to mix residential housing with commercial businesses.</p>
<p>Remove parking minimum requirements. This reduces the cost of housing while showing the true cost of vehicle parking.</p>
<p>Stop taking every piece of land and stuffing it with houses. Our state cannot sustain the overbuilding. Our wells are drying up and we can't afford what your doing. It's not always about money you know!!</p>
<p>It is very important to protect and preserve the look and feel of older, historic areas.</p>
<p>We need to discourage the continuing move to the Treasure Valley, so we will not have to devour the open land to build housing. I am SICK of the open space being converted to housing units.</p>
<p>Organize walking tours of various neighborhoods with one of the planners along to point out issues-- maybe have a checklist to identify positives as well as possible problems... maybe retake some of the survey, ranking, perhaps, afterwards.</p>
<p>This is a regulation change in support of developers and opposed to the aesthetics of the community.</p>
<p>What many residents in Boise enjoy about this location the most is outdoor spaces to access trails, paths, hiking, nature, etc... I would sincerely hope to see the city consider this as we continue to grow and build new development. Our built environment is so important in maintaining health and a connection to land and physical activity opportunities. A balance between growth and upholding outdoor spaces is most ideal.</p>
<p>Not sure at this point because the growth in the valley is out of control traffic is heavier two lane roads speed that people were traveling etc.</p>
<p>growth needs to be commensurate with the infrastructure to support it. I live along Hill Road and huge subdivision are planned without any change for the streets/bike lanes, etc. Traffic and safety (bike riders and pedestrians) are already effected.</p>
<p>Remove parking requirements also</p>
<p>Lots should not be overbuilt and destroy the feel of the neighbor. Currently they are tearing down houses and building 2-4 zero lot line houses in our neighborhood which I feel is destroying the feel of the neighborhood. Also what is being done to update and upgrade the infrastructure of the neighborhood as the amount of people living in the area increases?</p>
<p>Don't change it! We don't want a bunch of tall apartments with inadequate parking and minimal landscaping surrounding our homes.</p>
<p>By not allowing R-1 and R-2 lots to build multiple houses and apartments will help with the congestion.</p>
<p>I can see this used to pack all the high density residents into one area while protecting the higher income single structure areas(single family homes)</p>
<p>Include considerations for use of scare resources: water, good agricultural land (even small, in-city "farms")</p>
<p>Combine both regulations?</p>
<p>Remove it</p>
<p>Areas like the north and east end are historic places full of bungalow style houses. Adding high density poorly built structures would ruin the area. Keep the design with more strict controls of what can be built. The horrible structure on Jefferson Street is a perfect example of what not to build.</p>
<p>In all honesty, I would prefer restricting the the minimum lot sizes. Home lots are getting smaller and smaller and there are too many apartments/town homes popping up compared to single family homes.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>I'm considered fairly liberal for Idaho, but I believe this draft still proposes high-density areas that the infrastructure does not support (and is not wanted by residents). In addition, I'm very disheartened as the council seems consistently more interested in accommodating developers regardless of the support of the existing community.</p>
<p>There should be 20 or more foot minimum distance between homes.</p>
<p>The more dwellings within a given space will directly impact the surrounding community. The Infrastructure is not prepared for the current High volume High density housing. City counsel is not informed on the impact this process will cause long term. Example... Existing homes with well water contamination.</p>
<p>Get rid of the historic districts so we can have variety and not more bungalows</p>
<p>I think that having a standard is important. If there's not consistent way to measure then we might have housing that over-saturates the roads systems that we have. I would be interested to see what "innovative" designs are not possible with the system the way it is.</p>
<p>Wording should be specific do we don't end up with more apartment buildings everywhere</p>
<p>I feel that focusing on the design criteria will help limit overcrowding and poor space management</p>
<p>I still strongly feel that minimum lot line dimensions need to included for both aesthetics, access from front yard to back yard, and for fire purposes. I feel like rules either do not exist or they are too leanient allowing too many houses to be built too close together. I know this as my house currently sits on a lot with a 5' on one side and 7.5' on the other. This really isnt enough room to help with drainage, have a place for trash can storage, or any type of land use on the sides of the house.</p>
<p>It's fine as it is, changing the unit size is hardly a fix for design.</p>
<p>I think that a combination of density calculation with taking into account height or added square footage via creative methods should be used. It is important to still consider adding a 50 units to a small area even with added parking can dramatically impact traffic and essential services such as fire and schools.</p>
<p>They may be creative but they wont have a good quality of life</p>
<p>Provide some sort of input from independent architects and maybe even neighbors.</p>
<p>A full size home that includes a small rental unit enables mixed residential use. It also makes it possible for more people to buy the home, because they can rent out part of it.</p>
<p>Stop putting skinny tall houses in existing neighborhoods just because there is room</p>
<p>Honestly, I feel that a developer with the most will always trump what the public wants. This city often times ignores the desires of the residence in favor of any developer who will continue the urban sprawl we are experiencing.</p>
<p>It should take into consideration new types of construction such as straw bale and underground houses. Also give tax advantages for renewable power sources on new or existing dwellings of any kind.</p>
<p>Exterior lighting, screening plants and fences, and height of buildings should be restricted as proposed regardless of a single family home being more than 50 ft away on a large lot. The setbacks should be from property line and not just house. The am imagining apartments built next to our fence when our house is set back.</p>
<p>It is critical to make residential housing development meet the aesthetics of a neighborhood</p>
<p>I do not feel this creates creative housing design but rather removes obstacle(s) for the city to maximize it's space. The question seems to want me to agree in creativity but it's impeding it. Is it possible to be creative within the existing code? If not, why? It feels like you want this to create higher density and this code is standing in the way of that. What are you really wanting to know? If I support densely populated neighborhoods to help the city maximize it's tax base? No. I do not support that. Do I support the city trying to be creative when it comes to housing? Yes. Is modifying this code the way to unlock that creativity? No.</p>
<p>Fix the existing roads, curb & side walks before adding a mess to the surrounding area.</p>
<p>Have a minimum lot size of 10,000 sf</p>
<p>Keep wild land wild. Stop putting 9 houses on a lot that used to have 1.</p>
<p>Provide more off-street parking, require housing types to provide more off-street parking, have larger lot sizes to encourage developers to include outdoor spaces for each residence, do not overcrowd neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Family friendly lot sizes for children to safely play in their yards</p>
<p>Don't allow multi family units in traditionally single family home subdivisions</p>
<p>The proposal to evaluate whether or not new construction "fits in" with existing construction is a positive one. My concerns are subjectivity (who decides what "fits in" means) and potential for abuse that leaves existing neighbors voiceless and powerless as to what truly "fits in" with the neighborhood.</p>
<p>Make the question more specific and understandable</p>
<p>innovative design can often conflict with the current aesthetics of the area. Care must be taken to preserve the appearance and feeling of the original neighborhood. creatively making a multifamily dwelling fit on a lot doesn't necessarily make it appealing to look at. nobody wants to live in a jigsaw puzzle</p>
<p>Keep it as is.</p>
<p>I worry some developers will take advantage of this and over-develop some areas of the valley. I think increasing this value, and not necessarily getting rid of it is a better plan.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	limit height of all new construction to that of neighborhood. Provide for more landscaping and yard for homeowners
	The new homes are TOO close together. It does not match the older neighborhoods. Also EVERY development near me is 9 or less houses in order to AVOID a traffic study. This loop-hole needs to be addressed.
	Quit attempting to fit too many various people together in small areas!
	Parking minimums should be abolished. There is significant research showing that they make development more expensive. When parking is needed, developers will build it. Height maximums should be used sparingly.
	Whatever protects the open spaces south of the airport is what I want. Stop the building in the southwest and airport areas
	Minimize or eliminate parking requirements. We should not induce demand.
	Be more strict on developers and make Boise less dense.
	Take into account road width (no parking on street if too narrow), and make sidewalks mandatory on all new constructions so pedestrians can be safe as traffic increases
	I prefer to not see more of the long and skinnier homes that can fit more houses on a larger lot. I find them to be ugly, have no character. Fitting in should not mean this, it should mean fit the all ready existing neighborhood. I live in the East End and have for years, many years. I dislike what has happened in my area of town and wish to see the zoning code to reflect the neighborhoods character, not how many people can be accommodated in one area
	minimize the number of houses on a acre! no more then 1 per acre!
	Used universal design in all building design.
	Stop trying to zone us out like in Austin TX. In my experience, all your meddling resulted in exparte lunches between developers and city 'officials', a total shut down of all neighborhood concerns, and a total victory for developers. Our quality of life has diminished to such an extent that we can't even open our windows now let alone enjoy the quiet solitude of our back yards. You have made our first home purchase a total nightmare and a total waste on money.
	Use both criteria, outside looks and number of units.
	Stop the growth Boise can't handle what we currently have.
	Leave it as it is so you don't end up cramming more cheap houses into an already crowded neighborhood
	Stop paving farmland. Period. We live in a desert in case you missed it, water is limited and should go to FARMS. No farms = no food. Food does NOT come from grocery stores. Tell the developers to shove it. Stop lining your greedy, lying political pockets with their money and do your job you putz.
	Separate or zone different parts of the city to have specific housing types
	Skinny homes are often rentals and people do not use garages. I have 5 skinny houses across the street and one of the houses has 6 cars and only 1 car space in front of the house. People cannot pay the high rents and need others living with them. They park the wrong way and in front of driveways. They don't care about our laws, they do what they want. This makes very unhappy homeowners when you cannot park in front of your own home. I beg you, PLEASE LISTEN this is going on in the older neighborhoods. I have lived here over 30 years and seen and heard alot of this happening. I am second generation of Idahoan and if my grandparents could they probably would be shaking their heads in disgust on the lack neighborhood etiquette.
	Boise is a booming city and growing. Loosening restrictions and implementing the Module 2 draft proposal may allow quicker building for developers and more houses on smaller lots, but our existing code will not discourage builders. Developers will still build in Boise no matter what.
	The intended result is to avoid overcrowding on existing city lots, correct? How is this standard out of line? I know growth is inevitable, but it seems like lifting this standard gives more flexibility to developers, not benefit to existing residences who want to keep the look and feel of Boise the same.
	Number of families
	It doesn't matter what residents say or feel. The mayor and city council are in it to bring major changes to our once beautiful city. It's happening what seems like over night. Cram as many houses into a tiny lot with no regards to neighbors or neighborhoods. Dollar signs are all the developers and so-called "leaders" of our city. They want Boise to be the next Portland, Seattle, Los Angeles or other huge city. As a 3rd generation Idahoan I am appalled at the growth and the lack of foresight that has been demonstrated. It's disgusting.
	Zoning must maximize recreational space, including, paths, trails and access to recreation.
	Include creative design requirements in code as well.
	I feel this will help increase density, not necessarily make the developments blend with the neighborhood
	Disagree with the objective as it neglect broader community impact such as roads capable of handling increased traffic, schools with sufficient capacity for students in boundary (MVHS is far to overcrowded and getting worse), inadequate planning for fire/police/sheriff.
	Keep building with buildings. Houses with houses. If buildings are next to houses they should be smaller.
	Packing in apartment buildings is not the answer.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Instead of "Fitting in" It should still be required that there be plenty of SPACE - once people start getting tighter quarters and cramped - escalated behaviors will increase.</p>
<p>Minimum trees, front and back yards! Increased setbacks minimums. Speed humps.</p>
<p>the smallest lot size should be much smaller than the proposed 100 x 40 lot size and ease up on setback/parking requirements.</p>
<p>Let people do what they want.</p>
<p>Less density</p>
<p>We must keep our aesthetic of non-crowding in terms of residential neighborhoods. Keep large lots and low density in residential neighborhoods. But by all means; please increase density in downtown urban areas.</p>
<p>Limit the height of apartments to two stories? Or limit the frequency a high density zone is allowed in one same area</p>
<p>Tell the state legislature to keep their hands off our regulations!</p>
<p>Developers find ways around these rules. We have cookie cutter houses flooding the area so changing a requirement for density won't solve this creativity issue. Maybe the residents within a certain distance can vote on design types that are submitted.</p>
<p>Incentives for higher density housing that benefit both developers and middle income Tennants.</p>
<p>I don't know if this is already done yet or not, but it would be great to see tax incentives for multi-family developments and higher tax rates and fees for single-family developments. I'm so tired of seeing massive single-family homes going up in my neighborhood when a reasonable quadriplex would fit just as well on the parcel, and would house 4 families instead of one rich family.</p>
<p>Remove parking requirements/have easier ways to get variances for multi dwelling properties, encourage public transportation and alternative ways to get to work (i.e. not everyone has a car and if Boise keeps growing there wont be enough room for everyone to have a car and be at the density we need).</p>
<p>I would like to keep the current neighborhood nice and safe.</p>
<p>but don't allow parking reductions</p>
<p>More affordable single family starter homes, i don't care about seeing apartments - but people don't want to live their lives in apartments. They want to own if they can</p>
<p>Stop building</p>
<p>I'm not so sure "fits in" is always a desirable goal.</p>
<p>Nothing in the proposed changes guarantee that a developer will just squeeze every dollar out of every inch of a project without regard to impacts on the surrounding area. I would expect a continuation of maximum density with very little creativity.</p>
<p>You have to take every project on a individual basis. What works in one place may not work in another. It should not require a huge pissed off group of people to overturn a project which is already decided and is only going forward because it meets the General City Requirements.</p>
<p>To avoid infill mishaps that weaken older neighborhoods, I think it's very important to ensure that all new housing (or uses) is appropriate in scale and density to existing residential houses. Our older mid century neighborhoods are in danger of loosing cohesive integrity, it's mature landscape and the appeal of residential privacy. Zoning Code should enforce and limit the construction of multi story homes directly adjacent to single story homes. I think enforcing appropriate scale, proportions, setbacks, landscape in established neighborhoods is very important to maintaining Boise's charm. I fear a zoning code rewrite will encourage the mishaps of cities like Portland, where it is very common to have an oversized multifamily or even single family residence directly adjacent to a single story residence in established single family residential neighborhoods. Densification needs to happen, but it needs to be located along commercial and mixed use corridors.</p>
<p>There should be some limits on units allowed in a lot in single family neighborhoods</p>
<p>Keep low density</p>
<p>I worry that we are going to develop all property in Boise and not leave space for recreation and common use. Density is a good thing when used with restraint. I think there should be a minimum landscaping requirement as well so we don't turn Boise into a concrete jungle and ruin the natural bird and wildlife habitats.</p>
<p>I think really looking at what a development will look like from the people on all sides is important. I liked the idea of preserving sunlight. The worst example of a design is 2312 N 29th St. I hate how it looms over the small houses around it.</p>
<p>Stop making more room for Californians to send their spoiled brat kids here, pushing out existing affordable housing.</p>
<p>Considerations need to take into account existing infrastructure and the ability to absorb new densities safely without compromising EMS response time</p>
<p>The code should include requirements to include mixed use space for certain lot sizes and walkability/accessibility requirements for all developments. No one should have to walk more than a mile to some type of service (transit, retail, food, library etc).</p>
<p>What is the definition of 'fits in'? Is there an overall standard look or design for Boise? The real question is how the proposed regulations encourage more affordable housing?</p>
<p>There needs to be checks and balances on what kind of buildings can be built where. Ie, no 10 story apartment buildings next to a single family neighborhood.</p>
<p>Not sure</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Make permitting easier. Too many hoops required now. Neighbors of mine had to get permission from dozens of neighbors to add onto their kitchen. It was ridiculous.
Better planning with the land. I see a lot of wasted land in Idaho and some states use as much as possible for housing and commercial use.
add a minimum allowance between structures. Cramming housing into small spaces is unsightly and not in fitting with what Boise is/was
none i can think of
Requiring a larger number of parking spaces per residential build as well as requiring exterior lighting will keep Boise safe and open to all. I think changing requirements to encourage new types of denser housing will increase the number of affordable dwellings in the city.
The intended objectives of "fits in" and "creative housing design" seem to be fundamentally at odds. I personally think the zoning code should be flexible (less restrictive) and allow for development that "fits in" or is perhaps somewhat different but meeting current housing market needs.
There can be some regular box looking housing neighborhoods, but also consider abundance of acreage lots being intermixed to preserve the land/agricultural life idaho once was. The more urban type high density housing the more potential for crime and the areas to become dirty like some areas in California
Innovation is great but please avoid too much population density that will stress traffic and public resources. Growth has its perks but no one is happier when we are jammed together. In the short run we will get SOME housing supply relief but more congestion. I'd love increased housing supply so Boise is accessible to more people. But in the long run demand will keep growing past supply, affordable housing will seem like an expired dream, and everyone will begrudge the density. So the question is: how densely peopled do we want to be? Bay-Area CA has laws around growing housing to keep up with certain demographic changes but no one is keeping up with those laws because the place is too packed already. I'm excited for our city and it's growth. Please limit population density growth. If we get greedy the cons outweigh the pros and it'll be irreversible.
Community impact report
Build single family homes! These new designs look like shit! If you need to reduce the property size (backyard, front yard, distance between homes) do so. But stop building hideous properties. They are very poor quality too.
Keep as much of the original vegetation to help it blend in.
Keep and adhere to the existing code
Keep the current calculation of number of units/size of lot. That is the best way to regulate density. It does not interfere with creative architectural design, but rather encourages it. Density needs to be limited or quality of life for everyone is diminished.
More allocations and allowances for lower cost housing, instead of investment properties that force lower income people out of the market and into homelessness. There are far too many restrictions for smaller property owners wanting to add affordable housing – to wit, the existing archaic ADU codes, fire requirements, Boise City density road-blocks, et al.
Keep some green space near existing residential areas to avoid overpopulation that isn't supported by current road infrastructure.
DECREASE THE DENSITY PER ACRE.
Yes
I think the only code that should be followed is that the exterior fits in with the neighborhood. I don't care about wood windows, but I do care about architecture. Downtown is historic, the Northend is historic. I do not want to see a modern design house next to my 1905 house. I'm fine if they build apartments, condos, new houses, etc. I just want them to have a historic "look" to them. And if there are existing buildings, I want them updated rather than torn down.
I don't know that a regulation would help, but I would like to see the city STRONGLY encourage the development of mixed-use neighborhoods.
The plan appears to change existing neighborhoods by stuffing in more housing. This is NOT a positive decision - and the proposed regulations could be very damaging to existing neighborhoods. There is a difference between new developments and existing neighborhoods!!
In surveys you should ask questions that laypeople can understand. These questions are too technical for a lay audience. I suggest you ask about values and priorities rather than zoning policy if you want normal people to engage
Design criteria as specified above should be used along with limits on number of units per lot or acre. They are not mutually exclusive. Removing maximum unit provisions sounds like a giveaway to developers.
More but smaller homeless shelters
I don't know.
There should be a cap on maximum cost price per square footage . That would encourage balanced and inclusive development.
I don't think an apartment style building is appropriate in a single-family home neighborhood.
Make sure you seriously consider public input from those most effected by changes.
The removal of zones for single family housing only to encourage a mix of single and multiple family housing within a zone or neighborhood.
Max per acre

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

It seems the intended result is high-density housing, which will disproportionately impact SW Boise, because that's where open space is. If that is indeed the end game, it doesn't align with keeping the essence of Boise unchanged.
More is not better
Make my rent lower!!
Listen to the city residents who need to be heard if there are problems in further development of the area.
Yes I think you could actually follow the regulations. Instead of allowing special exemptions and pushing Idahoans that lived here their whole life generations of Idaho and out of that their neighborhoods. You should take care of Idahoans native Idahoans over transplants. Follow the regulations that we have.
Keep calculation method based on lot size for density control
The way these questions are written, you are not allowing comment on proposed changes as you have already made up your minds on changes, you are only giving people the chance to validate your changes. This survey is very slanted to your point of view!!!
No
Design criteria is very vague and does not by itself address affordable housing. The need for affordable units needs to be specifically stated and incentivized.
Not that I know of.
The city should not apply too heavy a hand in regulating design, especially height and parking. The market will take care of that. Buyers and renters want to live in nice places. Let them decide how much a parking space is worth.
Neighborhood approval of design and location
Blah blah blah, nobody wants sketchy apartment complexes next to them.
Strong limits on density due to increased traffic, which does NOT make Boise a great place to live and work.
Slow development. Boise is becoming a nightmare. More development more traffic.
Protect historic districts, and anything outside can be innovative.
Perhaps color restrictions. For example no bright orange buildings. No flashing signage near residential areas...or anywhere. Construction possibly following a theme within determined areas. For example: no high tech shiny building next to a western themed building.
If we are trying to create affordable housing that means it will need to be high density. There must be communal green areas set aside for the housing development. Climate change is real. Temperatures are increasing. We need to have room for green areas to offset at least some of the heat created from all the concrete and housing structures.
Higher density housing should be reserved for new developments; high density housing should not be crammed into existing neighborhoods which often don't have the existing infrastructure to support the additional traffic.
Please stop over building!!! Are roads have become overcrowded in the past several years. Multistory buildings are going up on every empty lot and these large developments are ruining Boise! Please stop allowing these big out of state big developers to ruin our beautiful Boise!!!!
Does the construction meet the needs of the area.
I don't believe removing density requirements encourages creative design.
No more raising the rent and put our seniors and disabled out. Out of state Greedy people need to take note not to do this in Idaho.
Encouragement of keeping historical buildings
More sidewalks
Leave the code the way it is to preserve Boise look and feel.
There is already too much high density building. There needs to be less. People are crammed in homes and apartments like rats.
Increased density of housing on a lot has pros and cons. I think there needs to be a limit on the density allowed because too much density really changes a neighborhood. I like variation and creative designs, varying socioeconomic affordable housing blended in but at a density rate that is balanced without changing the overall feel of a neighborhood.
Stop building skinny tall houses with little to no yards or privacy we are not California
Don't overcrowd my city and neighborhood unless I ask you to. Do the will of voters.
Focus on fits in with the neighborhood. Ex-Do not allow a 4plex in the middle of a single family neighborhood
This is such a large change, it is hard for a lay-person to determine what affects this will have throughout the City. An example showing how the current codes limits/protects a neighborhood vs what the new code will do to the neighborhood. Would be helpful
Lower
Making sure that every development has sufficient area for children to have creative play space outside the house. Disallow mega houses on postage stamp lots.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	This will just encourage developers to build slums
	Accommodate option of tiny houses in a setting with larger shared, open outdoor space, breathing room, privacy, garden space, not jammed next to neighbors (not like a trailer park). A lot of folks who work in tech with good income choose environmentally friendly simplicity within high quality, flexible outdoor space that has a wilder, freer feel, not the usual overproduced landscaping and confined by concrete
	If the builders are forced to do away with track housing and such, maybe there will be less new subdivisions.
	Leave it alone. If it's an existing neighborhood, let's leave the existing rules. They were made at the same time as the homes. More homes may make more taxes, but it does not equate to improved living conditions or situations. Bigger, tighter and more doesn't mean better.
	Clever loaded question. I propose: Limit the dwelling unit per acre so as not to increase the total dwelling in the surrounding area it encompasses by more than 50 %
	Allow for more small single dwelling houses on large lots.
	It seems like the city just wants more density...wherever and whenever, and will adjust the "rules" to accomplish this.
	This seems like semantics and I'm not sure this change will help approve more high density housing which people trying to afford homes desperately need.
	The neighborhood tax-payers will have no say in what the city council ultimately decides. They will re-write the code to encourage the most density, in the least amount of space, without concern for design or livability or harmony of neighborhood, in favor of tax profits and developers favors.
	The wording of the proposed new regulation simply increases density without considering the nature of the neighborhood.
	People that live in these areas do not want to live next to apartments, duplexes or row houses. We live here because of the privacy.
	keep the current system. Your proposal sounds like an effort to mix low value housing into higher value neighborhoods which lowers the overall value of a neighborhood over time.
	Neighborhoods should honestly have little recourse to block development that they don't think 'fits in' with the character. Boise needs to build multi-family like crazy in EVERY neighborhood and part of the city and aggressively reduce or eliminate future single family development/building in city limits.
	Don't allow out of state investors to buy property and outprice locals from buying homes
	It is not going to improve the neighborhoods. The sprawl will continue with annexations and subdivisions. But where there is redevelopment there will be thoughtless and unsightly skinny lot development as rentals. It is a defeating combination.
	Innovative design, aesthetic, and livability should determine results. Density calculations don't lend much to basic design ethos, and should be a consistent consideration, not prerequisite.
	Quit building these cheap condo type houses on such small lots. SE Boise is looking like a ghetto or government project
	Leave established farms alone. There doesn't have to be buildings, concrete, or asphalt on every inch of dirt!
	Allow for a lot of flexibility so that costs can be minimized to allow for maximum number of units at least cost
	That just allows for willy nilly construction to crowd in neighbors in the pretense you are using better design. Using the words creative means you want to bend the rules for your own benefit. Usually, not beneficial for the neighborhood but to accomplish your own purposes. Which is to crowd in more people, which creates more tensions, not better neighborhoods more noise.
	Stop allowing skinny houses. They always seem to be occupied by people with too many vehicles, causing parking problems.
	Making the rule flexible would help. For example, a house can't be unreasonably tall AND very big horizontally as well. But having a shorter house with smaller setbacks could maximize land use while still fitting in. Likewise a tall house with bigger setbacks could achieve the same thing.
	Off street parking needs to be addressed. Most plans have 1.5 spaces/unit. I know no one with fewer than 2 cars, usually more. This jams streets and sidewalks and makes neighborhoods less walkable/billable. Also spaces need to be sized for trucks not compacts or trucks end up on the street blocking views of cyclists, pedestrians, and oncoming vehicles.
	Also must consider parking availability, as too many apartments don't have sufficient parking.
	Density needs to be limited. One of my biggest concerns right now is the massive increase in traffic through my neighborhood. For some reason, higher density isn't translating to lower property taxes. More people paying should lower the amount paid by each.
	Ya keep it, I don't want this to be another tokyo or nyc
	Tiny homes should have less restrictions on building codes,
	If there is much more park acreage attached with every approved dwelling unit the building lots can be smaller.
	Remove the density calculation is an open pass to sardine can living. The developers will have a field day cramming in units. NO

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>Each home or dwelling needs atleast 2 parking spaces. 1 parking space does not allow for guests, a second driver in the household, or a second vehicle for utilitarian purposes, like a truck. It's nice to think you can encourage folks to drive and share one vehicle, to take public transit, but it's not realistic. If we have another pandemic, public transportation is not a good option. Encouraging bicycles, Scooters, and Motorcycles would be a better direction.</p>
	<p>No, remove the changes for the intended result to put multi-unit housing in the middle of a single family housing unit neighborhood. I'm sure that the decision has already been made for the "intended result" of large multi family units or large offices on my quiet street. Making them "look good" doesn't remove the impact on our neighborhood.</p>
	<p>Additional restrictions should be applied that are really easy to meet but at least set. Eliminate others from "working in the grey area" to their advantage.</p>
	<p>I am completely against shrinking lots just to force more housing in those existing spaces. Build out not in</p>
	<p>Do not encourage high density housing with single family dwellings. Keep scale or height personal.</p>
	<p>Limit how many properties can be rentals and second homes with the exception of affordable housing.</p>
	<p>Decisions should be made on more than just one calculation. I want housing that isn't ugly and doesn't cram people together on top of each other. I can't currently afford to buy a house in Boise at all and I would love to not have to move away.</p>
	<p>I don't have enough information to form an opinion--my concern is which method would more naturally lead to cramming more people into a smaller space. I don't agree that stacking units higher or reducing their size to fit more people into a smaller space would be a desirable way to increase housing. Innovative housing designs that do not create "sardine can" housing would be fine.</p>
	<p>Eliminate skinny houses. Putting soulless overpriced low quality cookie cutter houses in existing neighborhoods is the antithesis of "making Boise the most livable city in the nation."</p>
	<p>There still needs to be limits to density.</p>
	<p>Don't do it</p>
	<p>Forcing setbacks limits improvement to existing homes and decreases potential for creativity especially in the north end where lot sizes are already small.</p>
	<p>Parking is always an issue with multi units (not just residents of those units but visitors as well) and often affect nearby residential areas increasing traffic and affecting residents ability to access their homes and enjoy their neighborhoods.</p>
	<p>I would prefer to see a regulation that determines lot size, house height, etc based on something like the immediate area (surrounding 1/2 mile). This would allow for subtle changes in neighborhoods without hurting the feel. I live in SE Boise we have mostly nice little '40s cottage homes. Then stuck in the middle of the neighborhood are three row house smashed where one house was before. I am not against row houses, but they don't blend with the neighborhood. They are an eye sore based on location.</p>
	<p>Get rid of preference for single family dwellings. Allow more vertical designs. Allow tiny homes.</p>
	<p>Stop allowing developers to over develop land and stuff multiple homes on small lots. This disrupts the feel and safety of neighborhoods. It also leads to gentrification.</p>
	<p>Absolutely not, since it will only encourage bad designs in inappropriate areas.</p>
	<p>4 story apartments & Zero lot lines next to homes with yards, Childrens play equipment does NOT fit. Look at the current profile. No compatibility</p>
	<p>Stop letting profit driven builders buy large amounts of land and let people pick their builders. Large construction companies build very similar houses which make all the house look the same with zero creativity and often poor build quality.</p>
	<p>Remove setbacks when feasible.</p>
	<p>I don't think you need to make something fit. Making smaller homes and smaller lots and jamming it in a neighborhood creates chaos across the board.</p>
	<p>Eliminate single family housing zones. We need more terrace homes, duplexes, and ADU's.</p>
	<p>This is a joke you guys absolutely do not care how anybody feels you will do whatever is the best to lace your pockets and and take as much money from the people that live in Boise. In my opinion the people running this gay guys doing a terrible job and should all be fired. You have made it so expensive to live in this state you let the prices run rampant. We're so overinflated. That the people that's lived here before all the other people moved in can't even afford to live here anymore the reason that there's so many Help Wanted signs because the apartment and housings are so expensive normal people that's lived in this area most their life cannot afford to live here anymore. You're going to chase away all the service people. You are turning our town into a garbage can. There is nothing that you will ever do to help the community unless it puts money in your pocket. This is my opinion and only my opinion</p>
	<p>Address that lowering housing costs and fighting homelessness are more important than neighborhood aesthetics</p>
	<p>STOP BVA from building tall, square, ugly buildings that change the way our downtown looks. There is plenty of land available without cutting off the view of our beautiful capital.</p>
	<p>transparency for each building project for the neighborhood to consider. For Example, If that new construction goes in, how will their lack of parking with a smaller driveway impact our ability to use our street parking? And how will you work with the federal mail service, who often will not deliver mail if mailboxes are blocked by a car? And what will it mean if they tear down a single family home next door, and cram eight units in on the lot? We need a say in what these 'design criteria' are, in order to ensure that they are not arbitrary.</p>
	<p>Stop overcrowding all the areas outside of your preferred NorthEast.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

It will just keep allowing cheap contractors and builders to come in and build homes and make a huge profit.
Don't know
The only good change would be less government, less oversight and less manipulation of population. The only real need for government in design is to enforce reasonable building codes for safety and security.
Make it like Sparks Nevada where only so many houses are allowed in an area to keep the land open and not crowded.
Keep a dwelling unit per acre limit but allow variances for especially creative designs and innovative types of housing.
Just think if you make things to dense your going to get more slummy places
Don't tie lot sizes specifically to existing adjacent properties since times have changed
Include landscaping and plants that must be native, and appreciate for climate. Building without obstructing views
Quit allowing homes to be built EVERYWHERE and ANYWHERE not caring what the city does to neighbors!
You want to take a standard that is relatively objective and make it subjective? Looks and feels?
Prefer not to answer.
This will result in cookie cutter designs to fit max number of units to "blend" them into the landscape. The unit acre requirements also had original ideas that people would be gardening and utilizing the small plots not in our current way.
We don't have any use for the " affordable housing" that's not even affordable after all the urbanization these buildings get.
Boise City needs to stop efforts to social engineer the City into a leftist enclave.
I don't want increased density without the infrastructure to handle it. I believe we need the infrastructure first.
Stop Californians from moving here
Keep the minimum lot size. I don't think creative housing design is a good thing.
Approve multi family dwellings in what before was a single family dwelling or duplex
the regulation should be more specific on minimum residential requirements per person. specifically addressing number of full bathrooms, square feet of dry space, parking, and square feet of green space.
No. Suburban neighborhoods should be suburban.
I think you need to provide more parking spaces and tie them to number of residents, rather than number of units.
More space between houses. Extreme fire hazard with houses being so close together. And it's ugly.
N/a
STOP OVER CROWDING!! By "encouraging creative housing design" do you mean cramming even more high density suburban ghetto housing onto the tiniest piece of land possible? STOP THE MADNESS!
Multi-family developments need to include sufficient parking to reduce on-street parking adjacent to the development.
Instead of trying to change old zoning areas that have come up against multiple rejections, follow the original zoning.
What we need now is more, dense housing. We need to build up (higher). The maximum height needs to be raised to accommodate more housing.
don't change it. This encourages out of state growth and affects the natives in the area. This type of change drives the native residents out due to property values rising and our current homes are no longer affordable to live in. Don't change our neighborhood!
Community involvement/chareetes
Homeowners in my neighborhood are opposed to these horrible zoning changes that are being approved. We don't want to live right next to apartments, condos/townhouses. Renters with numerous cars, commercial buildings. I worked my entire life to have a home not live with everyone else because of all the greed of the group approving every single projects that proposed.
Keep the density calls and be very specific on varying density based on neighborhood.
This would not be my goal.
I believe the focus is a good idea but I do not agree with cramming too many houses on a lot.
Leave more open space to keep Boise "Boise."
Leave the current calculation in place. The proposed change willed to higher density, traffic, lack of parking, etc.
in my little area the plans in place will make it a getto, over crowded, very limited access to safe pedestrian infrastructure, very limited parking and on the verge of near80 new apartments with clueless parking access egress and exit access and storm drainage designed for flooding the dewellings?

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Stop the development!!!
Take into account guest parking as well as resident parking when calculating parking requirements. Many apartment units are being built with insufficient parking, creating inevitable conflicts between residents and visitors.
40' lot width seems too much of a reduction from current 50' frontage. Perhaps 45' frontage would be more helpful.
The zoning should be by land use not appearances. Boise zoning, if it does exist, seems to be ignored in favor of development.
Needs to have more parking on each lot per lot, not less. I understand the idea of promoting less driving, but we all know in reality this will result in even more street parking. So many neighborhood streets are already de facto parking lots, if this change is allowed any new development will be even worse.
I don't believe mashing a ton of people together into as tight a fit as you can is a good idea. If you don't like the arbitrary methods used in the current code, just tighten the calculation method.
The focus of the mayor and city council is jaded. We need more done to control the prices of rent. Less out of state landlords.
Most regulations only hinder the design process.
Old regulations were concerned with people density: more people require more accommodations. I'm concerned that new regs may not accommodate space for cars, people & increase problems with increased densities. Many families have 2 or more cars. Just because we have an idea that car densities should be smaller, doesn't make it so. What's the reality right now & in the near future?
Allow enough space between homes and buildings to breath.
Very much support
Protections need to be put in place for neighborhoods wanting to retain a low population density
By "creative " you really mean high density designs. I am opposed to high density housing. Don't turn Boise into Portland
Close the borders to Idaho
Too many apartments are being built that do not have enough parking, so residents must park on the street which causes congestion, damage to vehicles and theft of vehicles.
I'm opposed to the increase of density in my neighborhood. Most lots selling recently are maximized in density at the benefit to the developers, regardless of whether all of the surrounding area is comprised of larger lots; this does not result in new development fitting in with the existing homes.
I think it makes sense to remove the density requirement, but it's absurd in my opinion to make decisions based on design criteria. This is purely subjective, and will only stall the development of more affordable housing. Also- maintaining requirements for parking is ridiculous and counterproductive to the goals of creating more affordable housing and more neighborhood connectivity.
Innovation is critical, but density is as well. Achieving a balance is ideal.
We need more housing, pack it in. The closer to the city center the better to reduce commute. Note I am supporting density to get affordable housing, NOT dense luxury housing.
Stop letting these developers up everything and make things look like social housing. People want houses and land not apartments
I'm not sure. I worry about too many homes being crammed info tiny spaces, and street access and parking being awkward.
Allowing smaller units to be built on existing larger lots in a conscientious manner.
Just kill all the developers and real estate assholes. Problem solved. Fuck you and your stupid developments fuck you
I think Module 2 should match (to the best of its ability) the current surrounding area. If there is already some high density buildings, maybe there approval for larger density types of buildings is the direction, if it is a large parcel type of neighborhood (single family homes on .25 acres), don't allow someone to subdivide and build 4 houses on a parcel that once had a single family home.
remove all regualtions
I live in the North End. It is an increasingly expensive area with many single story homes. As money moves in the homes will be leveled and rebuilt taller because expansion is limited by lot size. Height must be limited! A good example is the old Booth Home development on Hazel St. The two new houses side by side, with bare white exterior walls, as tall as the previous admin building have created a reflective blinding eyesore to everyone on the block.
No
Turn people away saying we are full and have no more room. Send the illegals back to where they came from.
Make sure the code has room for and allows Tiny Homes, Micro Units, Pocket Neighborhoods w/ zero lot lines and Lofts b/c these are valid and necessary housing options to allow working Boiseans affordable mkt housing. Also, condominium ownership in growing cities provides young families and individuals opportunities for entry for sale housing. Boise needs to make the condo process smooth and timely for developers so they can provide for sales housing in the \$250,000 to \$400,000 range.
Individual input by design

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Increasing density and reducing sprawl is very important. It sounds like you are effectively addressing that.
Remove or reduce required parking in certain areas with access to public transportation and alternative transportation options (greenbelt, trails, bike lanes, etc.).
I would allow nearly any height, with sunlight penetration rules instead above certain heights in certain zones - it is fine if a building is a floor taller if that floor is mostly rooftop garden and allows light to sunlight to fall on adjacent properties for example. (Also some sunlight loss is completely acceptable in all zones, as it reduces cooling costs in our climate.)
Don't pack in houses just to build more
More open spaces
I am against smaller lots but that seems to be the trend. People want to make more money with smaller lots (developers, real estate etc) and nobody wants to do yard work.
Make it equitable. If you are going to make this calculation do it to every neighborhood. Don't protect some as historic. That angers citizens cause you protect their neighborhoods while you cram housing into others. Citizens see this as unfair and poor governance.
I think ya'll are going to do whatever brings the most \$\$ to the city and meals to you
Stop regulating us!
If anything, I feel like less regulations would help achieve the intended result. Normally I'm all for government regulations on stuff, but if you look at the data for the most desirable neighborhoods in cities across the country (the ones that weren't bulldozed to build highways or parking lots, at least), they were all built in a time before zoning regulations. How to square that with modern requirements for code is well above my paygrade, but I think letting people build what they want without catering to the whims of a small minority of loud property owners will lead to a better city for everyone.
I am worried that higher and higher housing with no parking will crowd in and hinder the beauty if our city
Site design and landscaping should be added as factors for acceptable design criteria options. Consult a qualified landscape architect for input on language that should be added.
Many units on small lots are undesirable.
It's obvious a number of these changes are intended to allow for high-density housing above the current standards, mostly in the Southwest part of the city but in other areas as well. I think this would be a huge mistake for a number of reasons there isn't space enough to give here, and I'm totally against it!
Less water for landscaping. Strict regulations for upkeep on properties
Larger lots for homes with less homes built
Involving public in decision making
Stop using out of state developers that don't care about this state and only care about profit
Finding a balance and not having an excessive number of tenants
Micro homes
Allowing multiple types of construction (ADUs, tiny houses) on one piece of property is important for the future required density and cost of rentals.
It depends on the "desired" result ... it seems that this survey already has a predisposed outcome... the questions do not really ask what we think about the plan as a whole but assumes we like it. Our family does NOT like the idea of higher density being required... families should be able to find a house on a large lot if that's what they want. Forcing people to live in high density situations is not healthy .. it breeds crime and mental health issues.
I'm not sure how the size of the lot limits design options. Design options are endless. Try hiring some different architects (like women)- everything new going up looks the same and is not attractive, iMHO.
informed design review
Make sure people have garages and back yards.
I don't care about these issues. I care about landlords and corporations' abusive practices like pet rent, discrimination towards specific types of pets or breeds, and price gouging with pet deposits and falsely claiming that normal wear and tear being blamed on pets, clearing the path for landlords to confiscate the entire rental and pet deposits.
More like a "yes, but..." -I agree that design criteria is a better method than density requirements, but I'd like to note that the "skinny houses" trend seems a bit silly to me when those houses could just be combined into one multi-family unit, especially considering the energy savings of multi vs single homes.
Boise is a pack em and stack em
Can't tell from the way the question is phrased what happens now and what will happen with the change - it's far too vague.
ensure new neighborhoods have what is needed for play, biking, recreation. Those in existing neighborhoods should align with the existing design so not to stand out.
Less regulation. The city should have the least intrusive affects on private property possible. Leave it to HOAs to fine-tune their neighborhoods.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	I feel like as long as there is a financial incentive for contractors to cram as much as they can onto a given space, there will always be workarounds for squeezing additional profits.
	There is too much density being currently allowed.
	I think you need to look at the required lot sizes and setbacks for corner lots. Many large corner lots on the Bench could and should be divided into two lots, but zoning currently prohibits most of this because of lot size restrictions for corner lots. Many large corner lots could be subdivided and used for two dwelling units instead of one.
	I am against reduced parking in all areas. Downtown next to a parking garage I think is fine. Fighting for parking on residential streets is not fun and I fear this will bring more problems.
	Height requirements and limited multi family developments should be limited in the northend of Boise. No parking already as it is.
	Avoid high density
	It will make things too crowded, decrease privacy, will have minimal impact on affordability
	more apartments mean more people will never own a home
	You need to look at both - density and design - it is not an either or decision.
	Don't subdivide existing lots to pack in more people.
	Keep developers ensured in the interest of the people
	take into consideration the type of buildings next to the new construction... i.e.. height, set backs, open space, do not cram multiple new buildings in the back yard of a single residence.
	Good design standards
	It is not clear what the "intended result" is. Depending on the specifics of the regulations, the change might make it more difficult to develop one and actually limit creativity.
	no
	I think there is too many apartments in boise
	Parking, access to a place to walk or exercise...lessons from COVID
	It would change existing neighborhoods. Ok for new developments.
	Increase building set back space between major roads and require landscaping and pathways for all people. Increased bus stops with covers. Think of sunshine areas which brighten our perspectives on everything.
	It will create more apartment style living. Allowing more densely sized developments will change the feel of Boise and it's livability, and not it a good way. We do not want to become a Beijing with people living so closely that they have the feel of being in each other's "pockets."
	Giant houses with minimal setbacks have been replacing small neighborhood homes. More attention to smaller units, and not building massive walls at 5 ft setbacks that block sun from the neighbors.
	Keep guidelines with allowance for exceptions
	Too many folks in one spot is like having to many cows on a feed lot.
	Personally, I think that we need to allow more small apartment buildings to be built in neighborhoods closer in towards the city center. Mostly in the older neighborhoods would be best, with a mix of affordable and mid range price points.
	Foothill owners are treated very unfairly by the Foothills Ordinance. As an owner who allows the public to use trails on my land, I would appreciate being treated more fairly. Otherwise, the free trail may disappear. Adjust the Ordinance.
	Minimize how many units are crammed onto a lot
	My primary concern is in respect to climate change. For Boise to be creative, I would like to see a requirement for xeriscaping, no lawns except in park areas and even those areas could be designed to reduce watering. We are a desert in a drought, imperative that is addressed in new and existing development.
	Maintaining open space and walking/hiking trails and wildlife corridors
	Keep open lands undeveloped as already promised. Period. Expand EAST on the 84.
	Make back yards mandatory. Increase distance between houses
	I'm a little concerned about "efficiency suites," as I feel that these kinds of apartments are not very sufficient for daily life. I don't want to incentivize construction of efficiency units over regular, full sized affordable units, as these are more important for low income families.
	I am also concerned about significantly different density in neighborhoods. Consider an apartment building with 100 units inside a single-family home neighborhood; many might object.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>i love the character of this neighborhood between residences and businesses. although I agree with this proposed change, I worry that strict design/physical requirements will shift the character... or edge out existing businesses that make the bench what it is. (For example, Campos market shown in the example photo.. this is troubling because it is using an existing business that is inherent to why I love this neighborhood and demonstrates how the neighborhood could shift toward something "better", but refining businesses and homes to that standard feels incompatible with the neighborhood I love. If this standard had been set years ago, I wonder if we would be so lucky to have such diversity and unique restaurants.</p>
	<p>Parking is a serious issue in Boise, taking away spaces is a bad idea</p>
	<p>Need visual examples.</p>
	<p>Needs to address making sure that the design of the project blends into the existing neighborhood</p>
	<p>Elimination of the density limit will be exploited by developers. We should have BOTH a maximum density limit AND focus on design criteria, like maximum height, required parking, minimum lot sizes and setbacks.</p>
	<p>Please include availability and proximity of services (parks, grocery, schools, hospitals etc.) in the design.</p>
	<p>We live in the Sycamore Overlay and if this proposed change is implemented, it will lead to new developments not fitting in with existing neighborhoods - opposite of your intended affect. If these larger lots are allowed to develop without a density requirement, it will lead to a mix of super high density and super low density lots that will affect the existing character of the neighborhood that the existing Sycamore Overlay has successfully maintained.</p>
	<p>I think it's important to consider the environment and feel. However, it's just as important we provide attainable housing. Cost-benefit analysis is key here.</p>
	<p>We need to focus more on density so we can have more affordable housing. If this law removes a density limit and allows for more dense housing then I support.</p>
	<p>Require ON SITE parking for ALL new development. Your lack of this requirement results in street parking which makes areas ugly and unsafe.</p>
	<p>A public education module would be greatly beneficial to enable the public at large to provide informed commentary on proposed developments. An interactive, side-by-side overhead site model, comparing existing code to proposed code, might be a useful tool.</p>
	<p>I believe every resident of a dwelling (new or old) is entitled to an appropriate amount of space. A yard, a house or apartment big enough to move around in, etc. making lot sizes smaller to fit in more units is NOT okay.</p>
	<p>Keep the existing code. It protects neighborhoods and current property owners.</p>
	<p>Definitely remove the density limit. But get rid of setbacks altogether and parking minimums. How could we build Hyde Park if setbacks and parking were required?</p>
	<p>Each developer must be responsible for providing a minimum set of criteria to fully provide for the housing units built. All impacts including traffic, ems, ww and dw infrastructure, parking, and pedestrian security need to be provided if you want to build. Individuals should have less of this burden because their choices impact only them, or their neighbor impact is multiplied by only one unit, not a whole community like a development.</p>
	<p>Keep the maximum limit already established.</p>
	<p>I do think its important that we also think about creating affordable housing for larger groups of people.</p>
	<p>Still set caps to ensure density doesn't overburden infrastructure</p>
	<p>Remove Mclean. Save Murgito park</p>
	<p>Don't focus on increasing the population density.</p>
	<p>I would encourage planners to incorporate a density calculation in accepting or rejecting proposals. The density calculation requirement should be somewhat flexible to allow for innovative designs.</p>
	<p>Maintain current code.</p>
	<p>Citizens serving on review panels/committees.</p>
	<p>I think that one way could be to encourage builders and developers to include a % of affordable housing in every new housing development. This would encourage builders to build different types of houses and not simply build houses that will "make the most profit". I think your trying to change this code so that you can build more houses on a smaller plots of land , to try and tackle the affordable housing crisis. Unless you introduce a system where a proportion of all new builds have to be affordable, builders and developers will take advantage of the updated code and simply look to build "more houses" not more affordable housing options.</p>
	<p>Reducing the required number of parking spaces will NOT encourage people to use public transportation. Do city council members use public transportation to get to work, get to doctor's appointments, go out to dinner, get groceries?</p>
	<p>Add more parking spaces per unit</p>
	<p>Not all areas of Boise should come under the same guidelines. The north end may be able to have more density, but when you get to the rural areas of southwest Boise, the same guidelines just don't seem reasonable. Having something for everyone is also important!</p>
	<p>Lot sizes need to be larger. Buildings are too close together. Need more space between houses.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

No parking minimums, no setbacks, no height restrictions. Regulation should encourage building quality, not design.
Development must maintain all existing trees to maximize shade (cooling) and privacy.
I don't know.
No
Define required open space per parcel in development and define parking per parcel in any development.
No ADU STRs.
We need to be careful with this-- for example we wouldn't want to put so many people in one neighborhood that the rest of the services in the neighborhood (parking, access roads, sidewalks, etc) are not able to support it. However I do think there could be some unique affordable housing options, like smaller "dorm" style rooms. It would be much better than having those people on the streets.
Size of unit/number of units isn't as impactful in determining how a space or building feels. Making sure a development fits within its context, brings new and creative solutions to our housing shortage, and engages the public in a positive and healthy way is more important and will make the city a better place to live and work.
I support encouraging more housing but I agree there should be requirements for design, height and parking so that neighborhood cohesion and character remains intact.
Include impact on water and electricity and traffic.
No, this will only encourage maximizing square footage built even more.
Not at this time. I would need some examples in order to better comment.
Make developers scale and design development to blend into existing neighborhoods. Retain mature trees.
Pay attention to when the land was acquired and the intent at the time.
I don't understand the calculation requirements and if removing it will help with density building or height of buildings. Height of buildings and building on farm lands is a huge concern of ours.
While this is important to regulate the maximum this has potential to have a negative impact on minimum dwelling unit sizes. Can they fit more units into a building if they are within the maximum allowable size?
If I understand this...I think people in Boise strive to have a family HOME with land. Somehow balancing more homes/less apartments with actual land space. And limiting urban sprawl and less industrial sprawl. Maybe an initiative that allows people to own homes with zero down?
I don't think changing these things will help solve many of the issues. Rent control and taxes need to be regulated for any of this to make any difference. The more dense the housing, the lower quality of life we will have.
Compliance with design standards similar to LEEDS and Green Globe.
The current parking requirements are subsidizing the auto industry. I would recommend looking to cities like Amsterdam where they have had to maximize living space and green spaces. While parking can be important, far too much space is dedicated to it in our city that could be put to better use. I would instead install requirements on green spaces.
Keep the idea of single family and multi family with some mixed use but not everywhere.
Both! No high density. No building should occupy more than 40% of lot size
Parking needs to be adequate. Lake Hazel Maple Grove new building is horrible. Cars all over the road. Not enough parking
The formula seems like it would fit in better with the existing neighborhood because it would keep it consistent with the existing requirements.
It's fine how it is
It's a bad idea
Eliminate parking minimums entirely.
Stop the corruption
Don't change the current zoning regulations
Not having a minimum or maximum allowable density and instead focusing on design criteria will make it harder for developers to purchase land and know what they can build, and will inject too much uncertainty, since the design process is inherently more subjective. Instead, stick with the density calculation and offer density bonuses or exceptions for innovation to encourage innovation without unintended consequences of chilling development due to density and approval uncertainty
Don't squeeze in people. Creative housing, in my opinion, means high density. Yuck. And the infrastructure isn't there.
Indeed. Each new construction project needs to be evaluated on the total environmental impact of the dwelling over its plans lifespan. Each should generate at least as much power as it uses. Have appropriate water conservancy measures, carbon capture design and construction and sympathetic to the natural surroundings.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

There should still be a maximum number of residences unless you want to just build the 'projects' for the high number of low income families that Idaho is known for.
Assess traffic impact, safety/crime impact
Limit the amount and sizes of house that can be placed on a lot. Keeping with the neighborhood that it is in.
I think you should have affordable housing in every apartment complex. There should not be designated affordable housing complexes. Affordable housing should be a part of every community, every complex, integrated, not separate from others.
Instead of asking a question that asks us if we take such and such action, will this result, why not ask if we really want the intended results? The answer to THAT question is no.
I don't know. I'd there are provisions to protect people so landlords don't try to game the system that might be good.
Quit trying to put buildings on every square inch of the city/County
Require more assigned parking. Builders say they can use street parking or "bus lines" but then in reality it just takes up the space on residential neighborhood streets.
Don't remove it, modify it. Limiting the number of units is essential to keeping our neighborhoods feeling like neighborhoods rather than a sprawling metropolis of apartment complexes with thousands of people in a very small space.
It's more important to protect the neighborhood of people who already live here. Not ok to allow buildings to go up without adequate parking allotments
Tax benefits for self sufficient energy designs
This is a welcome change, however, the details of form based criteria are critical and I am concerned that, as written, these details may strongly inhibit the city's ability to achieve the goal of homes for everyone, throughout all neighborhoods, at all price points. In particular, we should adopt substantially smaller minimum lot sizes (1,200 feet would be preferable, in my opinion), eliminate parking minimums entirely, further reduce setback requirements, and increase height (including by at least one floor, to three floors, in R1c).
I feel that it will only allow developers to create super high density with little concern about how it will effect our overall city. We could easily end up with tenement style housing. The only way this would work is if we had very high pre-designated design standards. Our current design standards are lax.
More focus needs to be put on surrounding properties and how the proposal will fit into a neighborhood
I think allowing a minimum of a four-plex on areas which are continued to be zoned single family is a good start. In no way should the city put a minimum parking requirement in place for any structure, this just continues to push the car dependency for our community and weakens our financial position. Setbacks should also be reduced in order to allow buildings to sit closer to the sidewalk/street.
What kind of creative housing design are you hoping to achieve? Leaving the maximum dwelling calculation per the international building code will leave less leeway to allow the department to discriminate against designs just because they don't like them and keep us in check with standards used by most of the businesses that will be designing the dwellings.
Stopping people claiming it blocks there view .
I am 100% against high-density. I would suggest moving further out to surrounding cities and areas to accommodate residents. We cannot cram everyone into one city as it greatly takes away the quality of life and enjoyment for current residents.
Required input and listening to existing home owners around development. Don't cram as many homes as you can in a small space or put townhouses and apartments. You totally ruined our neighborhood and we had NO say
I have no opinion but you MUST take in consideration what is going on in the neighborhood. You guys approved a skyscraper in our two story neighborhood and that is so sad.
No more low income, multi level or apartments. No homeless shelters no more of our tax dollars used for diversity, community or liberal bullcrap
Need to design off street parking for 2 cars per unit.
A lot of neighborhoods have a limited amount of house designs. So when you drive through a neighborhood, the houses all look identical, and it feels very boring and monotonous. I like the idea of having parameters for building design, but there should also be allowance for home owners to choose variety and uniqueness, without looking strange or bringing down the value of the community. I'd like to see more designs per neighborhood
The problem is that most citizens don't trust you to not just jam high density in and say that it fits fine and meets the needs of the city. You have ignored most of the master plan recommendations that you used tax dollars to create over the last 10 years. How will this be any different? Look as massing and size of buildings compared to the buildings they are next to. If they are in an area with historic buildings then don't let those be overshadowed. Have your density on empty lots that won't destroy neighborhoods like you have done with the Idaho Credit Union building in the east downtown. I don't live there but you have condemned many of those great one and two story buildings to demolition because they will be in the shadow of this monolith parking garage with a few offices and expensive houses attached. What the heck was the purpose of this rezone project when you approved that ahead of all this work?
Ensuring that builders, contractors and investors understand vision of the city goals. This means that zoning must be written in such a diligent manner so as not to leave any loop holes for inappropriate builds being approved, especially in existing neighborhoods.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>It's only going to encourage more sense development and on-street parking. Additionally, it relies on interpretation of criteria that's not measurable. Leave the density calculation just like it is.</p>
<p>I think this makes sense, it's really about a combined approach to physical footprint and density. I also think when we devise these laws, allowable deviation for affordable housing should be considered, as well as sustainable building & design.</p>
<p>Denver did something similar thinking they'd outsmart developers. Developers instead built deep multi 3-4 story townhouse that had front doors that did not face street this allowing for 4-6 homes in a deep lot. Each sold for 1/2 mil and created parking and traffic issues, greatly changed feel of the neighborhoods, and of course hiked prices in what had been affordable areas. Just go ride the lite rail on the west route and you will see the havoc. Boise is already headed in this direction. As long as dev with deep pockets and connects to city council exist. I sat through several hearings and witnessed this phenomenon. Homeowners did not stand a chance against.</p>
<p>What do you mean "setbacks to limit the impact of development."</p>
<p>This is very disappointing. Boise is becoming a Seattle where homes and buildings are squeezed into any spot and a neighborhood's appearance is diminished. This is also an opportunity for developers to line their pockets while Boise builds hideous looking apartment buildings with no style and smacks unattractive homes on small lots that will look and feel cheap in ten years. New neighborhoods will look and feel unplanned and in time will look rundown. I do not want an apartment building built next to my home that will tower over out home and yard and take away our sunlight and privacy.</p>
<p>I think ensuring the structural integrity of the building is important and limiting height to keep our views. Additionally, understanding how the development with impact traffic flow is important as well.</p>
<p>It would not be an improvement to the regulation if it achieved YOUR intended result.</p>
<p>Although I support enhanced flexibility, I know that maximizing profit is the objective of developers and my experience with P&Z is that developers often are heard over the voices of the neighbors. I fear that this change would promote high density developments across the board. In some places, increasing density is a reasonable approach. In other areas, it makes little sense. Case in point – development within and adjacent to the foothills and near other sensitive areas (Boise River).</p>
<p>We need to legally allow tiny homes and more accessory dwelling units.</p>
<p>Density should fit in context with the neighborhood and building design.</p>
<p>height should not be over 2 stories.</p>
<p>In certain neighborhoods, lot sizes should still be larger in order to fit in, i.e. the foothills.</p>
<p>People should come before the look of a building project. Who cares what a city looks like if the people are unhappy.</p>
<p>Size of lot depends on size of house with parking and setbacks on all lots</p>
<p>We are already allowing far to much density and this will only serve to make it worse.</p>
<p>Keep existing code</p>
<p>No One in the City Council Will Listen to What We Say Or Take What We Care About Into Consideration, so Why Are You Wasting Our Time By Asking?</p>
<p>I think adding those factors to a more restrictive density calculation could help, but eliminating one for the other isn't a solution.</p>
<p>No we have enough laws on the books we don't want to be boston</p>
<p>Allow non owner occupied lots to have ADU's on them.</p>
<p>Keep the existing code density requirements. I DO NOT want high density housing in Boise.</p>
<p>Put a moratorium on new housing and building until road infrastructure is modified to handle new traffic. At this time area roads do not handle the traffic volume we currently have.</p>
<p>The only things I care about are truly affordable low income housing, transportation that has nothing to do with driving, and the environment for our sake and the sake of all beings.</p>
<p>I worry that the extra design criteria for duplex, triplex, and fourplexes are more burdensome than for building a single unit home of the same size. Additional requirements based on density basically undoes the update of removing density maximums by making them potentially unfeasible when single unit development would remain feasible. This does little to help with development of smaller units and will still encourage development of larger and larger single unit homes in desirable areas as costs continue to increase.</p>
<p>How are you going to protect the neighborhoods we invested our life saving into? The biggest investments of our lives are often our houses and it is planning and zoning's job to protect our investment. How do you plan to do this?</p>
<p>There also needs to be consideration to the roads and the ability to handle more people</p>
<p>Set minimum sq. Ft for the # of residents for unit being built. For example, 1 Person units require min. 750 sq.ft., 2 person units require 1200 sq.ft., and so on</p>
<p>Maximum dwellings cap per city blocks or specie area</p>
<p>Possibly. The idea is mostly good, you'll just have to be flexible when it comes to new developments and now they intersect with the existing neighborhood. We can't make everything super dense!</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	I do not support high density single family home plans.
	The city's intent with these new proposals is to densely populate the city of Boise to the point that our city will not be fit to live.
	Vote by people in the area.
	Offer much better public transit than we currently have. Reducing parking requirements to allow density doesn't work without easier transit. Allow parking restrictions where we offer transit. Boise is car centric for a reason- the routes downtown don't work for most people. Our huge empty busses aren't working. Set backs are important to me- height restrictions to protect the privacy and light of adjacent properties. New York did that in 1917-whats taken so long here?Unfortunately I'm stuck with a three story new house jammed into a small lot built two years ago. When I called you to complain that their balcony looks into my backyard I was told "oh sorry, you don't live in a design review neighborhood". Having set backs to protect light and privacy is good. Too bad you don't have that in the code for our downtown commercial buildings. Some blocks are now shaded most of the day. One thing you haven't mentioned is building materials. I don't care about "large windows" if they're the cheapest vinyl and the building is made with cheapest siding that starts looking bad soon after a developer walks away. And when are we going to care that all of our newer buildings look the same? A city is beautiful that evolves over time. The buildings approved now will make our city look dated in a few years and hardly any are built with good substantial materials. It breaks my heart to see how Boise has allowed the cookie cutter blah. Somewhere someone said it is the "cloning of American cities". I appreciate what you are now trying to do- now that it's too late to ammend for the gaping parking lot entrance holes on our once beautiful Capitol Blvd- I hope this new code your trying to do doesn't continue to pander to these out of state developers and investors. If I have typos I apologize- I'm doing this on my phone.
	New design decisions may help but continuing to pack hundreds of people and their cars where tens of people formerly lived is not feasible, sustainable, desirable.
	From someone who has worked in property management for years, apartments should be required to provide 1 parking space per bedroom. Parking should not be an after-thought.
	Make developers create affordable housing . Nothing is affordable in Boise. and certainly not in East End. All the new construction has done in the past 5 years is make my taxes go up and bring millionaires to this neighborhood which was once mostly middle class. I'm sick of the new people driving 30 year residents out of the community.Small businesses cannot pay people more per hour and most hourly worked in Boise no longer have anywhere to live. It has changed to fabric of this community.
	I am against development of any property when it effects the surrounding neighborhood adversely.
	after driving around Boise the other day and saw homes literally crammed into spaces here and there makes the city look desperate and trashy. none of those tiny dwellings are affordable and have really nothing to do with the actual zoning. its all about money.
	Get rid of street level setback requirements, focus on design outcomes; connecting lanes for pedestrians, bikes and other important public needs like trees.
	I think it will encourage creativity but I worry that it Will result in too much density if the restrictions are removed. Perhaps a new policy that still includes a density calc but that is more forgiving than the original would be good.
	Blanket set back and parking requirements become prohibitive of doing progressive development projects. Logic needs to be considered based on location and look and feel of the area to determine.
	Define the center of a neighborhood. And set minimum density requirements scaled towards the center of each hood. Every hood should have a walkable commercial zone.
	Creative, natural design to fit in with Boise landscapes. Quality size and cost for individuals and family to feel like home.
	Is there a way to add a measure of quality? For example, building a lot of cheap, cookie cutter, buildings won't help Boise in the long term. Also, can environmental standards be part of the code? Use of reclaimed products, strict energy efficiency guidelines, encouraging the use of sustain energy, etc.
	"Density" has become a mantra that the priests of new urbanism all now pray. Yet there is no guarantee that increased density will do anything but crowd and deteriorate established neighborhoods, while having little impact on unregulated sprawl (which we all know in Idaho is never going to be meaningfully managed with urban growth boundaries or other mechanisms). We're just coming out of a pandemic, where living on top of each other in close quarters has been shown to be unhealthy. Why are we now promoting more crowded living conditions?
	The existing dwelling units per acre is the best approach
	Using the land as a guide, not just making "X" amount of houses fit in a development to get the most money for the builder.
	While we agree that increased density is important, it will be a recipe for disaster if the city doesn't make VAST improvements to public transportation. While I understand public transportation planning and investments are outside the scope of P&Z, they must work in tandem if the goal is to increase density. Specifically, the city must first commit to investing in alternative, more attractive public transportation that middle-to-upper class residents will actually use (eg think BARTs full of working residents and that are safe for adolescents to take on their own-- with lines of service running close to their houses and reaching across the valley, rather than our current state of empty buses mainly used by homeless and/or people with substance abuse and/or mental health problems with few lines of service). That is, we need to make transportation feasible, realistic, useful BEFORE (or at least CONCURRENT WITH) implementing a city P&Z policy that will have the effect of decreasing room for private vehicles as it increases density.
	Less density is preferable
	I don't think the "fit in" qualities of proposed development should be weighed too heavily. It is often the cudgel used by existing residents to prevent needed development to meet the demand. The proposed changes go in the right direction but I don't think it goes far enough.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	More landscaping is preferred. Units that are enclosing in one massive block building look better and adding a garden feel to apartment life is encouraging and healthier for the people who live there.
	Designate more common areas like parks, even throughout Ada County for those living just outside city limits.
	stop the forward leading surveys
	THIS IS A JOKE - THE "CITY LEADERS" HAVE ALREADY GREEN LIGHTED SO MANY "MCMANSIONS" IN OUR ECLECTIC NEIGHBORHOOD OWNED BY SO MANY OUT OF TOWN FOLKS WHO DO NOT CARE ABOUT IDAHO NOR BEING GOOD NEIGHBORS SO THIS IS A CASE OF TOO LITTLE TO LATE.
	New designs should not clash with what is already present
	People buy homes in some neighborhoods specifically because of the numerous 1A semi-agricultural homes and lots. They intentionally chose a lower density zone and generally pay a lot to live there. It isn't the homeowners in these neighborhoods who tear down the existing home and then cram 5 units onto the lot, it is developers with no concern for the character of these neighborhoods. I live near the sea of ugly townhouses on Roe St. and Bogart. I grew up in the Collister neighborhood. The developers don't seem to prioritize a neighborhood feel at all. If these had a charming aesthetic of high density neighborhoods in older cities like Chicago or New York my opinion would be less negative. Cory Barton and similar developers have given neighbors no reason to trust them, and quieter neighborhoods with old growth trees shouldn't be forced to be different just because developers actively recruit potential wealthier residents to Boise from elsewhere instead of keeping prices and homes affordable for the existing residents. Stop basing the health of our city on soliciting population growth!
	Require more infrastructure improvements by developers.
	Write it so you are not packing people in slivers of land not meant for inhabitation. Stop overloading our neighborhoods, it's ok to say there's no more housing Please find a community that does.
	We should NOT be dictating parking requirements. Rather, we should be creating high density neighborhood centers with alternative / mass transit options.
	Builders are focused on quantity, not quality. This zoning change merely removes the quantity restrictions. We do not need more condensed housing with nearly no backyard or land. We are ruining the beautiful land that Boise rests on by constantly paving over it and building structures with no distance between them. Case and point, the new homes being built in Southeast Boise off Division Ave. there was once a beautiful, historic home on the corner of Williams and Boise that is now gone, and replaced by 3 townhomes with nearly no backyard. That is not a healthy way to live and it is damaging to our ecosystem.
	Encouraging smaller living spaces may help to reduce the cost of housing in Boise.
	Something addressing effects on traffic and making sure that developments do not create intolerable traffic burdens for an area.
	I worry single family neighborhoods will have the ability to add an addy dwelling to rent as a stand alone unit which in most subdivisions don't have adequate lot sizes.
	Love removing density- make sure the design, open space, and parking actually allow housing you envision to get built.
	I think that density needs to be capped AND design criteria need to be thoughtfully managed.
	Adequate parking requirements and open areas beyond river and foothills
	Regulate how Airbnb and Recovery houses fit in with a neighborhood. Both greatly impact the feel and safety of an area.
	Not have this apply to historic districts. New build only outside of historic areas
	Limit square footage of new houses and allow smaller lot sizes so people can afford to buy/build their own at current prices.
	You are removing one set of limiting criteria and substituting another set of limiting criteria. Why don't we all just agree to live in fantasyland?
	Leave our open space alone
	Environmental impact is critical during this time when much of our land is being covered by houses and buildings. Consider the Impact growth of cities has on adequate garden areas, protecting agricultural accesses, and planning with the future in mind rather than just wealth. Do we want our children to see how growth ravages the land or incorporates protection for sustainable communities?
	Keep both! Still limit the number of units, but allow them to be a creative design. Families need space. Yards and privacy. Don't get rid of that!
	You need both a density cap and dimensional standards for residential development, primarily to provide predictability to your residential neighborhoods. Density is not an arbitrary standard. There is a purpose for it, and it has to do with neighborhood character and compatibility. Form based approach is better applied for commercial and non-residential developments.
	Limit development in Boise to keep our city beautiful.
	It's to late
	There should be some kind of spacing requirement between houses and a maximum amount of buildings. Otherwise developers will cram as many houses in and that affects quality of life and impacts our eny
	Not sure

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Don't be too rigid in your opinions remain Flexible. It is important
it just increases density without preserving neighborhoods
There could be best practices available for comparison so developers can see a successful use of space. Make sure the maximum height regulations are truly in alignment with living in that neighborhood. It seems like what is legal and what actually looks and feels right is not always in alignment.
Requiring adequate parking for all developments is definitely a must. Apartment complexes have ridiculously inadequate parking areas in comparison to how many people they cram into the buildings, and street parking in residential neighborhoods should not qualify as "parking space" for any new developments within neighborhoods, as there were always parking wars in our last neighborhood due to larger single family lots being developed into three to four cracker-box houses with one-car garages and no driveways for parking. There was an air of territorialism and dissatisfaction amongst many of the neighbors I chatted with because you never knew if you'd be able to park in front of your own house or if you'd be hauling groceries from a block away. Cramming more people into our city without preserving enough space just to EXIST without someone else rubbing shoulders with you will destroy our citizens' abilities to live peacefully with everyone.
No
Lower property taxes.
It depends on the size limitations placed on minimum lot size. It seems like this is a way to allow a higher density of population in a smaller area and justifying it by saying developers will come up with more unique ways of laying out strategies to place as many residences as they can fit in the land they are developing.
Require rather than "encourage" the intended result. Left to their own devices developers will shove the most expensive onto the tiniest space- 100% of the time.
More ways to achieve staff level approval vs. being subjected to neighbors opinions on if a project confirms or not.
To ensure the a maximum number of affordable units.
the regulation could be improved by a change to the mind set regarding the calculated density. one can embrace innovative and creative housing designs while still staying with the 'old' density calculation. one gets stuck doing the same thing again and again and feels the only way out is to throw out the old and remake it into something new. how about looking at the old in a new way?
Provide examples and approve options that are of scale with the surrounding neighborhood. You can have density when you get creative and there's no one size fits all, but don't let the infill or density clash with the surrounding neighborhood (esthetically, height, etc).
There is no way the proposed regulation would achieve the intended result. This change would decrease the chance new development would "fit in." Furthermore, this as an obviously (and pathetically) loaded question. You should simply ask if we support or oppose the proposed change, instead of suggesting a No vote means we oppose creative design. (This could be a sample question in a survey-composition course.)
If density is not used maximum lot coverage, setback and height limits should be enforced to reduce over crowding. Areas such as downtown and near downtown form based code works but not everywhere
Parking garages built on the basement/ground levels so that street parking doesn't make our access roads too narrow for snow removal.
The change you outline is a positive step. But who really cares if a new building "fits in" or not? Diversity of design and type make neighborhoods interesting. We shouldn't be mandating the arbitrary criteria of "fitting in." Let people build what they think is needed. In general, there shouldn't be a limit on how many units can be built on a piece of land. We need more housing, and a lot of it.
Oversight, enforcement, consequences
Designs should be context sensitive. For example, contrary to what is included in the Collister Neighborhood plan, work is progressing to build six housing units where there used to be only on single-family residence (6222 W Elmer). Given that the road is only 19' wide (at the widest point) the resulting traffic will make current even vehicle safety a problem in addition to pedestrian and bike traffic. The neighborhood plan should have been reviewed thoroughly before the P&Z decision.
Citizen review panel for major projects.
Do not increase density.
I don't know how to improve but I see great concern in letting developers maximize their profits at the expense of quality of life.
Start with the thought of packing people into small spaces creates problems. Stop thinking about money to be made and start thinking about quality of life. The impact of the massive numbers moving here is not good for anyone or the environment- prove me wrong those of you voted into rolls who should protect us.
Ensure there is adequate sidewalks and neighbourhood connectivity and deemphasize garages and parking in front of housing
Stop crowding houses onto tiny lots and putting apartments in areas of single family homes. Dense housing and tiny yards is creating unlivable conditions that the city, county, and builders ignore. Making money is all you care about. The new construction on 5 Mile/fly is horrible. Tiny homes of 2 or 3 stories crammed in will make for insufficient parking and angry neighbors.
I don't know the answer, but know what I don't like. I don't like housing that is so dense that you can literally look out your window and see into your neighbor's house 10 feet away. We shouldn't cram single family homes on lots with only a narrow separation. If we want dense housing, build condominiums or apartments instead.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Stop building apartments
I corporate both and then stick to it. No exceptions.
Not roll over to developer requests for variances, variances and more variances that make more profits for the developer and the neighborhood less convivial
Make sure there is space between residential buildings, not so packed in close to each other.
Minimize high density and building height
Designing homes to 'for in' with other homes is NOT a creative or person-friendly way to design neighborhoods! Priority should be for affordability and basic guidelines to assure there's enough space between homes for people to live, walk, and interact.
Keep the maximum limit and encourage creativity. they are not mutually exclusive.
Concern of abuse without the density regulations. But, I support the concept's intent, how will it be monitored and checked against abuse?
Compatible design qualities
Don't be like California hills but that is too late. It's already out of control.
I think no matter the zoning code, a developer will force any code to get the most return regardless of his or her lip service to "durability, wellness, efficiency, locality, and longevity" (from Welltower's REIT written material)
In table 11-04.2 R1C, R2, and R3 should have taller maximum heights, or an application for case by case exemptions to height restrictions allowed. Mandating short buildings promotes sprawl, which is the last thing we want. High density means building up not out.
It should include both - number of units as well as design criteria. Why give up one for the other?
You don't want to end up like Draper UT where the Planning & Zoning Commission never met a high-density housing project they didn't like. Traffic has exploded and on-street parking is an eyesore as well as hazardous, removing the "neighborhood" feel.
Mix apartments into commercial areas. Take the roads with frequent bus service - Broadway, Vista, State - and build apartments to replace some empty commercial. There is plenty of parking space there and ready to go on transit lines. Win-win
I think it is ok to be creative with how many units can be built, but I worry that too many trees are coming down and green space eliminated in our neighborhood. I think there need to be requirements to keep our neighborhoods green.
I think this is an excellent change to the code. Anything that will allow for more flexible and innovative dwellings within the city should be a top priority. Novel, more efficient home styles like "tiny" homes, retrofitted vans or school buses, and other unique livable spaces can create higher density housing without the cookie cutter "high density housing units" that spring up everywhere and make a neighborhood suddenly feel like it's neither a cozy neighborhood nor a bustling urban center.
Keeping enough density to include open space in each development.
This will cause higher numbers of units to be built in smaller spaces causing crowding issues, parking space issues and more problems. Quit trying to move California here. We are at capacity and need strict laws to slow the growth not speed it up. Affordable housing means putting to many people in a square section I'm not for that!
I like that there are minimum requirements. An extra house was squeezed into our cauldesac, and it ruined our yard. It was not what we bought.
A distinction also has to be made for rentals/apartments vs condos or other units that are actually owner occupied.
I do not want increased density because of safety issues with traffic.
Follow LEED guidelines for neighborhood development and building design and construction.
Required set back and side back area required based on structure size not just a set size of square footage per lot. Different size lots based on size of structure with larger set backs and side/back present requirements. There are some homes that have no yard area just crammed together
Unsure, but builders will still likely build as cheap as possible to maximize profit. And density calculation should still be used to determine wear on the area (parks, water, etc.)
Dwellings per unit acre is not arbitrary. It, along with things like lot sizes, set back, height, and required parking should be considered. And, any units intended to be used for families should be required to provide at least two parking spots.
NO CUP rulings anymore. Every new home being built/renovated in the N End has obtained variances or gotten CUP. That should be incredibly rare! Not the norm.
Yes. Please formally allow for building to include multigenerational dwellings and well as smaller homes on same sites. Please encourage multi-use buildings as well.
Why are you even sending out a survey as if we have a say in this? Like any opinion we have will spark you people to realize how bad you've screwed us and turned this beautiful city into a total shit hole? Mayor Beiter sold us out to developers and no offense, Mayor McLean, but you haven't done anything to help. What you're building are "projects." That's the solution. My boyfriend, who has a masters degree, can't even afford to buy a home for him and his kids. Affordable housing. Seriously? Why isn't anything being done to address the insane wage gap between living here and wages earned? That's the problem and a solution to that must be put in place. You have turned Idaho into California, congratulations. Now why don't you start paying us like Californians rather than putting us up in "affordable housing." Please. I love how you are so triumphant about it, too. You aren't fooling anyone. Don't insult us any further by thinking we are morons just buying into your housing crisis solution. How do you sleep at night?
Needs to be approved by the various

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Keep height low!! Keep number of parking spaces and keep parking off streets. Maintaining landscaping and building upkeep is a no brainer. I don't see any of the changes actually improving anything! It will only give developers more freedom to squeeze more apartments or houses into a small area to make more money!!!!
leave it the way it is you greedy pricks
Yes. People don't like change and with the impact of relocating I would not get too excited for another two years. The population may very well go down
Allow lofts and split level housing
Do not change the density currently set.
No, but just want to reiterate that I am a big proponent of form based design as proposed in module 2.
Criteria should reflect if development is in foothills versus flat versus infill land. Additionally minimum setbacks should reflect type of structure(s) planned
Houses should be spaced at least 15 feet apart
Government should not infringe on the rights of property owners.
Reduce noise and light pollution! These non-dimensional factors make crowding feel worse. Outlaw leaf blowers, as they cause significant noise and air pollution.
Require electric vehicles. Pedestrian streets. Sunday banning of cars on the connector.
Design standards and cost per square foot should be in same ballpark as surrounding area to ensure similar quality.
It should not be a one size fits all solution. Every different area of Boise has different challenges to look at.
Smaller lot sizes, higher buildings, make the city as walkable and bikeable as possible.
In order to housing affordability, minimum lot size must be reduced to allow for more density.
I don't understand what you mean by this. Near me there was one house on one lot,, average yard. Now there are eight houses crammed in there. This is not Innovative it's terrible. Look at the older subdivisions, North and East End North West End, Jordans Landing, etc. Those are the kind of houses we need. they're all mixed in together. Small, medium, large, duplexes, fourplexes, condos, townhouses. Even Harrison Boulevard has duplexes on it, but you don't notice them cuz they fit.
The number of units divided by size of lot has seemed to work for Boise. I say if it ain't broke don't fix it. It sounds like by removing the density calculation you will be trying to stuff more people in smaller areas.
I am all for 2 story apts and townhomes on the bench, but please limit higher than that.
Their a way to de-incentive the sprawl of HOA's? Wish their were options on the market to buy new homes outside the HOA style neighborhood.
"Simplistic formulas" don't/won't work. We need clearer guidance on what it means to "fit in" and have humans make the call. The thing you're allowing in the North and East Ends where people can have 1.5 story buildings where the dormers are ENORMOUS and effectively make a two-story house that towers over neighbors is bad. I honestly don't care about the size of my neighbor's house if it fits the character of the street. But shoving skinny tall houses into a street of single-stories makes no sense. If they want to do that, build down instead of up.
Hold density requirements otherwise existing beautiful single-family neighborhoods will become decimated. This regulation abolishes single-family zoning in Boise.
Appoint a citizen advisory board to review designs before the final approval of a building permit. Maybe one person from each designated neighborhood would comprise a board.
No featurless designs-(box) (non traditional designs)
Parking in the back of the building or home such as Harris Ranch
I fear this will be mid-used to overfill places.
Give priority to approvals of multi generational dwellings.
Use a floor area formula calculate density and parking that gives people space for privacy and prevent overcrowding.
Limit the size and number of multiple unit dwelling that can be built in single family home neighborhoods.
Taking away the regulation will only allow developers to build higher and smaller but still charge outrageous amounts.
Integrate bonuses/parking reductions for known bike and ped friendly areas.
Encourage ADUs and tiny homes.
Be sensitive to existing neighbors impacts.
I see a style of houses built in the northwest part of Boise show a California style that has not been hindered by the current code. My concern is that if a builder is given an opening to build whatever he/she my feel is creative it may not enhance the existing homes in the neighborhoods. It may encourage a drastic contradiction of creativity.
But then again how would I know??? The current mayor and several on the current City Council allowed rezone after rezone (even overriding P&Z) to absolutely destroy the character of our Northwest Boise neighborhood. What "FITS IN" certainly does not seem to matter unless you live in the North End.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Leave the lot size alone, bigger not smaller lots produce happy people
Too many apartments in NWBoise
"Fits in" sounds like an objective open to interpretation. A clear cut calculation allows owners to decide if they can develop a property before adding to their expenses/time to find out they can't. This all gets passed down to future buyers. Maybe not on this house but owners will recoup their expenses.
Don't change look of existing neighborhoods
Nope, CBH and other developers are still going to design cookie cutter homes at the lowest possible cost no matter what the regulations say
A single large lot and on a small residential street should not be sold to a developer who will put in dense housing.
This would not necessarily improve things like design. The City must hold developers to a higher standard, if the City does not hold them to a higher standard, we'll look like every other city in the U.S. with CHEAP boxes that will need to be replaced in 20 years. Hopefully, the new director will push the City in a better direction. See this article: https://archive.curbed.com/2018/12/4/18125536/real-estate-modern-apartment-architecture
I am not opposed to the change, but, think it needs to include what is not allowed (number of like structures per zip code, etc) to ensure that Boise does not become a city of dense apartment complexes with no land being used for single family homes.
We need more housing in communities that don't require cars. The more we can set standards for the look, feel, and accessibility of buildings while letting the market determine how many units or how much parking is needed, the better.
I live in an older neighborhood on the west bench. It is not unusual for a house to sell and the developer tears it down and puts up row houses in its place. This does not match the area. Personally, I think the city planners get a 'gift' and the developer does what he wants. A perfect example is the landslide area where all the expensive homes were built that are sliding away. Anyone that has lived her all their lives knows that was a landslide area as well as warm springs mesa area.
Sustainable building materials
The way this is worded you can only answer Yes. Of course changing the zoning code will impact the design of new buildings. But, is it a good thing if it's only used to fit more people/stuff into an area and still look good?
Requiring trees, landscapings, common areas, safe sidewalks and street crossings
Possibly consult with other successful communities.
Considerations for structures and residences directly adjacent to proposed development. Ensure there are steps downs, etc (i.e. apartments and condos can be next to roads or other large buildings and duplexes or tri-plexes but not single family homes; duplexes and tri-plexes allowed next to single family) as appropriate so as not to have looming multi-story building right next to a single family residences.
We should have an 'estimate' on what density range the majority of the projects would fit into (IE it wouldn't be a requirement per say but "According to design standards, generally R2 development will fall between 30-20 units per acre") or something like that so that people have a understanding of what they can expect.
At least one "street-facing" entrance is a nice design principle to incorporate with more densely designed buildings in neighborhoods.
why not a combination of density allowance along with design criteria - if 3 units meet the density, then those 3 should also have to meet max height, parking etc
Existing neighborhood should drive new development for compatibility. To mix attached houses or multiple family complexes with single family homes increases traffic in existing neighbors and risk of vehicle collisions with more driveways must be avoided.
Still unclear what the intended result is -- can creativity be prescribed by regulation? There should be a required impact assessment with an opportunity for public review and input.
Urban growth boundary.
NA
The intended result, "limiting the impact of development," is in itself a oxymoron and this proposal only focuses on several design limits so that it "fits in" and neglects whether the development has major impacts on affordability, traffic, environment, taxes, and quality of life.
Do not allow sloped lands to be included in the calculations for house density. An example of this abuse is the Moxie Ridge development in south east Boise
Lot sizes should be proportional to unit size; a 2500sqft home should be required to have a larger lot compared to a 1000sqft cottage. Larger homes with larger lots would be appropriate for families and encouraging outdoor activity. Obviously the larger lots would be more expensive, however, larger homes command higher prices anyway.
All this does is allow small ugly shot gun style houses in areas that make it look terrible
Focus on green building options and affordable housing and override regulations if these parameters are met.
Allow tiny homes
Offer a degree of flexibility in the approval process... For a price \$
creating flexibility for low income and no income housing is a must

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Doing this in conjunction with parking reductions ignores reality and creates additional parking and traffic problems. Both density and other metrics are critical. How can you possibly plan for traffic and infrastructure when you remove density control? Seeking to control this one knob and then ask people to twiddle with only it to encourage more affordable housing really misses the big picture. First the city must think about all areas of the city having mixed housing types. It must not simply pick on a few areas to get what is needed by removing density caps and reasonable parking requirements. It must also have a better, more realistic plan for transportation. Simply saying folks can take the bus, again misses the reality of the situation.</p>
<p>Please do not change our zoning in the Collister region to allow more than one house on our large lots. You will ruin the our neighborhood by allowing up to a four plex to be built on the back section of our lots. We pay high taxes so we can have extra property to garden, raise small livestock and not have any neighbors parking all over our streets. This are feels rural even though we are close to downtown Boise. If you can exempt this Collister area from the new zoning upgrade it would be appreciated.</p>
<p>Somehow take the "fit" out of it. Too subjective.</p>
<p>Listen to the residents</p>
<p>Building currently is much too dense in my opinion</p>
<p>If there are 5 families in a dwelling and one parking spot. Then there will be cars all over the streets and street wars among neighbors will occur. It already happens in Columbia Village.</p>
<p>Not sure. There is a master planned development in Bend, OR called Northwest Crossing that is mostly built out with a very inviting neighborhood feel to it with a mix of housing sizes and types, on generally smaller lots with design criteria and appropriate landscaping. This project includes street retail and offices uses as a core within easy walking distance of most of the residential.</p>
<p>A more discretionary code will simply allow developers to downsize. Existing density calculations protect existing neighborhoods</p>
<p>Stop both sprawl and increasing density. People who already live here don't want to sacrifice quality of life (open space, clean air, unobstructed views, less traffic, small schools) for the benefit of developers. We can't build our way out of the affordability crisis without degrading our quality of life. Embrace open space and the slow growth movement. Stop selling Boise.</p>
<p>Find ways to work better with ACHD and Valley Transit.</p>
<p>Closer set back on the side property line of houses. Also being allowed to move the home closer to the street and reduce the front yard to improve personal interaction with sidewalk traffic, as long as there is a front porch.</p>
<p>don't listen to developers</p>
<p>Keeping neighbors informed.</p>
<p>Too many tall buildings will make our city of trees look like a concrete jungle. I am already noticing this around new apartment complexes and 'patio home' neighborhoods.</p>
<p>You need to be respectful of the existing housing types and lifestyle that made Boise so attractive in the first place. Quit trying to meet all the demand coming into Idaho. We can't be the answer for everyone. Time to make sure we maintain quality of life and not pack in newcomers like rats. Make new development pay its fair share or necessary share especially for developers wanting to build beyond existing services. Those projects should bear the brunt of the financial load for infrastructure and services if they want to proceed.</p>
<p>There is no reason to remove density from the equation. You can make additional requirements to help a building "blend in" but cramming buildings into our existing neighborhoods should be avoided at all costs.</p>
<p>Just because a place looks good, doesn't mean 100 unit apartment is good for a neighborhood. Density still needs to be a factor.</p>
<p>Remove any arbitrary and broad stroke formulaic rules. Allow creativity and use common sense/good judgement for space design</p>
<p>I live in a old neighborhood and they jam as many skinny houses on a lot as they can with absolutely no thought of if theses will fit into the neighborhood. It's disgusting</p>
<p>I am concerned about the unintended consequences that could be negative. Creative can be great or incredible awful.</p>
<p>Get your regulatory hands off our property. Hippie scumbags</p>
<p>Rather than trying to make a project "fit in", I believe it is better to not overbuild an area. Boise is becoming too compact with housing that appears to not have quality but quantity. We need to keep our city from turning into a ghetto.</p>
<p>Industrial shouldn't encroach on established neighborhoods.</p>
<p>I am strongly against high density housing in established historic neighborhoods that do not have the infrastructure in place to support increase in cars and congestion. New development should NOT negatively impact existing neighborhoods. For example- the proposed housing development is WAY TOO BIG for the existing neighborhood and would have negative impact on the existing neighborhood.</p>
<p>I think it's a great idea, but am concerned about how this will be regulated.</p>
<p>It feels as if you are doing away with the neighborhoods in Boise in favor of high density housing. So I favor all wording that would not allow high density housing and would require developers to provide adequate parking for renters/residents. For example one bedroom unit requires 2 parking spaces, 2 bedroom unit 3 parking spaces, etc.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>Developers meet with Neighborhood Associations during the pre-planning process with Planning and Development.</p> <p>Your "intended result" is a false flag... this plan is really designed to force high density on Boise residents. There are some people who just don't want to live in high density situations ... the plan should accommodate ALL types of situations so that people have a choice.</p> <p>Yes. I was not informed of a mammoth project that may be unfinished right next door to me. I am very unhappy in Boise now.</p> <p>Remove vehicular parking minimums Require all parking constructed is EV compatible Increase maximum heights (4 stories in "residential" neighborhoods, no restrictions in downtown. We *need* density)</p> <p>Stop building single-family homes & neighborhoods. We need a mixture of different dwelling units</p> <p>Keep the density calculations</p> <p>I see the importance in updating design, etc, but to please keep in mind neighborhood density and to not try to put too many people, cars, homes on too small of a street, neighborhood, etc. This type of development can really have a negative impact on the livability of a community and the neighborhood feel/pleasure of living in a neighborhood.</p> <p>Don't over build</p> <p>Remove minimum parking requirements</p> <p>This is the result of North and East end Commissioners looking to improve Boise for the new people rather than the people who have lived here all their lives.</p>
Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?	<p>The over development of the city is killing affordable housing types. Changing building code and density will change what Boise is.</p> <p>I wish people working 40 hours a week weren't being priced out of reasonable sized homes, such as 1- or 2-bedroom for a single person. These smaller units will likely result in more tiny studios. At the same time, I'm not sure what else can help unless prices are corrected, or significantly more public money (city, state) is made available for both land trusts and tax credits etc for the buildings. Thank you for everything you are attempting on this affordability issue!</p> <p>I called into a P&Z Committee meeting regarding a very high density complex in my neighborhood and multiple concerned residents brought up loopholes in "affordable housing" for developers. We, the long standing residents of Idaho, have to deal with the repercussions of these developments. Developers make a quick, hefty paycheck and leave the city for another lucrative option, leaving the residents to deal with the consequences of more people, more traffic, inadequate infrastructure, inflated prices, and continual loss of open spaces (which true Idahoans cherish).</p> <p>Most builders would fill up with more housing but not necessarily affordable housing unless the city had strict regulations. Builders primary look at the new meets and profit and not the well being of the city as a whole, and that needs to change. More businesses like Neighborworks would be a good thing</p> <p>Single family zoning needs to be maintained in single family neighborhoods or the city will eventually transform itself into a slum</p> <p>Require new builds to set a set a percentage of units for lower income earners</p> <p>Developers don't care about rules, the people who already live in an area, or about addressing housing problems in our community. They care about PROFIT. They have to be incentives to build the housing that's needed. The existing neighbors need a bigger seat at the table.</p> <p>Again, as long as schools and roads are made a priority, you can build improved mixed use housing to help with affordable housing while being respectful of current long time residents.</p> <p>Make a percentage of every area in town have to have some affordable housing, defined by Idaho's wage instead of what people are making and how much homes cost from people moving here and making out of state wages!</p> <p>Need more urban density.</p> <p>make sure that x% of new housing for EVERY development is deemed affordable, even if the developer has to subsidize it!</p> <p>Less focus on parking, especially for units within walking/biking distance to downtown or bus routes</p> <p>Developers are not in this to be generous, they do not want to build this lower price point product unless the City gives them everything under the sun in exchange. Inclusionary Zoning would achieve the intended result.</p> <p>Nothing will change until you get a hold on the housing market.</p> <p>Government aid to help people purchase units instead of these huge rental no ownership mentality. Residents would earn equity and make better futures</p> <p>Builder nor city council have any vested interest in affordable housing past campaign rhetoric. This is no different, developers will manipulate the rules and city council won't do a thing about it.</p> <p>This is wrong. People who own property bought with an understanding of surrounding density. It should not be allowed to increase.</p> <p>I don't have any specific suggestions, but I am highly supportive of any changes that allow for increased density as a way to improve housing affordability.</p> <p>Boise needs to make certain is it paired with accessibility for those with disabilities and for those with lower economic means to thrive and have equity in their housing milieu.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Without other regulations to support and supplement these zoning changes by managing the market, affordable housing will never be a thing in this valley again until the market corrects on a larger scale.
If you want affordable homes, you need to simply deny permits for the non-affordable ones. We do not need every new house to have luxurious finishes or cost a million dollars. Builders will find a way to make them more affordable.
Nothing is affordable in Boise in any neighborhood. We could not even get a new home for the homeless on State Street. Income challenged folks are not considered at all. Take for example City looking at rezoning the old folks home on Hillcrest..for apartments..with no where for them to go. So just build affordable housing. I am you sure you can just do it.
Require that investors have local partners and cap the ownership % of each partner.
I'm not sure again, sorry.
Some argue that more housing stock contributes to affordable housing. At this time nothing is affordable for the working class, that includes rental units and home ownership. With respect to home ownership, home sales of \$300,000 (rarity in Boise these days) to \$500,000 is not affordable for the working class and most definitely not affordable for the working poor. THE CITY NEEDS TO CONSIDER CHANGING THE CURRENT SYSTEM FOR DEVELOPERS WHO AGREE TO PROVIDE A CERTAIN NUMBER OF AFFORDABLE (REALLY WORKFORCE) HOUSING UNITS IN THEIR DEVELOPMENT. AT THIS TIME THE COMMITMENT FROM THE DEVELOPER IS LIMITED TO A CERTAIN NUMBER OF YEARS. THE DEVELOPER SHOULD PROVIDE THE AGREED UPON UNITS AT THE AFFORDABLE PRICE INDEFINITELY. THIS SHOULD BE PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL PROCESS.
You would need rent control and housing pricing caps. Good luck with that.
The initial step should be the availability and provision for needed services such as public transportation, health care including physical and mental health, safe green space, schools and food.
Until the State allows for local governments to utilize inclusionary zoning there is no incentive for developers and landlords to build and provide below market rate housing. The developers will build a product that the most profit from and landlords will charge the highest rent price that they can get for a unit.
This could conceivably allow for a myriad of creative solutions to quality builders and developers, but we need to be aware that most laws, rules, and regulations are in place to protect the public from the most unscrupulous of individuals not the best of our citizens.
This will be perceived as a developer's land-grab, which current home owners will receive negatively. If existing home owners fight every project, they will not be kind to new "affordable housing" neighbors. You will not achieve the harmony and 'boise kind' that you are seeking.
Only if the focus is truly on long-term affordability. Fast and cheap design and construction may not meet long-term environmental and energy conservation needs.
More affordable housing. To many residents are being priced out of their homes. Also, when older more affordable buildings are being torn down, a lot of the residents can't find affordable housing which is increasing our homeless population.
I mean, building size lots and such do matter, I think building up vs wide helps with managing affordability and occupancy, but affordability, I'm unsure how?
not without restricting rights of individuals
Co-housing design would create mixed efficient and a new exciting option for our town
I believe there will be more housing but I seriously doubt it will be more affordable. Developers will be the winners and the city will have lost some of what makes the City of Boise a desirable area. The more houses on the limited land will end up being fewer trees, lawns, flowers in residential areas.
Affordable housing is in short supply because the return on investment isn't there. Relaxing zoning does little to affect fundamental economics. Instead it entices the development of cheap and poorly designed properties that are not good values for anyone.
I am not certain. Not necessarily. Smaller lot sizes are great, but in conjunction with lowered parking requirements, neighborhood crowding may occur with car parking. Developers will continue to maximize profits by pursuing the smallest lot size and the maximize building size. There are other forms of affordable house.
Better transportation system can help instead of jamming people together.
Market factors will still drive affordability; I.e. supply & demand, input costs, income levels of in-migration.
This regulation could negatively impact a neighborhood by increasing the population density too much and ensuring too much of a low-income neighborhood.
I think developers SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE for infrastructure investments BEFORE developments are approved.
I don't think this new code will help make housing more affordable because developers are out to make money, not save people money, so they will still find ways to make the living spaces more expensive to make more money. The city should provide incentives for developers that keep their housing prices down.
No, the city and government already offers programs to help make housing affordable. I don't see changing the regulation helping with that. Possibly the regulation could be changed to limit large entities from abusing rental fees or increasing rental leases for arbitrary reasons to encourage more affordable housing types.
not that i know of
Regulation makes housing more expensive.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

There's no such things as affordable housing, especially in an expensive area. The places built will just be smaller, not cheaper.
See first note for my opinion
Allowing and encouraging condominiums or mixed-use buildings will encourage affordable housing. Requirements for bike and pedestrian access to businesses and amenities will also help reduce the cost of living for residents.
Need affordable housing but not sure in the proposal
Require a percentage to be affordable housing based on the current and recent residence's demographic
Taller buildings equal more apartments which in turn encourages the highest earners to leave for better views and compact communities. thus leaving the smaller complexes for more affordable housing by local up and starting groups to manage.
You need to do SOMETHING! Maybe research what what other communities have done that are successful.
No required parking
Unless actual incentives/requirements are provided to developers to require/regulate/incentivize affordable housing be a certain percentage of new developments, this will not change the amount of affordable in the city. There is too much demand from people moving out of state who can afford expensive housing that developers have no incentive to build more affordable housing.
There are so few controls and incentives the legislature has left available to cities in this state. I'm concerned with the ability to guide developers towards affordable housing options when we see the kind of greed driving sprawl. (I'm looking at your Avimor) Affordable housing is needed so badly, thank you for anything you can do to improve this.
High density/affordable housing should be within a set distance to major arterial roads/shopping zones (2-3 blocks) but not allowed to be mixed in with established low density neighborhoods.
Stricter regulation on who is purchasing houses and getting the housing market under control. People will put money above humans - don't let them.
Require in some developments apartment complexes with x number/% of units that are subsidized, but still keeping it within the look and feel of the area. Young couple are starved for affordable housing as are lower income who want to live in a decent area. If requirements for setbacks, walkways, greenery and upkeep are done right it will add value rather than be an eyesore. Add in little shops of food, etc. with low key design/signage to fit in inobtrusively.
Stop building in Boise. Moratorium on Building befor Boise is lost
More affordable housing will only be achieved when developers focus on the overall need of a neighborhood and not the bottom dollar.
There would need to be incentives for affordable housing, or we'll just end up crammed into tiny, poorly built, yet overpriced and unaffordable apartments.
Landlords are just going to raise rent as high as market tolerates it.
Maintain the old method of calculating units allowed per parcel of property.
Please regulate rent prices and some way to give developers incentives to take on projects that create affordable housing.
n/a
Enrich the mayor pockets
Let the market decide (but at the same time please put limits on banking groups and speculators from buying everything)
See above.
This doesn't provide adequate incentives for developers and builders to build more economical housing. They'll still do what they can to maximize profit.
flexibility in types of building uses and relatedly, height standards and parking requirements.
stop trying to build affordable housing. is people cant afford to live here than they can move further out or move somewhere else. economics dictates where people live. Boise needs to stop trying to be LA, Portland, Seattle, ect.
Not sure what this would look like in the code, but there is a need for housing that accommodates multiple generations living on a single lot or accessory apartments like Austin's Alley Flats Initiative.
When potential profit is so high, the only way affordable housing will be built is if it's legislatively required or heavily incentivized. Requiring a percentage of affordable units, capping rent at a percentage of applicant income, or providing tax breaks for affordable development could go a long way.
Remove parking requirements and impose minimum densities. Density is the best way to make Boise an affordable, livable, healthy, and clean city.
not sure housing costs just too out of control with the vast amounts of out of state money coming in
Provide incentives for keeping homes affordable to own and operate by encouraging energy efficient construction and helping lenders see this makes loan repayment more likely such as requiring energy consumption benchmarking and disclosure by zoning type and not just in building codes.
Inflation and greed influence the cost
Larger lot sizes. Smaller homes. Stop building mini mcmansions on tiny lots. Pierce Park is a great example of what shouldn't be happening.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	In older neighborhoods, it might be good to consider the limits on ADU size with respect to the "main dwelling." Where I live, many of the houses are very small (800 sq feet or less). Maybe, for main houses that are less than a certain size and age (with sufficient room on the lot), there could be an option for a larger ADU so the property functions as more of a disconnected duplex. There are certainly older properties where I live that are set up this way.
	Not change the zoning code.
	Crowded housing does not bring more affordable housing How about sustainability?
	Don't allow developers to "buy out" of required affordable housing units. Mixed use projects have historically proven to be the best way to create successful long term developments.
	The builders eating up most of the land will it charge less when there is money to be made!
	Require every new development include some affordable homes.
	Don't turn all these buildings into slum cities.
	See #6.
	Greed has overcome the developers. I don't know what regulation you can change to provide better, more affordable housing for all.
	Outlaw Airbnb, TVRs , outlaw business in single family homes., zoning.
	Tiered property taxes for investors. 2x's normal property tax for 2 owned investment properties, 3x's for 3 owned properties and so forth. Keep out investors, so locals can afford to live here. This is a bigger issue than space in my opinion.
	Build the affordable housing in your neighborhood
	What is considered affordable housing? There are so many apartments being built. Owners need to keep the rent low enough to be affordable
	Multi family homes decrease property families and bring down neighborhoods.
	Just make smaller homes that most families could live in and be comfortable.
	I don't know but my address of 848 W. Melrose Ln Boise 83706 is about to have a 3-story apartment building looming over my house and yard which will be built at 2408 S. Broadway Ave 83706. Any zoning codes that will help increase the setback and allow creativity (maybe have it tiered back versus a large block building towering over the neighborhood) would be great.
	This is supply and demand. If regulations are eased so more units can be built within the same amount of sq ft lot, supply goes up, and housing becomes more affordable, but for ownership and for rent.
	In the short term, rent may be cheaper for the tenants if the units are smaller with more tenants in the building. However, in the long run our street capacity and public transportation will be even more below demand. It is very expensive to widen streets by buying up private property next to the street. Those expenses are passed on to all taxpayers, and raises the cost of all housing. Fix the Boise infrastructure first.
	Make sure that there are rent caps on these houses or they are participating in section 8 and other government housing programs that make it affordable if there's no rent control.
	House prices should be determined by the market, not manipulated by government.
	Housing First will destroy Boise and Mclean know it.
	For new property, I can see a difference to develop more affordable housing. The neighboring zones need to be informed and they need to have their opinions heard. I would like to see more affordable housing put on new lots.
	The city has to have density calculations. We currently cannot sustain this or keep up w/ housing developments. Many beautiful cities have ruined by max density projects. We need to build further out and not congest the city.
	Include common green space as a requirement-supports many reasons
	I can't tell, because the draft doesn't say what values were changed or what the old values were. When seeking community opinion on proposed changes, it's kind of important to state what exactly you're changing from as well as what you're changing to.
	Yes. Force the builders to make low cost housing.
	Regulate properties that are purchased by investors and used as rentals.
	The city can't control affordable housing unless it owns the housing units. Don't try to control what can't be controlled.
	Pay relative wages based on local rent rates, gas prices, and interest . People need to be able to make enough to live while working any job, so long as they put in the hours
	Yes by speaking and listening to the public
	Limit density except for in town apts and commercial transition areas. Do not cram high density homes on top of existing low density development.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Don't know.
How do any of those aspects help people afford housing?
Not sure how what is being proposed will drop housing cost and hit educated enough on the topic to make a suggestion .
Stop trying to squeeze tiny homes in residential neighborhoods. More apartment buildings near commercial hubs is a better way to address affordability.
Look at the environment and surrounding areas before building!!!
Potentially regulating inflation rates on cost per square foot for dwellings under a certain size or type.
There will never be encouragement to build affordable housing because people are too greedy. Too many implanted people from other states are buying up the housing and prices are raising because developers know the new people can afford it, kicking out the people who have been born and raised here.
No, regulation always has too many unintended consequences. the unaffordability issue has been created by gov policy, we're fortunate (for now) that those policies are creating a booming housing economy in Boise. Not so much in the large cities in our western neighborhood
Please consider revising the calculation to also include home maximum structure size & to maximize tree conservation.
There is no fix for the market. It has happened. The mistake was allowing it to happen. But you can not go backwards. Prices are now up. The more you squish onto land the less appealing Boise is. Boise is homes with land, trees, gardens, patios to sit outside and BBQ without your neighbors directly on top of you. We are not Portland, nor do we want to be.
In my view, the best way to improve housing affordability is to increase housing density, which is best achieved with reduced requirements from zoning.
Affordable housing is not created through more regulation and law. Encouraging current multi-family property owners to lower rents through tax relief incentives would likely work better. But, in reality as long as the market is bearing high rents, that is what will be charged.
I hope so because we need affordable housing and it's frustrating to see all these new high density developments being approved that are wildly expensive and not providing affordable housing at all. A % should be required for all new developments.
Drive for minimum affordable housing requirements in higher density developments located in 'mixed use' residential areas with walkable full services and on significant commuter corridors.
It will be affordable if people stop moving here. Don't accommodate for them, support the locals already here. We need to help the current need, not create more or we will lose the beauty and uniqueness of Boise.
Developers are never going to voluntarily develop affordable housing types.
It always seem the rich get more options and are catered to and lower income get less quality, lower standards and maintenance is unimportant so those areas look rundown very quickly.
Developers will always squeeze things for more money. Incentives will help.
There should be something to encourage developers to actually make so much of the housing affordable.
Stop viral landlording.
Limit the number of units/acre based on how many affordable housing options the development provides. Substantially increase tax rates on new construction of low density high end properties.
Only if the developer can make a large profit on the units and the tax per unit is good for the state, will the developer and P&Z create low cost housing. Need to define infrastructure improvement costs and green space costs per unit and force developers to create roads, bike paths and parks
Smaller homes should be encouraged. Most of us don't need 4000 square feet.
I think developers should be encouraged to build developments with more shared features (shared tool shed, shared laundry, shared cooking space for gatherings). I lived in co-housing which had all of those features and it resulted in more a community feel and a smaller carbon footprint, because people shared stuff.
The city has to mandate affordable housing, build it, or provide tax/zoning incentives.
Absolutely require the inclusion of affordable housing in new developments.
We don't want affordable ugly small homes.
Affordability and impact comes in 2 parts: design and management. If the design is great, but management is poor, you see negative impacts (190 and 252 e front) if design and property management are both there, you get better results (Adare, Valor pointe)
By allowing more density on vacant infill land, developers are less incentivized to build the largest, and therefore most expensive, homes possible. It makes more sense to build more, smaller homes, which is severely lacking in today's market.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>Make it easier for developers to know exactly what the regulations are and make approvals of new development quicker. A huge reason why we don't have affordable housing is because the process is time consuming and thus more expensive. There should be 1 person that reviews the development (much like building plan reviews for permits) that flags anything in the plan that doesn't work. The developer can then fix the design or decide if they want to move forward with design review to possibly get an exception. But the initial plan from the developer should have a yes or no within 30 days. The rounds of back and forth with 12 different people at the city, each one saying a different thing is burdensome and expensive on the developer and those costs ultimately end up on the end user. If you shorten the time for approvals and streamline processes for reviews it will also help get more products on the market quicker, increasing supply quicker, and thereby keeping up with demand better and providing pressure relief on prices.</p>
	<p>Unless the city specifically zones and builds affordable housing, the greed of developers comes first. I've seen enough zoning meetings and projects under the guise of "if we knock down these two single-family homes we can build 24 townhouses, and increase affordable housing"... city agrees, houses get built and then they are priced at the same going rate of the neighborhood. ~\$300+ sq ft. The tax incentives to build, maintain, and own low-income housing are not great enough to overcome the lost potential income.</p>
	<p>Remove ambiguities in the code. When projects get scaled back in the entitlement phase (i.e. unit count goes down), the price of each unit goes up upon the sale.</p>
	<p>Supply and demand determines pricing. You can restrict housing to percentage of median incomes, but the fact stays that where there is demand with little supply, prices go up. Trying to make new, affordable housing is a non-starter. Corners are cut to get the price down, but it still winds up more expensive than older 'affordable housing' places.</p>
	<p>The more complex the design constraints, the less affordable housing will be. Simply increasing the allowed density (number of units per lot) for strategically selected parcels will encourage builders to find the most economical and creative ways to maximize units on their lots, thus lowering costs, thus leading to the most affordable housing possible.</p>
	<p>Developers should have to pay into a fund for affordable housing or build a certain amount of affordable housing.</p>
	<p>It could but will also remove any and all open space we have left.</p>
	<p>Take into account the number of people moving into these units, the number of autos will be involved and take into consideration the traffic nightmare that is currently happening. Also figure in the number of new police needed and fire stations locations to accommodate all these new people.</p>
	<p>Yes, it would theoretically encourage less expensive housing but it's still going to be expensive no matter how you slice it in Boise.</p>
	<p>Find ways to allow tiny homes along with more alternatives with single family homes</p>
	<p>I think larger apartment complexes could have a mix of smaller cheaper apartments with larger more family friendly and expensive apartments. All of course with built in parking garages and accessible to bike paths and public transportation</p>
	<p>Stop soaking me in taxes. Try raising the fat cat's taxes for change. Do you have any idea how many self storage places there are in town. I might as well move in to one of them</p>
	<p>Questions should not be biased to give you the results that you seek.</p>
	<p>Apartments have been known to bring in more transient people, and low income housing leaves a huge gap from being in an apartment with section 8 and then being on an apartment on your own. There needs to be more programs to help people graduate out of the low income housing that makes the tenants want to strive for better. Its not fair that I would have to pay \$3200 a month when a person is in the same building with the same unit for a fraction of the price.</p>
	<p>No. The regulation wouldn't help because the housing costs would still be high and out of reach of many low-income earners.</p>
	<p>Both aesthetic and density rules are needed. Density to prevent mansions and apartment piles on the extremes. Aesthetic to create community. Consider adding small commercial zones inside large R1 regions to create walk-ability, with the needed semi truck access routes off main though fairs.</p>
	<p>When there is a community park in a residential area then the curb side of the parks should have no parking at the curb from dusk to dawn. There is too many people parking on these curbs and living on these curbs. The existing streets cannot accommodate emergency vehicles when too many cars are parked on both sides of the street. There should be no parking on the curb side of the existing parks as there are parking lots to use in the daytime. The park rules are to stay out of the park from dusk to dawn anyway.</p>
	<p>Yes start encouraging families to live together like they do in Europe. I know a lot of successful people whom would love to have a housing unit set up where they can have their older parents live on a level, their kid in their own unit, etc. But nothing is being built with this intention.</p>
	<p>Developers will only do what's good for them. The city MUST stand up for residents over developers</p>
	<p>We don't want denser housing in Boise. That is a huge mistake. Crowding everyone in is not the answer. It only good for tax collectors</p>
	<p>Only a little, the biggest issue right now is supply and the change addressed that conceptually but I don't think residential developers are going to reduce price to lessors in step with reduced land cost so while we'll have more housing, price won't change... a rent ceiling on certain development has historically been effective in areas of fast rising cost of living.</p>
	<p>I believe ending single-family zoning would be a great step forward to increasing innovative housing designs, as well as encouraging more affordable housing.</p>
	<p>Less regulation will lower costs of new housing, producing more housing and lowering costs.</p>
	<p>Could there be requirements for a certain percentage of new housing/developments to be dedicated to low income without packing (and stigmatizing) all low income housing to certain locations or areas of town?</p>
	<p>By building up instead of out, we can increase the amount of space available without compromising on quality of life.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Seems more productive to ask actual experts on this topic. I am not an expert in how to encourage more affordable housing, but I do believe that building more affordable housing is a critical need
	I think the developers have P & Z at a dead end concerning this, unless you are talking about really big projects. Each individual 'small' project gets to be looked at individually, so whether it is affordable housing or increased traffic, the individual developer says "This doesn't really change anything and the City 'has' to say OK. That's why State Street, Hill Road, Harrison Blvd (I could go on and on) are overwhelmed, yet the City keeps approving new developments. Sad, but that's the way it is.
	It would be better to situate affordable housing along State Street and Chinden Boulevard.
	Maybe some drone footage on the city website to go along with suggested changes.
	People will make smaller living areas but keep the same price.
	I'd like to see more regulation in place to prevent new developments from being unaffordable. I'd like to see more encouragement of lower-cost housing.
	Affordable housing should consider proximity to services like transportation, groceries, walkability/bikeability, etc... as many residents needing affordable housing also need low-cost options for getting around to access basic needs, food and medical care. While it's important to have a mix of development, it's also important to make sure that affordable housing is located in areas where it's most convenient for residents to get to where they need to go and access the things they need to access. This makes having this type of housing important in areas that are central to services and in proximity to necessary resources for basic needs, e.g. grocery stores, healthcare, etc...
	Really hoping Boise doesn't end up looking like some European over built area with massive housing complexes.
	A house was torn down on 31st & Sunset and they are building 2 \$1,200,000.00 houses on the lot. Is that affordable housing? If you're going to allow the overbuilding of the neighborhood the. Maybe you should have stipulation on what affordable housing is.
	Quit targeting the neighborhoods where people have invested their lives, sweat and money into maintaining WHAT THEY BOUGHT, knowing there wouldn't be high rises crammed next to them blocking sunlight and looking into their bedrooms. Why do we have to suffer because the City and realtors beg people to move here?
	Affordable housing is really on the builders, materials, etc. If all those costs were lower people might be able to afford a house. Low income apartments are not the wave of the future. Not only does that cause congestion with traffic and people, it causes high stress situations for our population.
	But again they would be locate in one area.
	Rent control for set time \$1100 max 20 years with some property rax reduction of no more than 5% of top taxed residential property of that zone.
	Affordable housing in the Boise downtown area is kind of a moot point. The people that are going to be living in affordable housing or not working in downtown Boise. They are working in Meridian in Napa and therefore our clogging up the interstate trying to get to work. I have noticed a huge increase in westbound traffic in the early mornings because of this. You would be much better off building higher end houses and higher in condos especially since you continue to raise the property taxes.
	The reality is that corporate land ownership is the biggest factor in our housing crisis. Simply building more houses and creating more high-density areas without the supporting infrastructure (which should be paid by the developer) is just making a tough situation even worse as it increases commute times, traffic accidents, and general public safety. There is a belief that our representatives in Boise government are only interested in creating an unsustainable high-density dystopia which is not supported by it's constituents and doesn't deal with the reality of what Boise residents need to improve their quality of life.
	Developers are building for the millionaires that are moving in.
	Existing generational Idahoans have been unable to keep up with the increase in housing costs and have been over run with demand for said housing by outside refugees from other states looking for a cheaper way of life. Without an increase in wages to keep up with increase cost of living in Idaho how can we feel good about middle income families turning into low income families because of exponential growth in our cities.
	Allow redevelopment in historic district
	Do not approve variances to the design criteria.
	Incentive or place rent requirements for property owners on any new developments. All of the new apartments that are being built are currently unaffordable despite supply of housing increasing.
	charge impact fee for each dwelling unit to fund additional services (including utilities like sewer).
	We are an economy based on making money, offering tax rebates on low income housing helps in some respects but also shifts city tax burdens from large companies to individuals in a way that can be unfair. Requiring a certain number of affordable housing units per building in buildings that are not single family occupancy may be the bast course. No discounts a simple as is. If its not a single family home then if there 2+ units per building you must meet the ratio determined of affordable to market rate.
	Just make a law 10% of *any* development must be affordable.
	Designs need to include players for children. These houses will of necessity be small, so there needs to be some accommodation made for playspace.
	Encourage a wide range of home sizes on the same block. That discourages income segregation.
	We need less density so I want to manage how large and how many people live there.
	Zoning has little impact on making housing affordable.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

I hope that affordable housing will take a front seat in the new drafts. We need to have more push for affordable housing.
I would encourage you to annex the southwest, incorporate it into Boise. Build the park off of Cole and find pockets of space to build housing in the south, southwest, west, and east side of Boise
Fix the existing roads, curb & side walks before adding a mess to the surrounding area.
Without regulation of rental or housing prices I do not think there is a reason for landowners to sustain affordable housing.
Developers need to be responsible for putting in infrastructure to support large, high density housing. We need adequate fire coverage more than cramming more people in a small space. Stop being greedy.
STOP BUILDING - THERE ARE WAY TOO MANY PEOPLE MOVING HERE AND WE NEED TO STOP BUILDING HOMES RIGHT ON TOP OF EACH OTHER AND APARTMENT BUILDINGS. LET'S GET OUR ROADWAYS FIGURED OUT AND REBUILT BEFORE WE ALLOW ANY MORE BUILDING.
Smaller lots with housing that cannot exceed a certain percentage of the lot, include enough off-street parking, include outdoor space for housing, include landscaping and outdoor space for pedestrians and cyclists to be able to navigate their neighborhood
No high density housing!
Leave things alone and enact a one year moratorium on new developments. Let us catch our breath and take a better look at things instead of pimping the taxpayers out to the developers!
The influx of people perpetuating of the housing problems in Boise are wealthy (relatively speaking) or are coming from high cost-of-living areas where their return-on-investment dollars inflate our market prices. Smaller dwellings as proposed will allow developers to charge more money for less house and further inflate their profits. In turn citizens will have smaller, lower quality homes. This regulation change will not solve our housing issues. We will only begin to resolve the affordable housing issue when speculative housing investors stop hoarding houses and charging exorbitant rent and businesses start paying livable wages.
How would have know if not given specific examples of costs?
there is a large conflict between "affordable" housing, ie multi story apartment buildings, and the space allotted for parking. in today's market, multiple roommates are required in order to afford housing. most apartments allow 2 parking spaces per unit, definitely not enough, so the overflow is pressed into surrounding areas putting residents there at a disadvantage.
There needs to be designated open space for nature. Harris Ranch is depressing and the foothills there disappearing would be a crime.
Regulations for landlords. Limit on rent increases
Affordable housings just turn into ghettos. Set high standards and high standard people will come.
Developers are still out to get the most money out of a deal. Allowing them to build denser is just going to allow them to sell more units. I think the best way to guarantee affordable housing is for the city to offer credits to developers who charge less for housing.
Nothing in these plans will encourage more affordable housing. Require more small housing with more bedrooms (i.e. 3 bedroom, 1,000 sq ft) should help families. Just limiting size alone will only produce more luxury type finishes on homes
To have affordable housing, you need affordable land. Developers are for profit. If it they can build more units, they just may the interior so high-end that it is still no affordable. I'd rather encourage sprawl and have good public transport at this point than cluster to many houses in a have a traffic jam, and no open space.
The less people that are crowded into a neighborhood the better. If the number of low cost housing units goes up substantially then the neighborhood will be forever ruined and there's no going back. You can't crowd people in & expect the same vibe.
Given current cost & time to build, I do not think it is possible to create more "affordable" housing for people who don't qualify for Section 8 but otherwise cannot afford property today. I do, however, think that these design changes are capable of reducing the rate of growth of the price of housing, if developers actually take advantage and people are willing to buy, and developers don't price gouge.
Don't pass the regulation!
You should have some requirements about mixed-development zoning to ensure a certain portion still remain more affordable or multi-family, to the extent Idaho law allows/
Doubtful that it actually will be "affordable" but it at least will help slow the increase of costs
Increasing density and housing supply is good, but it does not make housing affordable on its own. You have to address the cause of high prices, which is commodified housing. If you increase development without changing anything else, you are simply giving a handout to developers and landlords. I support high quality public housing as an effective method of addressing housing shortages.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Minimum lot sizes should only be employed in in-fill developments and developments directly adjacent to existing ones. Alternatively, minimum lot sizes should only be employed when there is demonstrable utility. Oftentimes building size limits can serve the same purpose as minimum lot sizes. For example, luxury housing built near old housing increases the price of the old housing unless the luxury housing serves to relieve a housing shortage that is the major driver of the market. However, 1,500 sq. ft. homes in an area with an average home size of 1,200 sq. ft. homes are unlikely to gentrify the area appreciably, so minimum lot sizes may not be required, as it makes little difference whether this new house is one or two stories, and they could be built more densely if they had two stories. Maximum height should be able to be appealed if the developer can demonstrate a good reason to do so.</p>
<p>Boise is in an awful time to be renting/buying and the current allowance of these god awful rental prices are perpetuating the poverty level of those who will never be able to get out of the rental cycle</p>
<p>Encourage denser housing.</p>
<p>We have to stop depending on developers to create affordable housing; they have very few incentives to do so. The city should buy and create more city-owned and operated affordable housing units.</p>
<p>Take into account road width (no parking on street if too narrow), and make sidewalks mandatory on all new constructions so pedestrians can be safe as traffic increases</p>
<p>Again, it has to fit the area of town that has existed for many years, especially in historical areas of town. Newer areas of town are a different story but still need to meet the esthetics of the neighborhood.</p>
<p>More apartments above commercial buildings</p>
<p>New construction is still expensive. I think the city should offer incentives to builders for affordable housing or find a way to require some sort of contribution from that builder.</p>
<p>Enforce a required amount of green space between the road and sidewalks that parallel the parking/ building.</p>
<p>Build it in your backyard first and then we will talk.</p>
<p>change downtown rules to allow more "in-city" multiple family units (with parking). Encourage open spaces, single family units and larger lots in area "out-city" (suburbs) areas.</p>
<p>Stop the growth</p>
<p>Quit allowing over-the-top large houses in a neighborhood that is predominantly small, older homes. Have new housing match the existing feel of the neighborhood</p>
<p>Actually provide affordable housing and stop catering to out of state greedy developers. Think about the natives for a change instead of big business, ego, and money.</p>
<p>Stop paving farmland. Period. We live in a desert in case you missed it, water is limited and should go to FARMS. No farms = no food. Food does NOT come from grocery stores. Tell the developers to shove it. Stop lining your greedy, lying political pockets with their money and do your job you putz. I'm from Memphis, I'm not an idiot--more development means higher housing prices, there's no way around that. Stop paving farms. Period.</p>
<p>Offer and incentive or requirement for affordable housing</p>
<p>Even % of affordable housing for each portion of the areas in Boise by size or clusters of affordable housing dispersed evenly throughout the city</p>
<p>No more smaller lots. I know it means moore money but our way of life in the older neighborhoods are suffering. I know you probably don't care about my opinion</p>
<p>We are already seeing large homes being build on smaller lots and the homes are being priced at 800k. No developer will be "encouraged" to build more houses and sell them for less. Especially on smaller lot sizes in a hot market such as Boise.</p>
<p>Specific protections for ADU projects in progress</p>
<p>The bigger the better with mega dollar signs seems to be the answer. We natives are getting squeezed out of homes and livelihoods.</p>
<p>Smaller lots will improve housing density and potently price.</p>
<p>I feel like this will just lead to more luxury apartments that no one can afford so it "looks nice" within existing neighborhoods, but will remain empty because no one can afford them.</p>
<p>We need bigger roads and better ways of commute in order to add more housing. Our roads are not prepared for all the new people moving to boise.</p>
<p>As long as the middle man (property mangers) are getting a take of the rent money prices will continue to rise.</p>
<p>The way to improve housing affordability is to make owing more than two homes tax prohibitive. Tax any rent profits over a certain percentage of value, use rent control measures.</p>
<p>Affordability for first time home buyers not for rental units. Not allow people to own three house to rent out would be another idea.</p>
<p>Nothing short of the city requiring some of the units in the building be rent controlled.</p>
<p>Affordable housing won't happen - because of the demand.</p>
<p>Include a definition of "affordable" that helps mid- to lower-income singles and young families be able to pay for decent housing.</p>
<p>No</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

the smallest lot size should be much smaller than the proposed 100 x 40 lot size and ease up on setback/parking requirements.
Take away HOAs so that people can focus on paying their house off instead of paying for further rules.
I have no idea I'm not a city council member. Do any of these things make a difference to our local Idahoans and affordability?
This would encourage high density over-crowding and a strain on our resources. You forgot about going green. We need open land
Change property tax laws so residents who have grown up here aren't forced out of the market.
Affordable housing can also be shifted to the area residents who can vote on where the space should be planned for.
I think developers will try to make as much money regardless. I wish there was a way to address that.
No more 6 bedroom McMansions - more 3 bed 2 bath starter homes
Stop building
taking the density cap off is a good first step... but how do we ensure this won't simply enable out of state developers to come in and build massive luxury condos? Could we add something about any building over X size needs to allocate x% of units for affordable housing?
Laws that limit corporations or people from buying properties for the purpose of income revenue. Tax homes not occupied by purchaser.
Only by better incenting (or requiring) more affordable housing in all new developments.
I am unsure how the code addresses ADU or multifamily in established residential neighborhoods would address affordable housing . I think that all new developments need to have a mix of housing types and services. I also think that open space and larger residential parcels also need to be encouraged and not completely done away with . I know that we are in a housing crises, but we need to fully consider what makes neighborhoods livable and desirable. I am disheartened to see so many zero lot line or super small side yard residential developments being developed with no thoughts to services and green space, proportion and scale . It's just a monotony of horribly designed and poorly constructed houses all smushed together. There appears to be no encouragement of good design, open green space, or anticipation for future mature landscaping. Multifamily and denser residential areas should be encouraged to have mixed use (retail at grade, residential above) in urban core locations areas. Connectivity to communal open space and wide variety of commercial services.
I can't see this helping with Boise affordability problems. I think the only tangible way to help make Boise more affordable is to prevent foreign corporations (I.e.Open Door) and large investment companies from buying up SF dwellings and outbidding first time home buyers and Boise families and driving up the cost of living.
Could there be incentives like tax breaks etc for developers who create small apartments/ ADUs as part of new projects (making sure there are reserved for long term rentals). Or require all large developments to have a certain number of "affordable" units.
As long as money is cheap to borrow, all new development here will cater to the wealthy, and only the wealthy.
Restrictions on use of new spaces as AirBNBs and other short term rentals is a need if we want to keep housing affordable.
I honestly don't know. I hope it does. But people are moving here in droves with their big money and unless these units are designated as affordable I don't know if we will ever see affordability again.
It will certainly bring innovative designs to reduce overcrowded residential areas. It is still unclear as to how, specifically, these proposed regulations it will incentivize the construction of affordable housing.
Less regulation. If property is owned, let the proprietor do what they wish to their property.
Owners still charge high rent, even if it's subsidized housing for a percentage of units, the remaining units are too small and rent is too high for locals. It's all about squeezing as much money as possible out of these buildings.
Not sure
I don't know. Developers are in it for the money, not to make affordable housing.
none i can think of
Affordable housing and new development don't really go together IMO. I think allowing flexible building re-use and non-master planned construction (like laneway houses) will help much more with this goal.
Make housing affordable anyways give 3 bed 2 bath housing options with land- not just big backyards in a cookie cutter neighborhood in order for family options to have chickens, small farm animals and to start a garden
Please look beyond the short-term benefits of affordable housing today and weigh them against the issues of population density. How populated do we want to be? So I'm amenable to boosting our numbers in our neighborhoods to a degree but let's please be cautious and moderate about it.
Include metric about how lessening close-by homelessness would improve overall neighborhood feel and function
Price ceilings for low quality and small properties. Give priority to local residents and first-time buyers, not outside investors!
I'm not sure. I hope it creates More affordable housing.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Future slum creation is what you are doing
Developers aren't interested in building more affordable housing, they are interested in making money. The more units they can cram in, the more money they make. Stop advocating for developers and maintain current density guidelines to provide better quality of life for residents. If we wanted to live in cramped quarters, we'd move to NYC.
Hopefully. This existing regulations are clearly catering to developers instead of affordable housing. There are infinitely more obstacles precluding smaller property owners from providing affordable housing than there are for larger developments – clearly financed, owned, and managed by out-of-state investors.
Less development, preserve more green space
Yes
I fully understand that the Northend is becoming unattainable for nearly everyone(me included). I don't believe it should be flooded with section 8 housing. I believe just adding more units to existing houses, and maybe some condos, etc will drive prices down with simple supply and demand.
I feel the zoning code is only part of the equation in creating more affordable housing.
I think by encouraging sustainable housing that uses more affordable materials and technologies.
Destroying existing neighborhoods should never be the outcome of growth. People move into an area for what it is, not what it might become.
How does it encourage affordable housing? It let's people build as small of a unit as they want. It doesn't do anything to make those units affordable, other than in theory.
Financial Incentives for developers to build quality affordable housing that doesn't include cramming as many units together as possible.
Start regulating proper parking
I don't know.
Higher density zoning is the key to affordable housing.
Homes will become affordable as the supply increases. Allow for the building of many more sub-divisions and single family home prices will return to a more affordable level.
The removal of zones for single family housing only to encourage a mix of single and multiple family housing within a zone or neighborhood.
Charge developers more to initiate infrastructure improvements
Yes, but again, whether people like it or not, that means high- density, smaller buildings, smaller lots, taller buildings, more traffic, and more crime. And again, it seems it's the N end council and mayor dictating this reality for SW Boise, while their neighborhoods remain unchanged.
Not sure if there is such a thing as "affordable housing" in Boise anymore. Every thing is getting sky high pricing. I have lived here since 1992.
Nothing is affordable now. There needs to be a rent increase limit instead!
I'm not sure. Real estate investors are crushing the residents of this city!!! How about focusing on rent controls & limit the number of residential units investors can own?
I think you should try to follow your own regulations that you have and stop allowing special exemptions
The regulation could be improved by including specific and clear language about affordable housing rather than focusing on "fitting in" to an existing neighborhood.
Not sure how this will translate into more affordable housing necessarily.
Impact and infrastructure needs to be discussed in all future projects
Builders will just pack as many units with the cheapest design and materials on a lot, tanking the neighborhood. We already did this 10 years ago with skinny houses.
More affordable housing could be placed in areas where development is all new: where existing inadequate road designs road do not have to bear the brunt of so much new traffic.
"Affordable housing" only works for all the transplants coming in and paying cash for a house and brand new cars.
Protect historic landmarks and land. Develop affordable housing further outside of downtown and increase modes of public transportation.
If building designers are allowed to create plans in one building that may allow for very small units along with small, medium, and larger units, which coincide with fair rental pricing, more folks may be able to afford a home. This needs to allow for pleasant outdoor areas for the whole community.
There has to be incentives to build affordable housing.
No, Please no more high density Buildings!!!!
Put a cap on the rent for greedy people who are making billions and putting our own people homeless.
Nothing is affordable now. The more that is packed in an area encourages slapped together cookie cutter structures with no less price. Probably even higher prices, because it's 'new'. Look at downtown.
I would like more clarity on how allowed density will be controlled.
Build more simple houses with open spacing as well as smaller houses for the smaller less rich families

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

No. Raising my taxes then trying to jam in more taxable dwellings is disrespectful to us that built this city. You have plenty of tax money.
Removing barriers on the limitations of tiny homes on wheels while making a differentiation between said housing type and rv's, mobile homes, and the like.
Housing price is driven by the free market. Expensive houses can still be placed on smaller lots.
If the intended result is only more affordable housing then Boise will appear cheap - we need both high quality, luxury structures and spaces next to well maintained, beautiful, and cost effective (affordable) structures and spaces as well. I care about the long term beauty of the city and the code should not be written ONLY to accommodate affordable housing (and I say that having developed affordable housing).
Lower
encourage the development of small to modest size housing. 1000sf to 1800sf. Discourage large (in excess of 2000sf) houses within city limits, especially in older neighborhoods.
I know there are problems building to the east of Boise, but for Boise to grow, you must go east
Allow exceptions in zoning to incentivize someone or a group to purchase a large lot and outfit it progressively for a nature inviting, environmentally friendly tiny house community with a garden space, common outdoor area and access to bike paths and public transport, solar etc
You can fit a lot of people in trailers, high rises and apartments, but I sure wouldn't want to live there. How about we lower property taxes? There's a million acres between here and mountain home. It's ok to spread out a little bit.
Again clever loaded question: minimize the negative impact on walkability, traffic flow by limiting the dwelling unit impact.
Offer tax credits to owners with existing lots to build affordable housing on.
It seems like the city just wants more density...wherever and whenever, and will adjust the "rules" to accomplish this.
I think these regulations including maximum height have been used to restrict creative developments, not encourage them.
Developers only work for themselves. They only wish to build as cheap as possible, without regards to longevity of structure, and then to walk away. Affordability means rolling back the insane property taxes - that currently only benefit a few.
It will destroy the city and make is Portland. Move the high density south of the airport.
Yes it will dump an apartment complex on every empty lot in the city without providing for any parking or services.
I want the zoning left as it is.
Require developers to build 50% of their buildings to be affordable for the median wage-earner.
build for what the market demands, low value housing exists as neighborhoods age and decline. Low value housing declines at a faster rate due to materials, amenities and what those homeowners can afford in upkeep and remodel
Actually affordable housing should be mandated for all development projects as aggressively as possible.
Don't allow out of state investors to buy property and outprice locals from buying homes
Affordability is relative. If there are investment banks building the units, they are seeking yield. All the money in circulation because of low interest rates and quantitative easing has money chasing anything that people will pay money for. Saying you want affordable housing is not going to overcome this fact. There is asset inflation. Wanting more units per acre makes each piece of the acre more expensive. You need a factual premise to derive a true conclusion.
If more affordable living/dwellings is an intended result, it's no surprise it's gone entirely wayside. You can't have your cake and eat it too. At the current rate, there won't be any cake because nobody with a baking skill set will be able to afford living anywhere near civilization on baking wages.
But that is a bad thing. The goal should not be to cheapen up Boise but make it a place you want to raise a family. This is not California or Tijuana. This is Idaho
More thought going into building types to fit this criteria.
Subsidies for low income people
Yes, not to create regulations that pack people in neighborhoods, lower, rents, more crime. If you are going to do something for people expand your city limits and add your needed housing there.
Factor in space for public transportation pickups/dropoffs.
Raise minimum wage, vaccine job mandate gone,
It will encourage more development, but I don't see how it would promote affordable housing in our current boom. I think the idea is imaginary.
Affordable housing is based on limiting wasteful design and building methods and materials. The energy code is one reason for increased Constructuion cost along with increased cost of real estate.
It'll just make this town even more cramped than it already is. Keep the damn californians out of my home state.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>There should be independent research done by Boise ,apart from developers,to find the actual cost of building a dwelling unit.Affordable housing projects are not benefitting those who wind up living there.The city needs to accumulate data from construction colleges around the country to see which cities in the country are the best at intelligent design.</p>
<p>It's just an excuse to increase rental income at the expense of cramped living quarters. NO</p>
<p>If the intended result is lower housing costs, smaller lots alone, will not help. Look at the costs of condominiums downtown, not cheap. Build more homes of all types, Townhomes, Single Family on a variety of lot sizes, etc... In additon, commercial space needs to accompany each new neighborhood. The addition of commercial space within existing neighborhoods could reduce the amount of travel that residents need to make to aquire groceries, fuel, and goods. It may bring working enviornments closer to the residents and reduce commute issues too.</p>
<p>Read previous comment</p>
<p>People will just charge same/more for smaller lots</p>
<p>All your high rise apartments haven't turned out to be affordable, just ugly.</p>
<p>Put in that a certain percentage (and more than 20%) needs to be affordable housing</p>
<p>I don't know. I wish a magic wand could be waved that would make my rent go down and also lower the prices of all the nice houses on the market. I feel like I'll never be able to "upgrade" to a house and when my rent price goes up this year, I might not be able to afford it. Very discouraging, very frightening. I know you guys are trying to fix it and you're probably smarter than I am.</p>
<p>I don't have enough information to form an opinion--my concern is which method would more naturally lead to cramming more people into a smaller space. I don't agree that stacking units higher or reducing their size to fit more people into a smaller space would be a desirable way to increase housing. Innovative housing designs that do not create "sardine can" housing would be fine.</p>
<p>Keep existing houses. Replacing existing housing with new low quality housing increases the coat per square foot to rent or buy.</p>
<p>These apartments aren't affordable. It just offers more smaller homes. What are we doing for families that are the ones that need affordable housing?</p>
<p>Lower property taxes</p>
<p>This puts the focus on profit over quality. It will turn Boise into a city that charges \$1,800/month for a 300 sq ft apartment.</p>
<p>I don't believe you can manage "affordable house" at the zoning and planning stage. All you will get is cheap and small. That isn't affordable, it's crappy.</p>
<p>Create more strict zoning codes. This will help housing become more affordable.</p>
<p>Absolutely not, since it will only encourage bad designs in inappropriate areas.</p>
<p>Look at the existing footprint & surrounding homes. Density should somewhat match.</p>
<p>I feel like it would jam more houses into already crowded areas. Set a lot size minimum where single family homes are to be built. In my opinion, nothing less of 1/4 acre should be allowed for a single family home.</p>
<p>I think the term affordable housing has a bad wrap. Unfortunately the reputation precedes itself. I lived in affordable housing before and crime was always an issue. I don't think affordable housing needs to be built in existing neighborhoods. I think to improve low income and get rid of affordable housing program we need to do a better job with education. Better policies help too. I could go on and on about this topic.</p>
<p>See above</p>
<p>Stop all this artificial inflation there's nothing that you're going to do that will help anybody in this state.</p>
<p>Maybe but developers are making good money on regular rent.</p>
<p>Anything that limits lots to "single family homes" is something that needs to go. Aesthetics need to take a backseat to addressing homelessness and rising housing costs.</p>
<p>The further you get from the downtown area the cheaper the rent. Add another bus route.</p>
<p>So, then, what is your intended result? Affordable housing? You honestly think a developer is going to build AFFORDABLE housing in Boise? No, I am afraid not. You might be able to get creative on how many units you can cram in a lot, but that won't guarantee it'll be affordable for those who need it.</p>
<p>Preparing the city for the fact that you guys kept putting us on the best places to live. There's no public transportation, there's not enough affordable housing for people that grew up and live here. You should be taxing the people moving here not the people that have already paid for the development of the city that is thus far inadequate.</p>
<p>Put in affordable housing</p>
<p>Less government and less oversight will encourage construction of houses that the buyers desire. This is an important feature of our economy, let the demand drive the design. I do not trust a few "progressive" designers to make this city better; things will only get worse. Look at California and NY.</p>
<p>Raise house prices for people moving from other states and give at least SOME SMALL benefits to local Idahoans.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Keep a dwelling unit per acre limit but allow variances for especially creative designs and innovative types of housing that are required to be sold/rented at affordable housing rates set by the City of Boise.
If higher density and smaller lot sizes are allowed, yes it will help with affoo
Again, more plannig from people who actually GO LOOK AT THE AREA that the city is allowing homes to be built. Sooooo many neighborhoods have been ruined in Boise. BO MORE!
I don't think that affordable housing, the value of homes, is something I want government trying to control and determine, determining what the value of housing is economical is a form of government overreach. That is not the purpose of a city government.
Prefer not to answer.
The city should not be involved in trying to move the market in a specific direction. Low income\affordable housing has never worked the way as described (I spent the first 10 years of my life in low income housing). Inevitably they become a "ghetto" and crime ridden area.
Build suitable housing but within a reasonable price. Stop pricing locals out for a more hipster community. All that brings is more taxes for us homeowners and a lot more crime.
It is not the City of Boise's responsibility to insure affordable housing.
Stop Californians from moving here
Use of reusable/recycled materials
I don't know if this is the right place to put this comment, but I want to see alternative housing like tiny homes, mother-in-law units and other affordable options easier to achieve.
Set aside a specific area to try some creative designs.
mandate that the developer include 20% affordable housing in any development project. affordable house being defined by calculation based on income of nation poverty level.
I am against the high density apartment complexes that are currently being built. Many do not have sufficient parking for tenants so they spill out onto streets and neighboring homes to park. In addition, they are not "low income" rental units. The city has not adequately addressed the impact to schools, infrastructure, traffic and emergency response that these mega complexes create. We cannot continue to allow mega developers to build without the aforementioned impacts. I hope the new code would be a step in the right direction.
Building gargantuan homes and packing them together like sardines makes no sense. Building smaller more affordable homes is the ideal answer.
Allowance for certain types of "tiny house".
N/a
McLean and the GREEDY City Council are only out for themselves. They demonstrate regularly that they have ZERO cares to give about Boise. SAVE MURGOITIO PARK!! It was designated as a park, KEEP IT A PARK AS PROMISED!! If any of you jackhole really wanted affordable housing you would have been charging the DEVELOPERS AND NEW People more for infrastructure and services starting 20 years ago. McLean and her minions are shady liars, thieves, and sellouts. YOU ALL SUCK!!
Don't incentivise developers to 'Pack 'em thick, pack 'em deep, pack 'em high. Avoid 'project' housing.
Allowing smaller homes made with sustainable materials would help. With deforestation and fires, and climate change, you'll need alternative materials.
Focus on design means more expensive finishing. Usually housing that emphasizes design is not affordable.
The market drives housing costs. Supplemental supports for development to ensure that can make projects pencil can help.
You can try to sell it that way but most people with a brain know this is completely untrue. There will not be affordable housing that's a lie.
Any newly allowed dense housing should also be accompanied by a required common area for recreation.
Keep high density out of residential neighborhoods. In an area of single family homes don't allow multiple unit apartment buildings or mobile home parks.
Require either a % of housing in a development be affordable or set a maximum average housing price per development.
smaller set backs in certain situations
I feel though as if the city proceeds with those changes, then there needs to be some measure of accountability to build housing that negates the density requirement but not just out of profit.
This would not be my goal.
If your intention is to pack more people into our city then, no, I don't see how any regulation can stop that.
High rise dense living is not affordable and leads to paying rent forever.
Prioritize open space!

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Density should still be a consideration. Don't throw it out altogether. Once other requirements are met, density should still be contained by a reasonable formula. Space is a major contributor to the quality of life. Crowding breeds conflict.
The only way to insure affordability is to enact rent controls. I understand that this would be opposed by the majority in the Legislature.
The zoning should be by land use not appearances. Boise zoning, if it does exist, seems to be ignored in favor of development.
Housing price is determine by demand, it doesn't matter what regulations are in place if there is no rent control law.
See above.
But also not dumping this into a neighborhood with 120 living and 5 story's high.
Focus more on helping renters and stop trying to make Boise the new Portland.
I live in a neighborhood where many lots are being built with attractive homes, two or three to a lot where one used to stand. They ARE NOT more affordable.
This depends upon whether or not developers buy in, or just try to get around regulations.
Study "carefully" what the neighborhood needs truly are versus the developer use.
Clearly state in the proposed change that "x" amount of housing must be affordable.
Limit home price increases to be more realistic in the income range in Boise. Average home price vs. average income dont add up...
I don't want affordable house because it leads to urban blight
It will only allow out of state developers to continue to ravage our state for profit that they will take back out of state! Owners of property will continue to raise rents to accomodate the increase in property tax due to rising values caused by out of state over developers!
It will benefit the developers and added an uninvited (to the existing home owners) increase in density to areas; additionally, there will be more congestion and infrastructure problems.
Require developments over a certain # of dwellings to donate a % of the dwellings to city for low cost housing. Such as 1 per 100. For example the project on Victory is aimed at people making 70,000 to 150,00 a year. \$49,209 a year However the median income is \$49,209 a year. There is a large discrepancy!
See response to #6
Again...my concern is density. We're already seeing serious problems in that area!
Stop subsidizing luxury buildings that claim they will have a miniscule number of affordable units. Instead subsidize impact fees for deveopments that are 100% affordable units. We are going to continue to have labor shortages if we don't find a way for people to afford to live here. Long time residents are going to howl about the density. Screw them. Boise is growing, if the don't like it, leave. Boise is not going to be the size/pace it was 40 years ago. Get over it.
Housing is crazy right now these prices even for rent is so expensive! Stop it!
Define affordable. If you want affordable housing, eliminate property taxes. That will do more than cramming tons of people into small spaces. When too many people live in small spaces of low income housing, crime rates increase. When the tax burden becomes too much, it pushes people into poverty. How about, you get rid of property taxes, and back off and let the people figure if out?
Subsidizing housing costs and maintaining aesthetic of the properties.
Il think we have to stop thinking "renting" is affordable - it is not . We have to design developments that allow folks to get a financial foothold, develop some housing security and start gaining some assets. you need to stop believing that lifelong renting is affordable.
Eliminate mcmansions totally. Make decent size housing suitable for single families. Fuck your apartment complexes
This might have to be individual neighborhood/subdivision zoning. Not sure if that is possible. Implementing a blanket zoning is not in the best interest of neighborhoods and the character they hold. Ex. I live in a mid-century neighborhood (Franklin Randolph/Borah area). When houses are approved to be torn down and a 4 plex approved with zero attention to design and architecture based around the original era of the neighborhood, the charm of why we buy in different Boise neighborhoods is lost (neighborhood specific). I am ALL FOR affordable housing, but I think close attention to where it is being built is most important. (The new Franklin Moda I believe is an excellent addition to that loca-tion since the character is high density usage (shopping, "transit", industrial).
Maybe have the regulations scaled? Meaning a single family house has X criteria while a duplex has Y criteria?
I know this isn't helpful but I don't think developers care about building more affordable housing types. They are only out to make the most money possible. I think we need more regulations or something that require developers to make more, not 10% maybe 33%, of their new homes affordable.
no
Yes. Factor the impact to others in approving designs. If affordable housing is needed, the city should purchase land along bus routes, amenities, etc. and resell for the purpose of building affordable housing. This can be a revolving fund after initiation.
No

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Eliminate property taxes and once again return illegals to where they came from.
No, because the City of Boise is NOT providing for a faster and smoother process for quality developers to have their projects approved. I think there needs be in addition to proposed changes incentives of lower impact and permit fees for higher density projects b/c this is meeting the City's huge need for more housing. The rates should scale down as developer's provide more units by project - this will increase the housing stock and push rents and sales prices down. But this will not happen as the costs of materials and labor and land and project processing increase and less development is accomplished.
The only way to affordable housing is to eliminate greed. That is not going to happen. Also what is affordable to you? I was looking into "affordable" housing where I would have to pay 700,000 for a house that I don't even like who is 700,000 affordable to?
There probably has to be a monetary incentive to develop actual affordable housing.
But builders are putting too many in a certain area. Should be spaced out and take in to account the impact on high density cars on the area makes. Many roads cannot handle high density housing on all corners. Need to see the long term conditions before approving high density housing.
More open spaces
Put caps on rent and the raising of rent from year to year. People in Idaho do not have the income to pay for housing.
There is no data to show this is going to reduced the cost of housing. There is no city that you can show as an example. Give citizens data. Show them actually how cramming housing is going to work. Not just in theory but in recent reality.
Specifically build housing that is rent controlled.
There's money to be made. Inflation is on the rise. "Affordable" housing isn't affordable
We don't want more affordable housing. Stop trying to create things our Community does not want.
It's probably beyond the scope of the regulations, but having some sort of stipulation that the affordable housing being built must be available for sale to low-income people instead of perpetually for rent would be a good add, wherever it might fit.
How can we have affordable housing with the high cost of land and construction
Incentivize the development of affordable housing
bonuses or incentives for affordable housing set-asides (do these go into the code?? or through other avenues?)
Relying on site design (berms, plantings, fences, walls) - creative landscape design solutions can often best facilitate the use of a lot without requiring strict setbacks. Qualified landscape architects can facilitate best site design and should be required for any design.
Developers don't want more affordable housing. They want to make as much money as possible. I'm not sure how to fix this.
If you force a large number of small housing options in a relatively concentrated part of the city, you're not only going to alienate existing home owners in the area but also make that area a less desirable place to live relative to others in the city due to population density and all that comes with it (i.e. more people sharing fewer parks, more traffic, etc).
Yes
Keep homebuyers Idahoans. Stop the building growth and the other states taking advantage of this beautiful land
Stop being greedy
To approve a project, require a set number of affordable units that is a higher than typical portion of units. Unfortunately affordable is a difficult term to define in the current market, with so many long term residents being forced out.
Single family zoning could be seen as a multiple family zone, unless CCR's prohibit.
Directly addressing how the owners of new properties are allowed to select their rental rates (for example, limiting rental rates to a certain percent of the median income of residents of Boise) for tenants would be more effective.
High density does not mean lower prices for the home buyers ... it means lower costs for developers but they will sell the homes for whatever the market will bear... which is fine as we live in a capitalist country. When government tries to manipulate market forces they fail badly... The gov't should not be involved in trying to manipulate housing prices.
Requirements and/or incentives
Investors will buy them anyway to rent. So don't allow that.
Real estate will take care of prob.
It's not the place of municipal government to dictate. Let the marketplace and supply and demand set the price.
Maybe there needs to be a policy that outlines how much rent can be charged in a given area or based on the dwelling to eliminate price gouging. Maybe that already exists I'm not sure.
Build low income housing, not high density homes all over town

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	If we want affordable housing we need to remove investors much like it was back in the 60's and 70's. Now housing is a commodity like oil and it's no wonder why all cities in US are having problems. This is a problem Boise can not solve.
	Leave as it is
	Maybe- but it also may lead to areas feeling overcrowded if the option doesn't fit well within a small neighborhood. I think anything approved will still have to be judged on whether the design proposed fits overall.
	The city needs to significantly raise impact fees for anything other than low income housing.
	Developers will increase profits by jamming too many units together. and will increase congestion and traffic.
	I think it will destroy the livability of existing neighborhoods - it feels like you are trying to cram extra units into existing neighborhoods
	incentives
	No. Developers and land owners will maximize the return on their investments, which means they will maximize the value of their product. The City should not be promoting any particular housing type by regulations.
	no
	stop building houses so close to each other
	small dwellings
	Take the burden off taxpayers for infrastructure, schools, and parks and mandate that the developers pay the bill. This would slow down development and put more thought into what the community would benefit from. I'm a senior being priced out of my home by property tax increases. I thought owning a home was my security in retirement. Now developers are taking it away from me. Think sunshine, trees, open space, please.
	Yes it will, but that's not always a good thing. It has a real potential to change Boise into a city of outwardly pretty, low-income housing across the board. We need more affordable housing not densely packed apartment living, which is what those developments turn into. Find a better way to reduce homeowner costs.
	Limit short term rentals. The new houses and garage units near us are mainly investment properties used for short term rentals. Higher density has not addressed housing shortages and has increased parking congestion. There needs to be an incentive for long term residents.
	You could demand that large developments such as multi-story apartment or conds buildings, require a % to be affordable. You could do the same for subdivisions of single family or town houses.
	Add info for "Tiny houses"
	The only way to have affordable housing is when the Gov. gets involved. Stop flattening the "affordable" places that are already here but vanishing fast. There are ways to improve and aid what is already here with home improvement. When we lost all the mobile homes that were on federal way, we let down a huge population of low-income earners. Tragic in every sense. Just because it wasn't prettiest those folks didn't deserve to be thrown on the streets or crammed into Apts. They had a home!
	We need an enforceable requirement to include a certain number of low income affordable housing in each neighborhood.
	I can only guess that limited lot size would make units be more affordable.
	Making very expensive new single dwelling homes hard/impossible to build
	Stop investors from buying up property. Have a live in clause after 3 properties are bought
	Developers seem to prefer to build high-end housing.
	i worry if it will actually be affordable, but do support affordable housing options in this neighborhood (duplexes, apartments, etc)
	Make sure a set number at least half are affordable. There are many apartments that have been built in the last 3 years that are supposed to be affordable and they are not.
	By allowing for the use of land to blend in with the existing neighborhood I think that new and inventive design can be looked at
	Please include availability and proximity of services (parks, grocery, schools, hospitals etc.) in the design.
	I sure hope so. Reject arguments that people are building cheap housing. Housing is not cheap. Permit developers to build homes that IDAHOANS can afford.
	Yes and no. This proposal could open up the opportunity for more affordable housing. However, it could also leave room for the more wealthy to buy up land and develop crazy unaffordable housing too. Inclusionary zoning needs to be addressed for a proposal like this to really work.
	Get rid of parking minimums! Encourage the building of housing that has fewer parking spaces or no parking spaces to encourage more bike and pedestrian oriented individuals. Cars take up valuable space in our city.
	Require ON SITE parking.
	A qualified "yes". It will all depend on the "innovative" component.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Work with Ada county to make it easier to sub divide larger lots. Not everyone wants to be a landlord or renter. Bit giving the opportunity to subdivide the larger lots and sell off the small parcels to individuals for smaller homes would be helpful. It would also be helpful if the City could help with utility installation to the smaller parcels.
No.
Get rid of setback requirements and parking minimums.
By making development criteria fit the needs of people, development will be better poised to improve or not hinder their communities. Developers will build to the lowest bar, so make the bar equitable and responsible.
If density regulations disappear, but the setbacks/parking standards remain strict, nothing effectively changes. Setbacks and parking standards have to change along with density regulations to actually allow anything to be built
See above
feel there should be requirements for developments over a certain size to have affordable housing integrated into the project
Stop trying to increase population density. A landscape of single family homes leads to a more pleasant city.
My 'Yes' answer is tentative. I beleive the encouragement of more affordable housing is paramount to the quality of life in Boise.
Create first time home buyer programs. City investment into assisted home purchases
Neighborhood flyers and opportunities to respond with ideas.
Please see my answer above, its the same : I think that one way could be to encourage builders and developers to include a % of affordable housing in every new housing development. This would encourage builders to build different types of houses and not simply build houses that will "make the most profit". I think your trying to change this code so that you can build more houses on a smaller plots of land , to try and tackle the affordable housing crisis. Unless you introduce a system where a proportion of all new builds have to be affordable, builders and developers will take advantage of the updated code and simply look to build "more houses" not more affordable housing options.
Build homes closer to jobs and public parks.
But they will be ugly. We need affordable single family HOMES, like Idahoans used to be able to afford with Idaho wages.
Builders are only in the game for the money.
It depends if you can fit more units in the maximum height. To improve, remove parking minimums, make heights much larger. Remove setback. Allow buildings to touch. Don't regulate design, just quality.
Affordable housing needs to be mandated into building and development regs. At a minimum it should be half of dwelling units or the percentage of residents who are housing insecure or struggling. Developers are not going to offer affordable units/dwellings because their interest is financial gain.
Make it fit the location.
No
Give incentives to builders that develop quality affordable housing, emphasis on quality.
ADUs should not be allowed as STRs.
Not sure, is there money in affordable housing? If not then no.
Since developers ultimately want their proforma to work, they want as many units as possible, so removing this will make new developments more appealing for them. I do think it's important to uphold a design standard that makes beautiful spaces and offers solutions to other city concerns as well, though.
Maybe add the requirement that x% must be low income.
Give breaks to those achieving higher density to encourage it
The current trend is to build high end and maximize square footage to maximize profit and this will do nothing to adress that trend and increase building actually affordable homes.
I do not trust developers or city planners to be creative rather than do what is the most cost effective plan.
Retain existing smaller, older homes. Subsidize first time home buyers.
Don't ruin Boise and turn it into a slum
I do hope that the City can incorporate affordable housing, but not simply apartments but working with families on responsible and successful homeownership.
With the housing shortage we have, increasing density is one of the only viable solutions. The question isn't whether higher density is good or not, but whether we can increase density and maintain the livability at a unit scale up to a district scale.
Regulate tax and rent, leaving some of the lots (like the radio tower on cassia lot) that has wildlife access is incredibly important. There is a creek with frogs, lovely hawks, and other wildlife. Idaho should value it's open spaces and not shove housing into every inch.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>Yes. For the R1B lot size, there is currently a footnote in table 11-02.5: "[1] On blocks platted before the Effective Date, minimum lot size, lot width, and lot frontage shall not be less than 75% of nearest two occupied residential properties on the same block face." This footnote must be retained, even if only for the Sycamore neighborhood. Without it, the Sycamore neighborhood will be subdivided and its character destroyed. The large lot agricultural feel is the thing that makes this neighborhood.</p>
	<p>Allow denser concentration but include more green issues.</p>
	<p>Raise the minimum wage. Get rid of the parking requirement. Make requirements which regulate green spaces and open spaces so that we aren't just building more affordable housing, but building housing that conserves Boise as the incredible place it is, respecting nature, honoring our open spaces, and honoring the humans that live in these environments.</p>
	<p>Designate high density areas and plan transportation around those. Keep the existing zones and make sure they are not able to circumvent zoning laws.</p>
	<p>Minimum lot sizes. Minimum road widths.</p>
	<p>Maintain current dwellings per unit requirements for residential development that allows for short-term rentals.</p>
	<p>It only encourages out of state people</p>
	<p>The City should maintain existing regulations in the existing older neighborhoods and use the new regulations on the new developments of undeveloped land on the outskirts of town. The City could encourage development of more affordable housing by putting maximum density on undeveloped land on the outskirts of town.</p>
	<p>I don't know if the free market can fix our affordability crisis, but I do think more housing is still worthwhile.</p>
	<p>This will in no way make housing more affordable. Youll just get less land with your house</p>
	<p>No</p>
	<p>Reduce restrictions that will inhibit new unit development. Limits on density make housing less affordable.</p>
	<p>U want more taxes</p>
	<p>Don't change the current zoning regulations. Much of downtowns business offices and buildings are currently empty due to covid due to working at home. After covid many bususiness will continue to work from home. These buildings can be repurposed into apartments & condos</p>
	<p>Give density bonuses or other development incentives (tax breaks or other cost savings, perhaps) for a portion of developments being affordable housing. Making development more affordable is the best way to increase creation of affordable housing.</p>
	<p>If taxpayers must subsidize "affordable housing" that's undesirable.</p>
	<p>The demand for housing is so high there is not a way to dissuade high costs, through increased supply, to address the dilemma faced by incumbent and and native residents. Make new residents pay the tax burden of improvements to infrastructure requisite to accommodating their presence in the valley.</p>
	<p>I doubt it. The state would step in and change it to benefit large property owners.</p>
	<p>Corporate buying of residential real estate should be limited.</p>
	<p>The City should impose a requirement that a percentage of affordable housing units be included in all new multi-family dwelling developments. Additionally, this requirement should not have an end date i.e.: not allow the affordable units to revert to prevailing rents after a certain amount of time.</p>
	<p>Builders and developers will try and put the largest house they can due to the fact that increased square footage means a higher value to the builder/developer. Dollars motivate, not affordability.</p>
	<p>We need actual houses that are affordable as well. People want to buy and live in homes. Again all apartments should include affordable housing. There shouldn't be a separate affordable housing building. Boise has apartments everywhere! It is disgusting. Parks are being turned into housing developments. It is destroying Boise. If there is an affordable housing problem in Boise the answer is not to put all those poor people in one place. ANd if there isnt more room in Boise then there isnt enough room. Boise still needs parks all around not just in the North end. What's the point of building more? IF families cannot get the quality of life they need to raise there family ? Along with housing we need space for parking and space for children and space for walking...We need to quit building! Rethink what we have. People can move into other cities that they can afford and commute. Or pay more in wages. But the building more apartments is not the answer. No one wants an apartment building except maybe students. People want homes and the yard and parking that goes with a home. They want parks and to have beautiful neighborhoods....For every so many square feet of neighborhood there should be a park! Let's improve what we have. We have apartments. There should be a designated percentage of affordable housing in every apartment complex including housing for seniors. They shouldn't have to be put in senior living situations that take advantage of them either. Our community needs to care for its own by including all types of people in every building development. Luxury living must also include affordable and seniors. Affordable needs to be included. Our roads and traffic are shit. Not enough sidewalks and parks. We do not need to increase density. Please stop apartments!</p>
	<p>I HAVE and opinion, but this the answer to this particular question is it will probably encourage that, but why not ask if we are for or against the intended result? I am against the intended result, but I would cede that the result of these actions, would produce such results. They way these questions are written does not address what Boise residents want.</p>
	<p>Incentivize the building of affordable housing somehow within the code?</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>This will help but allowing smaller lots that use less land and reduced setbacks can help affordability more</p> <p>I worry that removing the limit altogether will allow developers to just chock a building full of half-assed units rather than having to be intentional with it.</p> <p>Tax credits for landlords of affordable house, increased amount on home owners tax deduction</p> <p>I am undecided on this, as above, the feasibility of building more homes within these constraints depends greatly on details of the form based restrictions. Minneapolis decided a few years ago to allow triplexes on all lots, and in the first year, they only received two (2!) applications for these due to the rest of the restrictions in their code. At a minimum, I would like the city to conduct extensive feasibility testing to ensure that reasonable incremental housing growth is feasible on lots of all sizes, including small existing lots or lots that could be split in the future, throughout the city.</p> <p>In an area that is so highly desired removing the density standards will only allow developers to make more money. We can't trust the developers to make decisions about what is best for the community and overall standard of living in our city.</p> <p>Allow developers to observe smaller set-backs and utilize narrower roads for denser/more affordable housing.</p> <p>Allow for more modular builds instead of stock builds.</p> <p>Build development further out in surrounding cities and stop trying to cram everyone into one city. Not everyone can afford to live where they like to. For example I would love to live in Hollywood, or maybe even Paris, but I can't afford to and I accept that.</p> <p>Don't approve every development! It just drives the prices up and encourages people to move here. Have a steady rate of development so infrastructure can keep up and prices don't skyrocket. When your property taxes double in a year that's a problem</p> <p>I think the neighborhood the structure is going into should have significant influence in the final approval. We have to live with it.</p> <p>No "affordable housing"</p> <p>We need more rent control and resale control.... Jackson hole had certain limits on certain housing types that could only be resold for say 30 above what it was purchased. We need ordinances for rent that people can't be kicked out and rent doubled. It's inhumane.</p> <p>I am concerned that even with creative ways to build large multi-family housing developments near established single family homes, there will still be a huge negative impact on the quality of life for existing residents. Pre-planned developments which ensure room for more traffic, parking, access, greenspace, shopping, schools, childcare, etc. are ideal. Otherwise we're placing more people in smaller and smaller spaces and the resources for all become overtaxed and quality of life goes significantly down. Further, large multi-family complexes encourage more use of public spaces and I would dearly hate to lose the wild spaces where my family can explore. Developed places like the MK Nature center are lovely, but so are the wild areas without development such as the Barber Observation Point. The more developed our wild spaces become, the more you have to share the space with school buses and field trips and large amounts of people all at once. This makes free, wild greenspace inaccessible to anyone who can only access what is within walking distance, and is a huge form of inequity both for the new residents and the existing residents of the area. Particularly I see this as an increasing issue in South-east Boise.</p> <p>Equality for single family homes that do not want to have multi-family homes right next to them. Let's think about the hard working families that saved to purchase their own home.</p> <p>External lighting needs to be dark skies friendly</p> <p>I don't want to encourage the building of multi unit buildings in areas that are predominantly single unit housing. Multi unit housing should not stand out or look different from houses</p> <p>No one will build affordable housing without some subsidy? Why would they when they are paying high prices for land? Affordable housing for middle income is different than affordable housing for those at the poverty line.</p> <p>Just having more housing available will eventually force housing to be more affordable due to vacancy. However, I'm more concerned about city infrastructure not keeping up with growth and proposed building. I can already feel it every time I try to schedule appointments with doctors, vets and when I have to be on freeway/connector during rush hours.</p> <p>Housing costs are going up. To prioritize dense, "affordable" housing at the expense of middle class quality of life is silly. Developers will build more densely, but they'll make them nicer and they'll be no more adorable than a normal single family home.</p> <p>Please see above comment</p> <p>There will always be a work around for these developers. You will not be able to control a thing once you allow them "in". It's foolish ego to believe you can. And, who defines and how is it defined what affordable housing is? Boulder, CO is trying but the median home still costs over 700k.</p> <p>It /might/ help with affordability, but there is very little incentive to drive affordability with this one change; it's not enough and I don't think you can market these changes as improving affordability, unfortunately.</p> <p>Maybe affordable housing, but the city leaders of Boise are catering to outsiders who are moving in as well as developers and forcing longtime and native Boiseans to move away from the city. This is all in name of collecting more \$ for the city. Also affordable housing is much different than low income housing.</p>
--	--

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	There is no such thing as affordable housing in Boise. Neighborhoods do not want low income housing.
	Still need to directly account for affordable housing no matter what. It must be included in all residential zoning codes.
	Housing in Boise has gotten so expensive that it has caused a significant economic divide throughout the treasure valley. The only way to truly ensure equity would be charging rent based on the income the individual is making, and customizing that number based on each individual. As a BSU employee, our salaries are embarrassing considering how hard we work to educate students who end up contributing significantly to the Boise economy.
	Housing prices are based of inventory and demand. Overbuilding today will cause future available inventory to explode because of the declining population trend that first world countries are experiencing. Think beyond today.
	In this market, any gains in affordable housing will be achieved only through subsidies, expanding availability of Section 8 housing and implementing rent controls. The chances of this are low given the reality that Boise is part of Idaho.
	I think minimum dwelling requirements are necessary to encourage more affordable housing since they are concrete measures of housing availability. "Creative" and "innovative" are too subjective to hold developers accountable.
	I have no idea how we can regulate housing prices. It's a capitalist country. It's tragic that the dollar means more than quality of life.
	What about minimums on size and number of residential units for multi-family housing and mixed use developments as well? I have felt disturbed by a trend I've noticed in the North End where former apartment buildings and duplexes have been renovated to be or replaced by single family homes. This is the opposite of encouraging or maintaining affordable housing in a neighborhood with proximity to downtown and I fear that with maximums but not explicit minimums the code could be interpreted to allow for more of this.
	I don't see developers caring about affordable housing unless that is implemented as policy.
	No, because changing this requirement would make housing more affordable. Unfortunately the number of units that would need to be added to make Boise affordable again is far beyond what is realistic to add. Adding housing units, while necessary, is insufficient for affordable housing in high demand places like Boise. Adding density will simply continue to make Boise expensive while at the same time inviting a number of other (expensive) problems.
	We need more affordable housing
	The lot sizes in Highlands Cove are smaller and not affordable. In the NE, lot size does not correlate to affordability. In certain parts of Boise, this might be the case though. Focus attention on areas in Boise where this might be the case.
	Smaller "cute" houses are achievable. People don't want to live in apartment complexes. Town houses for the next generation to own property and a house.
	If intended result is "fits in" with existing neighborhoods, it is very obvious that Boise City has zero interest in that. Neighborhood after neighborhood asks just for that and never gets it.
	Please define affordable housing. My two older adult children continue to struggle to find affordable housing
	NO. Keep the existing code density requirements. I DO NOT want high density housing in Boise.
	As long as builders can get high prices they will continue to build expensive houses.
	You know 100% that the only way to build truly low income housing is to ACTUALLY BUILD IT not leave it up to developers. Affordable housing is NOT affordable for most people. Everyone needs to live in housing that costs no more than 1/3 of their income even if their income is zero.
	same comment as for question 6 - I worry that the extra design criteria for duplex, triplex, and fourplexes are more burdensome than for building a single unit home of the same size. Additional requirements based on density basically undoes the update of removing density maximums by making them potentially unfeasible when single unit development would remain feasible. This does little to help with development of smaller units and will still encourage development of larger and larger single unit homes in desirable areas as costs continue to increase.
	Keep the 75% footnote on page 11 of module two that Clarion added so no one in Boise who worked hard to own a home has to give up the neighborhood they bought into. Specifically, the Sycamore Overlay.
	Focus on building homes w/ new zoning codes rather than apartments, creating more supply and thus less demand for homes and lowering prices = affordable housing
	Allow Motger in law quarters on certain sized properties
	I do not believe it is the city of Boise's business to manipulate the price of housing within the city limits.
	Be sure the laws don't have loopholes for developers. Since investors are buying up a huge percentage of single family homes- more than in any time in history- maybe assess a separate tax on them? It's the main factor in rising home prices. Gone are the days when fixer uppers were available to an actual homeowner. They have cash. Advertising homes as good Airbnb or vacation rentals.
	I know this is a very challenging issue. In Boise, it doesn't matter if a home is small or not, these days even small square footage homes are expensive. So it's not just what gets built that matters, but how much it ends up costing to buy. Putting caps on how much a property costs to buy seems like the only way to make a home affordable right now, but how possible is that?

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Adding more bike routes and bus stops nearby affordable housing.
Developers must be required to build affordable units or they can't have the land.
Can certain properties could be slated and incentivized by the city for affordable housing development versus continually approving only high-end "luxury" apartment and housing complexes?
nothing being built will be so called affordable.
Minimum % affordable units per x amount of units.
With the current housing price surge, I'm not certain what will encourage affordable housing development. Perhaps tax incentives?
Reduce road size to develop pedestrian and bike lanes if older existing buildings are built to the property line. As important as new development might be, encouraging adaptation of existing buildings has many benefits including affordability. Overlays that assume older buildings will eventually be remodeled - and can be brought into compliance - may inadvertently facilitate their destruction.
Require that every neighborhood have a variety of housing costs. No more north ends without apartment complexes. No more Garden Cities without a middle class.
Wealthy landowners don't seem to care about affordable housing. No regulation will change that.
Affordable housing is a vague term. I'm all for housing that is truly affordable, but \$1500 a month is still not affordable. What should rent be for a person earning minimum wage? That's what affordable housing is and I've not seen any so far.
The market does not indicate what income Boiseans are taking in and their ability to function and survive in the valley.
Realize that AMI is figured on GROSS income; however, people have to live day-to-day on their NET income, so while I may make 98% of AMI, after taxes I only make 65% of AMI and have to live off that. That makes a huge difference in the amount of rent I can actually afford.
using the word affordable housing is misleading. If you are going to use the term you need to set a value of what affordable is, and make sure the price is set
No. This is not an issue of creating affordable housing. This is an issue of supply & demand, an inability to construct homes at an adequate rate, and a resistance by a minority to seek higher income in a rising wage market. Boise is changing, and it's residents need to adapt.
While we agree that increased density is important, it will be a recipe for disaster if the city doesn't make VAST improvements to public transportation. While I understand public transportation planning and investments are outside the scope of P&Z, they must work in tandem if the goal is to increase density. Specifically, the city must first commit to investing in alternative, more attractive public transportation that middle-to-upper class residents will actually use (eg think BARTs full of working residents and that are safe for adolescents to take on their own-- with lines of service running close to their houses and reaching across the valley, rather than our current state of empty buses mainly used by homeless and/or people with substance abuse and/or mental health problems with few lines of service). That is, we need to make transportation feasible, realistic, useful BEFORE (or at least CONCURRENT WITH) implementing a city P&Z policy that will have the effect of decreasing room for private vehicles as it increases density.
-fast track permitting -allow existing structures to add units to new upper levels.
Downtown is becoming blocked in with too many high rises and way too many hotels and hotel looking rental structures. Hoping this doesn't spread out from the blocks of density we already have. So many giant buildings have encroached on the Basque block and ruined the vibe there.
Measurements do not necessarily translate to affordable housing.
yes, non residents who own a non revenue home should pay 2x property tax, non residents who own revenue housing should pay 4x property tax. Then allow truly needy people a housing credit as a result of this higher property tax rate. Idaho residents would pay zero property tax.
AS LONG AS THE "CITY LEADERS" BELIEVE THERE IS A HOUSING SHORTAGE AND KEEP ALLOWING SO MANY OUT OF TOWN INVESTORS TO TAKE OVER BOISE, IT WILL ONLY GET WORSE.
If affordability is the goal, it needs to start with what is required of developers. Why shouldn't they be required to build as many affordable units as higher end units
So far, more housing has not made housing more affordable to locals. It has made homes more affordable in comparison to the housing markets elsewhere but not for the average income of current residents. It will line the pockets of developers and still price seniors out of their homes and apartments. Restrict short term rentals, allow for more small private backyard rental units/mother in law suites. Be selective and strict with development contracts to promote housing the existing residents over marketing to out of staters.
Force developers to create mixed high/low income housing communities.
Why are you trying to put more people where there is no room??? Just let them wait for existing homes or move elsewhere. If a restaurant is full do you keep cramming more tables in the same space or do you accept they must wait for an open table or go elsewhere...COME ON!
Flexibility in units and bedrooms allows Boise to create more creative and beautiful (ie. dense U shaped apartment buildings with courtyards) like those found in the North End.
I don't think there are any zoning regulations that can control the housing market. By "affordable", you might mean smaller with fewer amenities, therefore cheaper. I think we have a greed problem right now and people are in need of the money they are being offered for their homes. We should probably examine why there is such a big income disparity in Boise if we are wanting to understand the need for low income housing.
Expand city limits east and south.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Require s calculated amount of "green space" per new residential area such as neighborhood playgrounds and park spaces.
This is a bigger, more complex question than a yes/no answer.
No parking minimums
If you create more affordable housing AND allow the development of huge subdivisions of houses for the rich, you will ruin Boise's quality of life. Everyone needs to rein in their expectations for the good of the community.
Allow for subdivision of tiny homes or other modular type. Do not allow for individuals to incorporate into the existing neighborhood unless majority of neighbors agree.
Higher density doesn't mean more affordable
It depends on the density requirements. We need them to be higher and higher closer to the city to help cut down on traffic. In NW the Percentage of people utilizing bus or bicycle to get downtown is pretty low. 6 miles is just a long way for most people when you have to zig zag through quiet neighborhoods for safety. Could small take out food or groceries be provided closer to homes?
Your department has killed more affordable housing efforts than it approves due to arbitrary criteria. The city planning department is an affordable housing killer, not facilitator.
Leave our open spaces - build towards Mountain Home
Require some affordable housing near higher-income developments?
At the present time, more developers and builders are concerned with lining their pockets with money than getting families into affordable housing. Limiting investors ability to outbid common families who are struggling to find affordable real estate would be more helpful.
People who need affordable housing still need space to live. Don't cram them in so tight.
What is the intended result? More units than currently allowed? If that's the intended result, be honest with the community and identify the actual density range.
Explicit allowances for housing intended to serve low-income/unhoused persons.
Protect already developed neighborhoods. Develop wisely.
No
Mixed housing requirements may be helpful
Move affordable housing out of the expensive downtown area.
I don't know but someone has to do something to regulate affordability of housing in this city. It is awful what is happening to low income people, families and seniors.
just building more will not make housing more affordable. developers and realtors will continue to cater to those with the money to increase their profits.
In my experience, developers are really not motivated to create affordable housing and I don't believe these changes will encourage it.
No
Lower property taxes. Let the people get creative with their own money.
Allow the tiny house test to be longer than 6 months to demonstrate full potential
To try and get affordable housing, the restrictions on how structures look need to be greatly relaxed. Unique structures are not found in affordable housing, the same simple structure that can be reproduced many times very quickly helps produce affordable housing. But nobody likes seeing those types of developments because they are an eye sore.
Unlikely- see above. Worth a shot.
affordable housing brings a slew of crime and the eventual degradation of property - stop acting like this isn't an inevitable reality.
I do want to see more affordable housing types.
one thing doesn't have anything to do with the other. sorry, this is a poor question.
Keep working towards allowing regular folks build ADUs so their families can age in place. There's many of us who are owner-occupied homeowners that want to help, but it's too expensive to develop a tiny home or an ADU on our property. We'd love to do a long term rental someday to help ease this burden.
There is no way the proposed regulation would achieve the intended result. The fundamental idea that smaller and cheaper housing will be more affordable is untested and suspect. Why should existing neighborhoods should suffer in support of an arbitrary, and unmeasured goal of affordability? This is feel-good regulation, with no proven benefit.
Reducing the Cost of development and restrictions on resale are the best way to support adorable housing
Allow higher buildings especially around downtown and on the bench
Implement owner occupied rules to prevent corporate landlord situations
We need more affordable housing no matter what

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Oversight, enforcement, consequences
Again, any development planning should be context sensitive to the neighborhood that is being impacted. More input needs to be considered from neighborhood associations regarding developments if you want to see better projects and/or more affordable housing types.
Developers look to maximize profit on projects. Not sure building codes alone will encourage affordable design.
No increase in density. That torpedoes quality of life.
This will just encourage developers to push as many houses as close together as they can to increase their profit. There is nothing desirable about living with neighbors on top of you, but people buy because there are no other options.
Craning more people into smaller places will NOT make Boise a better place to live.
I feel like you are masking the true goal here- which is to make certain people rich.
But your efforts to cram high density housing in is turning Boise into Los Angeles. You ignored our neighborhood's minimum lot size of 1 acre and destroy the wonderful rural feeling to get taxes and give money to contractors. Stop ruining Boise. People are leaving big cities like LA for a reason. The mayor's goal to turn Boise into another Seattle or Portland is terrible, and she's annexing County areas and destroying neighborhoods and dedicated parkland in the SW where most Vity Councilmen don't live.
There should be rules that require new development to fit the style of the surrounding neighborhood to prevent odd out of place construction. As an example there are tiny homes in neighborhoods that have homes on moderate size lots. The tiny narrow homes don't fit in. I have also seen huge modern homes built in mid century style well cared for neighborhoods, and the large 'mansion' house looks out of place and dwarfs the neighbor homes which looks ridiculous and probably blocks the sunlight to the neighbor's home. Unless a neighborhood is totally run down and in need of being rebuilt on each lot, I think new construction should respect the character of the neighborhood as a whole.
Incentives for affordable housing
People come to Boise for the "outdooriness" of this city! If you allow developers to pile cookie cutter buildings/crap- why would people continue to come here. I moved from Atlanta- that city has absolutely no heart/soul - please just discriminate on what you allow to come into this city! I don't want to move again
If people didn't have to build homes that 'fit in' with their neighbors, perhaps affordable homes could be built, and demonstrate the importance or diversity
But hopefully not at the cost of pure density.
Number of buildings on a residential lot should depend on size, type, use, design, setbacks, available services, parking, emergency access, etc., not by the current outdated codes. DO IT NOW!!
Limit the number of multi family units in established neighborhoods.
It's too late.
The developers will always seek the most profit, not affordability.
No, again it's about money. How much profit can be made. Further, as long as most of the developers are from out-of-state, they have no commitment to the community other than turn a profit for their clients/shareholders.
Possibly, but the maximum height is still too short. 45 feet is quite low for downtown or already urbanized areas where one would expect to see a large multi story structure (e.g. the west side of federal way, overland, maple Grove/Fairview areas) This is in reference to the heights in table 11-04.2
Nobody is ever going to build affordable housing until it's more profitable to do so than it is to build higher margin projects.
conform to the "dark skies" initiative for outdoor street lighting.
"Affordable housing" is a relative term. Build MORE housing and the price will come down. Right now, any apartments that are built for "affordable" are sucked up by university students with low to no income. Build more apartments. With lots of parking.
Allow various dwelling sizes within a range.
I think that more vouchers should be available to low income individuals and more low income apartment buildings along bus routes.
I think putting maximum heights on new construction to no higher than any other residential home in the neighborhood would help limit big developers from making a bunch money by charging exorbitant rent and instead encourage individual homeowners to invest in creative secondary dwelling units on their property.
Set aside a percentage of affordable units per development.
Affordable housing in Boise currently is unachievable. Making these changes allows for greedy developers to maximize profits by fitting more people into smaller spaces reducing quality of life. It will also increase crime, especially domestic violence.
If it's going to be more affordable, they are going to build smaller apartments on less land. Plus, it depends on WHO OWNS the "affordable" housing.
Is there a way to require a certain amount of affordable housing for new developments?
Will probably encourage more apartments, which is fine depending where. Usually single family dwelling owners don't like having a huge apartment complex build next door.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>Maybe, but it all depends on how much stock is created and what incentives and restrictions are in place. Developers are generally greedy and they have more power and money than members of a neighborhood. If a developer wants to build fancy condos that only Californians moving here can afford, there's not a lot stopping them from doing so since they can legally do whatever is allowed within the zone they build in OR the zone they seek to maximize a build through a rezone. Simply making buildings "fit" more with neighborhood character does not automatically mean that a new building will allow for more affordable units. To do this, there need to be higher impact fees that support bike and pedestrian connections (working with ACHD), stronger and enforced neighborhood plans, a cleaner and more equitable understanding of median income in renting a place and in purchasing power for a home, and a clearer pathway to support mass transit which is woefully under-developed throughout Boise and the Treasure Valley. Without good transportation, in particular, we only continue to encourage the use of cars, which will further contribute to the growing traffic problem we're experiencing as more folks are pushed away from the downtown core and bench areas.</p>
	<p>But not in a way that will actually make housing affordable to Boiseans. Just affordable to investors, which defeats the purpose. It also can lead to diminished quality of life for those who live in very crowded areas without much public space.</p>
	<p>More inclusive wording as stated above.</p>
	<p>can the city mandate building affordable - as in truly affordable - housing?</p>
	<p>Unfortunately the idea of affordable housing in Boise has been ruined by all the growth and demand for housing and infrastructure that does not exist. You can attempt to have it built but need to concentrate on high density, multiple family units that are close to a transit system (that also barely exist).</p>
	<p>developers are scum, they could care less what we think all they want is the money and screw the people.</p>
	<p>Outside space is just as important as inside space</p>
	<p>encourage wheelchair accessible and muli generational housing</p>
	<p>Set specific development criteria subject to P&Z review and have some type of way that a qualified, valid appeal can be made</p>
	<p>Density is not a good idea.</p>
	<p>Providing adequate sidewalks is fine, but what good are they if property owners neglect to shovel the snow off of them and allow bushes and trees to grow over them so much that pedestrians are forced to walk in the street?</p>
	<p>Build taller.</p>
	<p>We need denser housing options that do not compromise the aesthetics of the surrounding area.</p>
	<p>Not unless it's codified. Affordable housing requirements would need to be part of the code for all new developments in order for it to happen.</p>
	<p>Case by case basis. Listen to the neighborhoods not developers.</p>
	<p>Increase density to accommodate more people.</p>
	<p>Street frontage requirements need to be reduced or eliminated so that more properties are eligible.</p>
	<p>I don't understand what you mean by this. Near me there was one house on one lot,, average yard. Now there are eight houses crammed in there. This is not Innovative it's terrible. Look at the older subdivisions, North and East End North West End, Jordans Landing, etc. Those are the kind of houses we need. they're all mixed in together. Small, medium, large, duplexes, fourplexes, condos, townhouses. Even Harrison Boulevard has duplexes on it, but you don't notice them cuz they fit.</p>
	<p>More affordable housing types will ruin the charm of Boise. Please keep building codes the way they are.</p>
	<p>Some apartments should become condos, so young families could own instead of rent.</p>
	<p>Developers are not going to build affordable housing on their own, and this change will not affect that. They will continue to build luxury apartments and townhomes that maximize their profits. Additionally, smaller lot sizes mean more houses packed into neighborhoods that have been single-family home neighborhoods for years. Recent developments already show looming townhomes and apartment complexes shoehorned into neighborhoods filled with one-story, single family homes. It's really unfortunate for people who bought homes expecting their investment in a neighborhood to maintain value.</p>
	<p>Yes cause with more density these developers will realize it's more profitable to not overcharge tenants to break even. When they can fill more units and still be affordable and keep them investors financially happy.</p>
	<p>This gets solved by encouraging more townhome and apartment/condo projects... probably along major arterials or in areas where they fit (Hyde Park).</p>
	<p>This does not result in low income housing. It results in increase density, parking problems, increase in crime light pollution, and a general decrease in the quality of life for neighborhoods. Do you know units sell for the same as the single-family residence that was removed. Doesn't work</p>
	<p>Ship the burdens to the developers who are making a substantial profit on any development include a percentage for affordable housing and actually publish what legally is approved affordable housing rent prior to permitting; and use current prices/sales in Boise Idaho 2022</p>
	<p>Separate Multi family units from traditional housing single family units.</p>
	<p>A certain amount of green space required per sqft of bldg</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Unsure. Very concerned about investors overtaking housing inventories thereby locking individuals out of the ability to buy homes. Also private homeowners having an unregulated "business" in renting out ADUs (ie: those who use housing as a business and yet are shielded from any regulation or accountability)</p>
<p>Distinguish between air bnb type dwelling and affordable housing so that affordable housing is prioritized</p>
<p>Affordable housing must be determined by the consumer. Building low income housing projects with good intentions is exactly how ghettos begin.</p>
<p>I don't know.</p>
<p>These changes do nothing to prevent corporations from buying up all the available housing and increasing rent. This does nothing to make housing more affordable.</p>
<p>The city roads and current housing do not allow new buildings to be built without making more problems. We have housing but most people cannot afford it.</p>
<p>Allow ADUs in the historical zones, (which are close to the CBD) ...without the additional administrative and approval burden</p>
<p>I believe to have affordable housing built in Boise - the city should take the lead and set-a-side land within or along side of subdivisions for affordable houses to be built. This would allow an inclusive neighborhood. It would also help eliminate isolate houses that may identify with project type houses for the less monetary advantaged.</p>
<p>It's all over priced</p>
<p>Keeping planning costs down and less regulations will help keep building costs down. IE: asking for new homes to require upgraded electric panels for maybe someone who can afford an e car is getting passed down into the house cost. Further hurting the low income.</p>
<p>This all sounds like it is designed to make money for developers. How will you keep neighborhoods affordable besides this? New Small housing will just end up ridiculously expensive and ruin old neighborhoods</p>
<p>Developments should include a certain percentage of homes that are designed to fit into a community, but are smaller and less expensive.</p>
<p>By writing into code/laws that the NIMBYs aren't allowed to have a say in these things.</p>
<p>Costs are cost. Construction and materials are expensive. The City should look at other places that have used National programs to rehabilitate historic buildings that are already here and do not need to be built, and do not need to send more materials to the dump. Read some things from PlaceEconomics and open your eyes--it is cheaper to rehab a historic building, and oh my goodness it's actually GREEN. Not everything needs to be NEW.</p>
<p>Possibly. However, there is an equally important issue of no affordable middle class housing. I do not understand why the City does not offer incentives to developers to include 'affordable' (350k or so) single family homes. Owning your own home is not only the American dream, but, a generational method to escape poverty</p>
<p>I don't think they care that the locals are being priced out of the area. This has happened to many towns across the US.</p>
<p>Aren't there grant opportunities? How do we get opportunity zones in Boise city limits?</p>
<p>Yes, but only because it will allow smaller dwellings. Not necessarily better housing. It's just fitting more people into a smaller space, which isn't always good.</p>
<p>Not sure, but we need more affordable housing immediately.</p>
<p>Developers will always want the biggest ROI, affordability de damned.</p>
<p>Smaller units could = more affordable, but there is no incentive for a landlord to charge any less than market rate. Owners need to either be required or incentivized to build affordable units.</p>
<p>not sure since to develop 'affordable housing' has criteria that may or may not work well with density calculation and/or design criteria</p>
<p>Fill existing large lots along major arterials for multiple family complexes with multiple floor units requiring one or more elevators with each floor dedicated to ADA accessibility.</p>
<p>Why would this regulation encourage the development of affordable housing? Why would a developer invest in affordable housing???? Real affordable housing will only be built if it is backed by the government and this needs to focus on those making 60% of the Area Median Income</p>
<p>promote for purchase with condo fee/HOA style apartments over rental units. rental units never give wealth to the renter. this is all a bandaid until they can actually rise with the tide.</p>
<p>Yes, make it a requirement to provide real affordable housing.</p>
<p>The city needs to hold builders to an ethical standard.</p>
<p>The weakness of the ordinance is that it encourages cramming as many homes as possible into a property, something the current ordinance attempts to avoid with the homes per acre ratio. My concern is that developers will exploit the drive for "affordable" homes by overloading a development with homes stacked right next to each other. The short term gains of housing must be measured against how these developments will age and their value into the future.</p>
<p>more apartments and house bought up by investors does not improve costs of houses</p>
<p>Focus on realistic housing choices, not such slick designer options. Simple, function, solid,m housing that is green and small footprint.</p>
<p>Allow tiny homes</p>
<p>Make sure the people that need the housing can get it. I'm tired of those that need it have been passed by</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Think about zoning with reasonable caps and limits on various parameters including density caps better buffer and transition zones, true thought out transportation plans, etc. Don't create a plan that assumes others can be adequately caused to or incented to solve problems that the city should be solving simply by causing existing property owners to lose out on more and more of their quiet enjoyment of their property. Act in a manner to truly avoid creating new problems
	Developers and builders are about making money. They will only develop affordable housing if the profit margin for them equals that of high end development.
	Affordability is not addressed by this change or the code in question.
	Listen to the residents
	Government shouldn't be in housing unless it wants to own it. Many cities try and fail in U.S. and this is just the same policy in different town that has failed everywhere before. Why we don't look external and learn from other cities is beyond my comprehension.
	Incentives for smaller housing units on small lots, duplexes, four-plexes, townhouses, etc. with design criteria, and some type of faster track permit review.
	While affordability is an admirable goal, This is largely market forces and out of the hands of the city government.
	Allow AUDs in areas with plenty of parking.
	Loosen restrictions on density, require pedestrian and cycling access and connections.
	Make new development exclusively pay its way in order to develop. Otherwise you will have to burden the existing homeowners with additional costs to carry new infrastructure costs along with maintenance of existing infrastructure and services. The result will be increased taxes across the board thereby further increasing the cost of affordable housing.
	Remove ridiculous parking space requirements, i.e. per bedroom! Especially in neighborhoods where there is plenty of on street parking.
	Idaho doesn't care about what people can afford. It's all about how much money it can make. Idaho is about greed and power and to hell with the people who live here!
	There needs to be a minimum size of a space so apartments don't be come not so cheap "cells" like a prison. And therefore a tenement.
	Build low income housing in the north and east of Boise. Quit importing Muslim Jihadis and illegals to the Bench. If you love those scumbag so much why don't you put some of your f***neighborhood. socialist CUNT BAG
	Our prices will regulate themselves no matter what steps government takes to attempt to control prices.
	Smaller apartment buildings scattered within neighborhoods, like ten to 12 units with first level parking instead of huge apartment buildings.
	I am strongly against high density housing in established historic neighborhoods that do not have the infrastructure in place to support increase in cars and congestion. New development should NOT negatively impact existing neighborhoods. For example- the proposed housing development is WAY TOO BIG for the existing neighborhood and would have negative impact on the existing neighborhood.
	But only if we start placing some limits on short-term rentals. Those are already choking my neighborhood in the east end and taking away rentals for low-income residents.
	Clamping down on what developers are allowed to build near single family homes. You should not be allowing apartment buildings in the middle of neighborhoods. Land is so valuable in Boise that developers will do anything to achieve their goal. The city must stand up for single family home neighborhoods.
	It seems that the city's definition of "affordable housing" does not match the current economic realities.
	It depends on what you view as the "intended result" ... The City should be working to see that all Boiseans have a CHOICE in the type of housing they wish to live in ... high density is just not for everyone and should not be forced upon people.
	But that depends on lots of other factors....
	Stop letting rich get richer with big luxury developments like the one built on top of my face. I have no tv reception now. A road is surrounding every single side of my house. Boise just wants to make the rich richer and let the poor die of exposure. The luxury homes ripped up my street and are directly behind a mobile home lot. The zoning makes no sense whatsoever. You sold your soul to rich buyers. They have already won.
	Create affordable zone overlays to require that new residential structures have at least X% (maybe 50?) of units available for area median income (at varying levels to ensure that a diverse set of people can live in a variety of neighborhoods)
	With a mixture of dwelling units, it provides a unique opportunity to accommodate people of all incomes. Also, they don't need to be built with the most expensive material and furnishings.
	hopefully...fingers crossed!
	Remove minimum parking requirements
	You can mandate affordable housing. You build it and as soon as the time restraints on it are done, the price goes up. Just more liberal thinking that government can control economics.. stupid..
	More flexibility alone won't increase affordable housing. This needs to be paired with incentives or affordability requirements.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>" The Module 2 draft includes new ways to provide more predictability regarding compatibility between homes and more intense uses (like schools, hotels or other businesses) next to them. The draft would require the following:</p> <p>A maximum building height of 35 feet for any portion of the higher intensity building located within 100 feet of the low-density residential use OR an additional 10 feet of side and rear setbacks for the higher intensity building if it exceeds 35 feet in height.</p> <p>A maximum height limit of 20 feet for outdoor light poles and wall mounted light fixtures on the higher intensity property if they are located within 50 feet of homes.</p> <p>Additional landscaping and screening requirements on the higher intensity property.</p> <p>Limitations on the location of parking areas, drive-through lanes, or circulation driveways between the higher and lower intensity buildings.</p> <p>These regulations are found in Section 11-04-03.4.</p> <p>Do you feel the proposed changes will help protect existing residential neighborhoods and reduce potential conflicts between residential and non-residential land uses?</p> <p>Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?"</p>	<p>Regarding the lighting poles & wall-mounted light fixtures, the height limit sounds good. Is there a way to specify directional angles as well, so they are focused as much on parking and pedestrian areas and as little as possible toward neighboring houses (esp windows but even patios & porches)? Also, is there already an expectation of down-lighting only, to help with a "dark skies" type initiatives? That would be helpful.</p>
	<p>The distance needs to be higher and height needs to be lower.</p>
	<p>As long as this regulates commercial / residential boundary areas and is not used as a means to place apartments in single family neighborhoods</p>
	<p>These rules leave out the need for open space and continue to seek to accommodate developers insatiable greed for more profits. Stop trying to make developers happy and focus on what the citizens need and care about.</p>
	<p>a 10' setback is NOT adequate to protect sun rights from an adjacent 60' building.</p>
	<p>Make a requirement to limit outdoor lighting. Outdoor lighting should require a hood to reduce light pollution and neighbors who have floodlights that leave on at night makes it hard for their neighbors to sleep and pollutes the night sky</p>
	<p>STOP so much light pollution!!!!</p>
	<p>I think there needs to be more willingness to expand the high density zones close to the downtown core. In my opinion, rules like this continue to put boundaries on the downtown core, which continues to force development in the "suburbs". I understand why people who live adjacent to the high density zones dislike this idea, but at the end of the day they live in a city and need to accept that these changes are good for the long term health of the city, not to mention their property values.</p>
	<p>The height needs to include the highest point of the roof, not just the wall height, as this is misleading. Your sketch uses a flat roof to fool people, yet we don't generally build flat roofs here. An additional 10 foot setback to 45 feet for no set maximum height is too vague, as this could be a 6 or 7 story building only 45 feet from a single level home. Need a more compatible series of stepped-up heights to set back combos.</p>
	<p>Require "dark sky lighting" for all outdoor lighting.</p>
	<p>Dark money will make all obstructions etc go away. No tax breaks!</p>
	<p>Why are we changing density when it hurts existing home owners? This is not right.</p>
	<p>Without a stated limit on maximum height, it's impossible to know whether an additional ten feet will provide much protection to existing residential homeowners or neighborhoods. If 35 feet, then perhaps. If 100 feet, then it would make little to no difference.</p>
	<p>I don't believe so. I think people are apt to complain regardless.</p>
	<p>Incentivize parking underground. A ten foot setback does not provide equity for the neighbors nor those living in the high density units. Density should not be sacrificed for mental health green space and access to city resources.</p>
	<p>What are they now? I would prefer both be 100 feet minimum</p>
	<p>Possibly..this would have been nice to consider for the two homes on Castle as they both sit on the property line and impeded the homes on each side. Good idea..but needs more work</p>
	<p>There should be height limits considered for new residential housing where it neighbors older houses too. ie: large new homes or townhomes looming over older/smaller homes.</p>
	<p>Require lights to be at ground level as opposed to 20 foot light poles to prevent light pollution.</p>
	<p>I'm not sure that there is a realistic way to protect existing residential neighborhoods without limiting investor demographics and interests.</p>
<p>I'm not sure, sorry.</p>	
<p>more space for natural light between smaller units and largest units</p>	
<p>It will help, but it depends on the commercial property.</p>	
<p>This is not an acceptable solution.</p>	
<p>I believe the height requirement may be perceived as arbitrary unless it is considered a "best practice." The requirement for limitations on the location of parking areas, drive-through lanes, or circulation driveways between the higher and lower intensity buildings is really the crux and should be engineered in favor of the homeowner and neighborhood.</p>	
<p>Ten feet of additional set back is not enough to limit the impact of a 45ft tall monolithic building being built right next to a 1947 20ft ranch home. More set back should be required or the 35ft max height should be paired with the 10ft set back.</p>	
<p>Careful planning for the future will maintain standards for lasting value.</p>	
<p>Unsure</p>	
<p>There should be a gradual change in height of building structures if it exceeds 35 feet. I do not think it looks good or helps the existing property owner to have a drastic change, even with the additional 10 ft</p>	
<p>Is the City of Boise considering light pollution at all?</p>	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Again, the emphasis does not seem to be on protecting existing residential neighborhoods.
	not in all places in Boise we have no city water, sewer or sidewalks or a single fire hydrant this need to be fixed.
	Height is only one aspect of intensity of use, and not the most important one. Trip generation would be a much better gage of comparability of neighboring uses. Where it makes economic sense to build 3 stories or greater next to single level residential is almost always where the residential is an underutilization of the property.
	There should be limited mixing of residential and nonresidential properties.
	The requirement is too lax... requirement should be a greater distance from residential property.
	I would like to see more light pollution measures, such as dark-sky compliant light fixtures, motion-sensor activated lights instead of dawn-to-dusk light sensor activated lights, and down-directed lighting where it is needed.
	An additional design code you could add is more facade material changes to prevent the side of the building being an eye sore for the nearby homeowners.
	Even greater distances imposed on high intensity buildings would be better.
	I like the landscaping requirements. If developers are going to end up building to maximize usage in a space, landscaping screening requirements will help homeowners/residents maintain an adequate level of comfort. I suggest having developers be responsible for maintenance (for a certain amount of time) on landscaping, trees, etc that they install.
	10 feet is such a small distance. Who wants to live buy a business that close! People have no respect for property any more.
	There will always be conflict. Designate areas around downtown as high rise areas, build up to 8 stories or so.
	See first note for my opinion
	The more space the better
	while this might help with families applying solar panels to their roof you could instead raise the limit to 50 feet per lot and allow residents to sell or lease the air space (the height of 50 feet minus house height) to other residents/businesses. take the approach of new york for example.
	Further setback from road to add additional greenery to screen.
	Stop building in Boise
	I am unsure at this time.
	I believe in higher integration of mixed use zoning.
	We have limited land, so we need taller buildings to fit more dwelling units
	Keep more space between buildings. Less space is a fire hazard - ask Paradise, CA.
	What about noise?
	n/a
	There is lots of high density apartments going in all over the valley. You do not need to infill with high density.
	This sounds very helpful.
	why would high intensity properties be approved next to single family residences? stupid idea. whoever is approving this should be fired
	Yes, but: Also apply this to new/remodel residential homes. I see large/tall additions to residential homes having the same negative impact on existing homes as a business would.
	Incentivize pedestrian and bike development over cars.
	Car traffic is a bigger nuisance to homes than commercial buildings are, so in my opinion it's more important to focus on traffic/parking/drive-throughs than building characteristics. Streetlights are also a nuisance, and their illumination impact should be minimized to reduce light pollution.
	Partially. feel bigger setbacks might be necessary
	Don't allow hotels or large structures in a residential space.
	I hope so but I know people will find loopholes.
	Not sure how restricting the height of light poles would be an improvement. The lower the pole, the more light is likely to shine directly on a window.
	Houses are being allowed to be built too close together the way the rules are established now. There should be more space between houses. The CBH and Hubble homes are good examples of cramming.
	Horrible idea. We don't want apartments next to our houses.
	35 feet may restrict commercial or multifamily construction which should be encouraged . Remove the 35 ft tall restriction or allow a review process to consider and approve outside the 35 ft.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Did you forget you are in Idaho. People like their space and are largely opposed to multi unit dwellings anywhere near single dwelling homes.
Have the business provide fencing and landscaping to mitigate the noise? This is a great proposal and I support it.
adequate parking without infringing on neighbors is important
No three story development should be allowed outside the half mile of major roads like state street.
Existing residential neighborhoods and zoning laws must be respected. There shouldn't be high density right next to SFH, for example.
The exterior lighting at schools needs to be regulated better to be toned down! The new Pierce Park Elementary School parking lot is like a football stadium at night and shines brightly into bedrooms! This must be changed and stopped. The school and commercial buildings have no right to encroach artificial light into residential private places !!!!!!!
Again, what are the rules you're changing from? I can't tell what the difference is, so I don't know if it is an improvement or not.
This change seems helpful. It doesn't address the increased traffic in the residential area leading to more pedestrian accidents.
Don't build over another's property's 'breathing room'. i.e. view, parking, yard spaces, privacy, etc.
Yes by speaking and listening to the public
Screening to reduce noise from higher intensity buildings. Restrictions on where things such as large trash receptacles are located.
Transitional density.
Don't know.
Ask the existing residents what would work for them...
While this regulation update would encourage the construction of larger buildings, I do not think it goes far enough. Aside from historic or preserved neighborhoods, I think it we should be encouraging dramatically larger density with a focus on walkability and pedestrian transport, and this regulation doesn't quite go far enough.
Ensure local neighborhood associations follow code as well (i.e. no tighter restrictions by neighborhood associations or HOAs)
Incentivize environmental restoration by requiring those who wish to exceed the maximums to plant a certain number of native plants.
Too high. We're losing trees and gaining eyesores.
You again are trying to push mass units on small land spaces. It is not welcome in existing single family home neighborhoods. You are trying to do it in ours on Victory (the Bench). What a horrible use of land that will be. All rentals. Did you know the crime in our neighborhood is majority from the rentals? Pride of ownership is a must. You are going to ruin our neighborhoods with mass units and rentals.
The regulation won't protect single family dwellings from lower market value due to the high density dwellings or the additional noise, traffic, and general annoyances of more people in one general location.
Implement minimum on-site parking requirements in an effort to avoid negatively impacting on-street residential parking.
Don't build high. You're blocking the beauty of Idaho for greed. It looks gross and not like Idaho at all when you stack buildings anyway! 3+ stories is too high
Disallow the industrial looking building shown on the right.
Include solar access and lot location. That house could be shaded forever now.
Affordable housing options should have greater leeway with max height
If you say in one regulation that you want to match the current neighborhood, how can you allow 2 or 3 story apartments to be built right next door? This is to allow all the apartments to continue to go up in every tract of land available with a 'nod' to existing homes.... No lights over 20ft, fencing, etc is all to benefit the current apartment zoning regulations and practices. No I do not know how to improve the wording except to stop building apartment buildings with every development approval.
Use non light polluting lights.
The 100ft is not enough. Neither is the set back change. It must be tiered more gradually. If the developer wants to buy the residential plot to make their development without this more gradual height change, they can make that business decision and do so. Again, the developer must fit the code, not adjust the code to fit better for the developer.
If a 45 foot building doesn't work on the property next to a single level house an extra 10 feet isn't going to make it better. Not sure what the answer is but perhaps if the extra 10 feet came with a tall landscaping requirement of planting already somewhat mature trees/bushes to minimize the impact.
Land owners should have the right to build on their property. If residential neighbors have an issue, they should form associations that purchase development rights from neighboring properties and place transferable liens on the property. Not utilize city code to limit what their neighbors can do.
A maximum building height of 35 feet for any portion of the higher intensity building located within 100 feet of the low-density residential use OR an additional foot of side and rear setbacks for the higher intensity building for every foot the higher intensity building exceeds 35 feet in height. (ie. 45' building requires 10' additional set back, 53' requires 18' additional set back)

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	When people buy property, they should have be aware of the fact it sits adjacent to a parcel that has the potential for non-residential uses. It's very easy and free to find this information, especially with our city's excellent front desk crew at P&Z.
	Not all low density residential is 35' tall. My house's roof apex is only at about 13' (single story). This code would do nothing for preventing even a two story house being butted up to my backyard from a large development (empty lot currently, rezoning as R3). I believe there also already exists varying setbacks for different story levels of the different residential densities, so this would do nothing to help me not have to worry about large 2-3 story townhouses being built right behind my house.
	Larger setback. More consideration to the design and how it fits into the neighborhood.
	Make each neighborhood the same. Make it still look like a neighborhood. Why does SE Boise have beautiful planters & landscaping along with Eagle but the stretch on Hill Rd parkway is just a weed filled muddy ditch.
	Stay out of existing neighborhoods!
	Focus more on affordable housing vs. commercial development.
	100dt is too close
	Questions should not be biased to give you the results that you seek.
	all lighting should be "dark sky" compliant. Downlighting, as to not shine in the windows of homes as well as causing light pollution
	Houses need to be further apart, it makes them visually more appealing plus allows the home owners/renters to have their own personal space for kids, pet, relaxation.
	No! All it would do is increase land use density and impeded sunlight to adjacent housing to building.
	When there is a community park in a residential area then the curb side of the parks should have no parking at the curb from dusk to dawn. There is too many people parking on these curbs and living on these curbs.
	Too much light in an area, going into bedrooms can be a problem.
	Bigger set backs and lower buildings with less nite lighting.
	No
	Climate change is going to raise the temperature and reduce precipitation. The proposed changes fail to take those realities into account, and are going to create arid heat "islands."
	I believe that creating more affordable housing should be a bigger priority then reducing potential conflicts between residential and non-residential uses. Maximum heights on buildings would decrease the possibility of creating more high-density housing. High density housing has the possibility to decrease prices.
	I think the extra 10 ft if rear and side setbacks should be used either way. More cushion.
	Control how many higher-density properties are allowed on blocks with existing homes. Don't surround and push out the homes.
	Historic areas must be preserved intact. No changes to zoning should be made for the older and more developed areas of Boise.
	also have tours of traffic corners at entries from residences into arterials or subarterials. Large vehicles parked on the street and overgrown shrubbery can block views. Maybe incentivize positive changes?
	for more than two story buildings, minimum outdoor setback should be 20 ft from the property line.
	I found this regulation particularly confusing. I think re-writing the way you're explaining it here could help people understand it better to form an opinion.
	Maybe a moratorium on building rapid expansion in entire valley for a period of time would let everything catch up?
	the people of Boise want NEIGHBORHOODS, not massive housing complexes
	People will still complain, so it's not really solving that problem. And it doesn't really do anything besides trying to mitigate neighborhood angst. Easing use as you approach residential should not be a concern.
	Do you want a 35 foot building next to your house?
	I feel that the 100ft distance between low-density residential and other non-residential buildings should be higher.
	Builders of structures like this don't leave any room for "screening" and are allowed to plant trees that have no room to grow. A lot of new developments look like ugly military base housing. It's truly awful what the City has allowed and I have no faith anything will be better with this module.
	But the new buildings are still too high for the historic homes that exist. The higher homes being built can still look into others backyards which really sucks for the rest of us who instead of tearing down a home have chosen to update it.
	Please incorporate considerations/regulations for new technologies like the 5G roll-out.
	Tell them to get over it or move.
	This seems more appropriate for Garden City Eagle and Meridian.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>The setbacks and the height are still far too aggressive. I built my house in Boise over 20 years ago, and a lot next to mine was subdivided multiple times, the land was taken built up approximately 3 feet higher than mine + it's a 2 story (on a lot that is far too small) and now I have a house right next to mine that looks right into my backyard every time the neighbors look out their back door. It's beyond creepy. My advice is to stop listening to the minority fringe on both sides, and don't forget about the current residents. If you want to build a high-density apartment complex, etc., you should not put it next to a single-family dwelling.</p>
	<p>35 feet is ridiculously low. Schools, Churches, Retirement homes, etc... also need appropriate roof pitches. They are also expected to have larger lot sizes and yards and play-grounds.</p>
	<p>Example that works. Schools have a perimeter around it that allows the non residential building and homes to co-exists in neighborhoods. This helps with traffic, parking, noise, lights and other irritants for surrounding homes. Example Albertsons 36th and State st.</p>
	<p>The landscape separation and screening needs to not create shadows and hiding areas. Lighting should be encouraged</p>
	<p>The second option should be the standard. Need additional 10 feet of side and rear set backs, no light casting outside of the foundation, additional landscaping and driveway limitations.</p>
	<p>I would recommend not having lighting at 20' in the are. Given the offets shown, it seems that light polution could reach the lower-density housing, particularly when lighting is added to the sides of the buildings. Recommend a lower light height (such as 10') as fences tend to be 8'-10' tall and I would hate to have a light shine right into my bedroom window.</p>
	<p>These are good rules and take into consideration many of the concerns I have heard raised.</p>
	<p>There are numerous examples in the north end in the north west end where new buildings not only dwarf their neighbors but do so with big blank walls. It looks terrible.</p>
	<p>The "loom factor" destroys the residential feel for single family homes that have tall structures built next door. I would require more of a space buffer, with landscaping, for new tall building going into a residential area.</p>
	<p>No sure.</p>
	<p>35' is hardly enough space between residential home much less a business district.</p>
	<p>These setbacks do not help if houses are further back on a large property and just beyond the setback limit. The setbacks should have a setback from property line regarding height and lighting and not just in relation to house distance. If an existing house is beyond 50 ft, say 55 ft, what protections does it have for light and height?</p>
	<p>Depending on business, restriction on hours of operation & deliveries. Ex. No deliveries at 6 am to a coffee shop located next to a house.</p>
	<p>Fix the existing roads, curb & side walks before adding a mess to the surrounding area.</p>
	<p>The animals, farm land and residents in northwest Boise would like to keep it how it is. No more high density housing and breaking up lots into mini subdivisions. With no new schools, stores, fire coverage, community centers or adequate public transportation this new proposal is a nightmare</p>
	<p>EVERYTHING IS BEING BUILT RIGHT ON TOP OF EACH OTHER - TOO MUCH GROWTH TOO FAST - THE INFRASTRUCTURE OF THE CITY CANNOT KEEP UP WITH THE GROWTH</p>
	<p>That's not enough distance to provide the residents with privacy, keep their natural light, or provide sound resistance.</p>
	<p>Don't allow commercial or apartments or low income development in residential areas with traditional homes</p>
	<p>Multi-level buildings next to single-level homes are of particular concern. Single-level dwellings have the right to privacy that must be respected. Allowing partial-level and multi-level dwellings to be built adjacent to single-level dwellings (commercial or otherwise) disproportionately punishes occupants for buying an existing, older home and not a new home. I cannot build a fence high enough to preserve privacy in this arrangement and trees don't grow as fast as new development.</p>
	<p>Lower the max height</p>
	<p>cramming more building in, and then screening them with fences and landscaping, just presents a lower level of safety. What hides screens also hides attackers and thieves. And high rise building near one-family residences takes away the views and ambient sunshine. The built Central Park in NYC to have incredible views, until the land around the Park was bought up and tall building built, surrounding the Park, cutting off the intended views and light</p>
	<p>Open green spaces, bike lanes and areas for parking need to be strongly considered for this kind of zoning. Maximum building height needs to be considered based on location in the valley. Interrupting views of the foothills and surrounding area</p>
	<p>35 ft with a greater setback such as 200 feet. New construction should not be able to block sunshine if an existing homeowner decides to put up solar panels on their property or put existing building in the shade.</p>
	<p>This is just silly. A two-story house next to a 3 story building looks weird at 15 feet, 45 feet, 100 feet. You should be focused on building micro commercial areas like Hyde Park in each of the neighborhoods districts.</p>
	<p>Throw out the regulation. Long time residents are good with the old regs!</p>
	<p>I agree with part one of the proposal, but do not feel confident that part two (additional setbacks) will be as effective.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

There is absolutely no reason to "protect" low density neighborhoods. They are a drain on the rest of the city's resources and should be given no special accommodation whatsoever.
There should be an alternative involving fencing that is managed by the higher intensity building's owner in dense areas. This requirement should be relaxed for in-fill projects. This requirement should not exist at all in the North End or Downtown.
no
I would hate to see this type of housing in some areas of town, it doesn't fit, as proposed. It would detract from the esthetics of some neighborhoods and make it look like things have been just thrown in to fill space, not thought out. However, there are newer homes that have been built in the East End that are huge and don't fit the neighborhood and would like to see this end. If you want to lump Boise historical East End in with the Northend, they have the same issues occurring with newer homes being built that are too big for the lot, tower over the surrounding homes and "stick out like a sore thumb". Do not allow this to happen.
Require all lights be shielded and night sky friendly Consider sun shading limits
not build commercial buildings around houses
Universal design implemented in all phases of design. Green space everywhere possible. Design that encourages walking/ biking/ and wheelchair access.
It really doesn't matter because the kickbacks the city gets from the developer in their exparte meetings always include another way for both of you to force your way of life onto others without any consequences. In my experience, the height of a building was offset by putting a dumpster and parking lot 20 feet from my back yard, and a ten foot encroachment on what is supposed to be a landscaped buffer, but is now a barren access road directly abutting the parking lot.
change downtown rules to allow more "in-city" multiple family units (with parking). Encourage open spaces, single family units and larger lots in area "out-city" (suburbs) areas.
Stop cramming new buildings into once rural areas that current residents still have acreage. You are forcing people out.
If you actually enforced the new changes it would be great. However, using the example of the proposed State & Arthur apartment project, it's obvious that you will not adhere to your own standards if it's not convenient
Stop paving farmland. Period. We live in a desert in case you missed it, water is limited and should go to FARMS. No farms = no food. Food does NOT come from grocery stores. Tell the developers to shove it. Stop lining your greedy, lying political pockets with their money and do your job you putz. I'm from Memphis, I'm not an idiot--more development means higher housing prices, there's no way around that. Stop paving farms. Period.
NO All that needs to be said is "MONEY TALKS".
Residents will have larger building looking down into their backyards. Loss of privacy.
That isn't enough setback.....more green space in between.
Smaller. More parking.
Avoid mixing the two zoning types.
I do believe this will help conflict between residential and non residential land uses but it's not necessarily the amount of space between houses and buildings. There should be fences and or a sound barrier between such.
Density downtown makes sense. Density in neighborhoods, not really
Is this why the strip malls being built have a weird extra level? No more strip malls. No more hideous apartment complexes.
10 feet is hardly a difference when a 200 foot tall building is next door to you. A 6 foot fence doesn't give you anymore privacy in these instances. Apartment living should be separate from single family homes.
Separation walls along with trees and shrubbery.
No billboards! Minimal signs in view from any street. People don't need signs to find businesses. Everyone uses smart phones to find businesses. Signs are plain ugly.
No
Why do we need this? Let the school be built how the builders want. Why should the school perfectly match the surrounding houses?
probably not
Photos help me understand better yes, anything to help keep our open spaces still remain protected and open which does include air space and views.
Keep high density housing away from single family homes
I'm not sure what the setback requirement is now, so I'm not sure how the current rules "protect existing residential neighborhoods and reduce potential conflicts between residential and non-residential land uses". I think we should be building as densely as possible though, generally speaking.
I think no matter what the code says, homeowners will be upset with change near their own home.
I like the maximum heights

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

the existing residential shouldn't be shadowed by new construction, i.e. ICCU at 4th and Idaho-that building will be a death blow to the low(er) cost housing in the neighborhood
Having mixed residential and non residential means people can walk instead of driving - that's a good thing
Stop building!
first option is better -- we don't need to waste precious land on big setbacks!
In addition to minimum setback, there should be some sort of minimum green space requirement.
look at intended users and look at the requirements that they need parking etc make sure it will fit into intended area
Kudos for addressing outdoor light pollution. More can be done in this regard.
Again it should go by individual project. A tall apartment buildings with windows or a outside patio area should not be allowed looking down in a existing home. It may work if building is designed with respect to the homeowner.
This could be a good start for new buildings going up in commercial corridors that are adjacent to existing neighborhoods. Meaning the first residential house next to a new building going up on a commercial corridor. However, I feel that the 35' limit is too tall for infill into existing residential neighborhoods. Your diagram shows a two story residential house, what it fails to illustrate is that the majority of single family residences in the older neighborhoods are single story mid century houses. A 35' building next to it would dwarf it, destroy the historic charm of the neighborhood, and impede the home owners right to privacy and natural light. There needs to be another code scenario where the max height depends on existing building heights of all neighboring buildings and perhaps if the height is not reduced, then the required set back is increased even for a 35' height. The required setback should be a ratio of height of proposed structure to the existing structures. This would be for residential infill, I do think that commercial cores such as Overland, Vista, and Orchard should welcome and encourage higher density as long as parking is adequately provided.
Lower height of buildings.
I think we run the risk of destroying single family neighborhoods but creating mixed use zoning in or directly adjacent to them. I also think it could create unsafe neighborhoods if mixed use and businesses are incorporated into SF neighborhoods. These mixed uses create more traffic and people flow, we need to make sure children can walk to and from Schools in their neighborhoods safely and adding traffic will make children less safe in their neighborhoods.
I like all of these changes and I like the requirement for a tall building to have 100ft of a 35ft tall section but am confused by the "OR" an additional 10 ft on side and rear if the building is over 35ft. That seems like a loophole. So the building can be 100ft tall as long as it's just 10 ft further away? That sounds horrible. It seems like every developer would make this choice and 10 ft seems like a very small area between a small house and a giant building.
Stop letting developers turn single-family plots into multi-family units. Require greater distance between buildings. Keep the density we have and let the incoming wave of neo-nazis, homophobes and racists move to Kuna instead of Boise.
Limitations on parking areas, etc between high and low intensity buildings may have public safety implications. Perhaps strike that recommendation.
100 ft isnt far enough away. If an existing home has a building like this built that close to it this could drastically reduce property value. The distance needs to be significantly farther away. At least 400-500 ft.
Not sure
I don't know, but if I grew my own food in my garden and a 2 story or 3 story building was constructed and blocked the sunlight, it would certainly decrease my quality of life. Maybe the new structures can't be taller than the existing structures next to them.
Please please allow mixed zoning
none i can think of
It seems reasonable but I'm unclear what is currently allowed or what is likely to result of this in practice.
If a Mountain view or other view is going to be obscured by the height of a building or pole ask the residence who are already there if that would bother them.
Keep non residential buildings away from neighborhoods, schools are literally the only exception. Take them to commercial streets (fairview, chinden, eagle, overland).
Create a flexible guideline that allows decisions to be made by individual cas
You people will approve about anything as it is so what good is this going to do?
Businesses should not be built in residential areas. Period. Boise is enough of a hodgepodge already from obviously not having better zoning laws from the beginning. New business buildings should not be allowed in residential areas at all.
Again – hopefully supporting more community-based low-income housing instead of large investment capital funded development.
Yes

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	I am soeaking only for the northend. I do not think this would fly in the outskirts of downtown. I think this fits in perfectly for the Northend. We love our neighborhood because we can walk to all the things we need, grocery stores, movies, work, school, haircuts, etc. I would love the feel of more density and more mixed use buildings. I would love to see some of the businesses downtown have dwellings upstairs. It gives a city a great vibe.
	I think this should be a site- and situation-specific analysis incorporating public education as well as public comment/feedback.
	These regulations appear to be written for new developments by developers. The zoning changes appear to allow new homes to flag-lot with older homes. This does NOT protect existing neighborhoods.
	No setback. Just a straight cap at 35 feet. I don't support this at all though.
	Maximum heights should be fixed at 35 feet period if the structure is adjacent to residential properties. Horizontal setbacks as described are not equivalent to vertical limits and should not be used interchangeably.
	More parking enforcement for outside of downtown
	I like it .
	The illustration for 45' building is a bit hard to understand
	Prioritize restaurants and grocery stores when considering businesses that want to open up near neighborhoods and housing developments. My household was disappointed when we learned a car dealership was opening just a block away from our home. How great would it have been if it was a grocery store? The walkability of our location would have been improved greatly!
	Extend distance to 300 feet
	10 feet is negligible.
	More lights and more signs and high buildings take away from Boise. IDAHO. It's suppose to be dark and country.
	This all feels like a way to help your real estate investor buddies more money... why don't you work for the working class, like ever???
	No I think you should follow what we have now.
	The design should be considered on a case-by-case basis with neighborhood input on whether the regulations meet the needs of the existing neighborhood.
	So if you are going to limit the height of light poles will this also affect the height of street light poles? Currently street light poles are anywhere fomr 25 to 40 feet in height? This should not impact the roadway lighting as it is designed for roadway safety.
	More setback less height
	An additional 10' of setback for high use buildings above 35' will not make much difference and should be removed so that all high use buildings within 100' of existing homes are no higher than 35'
	Not that I know of.
	This is a well-meaning idea, but it's not as important as affordability.
	Consider implementing dark sky regulation on any new projects
	Lol, no, 4-story apartment buildings next to single-family homes is going to be pure trash.
	Current home owners will still be mad about an apartment building being built, irregardless about how tall it is. Parking is important so that at least the people living in the apartments won't be parking in front of other people's homes.
	Build further away from historical areas, preserve neighborhoods, and improve public transportation. People over profit. Our neighborhoods are more important that corpora-tions. Schools (not BSU) and hospitals are the exceptions.
	Be careful of the type of lightning allowed. No vivid blue lighting. Perhaps shaded lighting geared to light only the property, but not cast light onto neighbors. Reflected light must also be considered along with the color of the building. Reflected light on a yellow building may really glow at night.
	This doesn't address parking conflicts, noise issues.
	Yes, don't put in high density next to low density. Plain and simple!!!
	No
	When residential and business areas merge, it is good for the residential people to feel that the business area becomes like an open space for them, breathing room, instead of stressed impact.
	Put new construction in open fields and leave quality of life for us alone.
	I think the jump from single family/single family to single family/multi story townhomes will destroy neighborhoods, regardless of setback.
	require that more buildings have under ground parking

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

It seems like the city just wants more density...wherever and whenever, and will adjust the "rules" to accomplish this.
I think it is important to mix commercial and residential use so people don't have to drive everywhere. I think these regulations will discourage that.
A height restriction would be wonderful, as it appears that now there is none. The site of the art deco Travis apartments is a great example of the city council's unwillingness to ensure a historic district - or structure - both which mean much more than money.
Keep things as they are. No one wants to live next to these.
reduce or eliminate overnight street parking in all business areas, reduce or eliminate street parking in residential neighborhoods
Get rid of all height limits and impose minimum heights for future development that will make all single family development in the area more expensive and encourage developers to build multi-family instead.
Yes. Increase the setbacks when height and mass is an issue. Residential living implies privacy and by reducing these setbacks you are taking that from homeowners who bought homes. Predictability is not seeing high and dense buildings in residential areas. You are misusing the concept of predictability. Predictability means that you do not impose your density wishes on residential areas. You keep density where density belongs, which is on busy arterials and commercial areas. Because you say you are coming to cut our hands off at the wrists, and you're talking about it and warning us that this will happen to create affordability (a myth), does not mean that it was a predictable event when it occurs.
Not likely. Again, cake scenario. Intentional and thoughtful design has a much better chance of solving/avoiding problems. Regulations are generally an afterthought bandaid, and an ineffective use of recourses.
This is a horrible idea. This is not zoning It sounds like you are trying to drive down neighborhood property values and force cheap apartment housing on what should be beautiful neighborhoods. This does not work. Zoning should not be a way to force people to accept your type of thinking
Use common sense approaches to this. Not let developers and higher tax revenue users force change where there are better options.
Again, you are trying to cram more housing into single housing areas - skeeming your way in getting what you want.
35 feet is too tall
Single family homes do not want anything other than single family homes next door.
The zoning in existing neighborhoods should not be altered to allow more intense development. I purchased my house with the current zoning in place and would feel like the rug was pulled out from under me if it changed.
Their interests are inherently opposed so a middle path is hard to predict
Minimum setback and height limits ok but NOT more regulations for developers. That will only lead to higher rents!
A staggered maximum height combined with a minimum set back would work better. For example: A commercial building would have a single level maximum height with a 20 foot set back and the building height could increase by one level every 30 or 40 feet. This would help preserve sun light and privacy.
No because it will just get amended later on. Please don't push out existing property owners
What makes you think there are high enough paying jobs in Idaho to support the massive growth of expensive apartments?
But people will always complain about change
These sound great to me!
There must be a physical and clearly visible division of some kind between parking and pass-through areas for businesses and driveways for homes, to discourage business patrons from occupying the space in front of homes and negatively impacting residents' ability to use that space.
Don't like bike lanes taking away from street parking.
Don't do it
Increasing street width requirements for large housing developments that require street parking so two cars can easily drive through with cars parked on both sides.
Don't allow commercial development within an established neighborhood. People buy homes in developed neighborhoods because that ensures security and little room for uncomfortable change.
Absolutely not, this is already a problem and encouraging bad designs in inappropriate areas will only make it worse.
35 feet is too tall. These options are misleading
Stop all the building.
Don't do it.
Windows should not look over private living areas in buildings taller than its neighboring house, or, include a wall for those second floors to look at, instead of my backyard or into my kitchen window.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Do not try to control the predictability regarding compatibility between homes and more intense uses. The only need is a neighborhood notice of intent to build that allows the local individuals to discuss and negotiate.
Don't build so many buildings.
It will look better but there will always be conflicts with major changes to the neighborhood.
Require physical viewing of the areas to be developed.
We can not allow all new development to be high density residential.
Prefer not to answer.
Yes a 100ft buffer and a screening fence to limit the loss of privacy. Additionally loss of south facing access to the sun should be considered as not acceptable or reimbursable financially.
Established neighborhoods don't need multi level apartments. We bought our houses to not have apartments looking into our yard. We enjoy our privacy and expect to have that respected.
People will still feel crowded at 100 feet away when tall buildings are put in place. There will also be more traffic and parking becomes a problem. There's also the issue that it changes how a community our established neighborhood feels. Not a great option.
I think it's still too relaxed for requirements. I don't think it'll adequately protect existing neighborhoods.
Stop Californians from moving here
All new development should have rigorous storm water runoff controls in place to protect the environment. This is especially important where commercial buildings are next to residences. They should have green roofs, swales, filter strips, and whatever else it takes to keep potential pollutants out of the surface and ground water.
Don't allow high density areas next to low density.
building height must not exceed 5 feet above adjacent structures for any portion of the higher intensity building located within 100 feet of the low-density residential use AND an additional 20 feet of side and rear setbacks for the higher intensity building if it exceeds 35 feet in height.
I just don't like mixing large multi unit buildings in with single family residences.
High buildings even farther away can still be undesirable depending on the area
Limit any outside lighting to the recommendations of the International Dark Sky Association.
N/a
HELLO?! Have you actually driven around the valley recently? The suburban ghetto does not represent Boise. Or what Boise used to be... SAVE Murgoitio Park!! Stop going back on long standing promises!! The land needs to remain an OPEN SPACE AS PROMISED!!
Add barrier wall specs to enhance privacy/security for adjacent housing.
More distance between dwellings and commercial properties. So, it sucks that my neighbors can see in my yard because they had to build a huge energy wasting boring house 290 feet away from ours.
Setbacks for medium to high density, depending on impact for egress & ingress, should be allowed to have a variance applied for by the builder. Some lots work for medium to high density & make sense with surrounding buildings, businesses, homes, but because of setbacks, the number of doors are reduced which causes the per-door price to be higher than necessary further exacerbating the lack of affordable housing.
Cramming people and businesses in because of your greed will not end up well.
Your visual diagram shows a two story house set up on a foundation estimated five feet. So a single story house will not have the same visual with a 35" building set beside. This illustration is misleading. Therefore I believe the set backs should be at least twice as much as suggested.
I hope this works, not sure how to improve it.
Increase the spacing to a much larger value than 100 feet.
There should be no taller new builds within the block.
I had a huge apartment complex built in an open lot next to my 1960's home which site on an acre. The design of the apartments (which is higher use than any school I've seen) definitely does not fit in with the once spacious, farmland atmosphere of NW Boise. The lights are blaring at night and their height blocks my view of the foothills, sunrise, etc.
The proposed change will lead to destruction single family homes as land values lead to increases in property taxes, driving out existing home owners.
my adjoined neighborhood will very poorly accommodate the proposed height and lack of parking
Design requirements could place parking areas adjacent to neighboring residences, rather than building faces or sides. landscaping requirements could place a tree break between residences and taller neighboring buildings.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Height allowances next to residential property will always be problematic. Multiple floor housing should be separated by street, not by an alley.
The zoning should be by land use not appearances. Boise zoning, if it does exist, seems to be ignored in favor of development.
Focus on helping renters by regulating the cost of rent.
This is taking away people's views of the foothills that is one reason people move to the bench. Stop letting people build higher than pre-existing houses if that home has a view to the foothills.
Do not think these protections should be in the code. New development should be considered part of the neighborhood not something old house are protected from
Don't build high density housing in residential neighborhoods
Stop putting 5 houses on a 1 acre lot
The regulation still leaves the door open for over development of apartments. Where is Suez going to get the water for these developments?
What about when the building blocks site lines for existing residential areas such as above the canal on victory?
There will always be ways around regulations... Increasing density without supportive community structure (police, fire, schools, hospitals, roads!!!) is a severe problem I see.
Build single family homes or duplexes in Single Family neighborhoods.
Should add a better transition by designating lower maximum heights for properties adjacent to single story homes than those infill projects adjacent to two story home if you truly care about existing neighborhood protection and appealing projects that better fit into a neighborhood
Some people will be affected adversely no matter what. Including high density house in new developing housing tracts would be a better solution with park buffers to single family houses.
sky 40 and 45' do not belong in neighborhoods. it is not necessary to do this and provide housing. 35' is ample in a neighborhood. the higher the building goes the more amenities are added. Extra bedrooms turn its into mini dorms or vacation rental.
No residential neighborhood should have a house more than 25 ft tall at its peak.
I think there should be a max height of a building when placed next to a single family home/property. If there is a single family home and a 5 story building is built next to it, no amount of trees or setbacks can alleviate the looming building in your backyard. I think there should be a height ratio of what can be built next to single family homes. A formula. Height of house currently, times 2 is max height of building (something like that).
There is a difference between residential neighborhoods and the residential/urban interface. 48x100' buildings have no place in the neighborhoods unless they already exist. As you approach downtown, there is a narrow band of interface where the 11-04-07 need apply.
Don't allow tall buildings in residential neighborhoods
Put it all in the north bench area
I think that code should provide for a graduated setback so that there is some flexibility for the planners and dev services - sometimes a project may not be able to move forward if it cannot have a small section of the building in the proposed minimum setback area at slightly higher than allowed. Or the project may need some flexibility to get in 1 more unit but still accomplishes the spirit of the minimum setback - build in some flexibility.
It seems that conflicts are inevitable. While we should try preserve certain aspects of neighborhoods, Boise is growing and the need for dense housing is crucial. The maximum height requirement should only be used in certain neighborhoods, but not dense ones like near downtown.
These height limits are too restrictive. I'd like to see somewhat taller buildings even when adjacent to shorter residential. I'd allow 1 more floor beyond 35 feet in all the mentioned cases, especially in the case of more innovative top floors that function as open space or rooftop businesses in residential areas.
Keep limit of height
Density in established neighborhoods is a poor idea. Add density in downtown. 100 ft is too small of a buffer to build 35 foot building next to homes.
Why would you let a commercial structure be built next to a residence ?
Stop regulating! Her community does not want that!
The homeowners are going to complain no matter what concessions you make for them. They expect quiet suburban living within the city limits of one of the fastest growing cities in America. These might help, potentially... but think about what it's going to look like once there's no longer a single-family home next to these buildings who have had to make all sorts of weird design choices to accommodate the laws.
I think we need to limit height to not block our city of trees average tree height is 45 feet
There should be further restrictions on high density buildings that prevent them from existing near existing homes within neighborhoods that have no other high density buildings in them. High density should be limited to main roads with lights, crosswalks, traffic that already exist. There needs to be limitations on height to not exceed the rest of the block.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	I agree with the proposed restrictions, and also hope consideration is given to how the street views are connected (between low and higher intensity buildings) for walkability and aesthetics. are they inviting for all (with landscaping, benches, or other gathering spaces)
	Additional 10' of side/rear setbacks for buildings that exceed the height limit adjacent to residential zones is an insufficient amount of space. Should be a minimum of 30' additional side/rear setback if the building is going to exceed the minimum 35' height. Large buildings are constructed on LARGE lots and space will be available to preserve the integrity of the residential zone - 30' additional at a minimum. Sunlight and views are most affected by tall buildings adjacent to residential structures and an additional 10' setback will not help with the removal of these precious property values. A sun angle calculation can be required and if a building's height will affect an existing or future residential use then requiring a greater setback is warranted to preserve the integrity of the residential zone.
	Not all areas need to be mixed use. It is ok to have quiet neighborhoods without a winco in the back yard.
	I'm already losing the view of the foothills I have currently due to new construction that will surely be starting soon. I purchased about a year ago and don't get me wrong, I knew the view wouldn't last when I purchased, even though nothing was approved for construction at the time. I don't have a suggestion for improvement while achieving the intended result. I'm for growth of the city and will sacrifice my view. I'm just very against the idea of over stuffing people in high-density housing in any one area of the city, which I believe is beginning to happen in the SW part of Boise now. I live very close to Murgotio Park, again, for only the past year. While I think its unnecessary to use the entirety of such a HUGE space for a park, I think it's completely ridiculous to put 2,000 high-density units in the space. This would do irreparable damage to the area that won't be able to be undone. It seems like a compromise could be easily achieved and satisfy most by putting in say a large 60-80 acre regional park in while using the rest of the space for housing (much lower density house that what I've seen proposed please)!
	Apartment buildings are getting too high. More play area for children
	I don't really know, but the leak into residential areas is not a good idea. The new Fish and Game building must be an Idaho Power test building whose lights are so bright at night right next to the park and my kitchen building
	I'd like the height of new buildings to be considered in the light of how they impede the view of our beautiful mountains as we drive around the valley.
	The use of the term "interior" setback is very confusing. It is an exterior, site planning requirement. Call it as such. Density requires no light corridors, we need density. What we don't need is alot of light pollution at night.
	100 feet is NOT enough of a buffer from residential uses. The distance should be at least 300 feet.
	Informed design review
	Maybe just a simple angle formula would work better than having multiple setback rules. Would give a bit more flexibility to the designer.
	Brightness of lights, when and how long they are lit, affects the neighboring houses; height is less important. Setback should be enough for light and air, to reach windows, doesn't look like enough in the diagram.
	It can be done right and it can be done wrong. With all the exemptions that go on I doubt it will be done right.
	Approved on case to case basis
	That is a qualified yes. It will really depend on each individual situation. One size does not fill all circumstances.
	large buildings with high occupancy or higher than existing heights should not be allowed in already established neighborhoods
	The proposed changes do not appear to be very significant. A hotel or other large building next to a residence will impact the residence unless the restrictions are very great. Large restrictions on the higher-intensity use reduce the value of the higher-intensity property.
	no
	not in my mind
	I don't care about this. The population is growing. I care about healthy communities where people are comfortable going for a walk outside. I want people to feel safe outside with spaces they can hang out in without fear of other people or getting hit by a car. I want to be able to ride my bike to Alberstons on State and Gary Lane without worry of getting hit by a car.
	More voices of authority to the surrounding homeowners that affect the quality of life in their neighborhood. I grow weary of only the voices of wealthy subdivisions getting a louder voice in these decisions. Thinking of sunshine areas.
	Sensitive attention to impacts on existing neighbors should be a priority.
	Green space requirement rather than a height requirement.
	I think residential areas should remain mostly residential in nature and commercial areas should be very limited in those areas. I would be pretty mad if a commercial building was erected next to me if it was not already zoned that way when I bought the home!
	Don't put high density housing (appts, hotels) in a low density residential area
	Keep buildings shorter so we can see the mountains
	Conserving water but as many trees and bushes!

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Make sure any new lighting is off after a certain time or is the type that is directional and better for wildlife
	Stay much farther away. Still too close and too high.
	Keep residential property residential!
	The first example seems reasonable, the second does not. Consider making the distance between existing and new larger.
	elaboration on landscaping requirements-- push toward minimal water utilized for landscaping except for produce gardens.
	yes, but the additional minimum set back of 10 ft. is insufficient, and should be proportional to the height of the high intensity building. For example the additional setback should equal the height of the high intensity building.
	Additional 10 feet of side and rear setbacks on buildings exceeding 35 feet in height will not address privacy and shading issues for current residential
	I do not know.
	I do think the law will help appease the geriatric NIMBY crowd but I say to hell with them. We need more density! These setback laws are ridiculous. Allow for the building of tall dense housing. The people can hardly afford to live in this city anymore because of all the large McMansions being built.
	I grew up in Seattle, which has experienced a plague of replacing existing housing stock with out-of-scale "mc mansions". Many of those replacement homes occupy every square foot of the lot inside the minimum setbacks. They loom over the streets and the neighboring homes. Any design identity the neighborhood had is lost.
	Some of new LED signs are too bright. Please reduce the maximum allowable brightness or enforce the existing limit.
	Why such importance for single family lots? We do not ask that apartment dwellers are so protected.
	There should be a maximum height. Extra setback to exceed the height is not a good idea.
	These mitigating options don't really help that much - and fast-forward option 1 into the future - does that mean that a place can ever really change? That is the fundamental problem that I believe this re-write is intended to address, but does not. Lots /neighborhoods that are 'built-out' are not permitted to change in character, except by becoming more expensive per-unit. The solution is to more broadly raise height limits in residential areas. Mitigate impacts on direct neighbors with screening, prohibition of edge-of-roof rooftop decks. Expand by-right approval, as well.
	Remove Portlandia wannabe
	I don't think the extra 10 feet would be enough buffer.
	Increase the distances for impact. 100 feet is totally inadequate.
	The additional 10 feet of interior setback is fine for a structure that does not dominate the surrounding area. I would encourage a 'proportional calculation' to limit the height of structures build in close proximity to residential areas.
	Don't allow
	Abide by existing measures in place with fewer exemptions.
	Minimum set backs do not take into account the health and well being of residential spaces- put simply there should not be mixed used spaces next to one another. Residential should be next to other residential, not next to business and light/ high industrial spaces . Set backs and additional landscaping and screening only take into account aesthetics not the health concerns that putting these to different types of land uses together. Examples include exposure to pollution and toxic fumes, and reducing the amount of natural sun light that residents have access too.
	There is no way that putting apartments, schools, commercial buildings in a residential neighborhood can be alleviated by landscaping and screening!
	Public common areas would be necessary to avoid conflict between neighbors.
	keep at 35 feet no exceptions
	Neighborhood character does not depend on buildings all being relatively similar height. We should not be focused on maintaining what we have, but growing in to something better. Many of peoples favorite places have a tall "intense" building and a short home next to each other. It's human.
	Unknown.
	I am not as concerned about the height and closeness of buildings to residential homes as I am concerned about the car traffic and people traffic and how that will flow. In my opinion having bigger set backs is not a great use of land that we are just eating up. The land should be used more appropriately so we don't have to keep taking it. We should be rebuilding and filling in areas instead of expanding.
	I believe the home owner next to the proposed High intensity building should have more say than the rest of us and especially you. I would not want any building or business like that moving into a lot next to my home without my input.
	Give the existing dwelling owners the right to challenge a builder before the new home is built if they feel the design impacts their existing home. Existing homes should have precedence over new construction
	I especially feel the traffic/parking considerations and the landscaping screening and other buffer options as a requirement will really help.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Remove height restrictions on residential.
This should be waived in mixed use areas
Maximum height should be less and distance should be greater. Proposed amount is insufficient. Sunlight should also be a factor. Example pictures are deceptive because they are of a tall 2 story home and there are many single level homes that could also be affected.
Increase the space between buildings and increase landscaping requirements.
Keep height no taller than tallest existing house on the block. Minimize new lighting and make it night sky friendly.
Nothing good will come from putting low income housing next to home owners who have worked hard their entire lives.
I do not understand this module enough to have an educated opinion.
A maximum building height no more than the height of any adjacent existing structure for any portion of the higher intensity building located within 100 feet of the low-density residential use AND an additional 10 feet of side and rear setbacks for the higher intensity building if it exceeds 35 feet in height.
It is one thing if it is in an already built up area, but if it is rural...the setbacks need to be way more substantial.
Any developmental work should be done with some priorities to wildlife and perhaps controlling the size of some of these things would help. Bigger buildings tend to make the quality of the city less appealing.
Some environmentally-forward cities turn off or at the very least dim their lights at night. Constantly having lights on affects birds, bugs, and humans alike. One city I had heard of on the West coast agreed this together because they wanted their children to grow up seeing and knowing the stars.
I think you should specify what the max height would be. In your example of the house next to the higher building, it would look really strange if the house was next to a very tall office building. Just wouldn't look good. Maybe keep like buildings to the same area - office buildings with office buildings and single family homes with single family homes.
Too open to allow for people to build Frankenstein structures and skirt the rules
Honestly, this is really hard to understand. So I'm having a hard time having an opinion on this. I do not like the look of single family homes smushed up with what appear to be commercial buildings.
Nothing over 35 feet - ever! Setbacks of 20'!
Limit development to two stories within and bordering residential areas.
These need to be nowhere near a house and should never impede a view
The rich will always get there way
It is unlikely to prevent neighbors from resisting change and meaningfully buffer. You should not require lower development or lower height to please "those who got there first" and don't want something different next door; a percentage of people will always resist change but the vision should be long term on what is best for the city not on what is likely to please neighbors.
Do you really want Boise to look like Rancho Cucamonga, CA?
The monstrosities on Crescent Rim that have gone up over the last 8 years or so made it clear that no regulation will keep foreign investors and out of state contractors from doing whatever they want. Enforcement and requisite contractor residency may be a better way to address this.
10 feet may not be enough.
Limit how much housing can go into any specific area. Too many people packed into a space brings down a quality of living for all.
Zero lot lines are uncivilized, and not conducive to privacy.
No development should be allowed without enough parking for its residents included. Additional sidewalks and roads and parks should also be included in all development. No more building just to build. I disagree with creating affordable housing complexes. ALL housing complexes should include affordable housing and homes for seniors.
Pet property owners have no trip of the use of their property like in Texas
Allow one additional floor over neighboring properties, and then step back from there. It should not have to completely match the neighboring properties, but instead be a gradual increase.
I think you've got the right idea, but by allowing tall buildings next to existing single family home additions you destroy the fabric of the neighborhood. You change the whole neighborhood into something else. If larger buildings have to be next to smaller homes it should at least require a shorter facade and the taller sections behind. This could be done in a stair-step fashion.
Shorter Poles will require more poles to reach desired light levels... And increase nuisance light spill into neighboring houses
Put a recommendation for the height of screening/mature vegetation which would prevent people in higher buildings from being able to look down into the back-yard or dwelling.
Need to stop restricting height of apartments.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Keep hotels and other non-residential buildings far away from residential areas and subdivisions. It will be a conflict of interest no matter what and we'll create a lot of stress for residences taking away their sense of peace and enjoyment in their own home and neighborhoods.
	I think this one could be relaxed a bit.
	Don't put apartments and townhouses in family neighborhoods
	down cast lighting and not bright white bulbs should be the standard.
	No More businesses, no more housing. Absolutely no "affordable housing"
	There is the potential this regulation can help, yes. I believe the WAY this is implemented is most important though. Continuing developments will need intentional community engagement to build bridges between existing and new residential neighborhoods, as well as careful consensus building around sharing our common lands in ways that allow all to access them while still preserving them.
	Not sure, regulations will have to be enforced
	Exterior lighting needs to be dark skies friendly (i.e. with shading that focuses light downward so night skies are not impacted)
	Woudn't this have changed the approval on the Idaho Credit building application? Why would you rub our noses in this idea now that you have ruined that neighborhood? This is a start but realize that the height of new buildings negatively impacts residential communities even if you allow for larger setbacks.
	Buildings should be no taller than the average 2 story home (30') for 50'. Throw out the 45' requirement after only 10 additional feet. It's too close and too tall.
	Those multi home dwellings should not be allowed in single home neighborhoods. Once one is built it changes the look and feel of the area and opens the doors for others to be built.
	When the new building doesn't have sufficient parking, there is a lot of overflow on nearby street parking. So the limitations on parking areas should be specific and rigorous.
	The city allows to many variances to homeowners and developers and builders. I have seen too many exceptions to city guidelines and building codes.
	Absolutely not. I have been to three proposed projects in my neighborhood and none of them will have enough parking. The overflow of cars is going to be a nightmare for the existing home owners and residents.
	Yes, write a proposal that prohibits builders from mixed density neighborhoods. No single family home owner wants to live next to high density "affordable housing".
	Additional lighting requirements to reduce light pollution. https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/lighting-for-citizens/lighting-basics/
	Soft density and slow incremental rezoning. These proposals are likely okay, so long as they apply uniformly across the city within context of existing zoning. The Northend should also bear the brunt of increased density through rezoning and not hide behind its historic overlay.
	no one wants to live next to a tall building. More distance between buildings and no more than 2 stories next to residences.
	Less regulation is better than more. Shouldn't be trying to predict construction. Space for parking and driving cars through is a good thing for many reasons.
	You've given developers an easy out of the height restrictions. Foothills views are being blocked all over the city due to poor planning and allowing developers to build whatever they want, wherever they want.
	Check you set back on lots for safety. Having the garage less then 15 feet safety for drivers coming down street and someone coming from yard side garage is unsafe unless not on a busy street.
	An additional 10 feet of setback for structures over 35 feet would in no way help. If the intended result is " to provide more predictability regarding compatibility between homes and more intense uses (like schools, hotels or other businesses) next to them" the section "OR an additional 10 feet of side and rear setbacks for the higher intensity building if it exceeds 35 feet in height" needs to be stricken.
	Don't let residential and commercial mix
	Single home residential neighborhoods should be protected from encroachment of apartment complexes.
	NO. Keep the existing code density requirements. I DO NOT want high density housing in Boise.
	More space for existing housing needed. No giant buildings five feet away from houses. PLEASE CREATE ACCESSIBLE LANGUAGE, ACCESSIBLE NAVIGATION, AND DIGITAL ACCESS FOR CITY CODE I DO NOT UNDERSTAND WHAT THE CODE LANGUAGE MEANS.
	I think this should be simplified. Just require an additional 10' setback on any portion of adjacent buildings higher than 35'. or just an additional 5-10' set back in general to accommodate the additional landscaping. Over-regulating articulation/building shape and design results in odd facades and unintuitive architecture.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>Keep Boise unique and protect the things that are already here. Once they are gone they are gone. One of those unique areas is the Sycamore Overlay Neighborhood. Boise asked us to write a neighborhood plan for Blueprint Boise, we did that, then they asked us to help create an Overlay, we did that. Now, what can we do to maintain this wonderful area that other large cities only dream about having? We have so many people here who have lived here their whole lives. Middle-income people who are teachers, social workers. They are environmentalists and live here sustainably. Many are on wells and don't use city water. We have large mature trees and cool our homes and the city, use less electricity and clean our city's air. We follow many of the practices talked about in Blue Print Boise and in your Climate Change plan and yet, we are now being thrown under the bus with absolutely no place in this plan that protects us. It is heartbreaking that such a stable neighborhood full of retired people and multi-generations are now going to be displaced creating more people looking for affordable housing. With R1-A gone we have no place and no protection from planning and zoning. It is extremely disappointing. We have reached out to you. We have had tours with the city council, mayor, citywide committee and I would be happy to show you this unique area that is about to be destroyed to anyone who is interested. (outdoorflorist@gmail.com) We have so much to offer the city of Boise and this is you time to save it and help us save it. I feel a bit like the Lorax speaking for the huge mature trees, the open space for pollinators, butterflies, deer, and birds. NATURE that always has to take a back seat to human needs. The city thinks they are solving a problem, but really they are creating more. Please tell us what we can do to save this small footprint of land that makes such a huge difference in this city. Lets work together and figure out how we can both continue to live, work, and play in this city together. Don't push us out and bulldoze over our lifelong dreams and commitment we made we we moved into our neighborhood -The Sycamore Overlay. Do your job planning and zoning and as Don from Clarion said "No one is being asked to radically change the neighborhood they bought into." We feel like we are. Don put in the 75% protection, which may be the ONLY protection we have and we hope that that will stay in the plan. When I moved here I was told that it was one dwelling per lot to maintain this special neighborhood. That was why I moved in. My 39,000 square lot was protected because we were allowed one dwelling per 20,000 square feet and the other section 19,000 was too small for another dwelling. Now, we are being told that the minimum lot size is 9,000 sf. That is a HUGE change for us. An unbelievable change. You removed our R1-A zone and so now we are asking you to leave the 75% rule in there. This is now our only protection!!!!</p>
	I think both options will hurt the current residents.
	We need to be mindful of the semi rural neighborhoods and keep them that way-Collister area.
	The setbacks need to be increased and some height limits must be in place. The example noted above is not a good solution. The new building is way too big to be next to the existing house.
	We need to keep neighborhoods neighborhoods.
	Adding 10ft to a set back of buildings higher than 35' isn't enough. Especially if the original set back is 5ft. Not of the examples you're showing have a two story house? What about all the one story homes? The height maximum should address that as well.
	These may help but may not alleviate the problems as noted above. Simply adding a setback without additional designated parking will not help a parking problem. These changes also do not help flow of traffic in/out of existing streets and neighborhoods.
	leave neighborhoods alone and find other places to build mini malls, gas stations, and car washes. if a small home is built in a small lot..fine. but if an apartment complex is to be built, don't throw it up in a residential where the owner next door needs to live with your bad decisions. there are plenty of available plots of land here and don't be afraid to spread out a bit. if the city was so worried about the foothills, no building would ever have been done to begin with.
	Larger buffer
	Get rid of front setback requirements
	High density next to traditional single family home areas is always going to cause contention due to the additional people/traffic/aesthetic of the neighborhood. Grouping high density housing together in areas along existing infrastructure to support the traffic and parking (edge areas of traditional neighborhoods) feels like a good compromise and the additional commercial services provided would be a value add to the residents. Also, the reality is that desirable areas in the city are going to have higher prices.
	NIMBYs are the actual problem we're dealing with here, and they are what needs regulation, not just developers. These requirements need to go both ways. Existing neighborhoods need to become more diverse, not just new ones.
	Developers don't care about destroying existing neighborhoods.
	I rather abhor the insertion of high density commercial enterprises such as a hotel or condominium in traditional neighborhoods such as the demolition of two and three story units and construction of 4-5 story units with a 10 foot setback from the street as has occurred downtown in the last few years. Limit the the number of such buildings in a neighborhood.
	Oh, so there ARE "potential conflicts" from what you are proposing. Thanks for acknowledging them.
	Height requirements for non-residential buildings in residential areas.
	only allow development that is compatible and similar to existing the existing structures. It is impossible to build a fence or barrier that would be tall enough to protect the privacy of existing property owners.
	Transition is still too abrupt. Recommend requiring more space w/ vegetation & trees that can be used as public space (eg mini-park/ green area)
	Of course it helps conflicts, but if a high intensity use is allowed, having a loud whiny neighbor who chose to live on the border of a zone shouldn't limit development even further beyond the allowed restrictions.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>I understand the need to reduce conflict with existing neighbors and this may be a good compromise. For what it's worth, I think the 100' setback on height goes too far and would support something like a 40' setback. The lighting and parking/drive-through section is great.</p>
	<p>If these specs mean an improvement on existing height and setbacks then yes. But I don't know existing zoning. I assume this is to help new developments not crowd out smaller historic buildings like the Basque area already ruined. Hope so.</p>
	<p>stop the forward leading questions</p>
	<p>Any change to residential areas will likely cause change. New properties should try to fit in with existing properties as best they can to limit conflict</p>
	<p>Keep commercial properties in their own districts.</p>
	<p>THIS WILL ONLY SUPPORT OUT OF TOWN INVESTORS WHO DO NOT CARE ABOUT IDAHOANS ONLY MONEY, MONEY AND MONEY.</p>
	<p>Not sure where to put this, but GREEN SPACE is extremely important. I've noticed that new buildings downtown are being built right up to the sidewalks. And I understand cities must do this for cost effectiveness, but PLEASE ADD SOME TREES, too.</p>
	<p>?</p>
	<p>The facades of these structures need to be better. I realize this is subjective, but again, I refer you to the blindingly white and bland Roe development with zero charm. There used to be a lovely grove of trees and habitat for local hawks and critters. Some portion of that could have been preserved as a nice feature for the new residents and a buffer from the construction for the old residents. The exterior could look like a community of row homes instead of cheap barracks.</p>
	<p>Keep strict reign on commercial use of property highly residential areas.</p>
	<p>Stop trying to pack more people in...it's ruining quality of life for existing residents. It's contrary to your goal of making Boise a better place to live work and play. You're going to have a bunch of stressed out mean people making it an ugly place to live work and play. Too mischievous Density always causes stress and anxiety, how will that help your goal???</p>
	<p>Require dark sky lighting for all new construction.</p>
	<p>I think a maximum limit needs to be set for non residential structures. I also believe that builders/owners of non residential structure must be required to contribute a "green space" such as a playground or park for neighborhood use.</p>
	<p>I would remove the alternative: "OR an additional 10 feet of side and rear setbacks for the higher intensity building if it exceeds 35 feet in height"</p>
	<p>This is, again, a more complex question. Do the zoning codes currently address percentage of buildings that are single family homes in a block? If 100% are single family, then a behemoth like the example would be inappropriate, but small houses not built to lot lines could be.</p>
	<p>Many small lots along arterials are less than 100' deep. It is silly for owners of property adjacent to zones that allow more intense development to expect to have their lifestyle "protected" at the expense of additional housing or other development that will benefit the community. With these specific regulations, the devil is in the details. I appreciate requiring additional screening and landscaping where it makes sense. I don't appreciate de facto limitation of small lots in intense zones being relegated to 35' max height or additional onerous setbacks.</p>
	<p>The regulation would stunt organic urban development if required in the downtown core. Requiring additional space between buildings is not pedestrian centered development.</p>
	<p>More setbacks to allow for pathways and green space in front of buildings.</p>
	<p>Zoning should prevent hotels and commercial buildings from being built adjacent to homes</p>
	<p>Higher fencing allowance 8 feet.</p>
	<p>Including infiltration areas for precip. We lose a lot of water that goes straight down the concrete drains and runs off the landscape downstream.</p>
	<p>There should have been an option to answer "hell no." Look at the above drawing. Why not just force the homeowner to give his property to the developer of the high density project? How does this not permanently affect the value of the homeowner in an extremely negative way? A homeowner who has been paying property taxes, which help fund planning depts. for years. Its not right, fair, fitting, or proper. The developer should have to acquire all the homes OR, get the written permission of the affected homeowner(s), whatever that may cost them.</p>
	<p>Further increase mitigation between high and low intensity buildings through greater space requirements, landscaping requirements that might reduce noise, and lighting requirements that don't make it to bright at night in adjacent residential property</p>
	<p>No - the additional of all these homes is going to ruin the looks of our beautiful area</p>
	<p>Do not mix residential and non residential. Instead, provide residential and non-residential grids which resemble a center for commercial and spoke-type residential areas. Eventually mixed areas bring neighborhood values down as businesses close or change to less desirable ones.</p>
	<p>No one wants a stores lights shining in their windows at night, nor do they want to see nothing but brick and parking lots out their windows. Keep residential areas residential.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>It won't necessarily 'protect' existing neighborhoods but it will help mitigate the impact of the larger form and scale of new non residential buildings. I also recommend a step back requirement on three or above story buildings, where floor two and above need to be stepped back about 5-8' from the front wall plane facing the residential units or zoning. This helps recede the scale a bit. Finally, I don't think increased side or rear setbacks will really help all that much. The height is still a scale concern; the increased setback still doesn't really address it.</p>
<p>Give developed neighborhoods their space and avoid crowding. Treat them as though you live there.⁹</p>
<p>No</p>
<p>It would be nice to have lighting that reduces light pollution</p>
<p>Move higher density to the outskirts of the city</p>
<p>50 feet and 100 feet is not enough distance to provide for privacy, natural light, landscaping, and noise concerns. this does nothing to preserve neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Oof. This is a hard one. I don't really see anything working very well when you go from a low-density house to a high density building. I don't think 50 ft for a tall light pole is enough. The picture above has a big building next to a quite large 2-story house and it looks bad. I can't imagine how unhappy a homeowner of a 1-story 1000 sq ft house would be to have say, a bar set up 30 ft away from their front door. Or have a multi-story apt bldg looking into your backyard. No amount of fencing or vegetation would fix that nicely. It's one thing to have that structure in place when you buy. Of course this is happening in my neighborhood already as people tear down old houses and build giant ones. If you want to encourage new Hyde Parks there needs to be different (more strict) height, lights, and noise requirements.</p>
<p>Unfortunately, limitations on parking/drive through areas between commercial properties and residential properties do not stop people from using neighborhoods as highways, unless those neighborhoods are completely blocked off from the next-door businesses. Moving commercial or high-intensity buildings closer to residential areas will always deteriorate the quality of living for those residents.</p>
<p>Leave it alone</p>
<p>Lower property taxes.</p>
<p>Unsure but please provide enough parking!</p>
<p>Addition of infrastructure such as egress and exiting, multiple lane arterial roads, would help ease the stress of increasing the density of population on existing neighborhoods</p>
<p>More space is better space. No perfect solution but I think the setback should be even further increased</p>
<p>Higher intensity developments should mimic the average of surrounding lots housing height.</p>
<p>The drawings remind me of the book "The Little House" by Virginia Lee Burton. The single family homes will always contrast starkly with huge buildings next door to them. Just build the new structures a bit higher than the single family homes, but increase the density. Also consider building down into the ground and use technology to brighten the underground dwelling places and shops...ppl will think of them as unique and creative... think outside the box.</p>
<p>– Max height 25 feet within 100 feet. – 20-foot light poles within 100 feet. – No drive-thru lanes in or near any residential area.</p>
<p>Proposed setbacks are not sufficient to protect the quality of life and property values of the existing residents. Allowing buildings in excess of 35 feet next to existing homes if the increase the setback by 10 feet is not sufficient. Buildings that exceed 2 stories should require a minimum setback of 100 feet from existing residential property. This should be increased if the building is business or industrial.</p>
<p>Need a transition of use not just transition of building form</p>
<p>Since we can no longer ethically build out, increasing sprawl, we should focus on building up. Height requirement max should be much higher.</p>
<p>Least important issue in boise</p>
<p>Lower and enforce the height limit. Too much leeway to exceed limits has been approved for development.</p>
<p>This is all backward. "Protecting existing residential neighborhoods" from what, exactly? More homes? That shouldn't be the priority here. We need to build more housing. And separating out land uses is why we are such a car-dependent city. We should be aiming to create "15 minute neighborhoods," which means a variety of different uses in the neighborhood. Let's create a walkable city, not one that looks hegemonic.</p>
<p>To tall</p>
<p>You still end up having views of multi-story housing with the neighbors looking into your backyard instead of being able to see the foothills or other natural scenery. Not to mention that the sun is now blocked in many locations which interferes with the ability to have food gardens.</p>
<p>There should not be a change to allow apartment buildings in areas not previously zoned for them.</p>
<p>Increase the setback.</p>
<p>Build out, not up. We have a ton of land all around us. Spread out.</p>
<p>Whatever</p>
<p>Stop ignoring minimum lot sizes in place for years. Stop building high density housing. Stop ruining our city.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Ideally residential single family homes should not be close to business construction. I would rent an apartment near a business building, but for me a single family home has lower value if there is a business building next door or visible from the house.
	Limit height to 35ft
	But 35 feet high is too high if it's next door to a residence. Too high even with increased setbacks.
	I have no idea if these regulations would be helpful.... So I won't weigh in.... I'm assuming in addition to this very cool survey, research on what has or has not worked in other growing cities has been done and will be part of the decision making
	Do away with option: "OR an additional 10 feet of side and rear setbacks for the higher intensity building if it exceeds 35 feet in height." This will assure no option for a building to exceed 35 feet in height if it lies next to low-density residential property as many low density properties are single story. The 100' in before height exceeds 35' is already a compromise for existing neighborhoods. This should be about compromise for both developers (those working in that industry) and existing neighborhoods.
	Your 20 foot light pole 20 feet (10 foot each bld.) would shine into the window of the residence. Lighting on the tall buildings should be at the top to shine down to the ground for safety illumination.
	Anticipate structure needs by predicting growth in neighborhoods or areas. Designate school sites and prospective commercial sites.
	Put a park between them.
	As I'm reading the proposed zoning there is a 35' height limit on buildings within 100' of low density residential BUT then the buildings next to the 35' height limit don't have any height limitation - just an additional 10' of space between the buildings. That's not protecting low density residential.
	Extra setbacks could be added for taller and taller buildings, and floor to area limits added, eliminating the need to specify a maximum overall height.
	I live behind a parking lot. 20' lights are still very high and will shine into the neighboring houses, just like the ones behind me do. There just shouldn't be parking lots put up that close to houses. There should be more of a buffer.
	In mixed-use areas, retail, office, or high-density residential should not be any taller than the surrounding residential until you have an intervening property between the two, therefore probably not any taller than 2 floors. The next could then be 3 floors and this would be the maximum permitted next to a residential area. Also, non-residential should be located along main arterials. However, if you look at Hyde Park or Barber Station, I think this is what you should encourage. Great examples of blending in with residential.
	The issues are noise, parking, and culture. Government can address the noise and insist that new infill development provide plenty of parking, but not much can be done to ensure a cultural fit with the surrounding neighborhoods.
	I found this question confusing, as I don't know what the current versus proposed regulation is. I do believe that there should be protection of existing homes from large buildings and lights.
	You idiots didn't listen to residents on or near state st veteran tower. They have a massive parking issues and crime is up.
	It will help some, but no one wants their house to back up to a housing complex, especially if you purchased the house with no knowledge or plans of a housing project going close by your property.
	Do not increase density. This will increase safety concerns in neighborhoods, especially with traffic.
	LEED
	10 feet is negligible and won't make a difference.
	Maybe. It all depends on how they are designed and how they are used. Given the nature of some developers here, I'm inclined to disagree that this will help "reduce potential conflicts" between residential and nonresidential uses. I think a provision needs to be crystal clear in the code about which uses are and aren't allowed, including performance metrics of certain operations (moving from form-based to performance-based code).
	It's not enough. Nobody who has been living in a suburban neighborhood setting should end up with anything more than a 2 story building within a hundred feet of their property. And growth should take into account connections to and views of the foothills for current residents over new buildings.
	Oh those are so cute! Cheap, cracker box houses and stuffing four or five people in them like sardines. How thoughtful of you! Maybe, at \$7.25 an hour, with the kids working too, they may be able to afford one of these gems. If they are really lucky, the welfare recipients next-door will smoke their cigarettes outside rather than letting them seep through the half inch walls which I'm sure will be separating them.
	As long as you're worried about building heights too close to existing residential areas - housing will always be unaffordable. Boise needs to grow up and realize that high rise buildings need to be built for those who want to live in them. This is most affordable way to provide a large amount of housing. The residents of one high rise building should not be determining the height or requirements of a new high rise building (I.E. Imperial plaza).
	Keep height low!!!! More space between houses and apartments!!!
	single family single story, screw the developers

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

One thought - is it possible / feasible to set standards for acceptable light levels that spillover into neighboring properties rather than addressing lighting through a maximum mounting height limit? The reason I say this is that the type of lighting and way it is oriented has a huge impact on light pollution / trespass. In my experience working in the outdoor lighting industry, it's entirely possible to cause terrible glare in someone's home at a distance of 50' with a 20' mounting height if you are using poor lighting design. Specifying light levels as read through a light meter or photometric software seems like a better and more relevant measurement to prevent negative outcomes for residents.
No opinion because the way in which and locations of development will fluctuate creating different criteria for planning and development. Specific limitations as above result in a "jailed/jack-in-the-box" planning. P&Z staff should have the ability to work with developers/owners to render an agreed to plan that makes sense for the land, location and surroundings
Stop trying to create more density.
The height and width of a building are less significant than the amount of air, light and noise pollution they generate.
Limit permits west of Boise to address sprawl. Scrap school district buses for public buses kids can ride along with everyone else.
Need to ensure no/limited windows "looking down on" existing home/backyard.
Pierce Park was just built. The lighting cover should be deeper. you should not be able to see the light bulbs from our houses. And should go on and off when there's movement when dark. Again I'm not sure I understand what you're trying to get across
Not enough separation to protect existing neighborhoods
There should be a "Unsure or Don't know" button on this survey. I do have opinions about this I'm just not sure enough to make a decision
Lower height requirement
I would assume that residents would not want the business/high intensity buildings' busy sides facing the residential areas. In other words, keep parking, main entrances/ noisy air conditioners, etc. as far from residential areas as possible.
Not sure what current regulations are. ADUs being built in NEnd seems to have no restrictions on lighting or screening or regard for impact on neighbors.
As in the legal action taken by the Albertson family members and others, a view is not perpetual and shouldn't impede progress
I feel like the city would just approve any building height no matter the regulation. The school built recently near me - pierce park elementary - had to request approval to build higher than the current regulations allowed and the city just granted granted it - no questions asked. So any regulations put in place just seem to be ignored anyways.
Space the new building farther away from other buildings.
Increase residential lot sizes and increase the set backs on the non- residential property.
This is a pointless change. Get rid of low density residential uses.
Don't spot zone.
This only sets Boise up to existing homeowner of the house to sell their house and then that house is bought by the developer to build matching construction next to the lost home. This creates a whole new style of neighborhood making Boise a city of apartments and condos. :[
Keep height and higher density nearer to downtown.
Never mix residential with commercial or multi level housing keep them separate
I wish they helped but buffers don't help black out 3-4 story apartments
Protect existing housing from cramming more buildings into lots
Need good p&z meetings
No
A very large building to house numerous people should not be built on a busy arterial like State Street. This would be too dangerous to motorists and pedestrians alike.
This is a good start, but someone in a 45-foot tall building could cause issues to someone's sunlight which could affect their passive thermal heating. In addition, privacy is always a HUGE concern- where windows are located or balconies. No one should be allowed to pass the 35-foot height limit if it is next to a subdivision of ranch homes that are 1 story.
I see a lot of apartments going up that have a fence between the unit entrances and the sidewalk. A good example is at Maple Grove and Irving. The units are 15 feet from the sidewalk, but a resident would have to walk by his or her car in the parking lot on the other side of the building in order to access the sidewalk or nearby bus stop. Would the additional landscaping and screening requirements encourage this kind of barrier to get the sidewalk?
Outdoor lights must be shielded in such a way that they do not shine on existing homes.
This is too high next to single family housing.
Not sure
I like it although I'd require a step back (even making it so the 35 ' goes to 45' twenty feet down the line if you use the extra 10' set back would make a huge difference)

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	If we can have both regulations here, why can't we have dual regulations with density and design criteria
	Not likely. The property value of the R-1_ would stop appreciating at its prior rate and deprive the owner of its investment.
	What is the intended result? Keep neighborhoods neighborly and new developments sized to fit. We already see small houses being replaced by megamansions on small lots -- this is not adding additional housing and it doesn't fit in the neighborhood either!
	I don't think this was of much value with the St Lukes expansion to include the Children's Hosp--Where we once enjoyed residential rooftops, we now see the glare of numerous lighted windows and tall building.
	I think it could be removed entirely. the setback of 1:1 seems silly and a rare occurrence that is more pain than gain. if the tower after 100 feet is 8 stories they can still see in your yard. if I owned the lot that wants to go high, say a 100' wide lot I would be SOL. I would need to buy my neighbors lot or neither of us could go high. Why not let me build high without having to take more properties. It seems to me to deter unique single lot innovations and investment that you hoped to cause.
	more individual housing less apartment monster building
	Why would locating a huge building next to a single family home make any sense? It does not. The illustrations provide show that having a huge development next to a residential home is wholly out of character for the neighborhood.
	Recuse members of the committee with conflicts of interest.
	Perhaps consider including additional language about light pollution--limits on types of lighting allowed, lumens of lights used, overall lighting impact on surrounding properties.
	This is ugly and not wanted - apartments only trap people into not ever being able to buy their own house
	Use lighting that follows dark sky regulations so there is less light pollution and less conflict with neighbors.
	Lighting shining down, but not upward to illuminate the sky. Let us see the stars.
	Have these ideas been rated as to increased costs they will incur? Thus, discouraging or eliminating housing opportunities for non-white persons and any low-income, and no-income person. These kinds of zoning seem very white, middle class
	Larger setbacks for taller buildings. 10 feet makes little difference in the examples provided.
	I hope this works
	An extra 10 feet for a very tall building (eg. State and Arthur) is an insult. Their should be minimum setbacks for the entire mass that are greater than the common 5 and 10 foot commercial setbacks to residential (which now you only have to add 10 feet to upper stories). Possibly zone some commercial properties that would make sense to be in a buffer or transition zone, should have a specific zoning designation with more limits on height and density and more care so that parking isn't pushed into the neighborhood.
	no
	Boise has a parking problem that nobody wants to recognize brought about by having smaller streets in residential neighborhoods and high density (more than one family to a home).
	Require some type of design compatibility in favor of the residential design model across the mixed uses so they would blend in. For example, the use of brick material on the new elementary school addition, Roosevelt ?, in the East End.
	Stop, stop, stop. Just stop allowing builders to convince you that you're doing the right thing when you're really ruining neighborhoods.
	Residential and commercial properties need to be separated
	Keep businesses zoning void of homes.
	10 feet is a joke! Allowing higher density and higher heights adjacent to existing single family will have huge negative economic impact on home values and property taxes. If you want to be like Portland or Seattle then move there!
	This question is unclear so I am leaving it blank.
	Whatever is done, the rules need to be enforced. The current plan for the City was not enforced and developers have created some real atrocities that will be there for generations. Like parking on the lower floors of a building where people see it. It's ugly and adds no value. Just cheaper than underground parking for the developer. Are we a City of Trees or a City of Parking Garages. Look around and you will see cars, not people and trees.
	If it could be more specific to various locations within the city, with different design criteria that might get more people on board.
	Normally when a high-density property is located in a primarily single home area, the single-family homeowners will be overcome with traffic and less privacy. High-density properties should be located in areas away from not adjacent to single-family homes.
	Smaller apartment buildings scattered throughout a neighborhood with off street parking, preferable lower level.
	This is a good start, but doesn't go far enough. New building would still dramatically change the character of a neighborhood. However, much better to have these restrictions than none!

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>I am more concerned with the total number of units than the height of the building. High density housing does not belong in established neighborhoods. The side streets will be used for cut through traffic and many are narrow and do not have sidewalks.</p> <p>I really don't care about mixing uses, as long as it's done well. As long as it's not another Dutch Bros.</p> <p>I have read the new proposed zoning for big buildings next to single family homes and I don't understand the set backs. How about not allowing any big buildings next to single story homes? I see apartments that were built on the corner of McMillan and Five Mile completely blocking the back of a single family home. What is wrong with planning and zoning that they will allow something like this to be built? Building built next to a home should be no taller than the home that it's being built next to.</p> <p>Go live in a house with a 35 foot building that is 35 feet away from it. The distances should be much further.</p> <p>Create greater distance between different uses. Put the maintenance of this space on the new owner.</p> <p>See above re: selling out</p> <p>The setbacks should require place making elements to create pedestrian and human friendly spaces, such as pedestrian-scale lighting, bicycle racks, street furniture, bus shelters, etc. Also, urban greenery! If the set-backs are just concrete/asphalt, they're not improving the community, just making a built DMZ between residential and other land uses.</p> <p>Also, make sure it is pedestrian friendly & bike friendly to get to & from shops & housing</p> <p>Please no tall buildings, like anything over 3-4 stories. I know that's probably unrealistic, but it really takes from the historic charm and character of neighborhoods.</p> <p>This does not go far enough to solve the problem.</p> <p>This like the last 10 years of City government is destroying the existing neighborhoods.</p>
<p>"The Table of Minimum and Maximum Off-Street Parking Requirements has been updated to generally reduce the minimum number of required parking spaces. For example, the off-street parking requirement for a single-family home has been reduced from two spaces per home to one space per home to encourage smaller, more diverse housing types. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-07.5.</p> <p>Do you think the proposed changes make sense for Boise?</p> <p>Is there a way the regulation could be improved to encourage more transportation choices and mixed use developments, like Bown Crossing and Hyde Park?"</p>	<p>Removing parking requirements is a terrible idea. The traffic flow through Boise is already difficult enough. Removing parking and attempting to force people into public transportation is not how Boise should be pushing it's citizens.</p> <p>Keep it at 2. Most families have/ need 2 cars in Boise to get around. Until there are actual improvements to the way commuters and pedestrians can get around town, it's not helpful to reduce parking for homes yet.</p> <p>DO NOT REDUCE PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR ANY REASON! Reduced parking means our streets become impacted by apartment complexes and high density homes because parking was not planned for appropriately. Most dwellings need at least two parking spaces. Overflow parking into neighborhoods is not far to long time residents!!</p> <p>Though yes/no are the only options, my actual answer is "somewhat." I struggle with these parking space ideas. I understand the idea of encouraging density and affordability. And I understand that a 1-car carport or garage is less expensive than a 2-car structure. However, once that home is built, it can be difficult to add a second parking space later. While you cited data saying 41% of homes have just one person living in them, that demographic could change for a variety of reasons. As baby boomers pass away, for example. Or as BSU builds more on-campus housing, there would be fewer college singles living off-campus. In this valley, there's simply not yet enough public transportation - and it appears that our unique situation (our size restricts federal funding options, the state doesn't allow local option taxes at the city level, and the chicken-and-egg low-ridership volume due in part to insufficient coverage and frequency) will keep us in this limbo for quite some time. On top of that, there are numerous other reasons people must have cars. They work night shifts, or they have to make side trips on the way to or from work that can't be accomplished with public transportation. Or their residence or their job are not near enough to public transport to a) use it or b) have it make sense from a time / efficiency standpoint. You mentioned two cars parking in sequence in a driveway (one behind the other). That assumes quite a lot of coordination, and perhaps even both adults having access to each other's car keys (and permission to open / move each other's cars). I don't think this should count as a 2-car space, because it's not a reliable scenario in all / most 2-car situations. If we all had zero-emissions cars (a possibility in another 10 or 20 years), would you still be trying to reduce the number of residential parking spaces? It might make sense to reduce parking spaces in areas very close to public transportation nodes. Again, though - will the residents be working at companies / entities that are on public transportation lines? Will they be working schedules when the bus is running? Will they be able to catch another bus in 10 minutes if they miss the current one? Finally: reducing parking spaces ends up reducing options. For example, perhaps a 2-income household can only afford a 1-bedroom apartment and yet need two cars because of where their jobs are located. On the residence angle, they might be okay with a transport-node-adjacent apartment complex - but with the parking-reduction policy, there are certain complexes that wouldn't be available to them. That's the same with building code that's allowing full-story entrance stairways to be built for the infill housing popping up around the valley. (Example 1705 Division, built in the last year.) This isn't ADA and is limiting options for those with canes, walkers, wheelchairs - or for those whose friends and family (i.e. not living in that primary dwelling) won't be able to visit.</p> <p>Boise does not need higher density complexes on smaller lots. The two spaces per home was appropriate. One is not enough, especially considering more and more people are living with roommates due to the cost of living so having fewer spaces to park is not appropriate.</p> <p>Parking spaces need to be realistically provided for, not limited with intention of the owner deciding to build smaller</p> <p>Required parking should increase based on the number of bedrooms in a unit. Minimum should be 2 spaces! And street parking should NOT be counted in that. Street parking makes our streets less safe and more congested.</p> <p>There needs to be enough off street parking to accommodate high density buildings such as apartments. When cars are parked bumper to bumper on the street, it makes it dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Reducing the required parking per dwelling unit will just push the 2nd and 3rd cars per dwelling onto the street. Americans won't abandon their cars without EXTREMELY convenient alternative transportation. That is a long way off in Boise. My block in the North End has an average of 2 cars per dwelling. A similar number was found on the Bench</p>
<p>There is an unused section of railroad that extends all the way to the corner of Irving and Orchard streets. That would make a great extension to the greenbelt and would better connect the phillipi bike route to the greenbelt. The Idaho camera store went out of business and it would even be possible to build a bike/pedestrian bridge from their parking lot to the other side of Orchard street and eliminate the need to stop traffic with the existing pedestrian crosswalk</p>
<p>add required biking parking; add required vehicle charging stations, less room for cars in general to encourage less dependence on cars - we only encourage / sustain our dependence on cars when we have than ample car parking.</p>
<p>I like the change to a lower parking requirement, provided access to good bike paths are available. For instance, the new developments on Federal have access to the bike path on Federal, but the bike path to downtown on Federal between Protest and Vista is nearly unusable, which discourages biking. Things like that need to be considered on a location by location basis if park is to be reduced.</p>
<p>Bown Crossing would have benefitted from a round about instead of a 4 way stop at the main intersection. An excessive amount of backed up traffic is created as only one vehicle entrance/exit to the school was created. At the start/end of school, traffic is overwhelming and backed up at the 4 way stop. This is a great example of a poor thought out traffic pattern 4 way stop.</p>
<p>It seems like this will lead to a lack of parking spaces rather than encourage alternate forms of transportation.</p>
<p>Yes - make the zoning code more detailed, not less detailed. If you want duplexes to be built next to single family homes, but the code also allows apartment buildings in the same district, the developer will pick the highest value-producing product; the apartment complex.</p>
<p>Protected bike lanes (like those alongside City Hall) have really helped me to feel safer biking in dense car traffic, which is key to commuting by bike. When it comes to new commercial developments, could required parking spaces be constructed beneath the building, rather than taking up more surface area? The giant parking lots near Trader Joe's, Whole Foods, Panera right downtown seem like they could go underneath the building and that space could be used for other buildings or public space.</p>
<p>Do not reduce the already inadequate parking that is becoming an ever increasing problem in Boise!!!!</p>
<p>I believe it's unrealistic to think these changes will encourage the use of alternative transportation</p>
<p>Better access points, more buses, and clearer routing maps</p>
<p>Gift to developers, they could care less about smaller more diverse houses, city council approved maximum density. Need to come up with solutions that don't gift developers options to cram more houses into small read with no parking.</p>
<p>Yes. Look at the taxes people pay,, nice homes all around central bench and there pops up a decrepit trailer park or sleazy neighborhood tavern! Why? There's no room for any level of middle class in the entire city! Beiter ? The governor ? The American dream is about gone in Ada county and the greater boise metropolitan area</p>
<p>People need cars. Forcing on street parking is a bad idea for a number of reasons including enhanced crime, ugly neighbor feel, & more.</p>
<p>I don't think there should be a parking minimum at all across the entirety of Boise. It is an outdated principle and prevents developers from building creative and affordable housing choices in our densest parts of the city. Creating some sort of overlay where parts of the city have higher parking minimums than others would prevent certain neighborhoods from achieving density and connectivity. I think when talking about parking you need to keep environmental justice and equity at top of mind. Our poorest and most underserved neighborhoods should not continue building excess parking and shouldering the majority of vehicle pollution.</p>
<p>It fails to address a likely problem for neighbors -- i.e., that higher-density development with reduced off-street parking requirements will result in more on-street parking.</p>
<p>Incentivize underground or sublayer parking.</p>
<p>Reducing off-street parking for single-family homes and still allowing paid parking lots to exist is a wild compromise in a time where many people are having to move multiple households together into roommate situations to afford a house at all.</p>
<p>We have to live 3 families to a home just to afford it. We need parking for everyone. Teens, Parents, Grandparents. We should be focused on "complete neighborhoods" where we build a Bown Crossing/Hyde Park in every single neighborhood. Hill at 36 St. Hill parkway by Optimist, Emerald at Garden, Overland at Columbus to Federal Way. So many busier streets that could be slowed and allow people to walk to 90% of what they need. Nothing should be farther than a 15 minute walk.</p>
<p>Maybe..too many cars... I actually called the City of Boise code enforcement on a home in my neighborhood that has 4 pods on the grass,one rv in the driveway with plumbing and electricity coming from the house for over 3 years..and way too many cars out front. The gentleman stated that I live in a neighborhood, Jordan's Landing, that does not have covenants..But city code states no one can live in an RV..well he went over there..they moved one pod and that is it. So limiting one parking spot on the street for homes is a great idea..but no one enforces it. So another mute point adding to the congestion.</p>
<p>Remove parking requirements for homes to zero parking places required and enforce parking requirements for businesses in Hyde Park.</p>
<p>It seems almost comical that we're referencing Bown Crossing and Hyde Park as the ideal neighborhood while allowing purely bedroom communities to be built in South Boise, Star, and W. Meridian. I think that all community centers should have minimal vehicle dependence and maximum walkability. We all love Hyde Park, so why are we doing the exact opposite in a vast majority of the valley?</p>
<p>I'm not sure again, sorry.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

I don't think people will give up their cars just because they don't have space for them
We need to go back to grid development and none of this subdivision dysfunction. People need easy direct options for walking and biking.
On street parking is not sufficient for more dense neighborhoods.
Require and promote bike rikes at any new non-residential construction. Offer tax benefit to add bike parking to existing non-residential properties.
Boise is still very vehicle dependent so reducing parking spaces often results in lots of cars in the streets which becomes a safety issue on narrow streets. Not sure how to solve that, the idea is great but not sure if it is realistic.
Because of lack of usable public transportation and job requirements most families have at least two vehicles per household. What transportation choices are being proposed and who are they available to?
I am concerning about the reduction of minimum parking requirements with only one (1) parking space instead of two (2). It is idealistic that we require less parking and everyone is going to bike everywhere; however, that is not realistic in most Boise neighborhoods. With people taking on roomates or two (2) families living in the same dwelling due to lack of affordable housing. We are going to have households that have cars and there needs to be a place for them to be parked. Another problem either developers or ACHD has gone to a reduced street width that essentially on-street parking so there is no place for guests or visitors to park. There are already parking problems in Bown Crossing by not having enough parking. It is hard to go to the Bown Crossing Library during certain times of the day and finding a place to park as both the on street and off street parking are full.
From my perspective if the minimum and maximum off-street parking requirements are changed there should be a divergence between residential and commercial with commercial requirements to require more parking spaces rather than less.
Bown Crossing does not attract people that don't live in the area because YOU CAN'T FIND A PLACE TO PARK. Hyde Park is 100 years old and grew from a different time when families had 1 or fewer cars. The bottom line is that the "normal" household in Boise has 2 cars. More for those with teenagers, more for those who have RVs/trucks/ toy vehicles. You can't dream your way to a city that doesn't drive just by reducing the required number of parking spots for developers to build. All you'll do is make a mess of vehicles parked on streets, creating congestion.
Our city is spread out. Two incomes are often necessary to provide basic housing. Limiting parking options is not realistic for two working people going different directions on two different schedules despite our ideals of encouraging public transit, biking and walking.
Unsure
Build out better biking first
developers are going to have to get more creative -
I am against further restrictions on parking. I don't need a bus and I don't bicycle.
Looks very tacky to have a street full of cars
Make it harder to park and drive so people have to use other modes of transportation.
Reduce parking requirements further for apartments townhomes. Focus on providing alternate transportation.
I think this would have to be individualized rather than broadly applied. Where do friends park? What if there is no reasonable non-car option in the area?
This seems tricky, just because a house is smaller doesn't mean it will have fewer cars. Seems like the unintended consequence will be even more congested street parking and less parking available in areas like the north end and NW.
This will probably not work to reduce the number of cars
Parking will become more of a problem with the proposed changes. Harris Ranch and Hyde Park are perfect examples of hard to find parking spaces to visit anyone living in those areas. Yes, more people are riding bicycles; however, more people are also driving vehicles. With the influx of people and the current transit system parking will continue to be a major problem. Very few houses, and fewer apartments are occupied by a single car owner.
many have 3 or 4 cars in a family plus a rv
The goal of this regulation is fundamentally flawed in its goals, it's approach, and it's outcomes. People love Boise for the fact that it is NOT the place these regulations allow/ encourage. Choking out parking to force the use of transit/buses is unethical and irresponsible. This doesn't allow housing to be more affordable, it forces people to move to Meridian or Kuna. Please put back the 2 spaces per home.
making sure to have bicycle lanes and walking areas, which also need to make sure to include handicap accessibility areas
I am uncertain if reducing this will encourage other transportation modes. The caveat is the possible overcrowding of cars on the street. Unless this can be paired with defensible street design, where parked cars protect bike lanes for example.
There shoud be enough parking lot space attached to the building or elsewhere if off street parking is limited to one vehicle per household.
Treasure Valley residents generally have more than 1 car per household. Alternate transportation is not widely preferred. These regulations lead to increased street parking and congestion.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Rental properties should be required to have considerably more parking spaces for residents. On-street parking should be discouraged as much as possible.
Maybe provide more transportation options?
Stop with the idiotic alternative transportation pipe dreams! You need to plan on cars and the need to park them. Bown is an example of development getting away with no investment in infrastructure to sustain businesses in an area. Hyde Park grew up with what it has which is poor from a transportation perspective. As for Boise we are already a travesty where parking is concerned. Especially in downtown areas. Costs to park are higher than many other metropolitan areas in the NW.
Overnight on-street parking could be capacity controlled with residential permits for all public street parking to increase fair usage. Each residence could be allotted 1 to 2 free personal vehicle permits, and require paid permits for more than 2 vehicles per household and for all over-sized vehicles (work/recreation/utility trailers, super duty trucks, RVs, campers/pop-ups, boats, super-sized vans) etc. The public on-street parking was never designed for so many vehicles per home or the increasing size of recreational items parked on the streets. It makes visibility very difficult reducing safety for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers and leads to continuous conflicts about on-street parking availability with existing residents insisting they have greater rights to public parking near their residences. Those of us who do not use free public parking subsidize it for those who do, on top of paying for our own parking by purchasing property with a driveway or garage, maintaining those structures, and paying property tax on the value of the land each year. I'm beyond tired of those using subsidized parking on public streets complaining about every project not including enough on street parking because they don't want to share access to a resource they are using for free. Everyone who uses vehicles needs to share in the cost of housing all these vehicles more fairly. Limiting the amount of free overnight parking per residence, and charging for additional vehicles can result in more equitable sharing of the resource and people reducing how many surplus vehicles they choose to maintain.
Growing up in Seattle, I learned that it's best to not limit the number of parking spaces until a quality, convenient mass transit system is in place to handle the increase in riders from this new code. You can't force people to use mass transit and then not have a route that takes them to the place they need to go.
Is there a way to re-evaluate *existing* neighborhoods for the possibility of including small hubs, like Bown Crossing?
This will just increase street parking
I like Bown Crossing and Hyde Park. I would never take a bus to get to either place. I can walk or bike to Hyde Park. I mostly take out-of-town visitors to Hyde Park or Bown Crossing. Driving is the only timely and realistic way when giving visitors a tour of Boise.
I can see this change as possibly helping to create more Bown Crossings (which I love) and in creating more parking frustrations. In Bown, what's been lost is any specified and reserved spacing for parked cars for people walking the Bethine Church River Trail.
Plan space for bike lanes wherever possible
What single family home only has one car? Sure a single person has one car, but what about their friends and family when they come for a visit. Or visit each day, where do they park.
Bike and pedestrian only streets, more walking only blocks
Buildings should have a minimum number of parking spots, enough for all tenants plus 20% without any compact spots.
See first note for my opinion
The regulation needs to be paired with improvements to the surrounding infrastructure to make alternative transportation more appealing to residents. Regarding zoning regulation, making changes that will encourage businesses and services to open locations that are closer to the residential areas will reduce the need for households to keep multiple vehicles.
Designated parking on outer areas and make the areas pedestrian only
Light rail
Do not make Section 11-04-07 proposed changes.
with residents going back to work from stay at home, sometimes more than one car is needed unless busses can get a system like uber where they can be requested. think like school buses have a road map matching the incoming students than random pickup spots.
No required parking
This is not enough parking. I have lived in places where there is not enough parking and have spent hours trying to find a place to park my car near my home in these other places. Although I certainly appreciate trying to emphasize alternative modes of transportation by forcing people to not have a parking space, this is not the way to do it. Public transportation in the city currently is too slow (it takes me nearly an hour by bus to get home in what I can drive in 10 min) and has too few routes to make it broadly useful. People will still use cars unless you provide actual transportation opportunities that are reasonable.
I'm not sure if it's viable, but if there's a way to waive in a more significant way parking requirements for developments in transit-oriented planning areas that contribute in a meaningful/substantive way to the costs of public transit infrastructure/services I'd be ok with that.
This plan will result in more on-street parking which reduces safety for children and pedestrians. Requirement should be based on number of bedrooms. 1 space per unit up to 2 bedrooms. 2 Spaces per unit up to 3 bedrooms 3 space requirement for over 3 bedrooms. As children age, more cars will inevitably need to be parked off-street. On street parking should be reserved for guests. Garages are rarely used for parking anymore, so the off-street spaces are even more critical.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>Yes, require smart design that integrates human scale, nature, tasteful architecture, landscaping, sidewalks, separate bike paths, public transit, and parking appropriate for the area. BC and HP do this well. They are appealing, enjoyable to walk around and diverse. Enforce the Noise Pollution of vehicles and motorcycles. There is a State 49-937 that no person shall modify muffler or exhaust system to amplify or increase noise. Ensure varied pricing for business and housing. All ages and incomes makes for healthier environment.</p>
	<p>It is hard to regulate citizens who have multiple cars when there aren't many great alternatives... address the actual root of the problem</p>
	<p>Add in limits on street parking. Doesn't make sense to limit driveway widths if it all gets shoved onto streets and people must fight for space coming home from work, etc. While common in the older neighborhoods out east, or in Hawaii, it can be a headache if lots of groceries, etc. I don't think parking is the answer to make sure you have more diverse neighborhoods. Allow for bus stops with nice benches, bike lanes.</p>
	<p>One way to improve different transportation choices would be to offer improved busing choices.</p>
	<p>I like this idea, but Boise needs to ensure more accessible public transit options in place of residents having fewer cars and to help those who cannot afford their own vehicle or do not have a bicycle. Boise is doing a great job of being a bike friendly city and I would love to see that continue to grow to reduce the amount of cars on the road. The bike repair stations on the greenbelt have certainly helped me during leisure rides and have provided me peace of mind when choosing to ride my bike places instead of driving. Perhaps the city could add a few more of those stations within neighborhoods and at more of the city parks? I would be more willing to bike around the city knowing there will be a safer bike lane option for me or greenbelt accessibility to ride on that also has the bike repair stations (goat heads strike far too often!) relatively close.</p>
	<p>Better public transport options. Lack of parking is already an issue.</p>
	<p>Limit development to in-state companies that care about the community and not just out to maximize profits</p>
	<p>Is there commercial parking during the day that could be used for residences at night and during non-working hours for those commercial businesses? If occupants of a single-family home are expected to get by on one vehicle, then we need to vastly improve our public transportation and availability. I think this is what we need to do.</p>
	<p>You are creating conflict between neighbors. Single family homes require 2 parking spaces.</p>
	<p>I think these changes make sense, but they MUST be accompanied by improvements in transit and biking options. Building homes with only 1 parking space will only make parking 2 cars very difficult and make streets crowded with cars if those 2 cars are necessary. There must be reliable, affordable, and safe transit options if you want people to ditch a car.</p>
	<p>This does not make sense until we have viable (accessible, frequent, and timely) public transportation options and user adoption.</p>
	<p>?</p>
	<p>Maybe I'm reading this wrong, but in an area that doesn't currently have adequate public transportation, this feels like forcing a parking problem in order to prove we need to spend money on public transportation. Sounds like putting the cart before the horse to me.</p>
	<p>Developers Choice, most families have two vehicles. Also when do friends and family park.</p>
	<p>Create more areas that require 0 car spots. That should be the point of a downtown home.</p>
	<p>More cars on the street increases hazards to bike riders and others. Any new development should provide two parking areas per family.</p>
	<p>Make sure that other transportation choices are convenient, affordable and accessible.</p>
	<p>Reducing the requirements will lead to more street parking congestion. It's already a huge problem. Families have more than one car. No one wants to ride the bus!</p>
	<p>Better connectivity between light commercial areas and paths to residential areas, such as the greenbelt.</p>
	<p>minimum number of parking spaces should be 2 spaces per bedroom. why push poor people onto my street? i didn't spend money buying 2.5 acres so i could see other peoples cars in my front yard. stop trying to accommodate people. if they don't have the space to park their cars on their property they need to move or own less cars</p>
	<p>Good luck making people give up their vehicles!</p>
	<p>I assume this will put more pressure on street parking, so complementary parking restrictions should be in place to make sure places like Hyde Park remain accessible to those living in other parts of town. Parking and space on the street are already tight there.</p>
	<p>That is SO ridiculous to allow residences to be built without having ample parking for everyone who rents or owns the residence! Right now we live across the street from an apartment complex that was supposed to have ample parking in their own parking lot. There are lots of commercial as well as personal vehicles parked in the street right in front of our home by the tenants who live across the street. Our street isn't wide enough for all this parking and we don't even have sidewalks! (On W. Preece Dr.) It's dangerous and doesn't follow what the developer of the apartments agreed to do when he said there'd be enough parking for all the tenants.</p>
	<p>Drivers expect parking for their cars. Removing parking requirements from developers shifts parking burdens to streets and roads, decreasing pedestrian safety and limiting use of streets for bikes.</p>
	<p>Mass transit plans would be an idea, more buses, more safe bike lanes</p>
	<p>Eliminate parking requirements outright and let the market determine parking.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Maybe, for some areas of Boise. I generally favor making car ownership more difficult, however, living near the campus, I find that even if cars aren't driven, they exist and they need parking. We constantly face parking conflicts with access to curbside mailboxes. I never get to park in front of my house. I'm not saying that's a bad thing, BUT, for a less active/mobile person than I, this could be a problem. And I have only 1 car. What if my household had multiple cars? I'm very conflicted on this issue, as you cans tell.
not sure
Include incentives for developers of more than one building to provide pace for shared mobility and future public transit connections
We need to be looking to increase parking options or traffic systems
The smaller homes should still include two garage spaces. With the cost of living 2 people with 2 cars are needed for the income to afford the housing. Creating more street parking creates more theft
Fix the public transportation system problem first.
Offer paid parking spots
This requirement shouldn't be a blanket requirement for all of Boise but rather tied to transportation options, walkability, density of area. Otherwise on-street parking becomes the issue.
Create the transportation and make sure people are using it (make it easier and more pleasant to use) rather than eliminating parking first and hoping transit will follow.
Get the legislature to allow local taxes to support a transportation system.
Again, with modifications as needed per #6.
Again, you are forgetting the older neighborhoods and homes. Bike lanes have taken away most on street parking already - narrowing up the streets so we now have to drive over sewer lids constantly wherever you go.
Not requiring commercial businesses located in those developments to provide off-street parking.
There are parking problems in many areas due to inadequate parking requirements.
Household typically have two cars to commute too work. The residential lots should have a requirement for two cars Reducing to one space will result in people competing for off street parking
I think it depends on the culture of the neighborhood. You need to ask the specific people who live in those neighborhoods, and not a sweeping regulation for all of Boise. Central Bench is a different culture than the Northend.
We need to have appropriate public transportation before we take away individual parking options. So if the public transportation and connectivity infrastructure is planned along with this then you can make it happen. Until then, people in Boise have to rely on family and individual cars.
I think that we need more improvment of bike paths before we can cut parking.
There are already too many cars and not enough parking for the existing homes...adding more "diverse" housing with looser parking regulations will only make it worse
Safer bike paths (ie barriers between bikes and cars) on busy streets like Fairview or Ustick) would likely encourage more pedestrian/bike use.
Some of the new housing off Maple Grove near Irving Street has way too many units without enough parking. The tenants cannot find enough parking space out in the street.
Most homes have a minimum of 2 vehicles.
Stop the high density housing trend. It's making life miserable. Traffic is awful.
Then people will just park on the street and totally trash up the neighborhood.
Does this also reduce the number is spaces per unit in an apartment complex? If so, there will be a huge increase in the number of vehicles consistently parking in the street and have the complete opposite effect. Most apartments, townhomes, even single family homes have multiple vehicles. This would just push them all to the street if their properties or rental complexes aren't required to have adequate parking for multi vehicle households.
Packing the neighborhood with cars won't encourage anything but fights for parking spots. Every family has at least 2 cars. And there are delivery and service vehicles that need space.
You need a way to get to these places on bike or foot. It is hard to cross all the busy streets in boise on bike or coot
No
We need to consider population growth and the needs in the next 100 years. There will be alot more people l. These areas and parking needs will in reasonable drastically.
I live in a new-ish neighborhood that has a street parking issue in the section that increased the number of units per acre. I could call a parking violation into the police almost every day!
Reducing parking for new construction will just impact existing neighborhoods and make the streets less safe to drive in with more street parking. Make the new developments provide parking garages below or above the housing, or provide a big enough parking lot.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Reducing parking won't change car and driver density in my opinion. This change needs to be partnered with real mass transit investments. Perhaps a give to get for developers. Reduced parking in exchange for investment in alternative transport.
Just because a house/unit only has 1 or 2 bedrooms doesn't mean there will be less working age adults living there. If the units are priced lower larger families will live in many of them and have a car for most of the working adults. The only cities where I've met people who didn't own cars are NYC, Boston, and Chicago.
Public transportation needs substantially more development for the reduction of minimum number of parking spaces to be feasible.
Don't change the regulation until the roads and public transportation are updated first. We are getting the horse before the cart.
Oftentimes multiple families are living in a single family home to weather the housing cost increases. Limiting parking does not make sense. Multilevel parking in densely populated areas make sense.
Less high density housing units like apartments and larger lots encouraging family homes
You propose reducing parking when we have a sub par mass transit system and a spread out city. All of your parking space reduction has led to fewer folks wanting to go downtown. I can only imagine what this will do to our neighborhoods. Cars upon cars in the streets.
You are not going to get people to have fewer than two cars per household and they should be parking on their own property and not in the street. Our subdivision does not even allow street parking.
Building some amount of smaller homes is a good idea, just not more apartment complexes. However, I think the Minimum Off-Street Parking requirement for apartment complexes (of all types) needs to be increased. There are always way too many cars parked on the street. The set of quad-plex's I live next to constantly has parking overflowing into the business parking lot next to it, because there are far less parking spaces than people who live there.
People in Boise LOVE their cars. My neighbor has 6 of them. Where will they pARK?
Parking is going to be a bigger problem now with all the developers short changing it - more people who drive often live in a given rental - ie 4 young people or students when often only 2 drivers in owned homes
Having more parking available per property is beneficial for all residents
People want to have cars. They will find ways to clog up other areas with parked cars. Don't make this change.
Do NOT reduce parking requirements, we already see problems with parking problems all over the city. Why would you want to make them worse? AWFUL IDEA!!!!!!!!!!
Nah, people are moving here in hoards. And Boise hasn't the infrastructure feasible to support such mass and density of dwellers. The solution is to limit construction. People cant move here if we dont build more on the same land. Spread Out!
Require underground parking structures or similar. Boise (and Idaho) is a car-centric city. Pretending otherwise by reducing requirements only causes greater on-street parking congestion.
Almost every family has 2 vehicles. Look at the recent development called Carlsbad Crossing on State St. One space was provided and now there are many "second" vehicles crowding both sides of Carlsbad Way. Reducing the off-street requirement is a bad idea!
You would have to address the inadequate public transportation system in a metro like Boise to expect families to move toward one vehicle. We have not enough parking, not too much.
We need more and safer ways to make having less vehicles feasible.
Another enabler for developers to squeeze in higher density residences. STOP.
This doesn't make sense to do without an established and in progress plan to address the severe lack of public transportation.
Light rail system between meridian and boise. And a train that runs all the way to nampa. Hopefully that would reduce the amount of traffic and parking needs.
I absolutely think we should be reducing minimum parking requirements. Not only will this encourage more dense housing, but will help promote more pedestrian-oriented design decisions throughout the city. Downtown has seen excellent results already. The closure of 8th street to cars has show to have only positive impacts to the downtown businesses.
Build more safe infrastructure for hikers and cyclists. And ensure new construction has ample parking included. Otherwise Boise will start looking like Chicago and Seattle neighborhoods with cars parked on street bumper to bumper for blocks on end because parking wasn't planned or required.
I understand the intent of the rule change, but it doesn't actually change the need for parking spaces. Even a "smaller more diverse housing type" still needs 2+ cars to function in Boise. The rule change only makes parking more difficult for residents in these units. Parking/loading spaces should still be sufficient enough so that residents aren't forced to park along the street, which narrows the road and creates hazards for drivers. City efforts should continue to increase options for public transportation.
Absolutely not. Limiting one family homes to one space in their own property is absurd. My sister with 4 kids has no street parking near her house. She would have to park a street over and have her kids walk at night back to the house. This is unsafe and could lead to an increase in crime if people are unable to park their cars in their own driveways. Anybody who passes this has absolutely no care for Boise families and their only interest is money.
Bike lanes

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Don't enact it, parking as it is now is a big enough challenge; creating more parking hassles will not improve anything
OMG - we are not Portland - we have CARS and we have WINTER!!! You cannot force people to suddenly use the bus or ride a bike. It doesn't work like that. Per the new development going on Victory - these parking space rules are just going to force residents to park in front of single family owned homes on Victory. People aren't giving up their cars. Instead now existing homeowners will not have parking in front of their own homes. It's a hot mess of an idea.
The fewer parking requirements, the better. Let buyers decide how much of their land to allocate to parking
More people mean more vehicles. Therefore more off street parking is needed, not less. Maybe first floor parking under the multi-family unit would keep the vehicles off the street and be less of a foot print.
I love the idea of this but the reality is that most households have more than one car and so many neighborhoods are now difficult to drive through because the streets are packed with parked cars and there is only room for one car to get through at a time. That's an issue. It seems like this will make the issue worse.
Mixed use areas as the two sited should be encouraged whenever possible to reduce traffic and provide residential convenience.
This consideration may make more sense for higher density mixed use developments (like Bown Crossing) - but even those areas already struggle to balance commercial and residential parking needs. No way around it - Idahoans love their vehicles. Many residents own more than one vehicle per resident of legal driving age. Until Boise actual has more viable public transportation options - this revision will surely result in increased frustration and conflict between neighborhood residents and visitors.
Seriously!? If the apartment is two bed room you should Assume two cars at least. If a home is only getting one car you are foolish. How many American families only have one vehicle? Come on. Don't clutter our streets. Be smart about the growth. If we don't have parking we will suffer
WTF? Parking is already a headache for folks in my neighborhood as many homes are becoming increasingly multi-family or multi-generational. As most adults in the household are working, having personal vehicles for each is also quite common.
How in the world is reducing the number of required parking spaces is going to help street parking, bike lanes and sidewalks?
Neighborhoods with less parking in driveways seem less safe and more unsightly.
No empty lots to change to commercial areas, residential parking permits might be needed
I see issue all the time, not enough off street parking
People own cars.... So a family of 4 will have 4 cars. Where are they supposed to park them? Unless you are going to put in a light rail /people hauler type of transportation across the valley so people can reduce the number of cars they own. Or possibly put in bike pass that do not interact with traffic... look through some of the European countries for what they're doing, Boise could be fabulous!!
My neighborhood is full of parking on the street. More off street parking, narrower roads with parking only allowed on one side. Perhaps alternating. Nothing uglier than a wide neighborhood road
Get rid of parking requirements. Build more protected bike lanes. Close roads (Hyde Park) to cars.
Require adequate space be left on single-family lots to accommodate off-street parking for 2 vehicles. This will keep such homes from taking up the entire lot, and recognize that the vast majority of families own more than one vehicle, which would then have to be parked on the street, exacerbating parking problems.
How many people live in a home with only one car! Get real! This is not New York folks!
To live and work in Boise, you generally need a car. Lowering parking minimums negatively impacts the surrounding community. If we magically had transportation infrastructure and jobs that don't require a vehicle, we can lower parking minimums. Until that infrastructure and professional economy exist, we can't afford as a community to make parking a luxury that only the rich can afford
The public transportation system is not robust enough to promote this. Parking in any high-density area will be a constant problem.
This is in alignment with incentivizing smaller homes rather than McMansions.
More pedestrian-only zones with housing on top of small business shops. Eliminate the need to own a car.
People aren't going to own less vehicles just because they don't have the parking. They are just going to park in the street. ..like in Hyde Park. Reduce parking to 1 space for housing that has 1-2 bedrooms and keep it at 2 for 3 or more.
Street parking should be intended for the overarching population. Property owners should be required to have adequate parking on their property to store their private vehicles. Unless public transit is improved (to reduce vehicle ownership), this will just encourage more property owners to leverage public resources for personal, long-term storage of personal vehicles. This will decrease access of public street parking to the public at large.
This is a huge issue. Even if the house has a two car garage they are often filled and the residents park on the street. Or consider a 4 bedroom rental near BSU, if each room's occupant has a car and is street parking, one house has taken the allotted spaces for four houses. Stop allowing businesses to have reductions. Bown is a mess with parked cars overflowing on to the currently undeveloped lot.
2 bedroom apartment requirements are higher than that of a 3+ bedroom house. It should be equal at most.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>This is a mostly vehicle-centric city aside from maybe the ultra-urban downtown core. Residents like the outdoors and biking, but we don't want to be forced into making that decision for a commute. I don't see a correlation to residential parking limitations and the suburban mixed-use areas mentioned here..</p>
	<p>Reduced parking as proposed for smaller homes and condos/town houses as proposed. Even less parking might be appropriate for some multi family houses in limited locations. However for larger homes on larger lots two spaces might still be appropriate.</p>
	<p>If anything, off-street parking should be *increased* to reduce load on Boise streets. There should be a city-wide requirement that every new commercial and large multi-family residential building builds 20% more off-street free public parking than their stated capacity, whether in parking lots or underground garages. This requirement alone would eliminate parking problems and reduce congestion on Boise city streets over the long term! Other large cities unfortunately have ignored parking and streets, leading to traffic & lost time looking for parking, costs of parking, and long pedestrian travel to/from parking (safety & inaccessibility).</p>
	<p>Boise has close to zero public transportation compared to big cities. Reducing parking requirements will lead to a disaster in terms of parking, as has happened in other cities.</p>
	<p>Until public transportation in Boise actually helps people get to jobs then you have to let them have room for more than one vehicle. Taking the bus to my job is an hour commute for a 15 minute drive.</p>
	<p>Public transport with greater travel radius.</p>
	<p>Could the city of Boise please quit taking away parking?! Where the heck do you think a mostly commuter city is going to park?</p>
	<p>Parking space requirements should relate to how many bedrooms and inhabitants are expected in each dwelling. Reducing available on site parking is likely to contribute to more congested street parking around it.</p>
	<p>Yes. I would like to see more houses built above parking garages so that our streets can have more bike lanes</p>
	<p>Questions should not be biased to give you the results that you seek.</p>
	<p>Our public transit is so far from being fixed. Would love to see a train connecting the whole treasure valley, but that's decades in the future. In the west bench there's a lot of new shotgun style houses, and there's alley parking, but everyone parks on the street, if Boise wants families to be a priority in the city, then why one parking spot? That's not enough for a couple, non the less a family with teenagers that are driving age.</p>
	<p>If the number of off street parking spaces is reduced, that is going to create havoc with on street parking. Most families have two or more cars. This creates congestion for the neighbors, and limits access to local commercial places. Additional parking needs to be provided, whether as garage space or a neighborhood parking area.</p>
	<p>No. You are just reducing usable space by property owners which could use the space for many purposes.</p>
	<p>Increased on street parking inhibits services such as garbage, water run off, and infrastructure servicing. On site parking requirements are needed. Instead allowing for above garage and multilevel housing would serve better.</p>
	<p>When there is a community park in a residential area then the curb side of the parks should have no parking at the curb from dusk to dawn. There is too many people parking on these curbs and living on these curbs.</p>
	<p>Reducing parking spaces just forces more on street parking. Developers must account for 2 spaces minimum</p>
	<p>No</p>
	<p>Early in the life of any new plan, we are going to be driving increasing numbers of electric vehicles. They make street parking/charging pretty problematic.</p>
	<p>our city is growing...why take away parking?! people are going to need a place to park.</p>
	<p>building more round-a-bouts. Definitely on State Street and Bogus Basin-Hill rd! Get rid of street lights and keep traffic flowing.</p>
	<p>I think Boise needs a better public transportation system, with better busing and eco-friendly options especially.</p>
	<p>Improve the public transportation system. Until that is done, people aren't/can't reduce the number of vehicles per household</p>
	<p>Incremental development around existing infrastructure allows for a free flow of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. You can even go as far as having some areas with a minimum of NO parking spaces for maximum space usage.</p>
	<p>Change the parking minimum to a parking option. Allow Developers and home builders to create the amount of parking that people are willing to pay for. This will create more space for housing.</p>
	<p>It is hard to only have one space per house because then you can potentially have neighbors parking in front of your house. Unfortunately not every home owner uses their garage for parking cars....</p>
	<p>This is a chicken/egg argument. As long as we have a car for transportation mentality we need to have room for each house to have at least 2 parking spaces. If Public Transportation was better we could overcome it, but that won't happen until it can better pay for itself. Having these changes (to 1 space per house) will just make the parking situation worse...and the city will have to then do more R for Residential Parking plans like around Boise HS and near Whitewater Blvd. [But my hope comes from more people using e-bikes, e-skateboards, etc for transportation. I see lots of that in the North End, but not in West Boise or up on the Bench.]</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Don't amend the off-street parking requirements. Making fewer parking spaces does not make people get rid of their cars, they just park on the street. Reducing the number of required parking spaces for large complexes or multi-dwelling buildings also forces cars onto street parking. Examples: the large new apartment complex on Federal Way and Targee doesn't have enough parking, so people park on Targee and Hudson, and now two 4-plexes are going in without enough parking, so we expect the street to become even more congested. In downtown Boise, I have witnessed people who live in the two apartment complexes on River, between 8th and 9th park in the Cottonwood Grille lot.
	You are just forcing car owners to park fight over street parking spots. Parking limitations will not motivate drivers to not have a car, when other options, e.g., bus options are extremely limited (e.g., two hours from my house to downtown, waiting for the bus for an hour...).
	Most families have two cars and should have a place to park them.
	With the exception of Warm Springs, most streets in the East End should be closed to vehicular traffic, with the exception of school buses and trash service.
	Very few homes have 1 car nowadays. It's generally one vehicle per driving age person. Having only 1 parking spot available would be catastrophic
	I dont have information here.
	One space for a one bedroom apt/condo, otherwise two spaces. If the city wants high density housing, parking garages should be figured into development.
	Reduced parking is annoying, but it definitely helps with city development so I approve. And I would absolutely love to see more and better transportation development so Boise could be less of a car-necessary city.
	Considering walkability, bikeability and built environment in all designs is a great way to make sure that development meets housing needs and the needs for neighborhoods to feel like a 'community' in terms of access to getting around easily and having outdoor spaces, nearby restaurants, shops, etc... Bown Crossing and Hyde Park are excellent examples of this model. I would love to see more of this across Boise!
	Possibly limit the Hyde Park area because of how tight it is to foot or bicycle traffic only from maybe around 15th or down toward the school
	Scrap the requirement entirely and establish parking enforcement zones liberally. Then newcomers to the neighborhood know what they're buying or renting into.
	This does not make sense for families with multiple drivers. What happens when a apartment or duplex is built with multiple renters? This will cause congestion and people parking if front of other peoples houses and taking their sits.
	ABSOLUTELY DO NOT REDUCE THE MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENT! It is already a problem in the North End, and reducing the minimum won't stop most new homes coming with at least two cars.
	Unless the streets are wider, parking on both sides of a street reduce a 2 lane road down to 1, If these apartments, condos, townhomes, etc. continue to be built in residential areas they need to widen the streets first.
	One space per home only encourages people to park on the street. This can become a problem if the streets are narrow.
	Building more public transport would more likely encourage more transportation choices. Keeping groceries nearby to residential areas will reduce the need to cars as well.
	More pedestrian only areas
	24/7 bus routes with a 50% drop in cost
	We shouldn't encourage off street parking when building new homes
	People need a place to park besides the street. The streets are already crowded enough with cars parked there. It is hard to see bikes and people walking because of that.
	We need better local transportation infrastructure to encourage a diverse transportation choices. Our city is mainly a "car city" because of the infrastructure. Reducing parking would cause more headaches because of the other transportation methods being unreliable.
	I'd be ok with this if the minimum number of required spaces was 1 car, but we still planned for single dwellings to be allowed two spaces (rather than mandating 1 car). You have families where both parents have to work jobs and then you have kids that need to get to and from various school activities. Not everyone can carpool or ride their bike full time and I think 2-3 cars is fairly normal for most families. Furthermore, just because we reduce parking spaces or replace car lanes with bike lanes that does not change what the community wants or needs, but what it does create is a lot of backlash.
	What about zero?
	There should be adequate parking for all families. The minimum parking should include adjacent street. Poor families have cars too.
	A single family home on average has 3 cars
	Need the road, public transit and sidewalk infrastructure to be updated to support this! I fully support less cars but if we don't give people others ways to get around we're just going to have people parking on side streets and pissing off their neighbors
	Only if you can creat locally opportunity zones.
	Mixed use developments are a great idea! The only problem is that the only ones that are built are tied to condos. think that as long as taking the bus is less convenient than taking the bus this will continue to be an issue. For example- Boise cut the closest bus stop from my house so now if I want to take the bus to work it would take 70+ minutes while my commute is only 25 minutes.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	We do not need to eliminate any parking spaces. We need more spaces built with a focus on more electric car charging areas.
	A 'single family home' will most likely have 2 or more drivers - where are they going to park? As it is Hyde park has limited parking and when there are events no parking can be found
	There are more than two working and driving people per house hold that require more than one off-street parking.
	Are there plans to have new developments provide parking, such as a deck below the units? I live in a single family home with a roommate and this would cause one of us to not have a parking space.
	I think this is a great idea as long as businesses are still required to have a reasonable amount of parking and there are still options for people with disabilities.
	This would seem to promote smaller lot sizes or strange lot configurations in residential areas (we already have several cul-de-sacs or random shared driveways that stretch from a cul-de-sac. Please find a way to avoid this in the future; Boise is the first place I have seen this unique (and personally undesirable) layout method.
	People Factor this into plans when they're looking to buy or rent a house. Most people that live in Boise own more than one vehicle so this would not fix that problem.
	This could back fire as parking in my area is already a massive pain. Would it be possible to also require one space also be included that is not off street? I.e. one off street and one separate on location parking as well? This just seems like a bad idea in the long run and a great idea in the very short term.
	Every should have 1 parking spot per bedroom and every business a parking spot for expected customers per average turnover time.
	Shared garages help - it eliminates some of the side-setback requirement. The old block layout with allies enables more off-street parking. There can be parking under the home or apartments. Its no good having to many cars parked in the street. The neighborhood suffers livability problems when you can't park near your home. For example, its difficult to get groceries from the car to the house.
	Limiting car parking spaces is not going to do anything if there are no alternative transportation options available. Public transit in Boise is slow and unreliable. To encourage denser cities, public transit system should first be improved.
	Existing neighborhoods are already locked in to what they have. It's too late. Future development should focus on a clear separation between residential and business. And zoning for residential only to have a developer at a later date request to rezone for a business or affordable housing is wrong. It hurts the current homeowners.
	Since Boise lacks commuter trains and bus hours leave something to be desired, limiting parking availability is detrimental to feasibility for some dwellings.
	The apartments should limit number of vehicles allowed per unit. Otherwise, the apartments will monopolize all parking.
	Very bad idea to lower parking requirements. Unless we have a very prolific public transportation system we will always have the need for parking. Please do not lower parking requirements
	People will continue to drive cars unless it's safer/more efficient to bike/take public transit. Also biking only goes so far. Not many people want to ride in the snow or 110 degree heat. Need more public transit or the parking change is just going to be a disaster.
	Fix the existing roads, curb & side walks before adding a mess to the surrounding area.
	If we had better public transportation instead of taking it away (like was done in my neighborhood, Gary Lane Meadows) people wouldn't need their 2 cars. Taking access to public transportation away and reducing the amount of cars people can park is a double negative
	MOST EVERY HOUSEHOLD HAS AT LEAST TWO VEHICLES, THERE NEEDS TO BE ENOUGH PARKING SPACES ALLOTTED FOR EACH APARTMENT COMPLEX.
	I do not think reducing the required parking would be a good idea, especially in my neighborhood. While we all hope for more public transportation use, it won't happen overnight, and I find it discouraging or unpleasant to try to be a pedestrian or bike user on streets (even with sidewalks, which is still not continuous throughout the city) that are completely lined with street-parking cars (because homes and apartments don't have adequate parking space) and don't provide clear sight lines for safety. I don't think it is realistic to believe that people living in Boise could completely forgo a car, especially in a 2 person household. If lower income or more diverse housing has less parking space, I think you are encouraging more street-parking and then also creating the impression that those people somehow don't "deserve" to have as much parking or access, when the opposite is the case.
	Most homes in Idaho have 2 working adults, which means they have 2 cars and need parking for both. To encourage more varied methods of transportation: invest in bike paths and green belts so that pedestrians & cyclists can travel safely without impeding street traffic, improve the bus system by including enough buses and stops that it is a reliable, safe, affordable option to get to/from work and appointments on time, and implement a trolley/shuttle/subway system. Or encourage businesses to allow their employees to continue to work from home so they do not need to drive as much.
	Please learn from the mistakes of other cities. Just because you reduce parking spaces doesn't mean people won't but cars and need a safe place to park them
	Make them provide adequate parking for the development! You're myopic ideas about how many cars people have are one of the main problems! Quit looking at what you think things should be and accept things as they are!
	Fewer cars on the road and greater access to public transportation is overall beneficial.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>1 space per home to encourage smaller, more diverse housing types? That sounds completely asinine. Any dwelling with 2 rooms is realistically going to require at least 2 spots. I am a single dad and my son live with me. We have a smaller place. We both have cars. If you are going to drop parking spots you need to make better transport. It is unrealistic to not have a car anywhere outside of Downtown.</p>
	<p>Until there is major investment in legitimate transit, be very wary of reducing parking requirements anywhere besides the downtown core. I've been here for decades and this remains a very very car centric town, by necessity, as well as due to the seasons and weather, etc</p>
	<p>Don't build in order to maximize builders' profits. Build in order to benefit wildlife and dark sky needs, and provide parking for guests visiting properties. The best way to view this is to go to the BIG MESS on 36th street in Garden City by Luciano's and the walking bridge in Garden City! The housing crammed in there has made it impossible to drop off gifts for my adult Children, and blocked the views of everyone originally living in tall newer buildings in the neighborhood, and totally disregarded recreation, wildlife and accessibility!</p>
	<p>in most families both adults work and probably drive to work. In most rentals there are at least 2 or more cars per apartment, as extra roommates are needed to meet the high rent prices. Again, excess cars are forced to park on surrounding streets, putting the people living on those streets at a severe disadvantage. REDUCING THE NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES IS A STUPID IDEA! Check your current bus routes, they don't extend very far. How else are people supposed to go to work to provide this "growth" you talk about? Bicycling and walking in the pouring rain or snow? Probably not!! You have to take Boise's volatile weather into consideration.</p>
	<p>Leave it alone it works great now.</p>
	<p>Go back to 2 parking spots</p>
	<p>We don't have other transportation choices as of right now. Our public transportation needs a massive overhaul before this can happen. Right now you need to drive in Boise.</p>
	<p>This kind of regulation only makes sense if there is better public transportation or bike system in place. Most households require at least two cars so each working person can get to their job. Boise is too spread out to limit parking like this.</p>
	<p>Increasing transportation choices will NOT result in a decrease in vehicles owned and parked at residences in Boise. The updated policy will only result in more cars parked on the streets and lead to a congested mess.</p>
	<p>Boise's public transportation system is not well developed enough to justify limiting parking in residential areas. Additionally, in residential areas, residents will want to be able to have people over without taking all their neighbors' parking.</p>
	<p>People will not be able to park in front of their own home! this is a terrible idea. People have to live with multiple generations just to afford the house, so there are often many cars that need to be parked. We do not have a subway, railway, etc. we rely on our cars. This makes the problem worse.</p>
	<p>Remove minimum parking requirements entirely.</p>
	<p>Offer free permit parking passes to neighborhood residents & encourage non residents to use ridesharing apps or bicycles.</p>
	<p>Boise cannot reduce parking... yet. Getting to work via bus is not viable for many in my neighborhood because commuting past downtown from SE Boise is very time consuming (time from Bown to Idaho campus via bus in morning is 1h:30m to 1h:45m, vs 25 minute commute). And for getting to Bown Crossing from elsewhere - bus service terminates at dinner time, and doesn't run on weekends. Locals might be able to bike, but it's not like Hyde Park where I can just park anywhere nearby on a weekend day and walk a few blocks. Parking both at home and at businesses needs to be prioritized until people can actually get to work or go around town without cars on (mostly) their schedule.</p>
	<p>NO change to current regs!</p>
	<p>If you don't require adequate parking for our vehicle heavyarea, you'll create conflict.</p>
	<p>Parking in Hyde Park is inadequate and lack of parking infringes on neighboring homes for blocks around the area. Parking needs to be considered and the majority of people drive to their destinations.</p>
	<p>If you're going to reduce the amount of parking then there needs to be more efficient modes of public transportation. As it is right now if you don't have a car and have to use public transit it's not efficient or the main form of commuting for those in Boise</p>
	<p>To some extent, the off-street parking needs to vary a bit based on neighborhood design. Certain neighborhoods have massive problems with too much on-street parking spilling over into neighboring areas, especially where they attract multiple families per home, where the housing is dominated by rentals over owner-occupied homes, neighborhoods with narrow lots (IE ratio of on-street parking to number of houses, and where those homes far from public transit and biking distance. Connectivity to bike/pedestrian infrastructure, distance from amenities, and the availability of on-street parking, etc. need to factor into that design, otherwise you will get areas with little on-street and off-street parking that result in on-street parking spilling out of the neighborhood like in one area near my home. If a home is not in a place that is connected to public transit, and is not walkable/bikable to anywhere, it needs more parking than a home that is close to downtown or a more walkable area. Distance to schools, retail, grocery stores, downtown and other businesses, as well as the connectivity for bike/walking infrastructure needs to be accounted for.</p>
	<p>Stop sitting on our tremendous surplus and invest in a true transit infrastructure before it's too late.</p>
	<p>No parking minimums, period. Why are we making the private automobile a legal requirement at all?</p>
	<p>Developers should be allowed to appeal this requirement if they can demonstrate that less parking is required, or if the development is mixed-use. The size should be factored in as well; homes with one or two bedrooms may not need off-street parking. 0.5 or 0.75 off-street spaces may be more appropriate.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Because of noises terrible public transport system, single car homes are rare unless there is manly one person living there and again with the cost of homes/rentals - that is unrealistic
Increase walkability in neighborhoods-- walkability is proven to lower traffic use/noise.
You need to invest in affordable & reliable public transit before you keep letting the city grow! If needed tax developers for that.
Then there is nowhere for family, friends that are visiting to park and needing to walk several blocks to someone's home is ridiculous.
Encourage or require dwelling above garage design for apartments and condos in tight areas
stop trying to stack every business and every house on top of each other!!
Those are a few areas that may need reduced vehicles but other areas need the parking spaces. When you are looking at multi families or Co habitation with roommates etc most have a vehicle so it would increase the number of spots needed.
Mixed use development, green space within the development, universal design, public art. Invest in all neighborhoods not just the north end.
All its going to do is make people park on the side streets directly in front of homes that are privately owned. But don't worry, an investment firm will turn us all into renters soon enough.
There needs to be adequate parking - 2 vehicles per unit living space. Too much street parking in residensial areas - causing hazards.
Stop building so many houses/apartments on small lots.
Keep the two vehicle off-street requirement. However, using the example of the proposed State & Arthur apartment project, it's obvious that you do not understand the need for off-street parking
Parking is already a problem in Boise and this section wants to reduce parking? I don't know if that makes sense. Also, most single family homes have more than 1 vehicle and would probably need more than 1 off street spot. Maybe I don't understand the intended purpose of this section?
I Personally would never buy a home with only one parking spot. Where is the visitor supposed to park? Tell them they have to go pay to park to visit me. I don't care for that at all.
Stop paving farmland. Period. We live in a desert in case you missed it, water is limited and should go to FARMS. No farms = no food. Food does NOT come from grocery stores. Tell the developers to shove it. Stop lining your greedy, lying political pockets with their money and do your job you putz. I'm from Memphis, I'm not an idiot--more de-velopment means higher housing prices, there's no way around that. Stop paving farms. Period.
I think most families need to spaces at least.
Honestly this is all very confusing but what I do know is parking sucks just about everywhere in Boise and we don't have good public transportation nor does the weather allow for year round bicycling so we need more parking not less
Yes! Link this to TOD and improved transit, especially on enhancement or improvement corridors.
Make lots bigger for multifamily parking. I know it will not happen, but this is my opinion. We all know that MONEY TALKS.
All these changes seem to favor development more than current residents? We don't want a community with a denser number of units on each lot.
Include new construction requirements that support future public transit infrastructure projects (bus stops etc) and 5G connectivity
Do not change it. In many areas there are already parking issues, specifically tied to higher density that have not enough parking spaces so that leads into single residential areas.
It's the start of the green new deal. Fewer parking spaces is just trying to tell us fewer cars.
Make riding the public busses free or easier to pay. Currently it's quite cumbersome which prevents ridership. This would help alleviate space needed for vehicles
We need better public transit, including a commuter option from Nampa/Caldwell and Meridian city bus.
I think this will cause more parking issues for existing residents who live adjacent to me developments.
Public transportation system is not great or very accessible, so unless that changes I'm not sure that will encourage people to only have one car. It's tough in a family with multi-ple adults when you have multiple locations/differing hours for work schedules to get away with only having 1 car.
Bigger roads and pedestrian walk and bike ways.
When we all have the electric cars that Joe Bidenhole wants us to drive this will no longer matter.
Any development must include reasonable parking, or a very large contribution to city transportation options like a trolley to more parking. It is ridiculous to only require one parking place when most homes have at least two residents who drive!
Think more about walkability and bike lanes.
Already the streets are crowded with cars that won't fit into owners driveways. Absolutely impossible to do deliveries in many neighborhoods.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Parking is not just about a space for a car, it's access to the property for tree trimming and large haul maintenance. It's space for camping, boating, and just plan moving. Limiting neighborhood parking just creates more bottleneck problems.
	Less parking spaces will lead to overcrowded street parking which is more dangerous for bikes and kids
	No
	Consider the trend moving away from car ownership that makes lots of parking space starting to look wasteful and ridiculous.
	You think that decreasing the number of parking places is going to get people to ride the bus? That doesn't seem like it's a likely outcome. Maybe first we need to invest in a better bus system.
	Encourage underground parking. But a residence must have at least 2 parking spaces.
	I think so but most households will have 2-3 cars depending on children and we have useless public transportation so people need cars.
	The city always underestimates the number of cars that infill housing brings to the neighborhood. The result is numerous cars being parked on the street because the city required inadequate parking on property. A good example of this is the huge apartment block that was built on the corner of Boise Ave and Protest. The excess cars from this building are clogging the surrounding streets.
	Oh my god! You are idiots.
	Boise will likely never have decent mass transit options. So it is important that there be adequate parking for resident's cars, boats, RVs, etc.
	Denser neighborhoods with less parking when family's have more vehicles? Boise was enjoyable because we weren't packed in like sardines. Now there is subdivided small lots with barely enough room to turn around. Why pack people in and give less space? Keep it at 2.
	What we have in our subdivision is condos on each end of the street causing ridiculous parking. It is very dangerous entering off of Cloverdale onto W. Irving. I have contacted ACHD for solutions and hav now given up because nobody wants to help. It is an accident waiting to happen.
	I live in Columbia Village and work in North West Boise. I am a HUGE advocate of public transportation and would love to use it. However, if you are going to make this zoning proposal, please consider the fact that not all of us work and/ or live in places that is accessible to public transportation. Even if I worked downtown, I still would not be able to access it. PLEASE consider this for residents who live in all neighborhoods. We would love to not use our cars. Please improve the transit system!!!
	too late--driveways need to be increased in length to allow for parking of suv's and trucks without them blocking sidewalks
	Stop building!
	Yes. We need mass transit. Railway line to canyon county. More buses. More direct routes. An AirTram would be beneficial.
	start more one way streets to help either traffic flow due to more cars parking on the streets
	The transportation choices have to be there first. Limited parking may be one deterrent, but it won't be enough to keep people out of their cars.
	Get the abandoned cars off the streets to free up parking and make streets safer. I see many streets with vehicles that have not moved in months and some have expired registration.
	Parking is horrible now the way it is now let alone reducing the amount of parking spaces. Cars line the streets of a neighborhood because there is no place to park in their apartment complex. How does that help an existing neighborhood?
	I think reducing off site parking requirements will work only if suitable nearby on-street parking is guaranteed option, as well as increased public transportation. I think it also depends on the residential size. Often multiple adults share a residence to reduce costs, each adult requiring a car to get to work. This is a reality, and Boise public transportation is no where good enough to assume that a reduction in the ratio of car to adult will magically happen if we simply reduce off street parking. What we will get is a disorganized mess of illegally parked cars in residential areas.
	Sidewalks and/or bike lanes should be required for any new neighborhood
	No off street parking
	I agree with the theory of requiring less parking but it makes no sense for Boise now. If a person has no car this is a terrible place to live. Public transport is poor and so is bike connectivity. The only place it would maybe work is someone who lives and works downtown and buys everything over Amazon delivery. Most people live and work in places not served by public transport or which are too far to bike/walk and most houses do have 2 cars because people work in separate locations. Developments that have reduced parking are just a clusterf**k of cars. My mom lives in one of these and it is a nightmare. It is impossible to find a place to park when I go visit her and it caused such problems. They had to assign street parking spots to tenants because everyone had more than one car and most people use the garage as storage because the houses are so tiny. I love mixed use areas but if the parking is already reduced these areas also become parking nightmares. I feel terrible for the people who live within 3 blocks of Hyde Park because the area is always jammed with cars.
	People here NEED cars. There is no way around it. If you reduce parking requirements it is just a giveaway to developers to put MORE people here, creating more conflict as they will bicker over parking
	Need more off street parking so there is less lawn to waste water on.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Reducing off street parking to encourage smaller, more diverse housing does not equate to affordable housing. It is important to note that you need to have existing viable transportation choices before 'encouraging' people to use them. I would leave the parking spaces as they are and focus on planning a light rail system between Boise and Caldwell.</p>
<p>I do not like this proposal. More street parking, not less.</p>
<p>The above example of single family homes from 2 to 1 space isn't the problem. The problem is multi family units not having enough parking off street and then those residents taking street parking and congesting roadways</p>
<p>Boise locals have more than one car, the public transit is improving but it's not robust enough for locals to not have a 1+ personal vehicle(s). This is obviously just a density ploy so that developers can cram more units into a smaller space.</p>
<p>Not sure</p>
<p>Residents do not own only one vehicle per unit. They own multiple vehicles. Families and roommates own multiple vehicles. Street parking will be stressed. People will park in yards.</p>
<p>Maybe. Someone looking for affordable single-family home housing might only have one car. Or it might deter people from moving here :)</p>
<p>For multiple unit housing it could be really nice to have more options for non-car parking</p>
<p>some people have more than one it could cause problems because more peopl will park on street</p>
<p>We need to require more parking spaces per residential development like apartment buildings and townhomes. It is becoming very hard to find parking in many Boise neighborhoods and on downtown streets/parking garages because city code does not require residential developers to provide enough parking for residents. This is a serious problem that is making Boise hard to navigate and discouraging people from visiting businesses in certain neighborhoods like the north end and the bench as well as downtown. Additionally to combat this issue we should maintain and expand our bike lanes and pedestrian infrastructure to encourage people to choose transportation methods aside from driving.</p>
<p>It seems like parking minimums should be reduced or eliminated in areas where transit access exists or will be prioritized. They are probably appropriate in areas where automobile transportation is required.</p>
<p>More public transportation options would help t make guys feasible. Portland, OR serves as an example.</p>
<p>Everyone likes independence to drive their own vehicles nowadays, public transportation is nice to have, but many families have to live combined together to afford a place and that means they need space to park their vehicles if each had one.</p>
<p>All of this is, in my opinion, going in the right direction. I just want to put emphasis on the point that dedicated bicycle and pedestrian pathways between desirable places would go a long way in helping people choose to ditch their cars. Sidewalks on busy streets aren't places that are enjoyable to walk or bike along (they are noisy and you often breathe in exhaust), and I personally find the approach of The Netherlands to be incredible where non-motor traffic often have their own infrastructure paths, instead of running alongside automotive roads. Something akin to our greenbelt, but more widespread so that you don't have to bike on dangerous streets to get to the part that is enjoyable to be on.</p>
<p>Parking is already an issue, for new buildings to be sustainable and not damage neighborhoods adequate parking needs to be included</p>
<p>Stop reducing property sizes to make the developers more money! These homes are tiny, poor quality, and you still want to gut out more from them?!</p>
<p>I hope new residences or apartment complexes will have the infrastructure to allow EV batteries and also solar panels.</p>
<p>Too many apartment dwellers are parking on the street. Increase parking requirements</p>
<p>Live in reality and realize that most families are going to have at least 2 cars. No one wants to live where the street is full of parked cars because there's not enough off-street parking! It makes the neighborhood look junky. Get real. Boise is not a pedestrian city. People need their vehicles, and a lot of people have big vehicles, too. That is not going to change! Residences should have no less than 2 off street parking spaces.</p>
<p>There are many pockets in residential areas which were originally semi rural but now filled with homes where there are no curbs, gutters and sidewalks. I would like requirement and enforcement of in-fill building of residences to require curbs, gutters and sidewalks. In addition I would like to see a concerted effort by the city to fill in these long-standing gaps where fill in builders failed to provide them, even in fairly large developments. Without them, biking and walking are discouraged due to cars parking at various angles or in the only areas where pedestrians can safely walk. I live in SE Boise where it is difficult to walk to BSU, ParkCenter businesses, Schools, etc. without having to walk in the street or on gravel and uneven frontage. The presence of these basic roadway fixtures creates neighborhood continuity as well as safety and convenience and motivation to walk and bike. There are places where disability curb cuts have been newly installed but are not connected to another section of sidewalk. These little omissions on our street systems are build deals to seniors, the disabled and anyone trying to push strollers, etc. Please make curbs, gutters and sidewalks in existing neighborhoods a priority in the new plan.</p>
<p>There aren't enough garages in most homes in historic areas so where are people going to park?</p>
<p>Preserve more green space. Stop overdevelopment.</p>
<p>REDUCING PARKING SPACE WILL MAKE THINGS WORSE, NOT BETTER.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

I live in southeast boise...6 cars for one rental in a cul-de-sac. Where's the city in regards to rentals out of control.
Yes
No. It's not a good idea
I moved from DC, a city that knows how to utilize public transit. Our transit system needs to be available during times when people need it. We need a bus from Hyde Park and from other areas where there is nightlife, to residential neighborhoods. Even buses leaving from a downtown parking garage into hyde park or Bown's crossing would help parking but not drunk driving. Buses on the weekends needs to run until after the bars close.
More designated biking lanes to promote cycling as a primary means of transportation. More amenities along sidewalks such as lighting, garbage cans, benches, art, ect.
People should be given an option of one or two off-street spaces. Many families are dual income, and public transportation options may not conveniently meet their needs. Two vehicles (hopefully electric with easy charging options!) may be needed to meet their needs.
If the property cannot park 2 cars, more cars will be parked on the street - which will cause more congestion. New developments may have sidewalks for pedestrians. Many existing neighborhoods have NO sidewalks - and more cars parked on the street are dangerous. Public transit is sketchy at best...
First, add more public transportation. Second, why would this encourage smaller housing. It encourages a family to have fewer vehicles.
Until Boise has more public transportation options and usage it does not make sense to give developers this break. People have cars and eliminating off street parking won't change that fact. People living in Hyde Park or Bown Crossing still have cars and most work outside of those areas. Eliminating adequate parking for residents is not an improvement for our city.
More public transportation
Ride a bike
You can regulate parking spaces all you want, but until public transit is a more useful option in Boise, and cycling is safer, most people will continue to drive their own cars. It's a chicken and egg problem, sure. But I'm of the opinion you can't change one without the other.
Green belt like Access.
Could inhibit resale value, and value in general if not enough parking
Continue to improve bicycle and pedestrian paths. Look for opportunities to separate bicycle and pedestrian paths from the roadways.
Limiting parking results in increased street parking, exacerbating congestion and accidents.
One space is not enough. Two should remain.
Providing alternative transportation means would be a better option than discouraging parking. People still drive to Hyde Park from all over Boise, and parking can be difficult over there with many people parking on residential streets in order to access Hyde Park amenities.
Our neighborhood is a high percentage of rental homes. Tenants who live each have vehicles so parking is a problem. Changing the requirement from 2 to one space per home will cause problems in West Boise.
I've seen how the parking situation in the North End has become tenuous in areas and stifled neighborhood business like the coop and the yoga center. Neighbors get at each other's throats and it ends up ruining the whole feeling of living in that area. I hope that planning ahead could stop this. This change sounds too simplistic and could make situations like this worse.
The more transportation choices the more homeless will be here.
Lowering the parking spaces assumes a single person can afford to live in a home in Boise. Grossly out of touch. You know more than one person will be living in a home, unless that person is rich.
Maybe not. We are a culture with work trailers, campers and tractors. We need and value our space
Since people have a choice about public/other transportation and the population has not gone in that direction, the current requirements should be maintained. Zoning is not a proper forum for nudging people's free choices. Neighborhoods will suffer if this change is made.
You all ready do not require enough parking in developments. Giving incentives to reduce park further is not ok. Also requiring parking to be behind a business and putting the business at the street has a negative impact on business. My daughter managed a business that was required to do this and business was half of what was expected for that location. in another location the buildings had to meet the parking in back requirement and the developer had difficulty keeping the space leased as businesses had trouble getting people to find them. As far as being more like Bown Crossing and Hyde Park we dont frequent these locations due to limited parking. We used to go to hyde park all the time in the summer but the only way that worked was if we went on our motorcycle due to parking. (and we went a lot in the summer) But we no longer go there due to limited parking.
A lot still have two jobs and still drive to work and People rent out rooms to help pay for housing.
Reducing parking does not reduce the need for a car in Boise. More public transportation choices must be available first.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

More small scale public transportation and more designated parking lots.
Remove all parking requirements. Let buyers and renters decide how much they're willing to pay for parking.
Perhaps consider nearby off-street multi-level parking garages for multiple vehicle residents and visitors to use to keep street and driveway parking to a minimum.
Always require off street parking
Maybe the best way to look at the new rezoning laws is to really analyze new living quarters to accommodate the new population growth in Boise. As of now the retirees have homes to live in , A good portion of the middle class have residential homes to live in , now the lower middle class and the lower class people in which are the lower wage earners cannot afford to buy a house at this time so they need to save money and maybe someday they will be able to purchase a home ,those people are also having a tough time finding a place to live because of apartments are too costly to rent also because of no supply . I think we need to concentrate on that sector of people at this current time so that those people don't move to another state, so that they can survive and have hopes of living the American dream in Boise Idaho. If we don't have places for those workers to live then long term, then fast food businesses and restaurants and a lot of other businesses will close down because of a shortage of workers.
On-street parking already makes the North End nightmarish for drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists, why would you make it worse?
Do not do it. It spells overcrowding. Will not be worth it.
varies per neighborhood...need to take into account older vs. newer neighborhoods and what presently exists in established neighborhoods
Cars will spread out into residential areas instead. I see this with the Charter Pointe apartments, where resident's cars completely fill Brogan Drive behind the complex.
RV parking needs to be considered for suburbs.
Increase transportation options and provide community incentives.
Living In A town house with limited street parking is a pain. I use my garage, buy it doesn't seem like others do. They also have more than 2 cars and this new regulation just packs the cars on the street. More off street parking is a requirement if this would be a rule.
Perhaps there is a way to include mini parking lots for visitors/overflow every so often as long as no one leaves a car there permanently. Such as room for two to six cars. Possibly every 3 or so blocks? Also, bus stops.
The reality is we have no real mass transit system. I can't imagine a family or couple relying on 1 car in Boise. People have to use cars and there has to be room for parking at least 2 vehicles per household.
Parking for buildings is important to maintain. It needs to accommodate the structure.
Don't build on our wet lands. And people can't and shouldn't own a right of way like on the green belt and the road to the cross. Someone is pocketing some money somewhere.
I am not interested in mix use developments at the expense of safe neighborhoods.
We are already too high density.
I think this idea only works when done in conjunction with very accessible and affordable community transportation options. Otherwise, parking becomes a negative overflow for neighboring residential areas because of limited "legal" parking
Have the excess parking in front of your home and see how that works for you.
Excessive street parking clogs neighborhoods, especially those with residences that have multiple adult tenants. It also can help invite crime with vehicle break-ins
I don't have any good ideas. I know families in Hyde Park and Bowen Crossing still own multiple cars and still use them to take a trip to Target. I believe economics drive the decision to use public transportation and limit the number of cars.
Force ACHD to minimize their taking of roadways and provide more street parking. I live in 36th and it's unfortunate that we don't have street parking anymore like 28th etc.
one off street parking space per house may make sense for one and two bedroom houses, but not for three and more bedroom houses.
Parking is always going to be a hot topic and no matter what you do, there will NEVER be enough parking in anyone's mind. What people really need is a mind shift TOWARDS public transport with access to a web of convenient stops and a stellar public transport system.
This is a terrible idea. Boise already has parking frustrations. This idea would intensify it, possibly causing additional household cars to be parked closer to businesses. People have mixed households with room mates, partners that work in complex patterns and even friends and family that come to visit. A minimum of 2 spaces provides pressure relief, even visual pressure relief.
People are going to have the same number of vehicles, whether or not they have a place to park them. Taking away home parking and forcing more street parking is a stupid idea to put it mildly.
People still love their cars and will park them somewhere. Still only 1-2 people on the vista bus when I ride downtown every morning
Add bike corridors to low use thoroughfares.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>We need a train in this town - it's been long overdue. You drive down State Street, Glenwood, Hill Road, Harrison Blvd, Chinden, the connector, you name it - way too many single drivers for the exponential growth of this city. It is only getting more and more congested. I have lived here 30 years.</p>
	<p>It seems like the city just wants more density...wherever and whenever, and will adjust the "rules" to accomplish this.</p>
	<p>Lots of families only have one car. Requiring two spaces is silly. What's wrong with on street parking anyways? Most streets are wide enough to accommodate it. I feel zero spaces if there is adequate on street parking is acceptable and only require off street parking for very narrow streets that can't fit cars. Commercial buildings should be near housing so people don't have to drive everywhere.</p>
	<p>Stop inviting people to move and live here we are already at our Max</p>
	<p>This only means that developers can squeeze in more units on less land. If a north end lot has one home and a detached garage today, that same lot means a developer can squeeze in three terribly built and designed rectangles - because only three cars will be legally parallel parked in front.</p>
	<p>Our city leaders have no foresight. You missed the timing. This should have all been decided 15 to 20 years ago.</p>
	<p>The public transportation system doesn't support this. Boise is too spread out and expensive to make walking/biking as a commute a viable option for most, and private options are cost prohibitive.</p>
	<p>Again. We like our large lots & appreciate the fact that you can only have 1 single family home per 1/2 acre. We don't want this in our neighborhood!!</p>
	<p>Require developers to pay a certain amount for public transportation programs in our city.</p>
	<p>Create more transportation options! This is a backwards way of doing things. Other transportation options need to be available before restricting parking spaces.</p>
	<p>parking is a city wide problem because their is minimal profit in providing parking. You should not reduce minimal off street parking standards. My neighborhood has very little street parking because more homes have mulitple renters in what use to be single family homes. Your code should take more money from the developers to provide additional parking in neighborhoods</p>
	<p>Don't reduce, ELIMINATE parking requirements.</p>
	<p>Better public transport times would greatly reduce the number of vehicles required for jobs etc</p>
	<p>Your question is about parking and then you want to talk about mixed use of Bown. That is called creating bias. Think of areas of dense housing without appropriate parking, like near the city jail, a multi-bedroom plex, or studio apartments (None of which are like Bown, or the block known as Hyde Park.) You need enough parking to at least accommodate the adults in a home (likely 2) or the renters in a plex, based on bedrooms. As prices rise it also takes more people to afford the place so that means more parking. The transportation choices are not that many. Taxi or uber, bike, foot, car, or bus. Now is that available on every street, everywhere people want to go?</p>
	<p>Decades late, and hundreds of millions short.</p>
	<p>This really sucks. Bown Crossing started out so well and we excited to live nearby but now it's just a mass of people crammed into a once beautiful part of town. Now it's a laughing stock</p>
	<p>Two spaces per dwelling. Work with neighbors that don't have any vehicles or only 1 & cooperate parking.</p>
	<p>You are not thinking farther than your nose. Most people have two cars and if you have roommates it definitely will not work. By your design you are creating tensions in the neighborhood. Have you ever shared parking and a building that has more people than spaces. It is a design for trouble. I'm surprised this kind of stuff is coming out of Boise City. We don't have enough policeman as it is, why create zones of tensions.</p>
	<p>People don't use public transportation or bikes and walking enough to make that work. Each family unit needs at least 2 spaces for off-street parking plus enough frontage for at least 3 vehicles on the street. The skinny-house people always seem to have so much 'stuff' that the garage is invariably used for storage/workshop, so each house puts 2-3 vehicles on the street, impacting access to other resident's property.</p>
	<p>This will be much easier for people living closer into the city. People living beyond downtown, the bench, and north end will rely on their cars for everyday transportation even if they live in a mixed use neighborhood.</p>
	<p>Who has that few cars. Boise is backwards for parking/ housing units. We need more off-street parking not less, and the spaces need to be for large trucks that otherwise park on the street/sidewalks and block views of cyclists/pedestrians/oncoming traffic at intersections</p>
	<p>Limit on how many vehicles each household may have?? We live in a single family home neighborhood with 2-3 car garages and drives, and many people still don't seem to have enough space for all their vehicles, not to mention guests. Improving public transportation access in Boise might help.</p>
	<p>Certain developments can have less parking spaces however residential neighborhoods should have enough parking on the property for all residents.</p>
	<p>Access to bus routes needs to improve before parking is reduced.</p>
	<p>Better bike lane, more car safety</p>
	<p>Regulations should not change. The increase in congestion is getting unbearable.</p>
	<p>Write it so that it encourages the behavior you want instead of having it take away from what people already have. For instance, encourage fewer vehicles per household by incentivizing bicycles or shared transport.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Actually build a light rail system and better bus system. The mall is no longer a destination we need updated, and more routes and we need something to connect Caldwell to Downtown Boise with stops at the village roaring springs id center dt nampa and creekside in Caldwell</p>
<p>We can't stuff things in anymore. Most households have two cars anyway. What are we to do with the second for those that depend on street parking?</p>
<p>Multilevel Public parking garages should be considered within a development if the required number of parking spaces at a dwelling unit is reduced.</p>
<p>1 vehicle space is not realistic. This does not allow for guests, a second driver in the household, or a utility vehicle, like a truck. If there's only going to be one space for a car, there needs to be space for bicycles, Scooters, and Motorcycles. I believe that atleast 2 vehicle spaces are a minimum.</p>
<p>There is no way that you would encourage more transportation choices. What are the transportation choices, my car, Commuteride, and the city bus. City bus isn't running yet when I go to work and stops service at 8 pm. Commuteride is more expensive than me driving. I lived in a large Capitol city in a southern state for many years. They aren't doing this stuff there, mixing different developments in single family dwelling neighborhoods. It's A terrible idea, and my neighbors aren't happy about it either. Apparently, we will have to fight it at the polls.</p>
<p>Eventually people will have less cars as time goes on. There will be too much parking spaces in the future.</p>
<p>If required parking spaces are reduced, I don't think it will lead to fewer cars. It will lead to problems with parking, and potential reduced safety for residents having to park farther from their homes. Also, residents nearby may not be able to park in front of their own homes since these spaces may be taken by others since there isn't adequate parking for them within their property.</p>
<p>There will be WAY more congestion on crowded streets. Most properties have 2 occupants with a vehicle each. Where would the other vehicle be expected to park</p>
<p>Limit cars.</p>
<p>We need more off street parking or better public transportation. Not less off street parking and bad public transportation</p>
<p>This will only make sense if there are safe bike lanes with a barrier between automobiles and bikes/pedestrians, walking paths and places of work/school/shopping within walking distance. These steps would reduce the need for cars. Otherwise each individual in a household needs their own car and if there is not enough parking on their property they have to park on the street. I think this is a bad idea without more mixed use, walkable areas of town.</p>
<p>I have mixed thoughts. My wife and I only have 1 car and even if we had 2, hypothetically we could park 1 in the street and 1 in the driveway with these limitations. However, what if we could not afford rent/mortgage without a roommate? That is often the case nowadays, unfortunately. In a perfect world, I would be able to get into a single family home with my wife and not need a roommate.</p>
<p>Bike lanes cause congestion.</p>
<p>Stupid</p>
<p>Reduce parking space requirements around commercial developments to encourage density and promote walkability.</p>
<p>This is encouraging congestion and if the street is full of cars what difference does it make how nice the house is because you can't see it. This is already such a problem in the north end. Driving on the small narrow streets with no parking is a NIGHTMARE!</p>
<p>Trying to force residents to utilize public transportation by decreasing parking is neither good for residents nor practical. Many of the residents whose tax dollars support the city are required to travel for work and need available parking. It is not the city's job to try and monitor my "carbon emissions" Those residents who want to live closer to downtown and decrease their commute will naturally gravitate towards the new multi-units being built. Those residents who need a vehicle should not have to jockey for parking just because the mayor and city council want more people utilizing public transportation. (A public transportation system that is not very robust so might add)</p>
<p>Take into account the number of businesses and schools within say 3 miles. Enforcing this regulation in densely residential areas will hurt citizens. I think it's fair though in reasonably walkable/bikeable areas like, the ones mentioned.</p>
<p>Design with higher density housing and mass transit in mind. Urban sprawl is contributing to the destruction of our environment.</p>
<p>Absolutely not, since it will only encourage bad designs in inappropriate areas, and this will only add to people parking in areas where there is no room for them such as on nearby commercial properties or along roadways. This is a super BAD idea.</p>
<p>Dumb regulation! Idaho is an outdoor state with many outdoor options. Plan for Two vehicle spaces!</p>
<p>People who are from Boise don't want smaller spaces. They like Boise because of the outdoors and open air feel and that has become harder to find recently. People like their space, don't take it away.</p>
<p>Generate maximum limit of off-street parking. One way roads as feasible gives better flow and street side parking</p>
<p>I don't know an answer, but I personally tend to not frequent these places due to lack of parking or accessibility. I love both areas mentioned, it's just more hassel than it's worth as Boise grows. Maybe larger lots near by that offer parkr and free shuttle or trolly system services?</p>
<p>Keep it at least 2</p>
<p>Most households have more than one car. where is the second + car(s) supposed to go?</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Need to start taking the future of transportation seriously and inform people about self-driving/autonomous vehicles and taxi fleets. Car ownership will decline precipitously over the next 5-10 years, and we will need to do more useful things with ugly parking lots and garages.
	Get the people out of office now that are running this state that would be the biggest help of all in my opinion. Y'all doing a terrible job every single one of you in my opinion
	Hyde park is a busy two way street and often you feel like it is too narrow. Especially when another car drives by you. It should be one way since cars are parked on both sides of the street and bicycles.
	Needs to be more specific to align with the lot size. A minimum of 1 space means more parking on the streets in neighborhoods. Small homes on small lots...1 is ok, larger homes need 2 space.
	It seems the current code doesn't require enough parking for multi-family developments. Some new developments on Bogart Lane near State Street have multiple cars parked in the travel lane, creating a dangerous situation, because there is no place else for them to park.
	You are far, FAR from a pedestrian friendly city. Bus schedules and service are not sufficient for most commuters, and you must have a car. There is no light rail to get from one end of Treasure Valley to the other. You must have a car. Until you deal with the people moving facets of transportation, you must acknowledge cars are needed, and mostly one car for each adult/worker. If you want to do this, that's great, but you must first provide transportation options. I work 11 minutes from my house. I cannot take public transportation to get there; the bus routes and schedules do not enable that. You are asking for congestion trouble with this one, until you actually make this town walkable and public transportation usable.
	I like the idea of less parking spaces to encourage alternative transportation, but don't know if it's practical. Most households still own at least 2 vehicles.
	There is already not enough parking for people to live in the north end or in the bound crossing area. Plus the north end doesn't have garages in most homes nor do most of the homes in Boise. There is not a lot of parking availability street wise for how close the homes are together.
	Need to keep more parking
	The street parking is limited and is first come first served. Why increase governance when home buyers will request the off-street parking they desire. Let the market control the builders, not the government.
	Offer more public transportation. We're practically New York now so we should have a subway. Make the Californians pay for it.
	Need more parking on site
	Bring back a trolley on wider streets... warms springs 18 th street. Put in a Light rail from the depot to downtown Boise and get the trains running back from Caldwell to Boise
	Quit ruining the feel of Boise! We are NOT San Francisco.
	That the city is encouraging transportation choices and new urbanization and mixed used visions, is very troubling to me.
	Prefer not to answer.
	Truth is most people are not going to use bus or bike in the winter. (I'm sure the numbers show this) reducing the on-street parking reduction does what its on-street? I used to work just off the connector not once did I think hey I can bike to work or ride the bus (62min to 102min to ride the bus twice a day)
	Build an onsite parking. The side streets are already riddled with cars. Most people have to have multiple roommates, due to the affordable housing not being affordable. This then turns the side streets into a pin ball machine with hit and runs. This also causes an increase in car break ins and thefts. The more cars that are scattered, the easier it is for thieves.
	People like being independent, the parking proposal doesn't fit into that. Trying to force people into compliance will only make people mad.
	Not everyone likes Hyde Park or Brown Crossing. Quit pushing that style on everyone.
	I have only noticed parking problems at some apartment buildings where the cars line the streets for blocks around because they have too many buildings and not enough parking.
	I do not like the streets getting clogged with cars. Many streets have already essentially become one way roads. I don't want more of that.
	Fewer parking spaces is aspirational. Reduced cars can only be achieved by increasing availability of public transportation and planned pedestrian paths. The east side of Flagstaff, AZ has more density than in the past but the streets are clogged with cars.
	Stop Californians from moving here
	More family members are needing to live in one home because of exceeding costs. Minimum space should be 2.
	That would be great to reduce parking area size. Also, parking areas should have more permeable surfaces to allow water infiltration instead of runoff.
	Who wants those kind of developments? I don't.
	Does a one car garage fit the definition of one parking space? Or is it an outside space?

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

reducing off street parking availability, increases on street parking demand and more parking conflicts. This increases the demand on police and increases the difficulty of trash removal with more vehicles in the way. Widening streets for bike lanes and walkways without vehicles blocking access will encourage more transportation choices without creating more problems.
Make a condo developer build a parking garage. Make it underground, whatever. But SFH should not be changed - all you're doing is laying an apartment building on its side.
Off street spots need to be encouraged. Limited parking will NOT encourage people take the bus or not drive. No way.
There are 6 people in my 3 bedroom home. All 6 have a car. This change would have a significant negative effect on the ability of large families to find suitable housing.
Parking is a huge problem in this city. No matter where you are. Reducing parking spaces is mind boggling.
Ensure parking spaces for e-bikes, mopeds, etc. And for bicycles! (See photos of bicycle parking in The Netherlands.). They use far less space than cars, cut emissions, noise, congestion and encourage health.
N/a
I don't give a crap about Bown Crossing or Hyde Park!! It's already been turned to garbage. Ya'll go ahead and keep it. STOP TREATING WEST BOISE LIKE A RED HEADED STEP CHILD AND KEEP LONG STANDING PROMISES!! Keep Murgoitio Park OPEN LAND!
Parking in both places is problematic for visitors.
Charge astronho have to have a car
One car households aren't likely unless public transit is much quicker, easier, and more accessible. Also, covered bike parking should be provided in all housing complexes to encourage cycling.
Reducing the required off street parking only leads to overcrowding on street. It's a non-solution
We need more off street parking in Boise, not less. Streets are congested. Please reconsider making it 2 spaces per.
Again, builders/architects/designers could apply for a "variance" based on the design of the building and their target resident/ buyer. Right downtown and the new development on Franklin & Orchard for example, have very high walkable/bike able scores. Strategically placed multi family and single-family on substandard lots could go without so much off street parking based on walk ability. The whole package could be marketed and sold as environmentally friendly HERS/LEEDS certified and NOT needing a car to get around based on placement and other transportation options.
Until public transportation is very, very convenient parking will be needed.
Taking away our parking spaces. This is ridiculous.
I doubt limiting parking to one car per Home is going to encourage using alternate transportation. Boiseans are too ingrained with their right to own multiple vehicles. But requiring all new builds to provide their own on property parking might alleviate people's thinking about free on street parking.
Eliminate downtown street parking. Discourage out of city car commuters to encourage more use of mass transit.
13th St should be closed to motor traffic and only used for pedestrians.
Most households have two cars so a minimum of two spaces for each house.
Reducing parking makes no sense at all because Boise is a very car-dependent city. Reducing parking just forces more street parking, which makes it even harder for those of us who want to run or bike safely around town.
Trading parking for "favors" leads to conflicts in surrounding neighborhoods and businesses as extra vehicles are parked off site. This is a short sited solution to a complex problem that will lead to unintended consequences.
the multi dwelling buildings should include the parking for the units at 2 plus spaces for each unit and not be able to park on street without a permitting process and signage to limit street parking to daylight hours without the permit
This is a step backwards and will result in increased resident/visitor conflicts.
Parking is not allowed in front of a driveway. If the homeowner does not have a car parking should be allowed in front of the driveway.
Referring to places like Hyde Park and Bown Crossing, I can't see where determining the number of parking spaces per dwelling unit makes a favorable difference. Less would be worse.
Needs to have more parking on each lot per lot, not less. I understand the idea of promoting less driving, but we all know in reality this will result in even more street parking. So many neighborhood streets are already de facto parking lots, if this change is allowed any new development will be even worse.
I've lived in larger cities with minimal parking options - it was terrible. Hyde Park is really difficult to maneuver. You really NEED public transportation options in place before cutting parking spaces!!!! Where is the train? Light rail to downtown? From the airport to downtown? Public transportation should come first.
The northend has zero rules. Just look at the amount of campers and boats along the street
Help the renters of Boise

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Expanding bike lanes and allowing more street parking
See comments on question 6 ... I see problems with the 1-car for 1-unit rule.
Making less parking available isn't going to help anything until there is decent, city wide public transit. It looks like the regulations are putting the cart before the horse. We should be pushing for a street car or a tram or something that runs between the airport, downtown, and the high density neighborhoods being targeted.
Can we create a plan to take people to more places - Bus on Demand w/out charging so much?
I am concerned about more cars parking on the streets which deletes enhancing the area.
Make home builders put in diquat sized garages
In order for this regulation change to make sense, we'd need more transportation choices. Better bikeways, pathways, public transport, etc. Additional buses/bus stops.
This part of the code is allowing higher density housing not diverse housing types. You can say it any way you want but I am very opposed to high density housing
Make the roads narrow so people might take pudlic transportation
You are penalizing people who have cars. Most of these people use their cars for work, which helps Boise function correctly!
Until we can provide a diverse public transportation system Boise will continue to be a car use city. Until Boise's housing cost better reflect the median wages you will have multi- families, room mates etc. living together which means more cars!
Yeah, completely eliminate parking requirements!
Adding more parking
Most will still put in two spaces, but giving the option for fewer is a good idea.
Absolutely not. People have families- if you have a traditional family, you need two cars, even if only one parent works. When kids are teenagers, they go more places and more cars are needed to meet the needs of families. Reducing required parking spaces moves us back to 1952 when families had one car and Dad drove it to work. One way for housing to be more affordable is for people to have roommates- in those cases, more parking is needed. Reducing parking only creates more problems. Move to big cities like New York if you want less parking.
Comment: most people in Boise have two cars and many have more than two so they may ride a bike to nearby locations but they still need parking at their homes for cars
By allowing more mixed-use in neighborhoods, neighbors are more inclined to walk and bike to those places.
Add Bigger areas near housing for additional car but not recreational vehicles. Make the streets wider for parking.
Reducing the number of parking spaces without having a robust public transit system is just creating a problem, not solving one.
Boise's so-called transport system for the public sucks. It stinks, it's shitty. It's inconvenient, and hardly anybody takes it. Buses are for the poor you dumb ass fucks exclamation don't you understand that? Make the poor people have more money that's the fix you bastards.
Let's amp up public transit so that people can get to these places, with convenience and consistently (every 20 minutes not every hour). People drive because they can't get there by transit. I think if we cut down on parking availability, boost transit days/hours, AND businesses/city incentivize public transit, parking would be such a topic when building new building.
Because of housing prices you will see more people renting out rooms to pay for the mortgage. If you are wanting to encourage alternative transportation (which I totally agree with) then you need to put the housing within access to the transportation
I don't know how people can have a gathering with no parking. We are social people here in Boise and we like to have house parties. Not everyone lives close enough to walk or ride bikes. Even a dinner party with only 2 couples would likely need 2 on street parking spots.
Boise is attracting wealthier people. If they only need parking for one space , they will build larger houses-possible unintended outcome with a change in requirement. Micro-zone developments so they have to have a local mixed use area with transportation stops. This may keep more people from driving around so much.
Parked cars need to be in the garage
Most people have at least 2 cars if not more. Maybe if the city were to not tax people to death then it might help them to be able to afford to have more cars.
However, I my experience is that Boise do NOT offer enough alternative transportation options for residents and most households are forced to have 2 vehicles. Boise needs to find practical ways to provide more transportation options. Also, I question the City's 2010 survey that showed 41% of Boise households had 1 or fewer vehicles - who was surveyed and was it representative share of the whole city?
We rent and only have space for our cars on the street no garage. It only makes sense for the rich people, we both work jobs that are too far for biking or walking if public transportation was more reliable...
When there isn't enough parking it is such a problem. Providing parking structures may be required in some high density areas.
I very much like this change. I'm not sure how the regulation itself could encourage more transportation choices, but working with ACHD and VRT to improve alternative transportation access is important.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	I'd be even more aggressive here - 1 space per unit is going to be too much. There is plenty of parking elsewhere. Perhaps 0.75 per unit?
	Cars will have to be parked somewhere. The streets will be impacted. Safety concerns fro pedestrians. More accidents in ice conditions on road. Minimum should be two cars per every house and more than that for multi housing (apartments)
	I'm generally a big fan of reducing parking requirements - so I marked yes. But I have seen some cases where inadequate parking creates a mess, like the apartments near Maple Grove and Lake Hazel. That neighborhood is pretty far away from most jobs and shopping, and not sure it even has a bus line, so extremely car dependent. Having fewer cars is only a practical option for people if they have viable alternative transportation. So I think reducing parking minimums must be paired with investments in expanding public transportation.
	Most of Boise has to commute. This makes no sense for west and south Boise residents. Boise is part of a greater valley that requires vehicle transportation. Your trying to make Hyde Park. That's not the current reality. Most drive miles to school and work folks need more than 1 car parking on a street
	Good idea but will this just contribute to more congested street/public parking? Better public transport needs to be a part of the solution as well
	One on street parking per household !?!?! To force diverse housing !?!?!
	No front facing parking accommodations. The most charming neighborhoods, the best neighborhoods to walk and bike around all have one thing in common. Parking in the back, accessed by an alleyway or something away from the main street. Don't have the front of houses be dominated by garage doors and wide driveways, because that's not an environment built for people. It's an environment built for cars, that people happen to exist within.
	Why does Boise need to change... let the growth head to nampa or kuna and don't diminish the value of our open spaces and trees by building bigger buildings
	Having more transportation choices (i.e. public transport) would be a start.
	Off street parking is already difficult and to decrease the requirement is only going to cause problems. Boise does not have adequate public transport as is.
	(I truly have no conerns about making it easy to develop more single family homes.....and think perhaps...we should make the requirements MORE difficult). Realistically, i expect single family homes may need 2 parking spaces, while multi-family homes are more likely to have a variety of auto/parking needs (and the number of required spaces can be reduced per unit for them).
	Add a requirement that developments provide a common off-street parking area to be used by visitors/guests of residents.
	General parking for guest is critical. My daughter lived in bown and moved because not enough room to park for family
	You cant limit the number of vehicles people have until there is better public transportation options because otherwise you will just have more cars on the street making it inaccessible for people using the sidewalks and streets alike in many spaces
	I don't like residents parking all their cars on the public streets especially when there are multiple families living in a single family home - it makes it hard to drive thru the neighborhoods and dangerous for walkers, children and bike use! People have multiple cars - especially in rural neighborhoods - they need places to park - and I prefer them not parking their cars in front of my house - Homeowners get it - renters don't have a clue!!!
	Don't really know other than planning for them. Hard to do when shopping centers and suburbs keep taking up open spaces and patures
	The way I'm understanding this is that single-family homes would only be provided with a one-car garage or parking area. Given the cost of living in Boise and the abhorrent lack of effective alternative transportation available I believe most families will have 2 working drivers leading to a need for 2 vehicles and therefore 2 parking spaces.
	Not sure
	It's noones business how many cars my family owns.
	It's hard to answer this because it will depend on the area and the more common type of residents living there (family, individual, several tenants in one unit)
	This is an admirable change, but without incentives too assist users in reducing number of cars per household, it works against itself. Add a community incentive for households that have fewer than the average number of vehicles on the road.
	You seem to think that reducing parking spaces for residential buildings will reduce the number of cars. It simply doesn't work that way... a 2 bedroom apartment will usually have at least 2 people driving to work. Reducing parking spaces only puts more cars out on the street to park... some families will have teens or additional persons living with them. Your plan may seem good on paper but reality is going to prove it wrong.
	Develop more transportation options (light rail for example) or create carpool lanes and parking (more than 3 people please for the carpools!) and THEN reduce the number of parking spaces.
	Maybe it would help if there were some contractual commitment on Boise's end, as in "if you reduce parking, we promise to increase development of alternative transport options in that area"
	If it ain't broke leave it slone
	Can't reduce the number of parking spaces when there are no other practical transportation options. You need a terrific public transportation system first. Just making everybody put the second car on the street will not improve anything.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>Yes - supply and demand. Not the place of municipal government to decide what neighborhoods and enterprise zones should look like. Leave that to developers to assess, based upon the dynamics and needs of existing and planned neighborhoods.</p>
	<p>I think that is more of a city planning issue than a housing development issue. Reducing off street parking is only going to create more on street parking so I don't know what that will accomplish. People with vehicles will still need to park them somewhere so that's not really an incentive.</p>
	<p>This is insane. You cannot yet push people to give up their cars. Boise, we are not there yet. There's nothing worse than a development where people cannot find a place to park their car or their property only has space for parking one vehicle. I completely hate this. My neighborhood street is jammed with vehicles making driving to my home on a culdesac like weaving through slalom gates. And if someone has guests over it's a nightmare. And this would be an even worse nightmare in high density developments.</p>
	<p>We need more parking to keep our streets safe</p>
	<p>Parking is a problem and will increase as a problem. Figure out an alternative to reducing parking per household.</p>
	<p>I am firmly against this as a general zoning rule. For specific places it's ok but even Bown Crossing has parking issues at time. My opinion is that there are two updates needed. Driveways/Parking garages need to fit Trucks and SUVs and not hang on the sidewalk and then can reduce the number of street parking. As a garage plus Driveway/Parking garages parking should suffice for most areas. Most streets in newer neighborhoods are reduced to one lane because of the parking problem. This really sucks when snow sticks to the ground and creates safety issues.</p>
	<p>Horrible idea, are you kidding me? Who comes up with this stuff?</p>
	<p>What family do you know with 1 car?</p>
	<p>With Boise's current transportation options and development, I don't think this will help; only cause more parking difficulties. However, I am on-board with it if the city plans to help increase transportation options and more walkable neighborhoods. I would particularly like to see the city extend focus out of the downtown/north end area to create more Hyde Park areas everywhere (like south Boise, west Boise). Especially that focus on local businesses and restaurants, all with their own unique feel. We live in south Boise, but travel downtown for dining and entertainment. We would like more options in our own area that aren't chains.</p>
	<p>I think public transportation has to become much more robust for such a regulation to be accepted. Given the current status of public transportation, a personal car is almost a necessity.</p>
	<p>Reducing parking spaces will be a problem unless you assume (dream) that each residence has only one vehicle. The reality is that off street parking is important and should not be minimized. Ave you ever been to San Francisco ?</p>
	<p>more people are sharing living spaces and this dose not help anyone</p>
	<p>My neighbors have 4 cars for their family all parked on the street, they want to add an ADU it is crazy that they would be allowed to do this and add at least two more cars to the mix. This is not the 50s most homes have at least two cars attached to them. Establish some public transportation that is actually usable if your desire is to reduce the number of vehicles, reducing parking spots just creates a mess. We need a metro that goes from downtown Boise to the airport to Caldwell and to Mountain Home with reliable and continual connections by bus from all the local neighborhoods. Subsidize public transportation to make it more desirable but it must run often and to a multitude of places. Instead of great big busses have smaller mini buses that run often through neighborhoods to central pick up points.</p>
	<p>This proposal doesn't encourage people to use public transportation, it just crowds the streets of residential neighborhoods with cars.</p>
	<p>For crying out loud you limit parking to 72 hours max. How does this improve things.</p>
	<p>What would the enforcement be? Houses without driveways are taking up whole neighborhood street parking on the Bench already so cutting the number down isn't going to help those of us who have been here for years dealing with it without enforcement. Also, with the extreme housing prices , many homes have multiple adults with one car each and no driveways to park them.</p>
	<p>Boise does not have the density to support transit, so cars are necessary for most residents. Work with ACHD to avoid residential streets with limited on-street parking. Narrow streets with No Parking on one side make it more important to have parking inside the residential lots. Mixed-use developments like Bown Crossing serve only a very small part of the needs of our community, so a way to get to major shopping facilities is still needed. In other words, I am not able to walk or take a bus to Home Depot for some plywood, tools, or lumber, or to Costco or Albertsons for a couple of weeks worth of groceries. Limiting parking will result in housing that is not functional and not marketable.</p>
	<p>no</p>
	<p>i do not the houses are already small in hyde park</p>
	<p>We are a large outdoor state with a need for two cars for most families. This is silly.</p>
	<p>Widen roads through neighborhoods to allow for on street parking AND two-way traffic patterns. Think sunshine areas, please.</p>
	<p>People in Boise will continue to have multiple vehicles even without adequate parking. Quit reducing parking requirements for new construction. Existing residents should not suffer so investors can make money.</p>
	<p>Required parking area for specific areas of high use. One parking space for a single family home is not realistic. Any 2 income family with a teen likely has 3 cars and families with multi teens raises that higher. Also, a large % of families have RV's and the expense of off home parking is exclusionary (often 300+ per month).</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Leads to too not enough parking
If I own a home and there are 2 resident drivers, I would need 2 spaces. If I own a home with 2 driving adults and 2-3 driving teens and I was limited to one space, that would be ridiculous.
Most families have more than one vehicle. Single family homes should have parking for at least two vehicles! If they do not have that much then what happens when people have guests? Lowering this requirement will make streets much more crowded because many more people will be forced to park on the streets every day.
Homes should be allocated for 2.5 cars per unit, and apartments 2 cars per unit.
Without requiring enough parking spaces for each home you are creating a parking problem for the entire neighborhood. People will park their cars on the streets and anywhere they can find a space.
require more parking
Cars are unfortunately still the mode of transportation, 2 cars are the norm and restricting the space just forces more on street parking. Though, hopefully mixed use neighborhoods would lessen car travel. Plans with a garage under the house or apartments could lessen on street parking.
Remove minimum parking requirements altogether.
Require 3 parking spaces per home unit. Why does it have to be like Bown Crossing and Hyde Park? Those examples are mixed use areas along a single street. Why not promote neighborhoods' mixed use, like the west end?
Because of house and rent prices in the area most people need to live with someone else to get by. If you restrict it to only 1 space that will put more stress on street parking
No way any family home has only one car. Keep it as it is
I wish more people used public transportation, bikes, and walking, but the sprawl in Ada County does not encourage this. I'm concerned about the on-street parking that will occur if only one garage space is required. Increase the bus system and maybe people will give up their cars.
I want to support this... but here is the concern: rent is so high in Boise that many people need to have roommates/shared spaces. "Single family homes" are often housing several people who are not related. In my case, I rent a home with 2 other people my age and each of us has a vehicle. I am all for incentivizing people to use alternative transportation but worry about this regulation harming folks who are already struggling to find a place to live.
Most house hold have an average of 2 cars. In my current neighbor because the alley ways are so narrow people cannot park in their garages causing more street parking and obstruction of views when trying to turn. I would be for the one parking if the garages we at the front instead of the back so both the garage and the driveway could be used.
Strange question. Of course. Improve development requirements?
If I am remembering correctly this past year the city council passed a new rule about not parking more than 48 hours at a time. I do not know of very many families that only have one car. I think that is a real conflict on what the city council did
the number of off street parking spaces should be proportional to the number of bedrooms in a single resident home, or to the number of units in a multi-residence home complex. For example, a 1 or two bedroom home can have only one off street parking space, but a 3 bedroom should have two, and a 4-5 bedroom home should have three.
If there is a general parking area designated for surrounding businesses, non-resident visitors would have a place to park leaving more street parking for residents.
For most people, cost of a one-bedroom or single-family home requires 2 incomes. Transit and other non-vehicle options for commuting are poor. Be realistic, 2 parking spaces are necessary.
One parking space per home in Boise is ridiculous. Boise has weather extremes, people with physical limitations and public transit that is absolutely insufficient to fulfill the needs this change would create.
Roadways, electric charge stations and biking need to be prioritized. Affordable homes, also need to be prioritized.
We need more on street parking
Maybe...? If you're speaking about public transportation, Boise's is totally undependable. Carpool...maybe. There's some incentive. Just be prepared, either way, for denser street parking.
I like this. But we should just abolish the minimum entirely. We need to encourage fewer people to drive. We have a housing and climate crisis. Getting rid of parking minimums would help solve both those issues. Boise is a bikeable city.
This is a HORRIBLE idea. There is NOTHING GOOD about cars parked on streets. It is UGLY and USAFE. Require ALL VEHICLES TO BE PARKED ON SITE!!!
Qualified yes. It would make more sense if we had more public transit. Also, I'm unclear if this requirement is exclusive or inclusive of garages on the property. If it is inclusive of garages, then regulation of contiguous street parking needs to be taken into account. This is already an issue for residents in the Hyde Park area. I live in the East End, but the situation in Hyde Park is evident to anyone who visits there.
Boise is a very vehicle dependent city, most families are multi-vehicle homes (parents each/kids etc) our public transportation system is a joke, to reduce actual at home parking makes the likelihood of accidental damage to on street parked vehicles skyrocket.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Without a more robust transit system, reducing the number of off street parking stalls does not make sense. People still may have to leave their mixed use area for some appointments and recreation.
	Having inadequate parking ruins a neighborhood. People start fighting for parking. Cars overflow into nearby streets. New developments without adequate parking destroy the older neighborhoods nearby. It's terrible. Please plan for residents to park at or very near to their own residence. Thinking you can encourage residents to have less cars is flawed. They can't walk everywhere. So even if they walk more they will still have a car.
	Get rid of parking requirements altogether. Let property owners decide how much they want to provide. Many cities have had great success allowing the supply of housing and unique local businesses by not requiring them to supply parking.
	Provide parking so there are not conflicts between neighbors. If you want less cars provide better transportation options so less cars are needed. This 1 car pressure is not realistic in Idaho. People need cars and will own them regardless of this regulation so you should just plan for it to reduce conflict.
	Keep the minimum number of spaces.
	I think we should encourage as much walking, biking and public transit as possible. That being said we greatly need more public transit connecting boise to the surrounding cities.
	The re-write should go much further. Required off-street parking is enormously expensive and detrimental to almost all of Boise's stated goals with the zoning re-write, and stated goals more broadly (walkability/alternative transportation/energy and environment).
	House on top of house. Come on
	ultimately it comes down to providing a functional mass transportation system before the reliance on the car will become reduced. This is something that I feel the City of Boise is finding it hard to address
	This is an absolutely terrible idea. It just creates parking congestion. Leave it to a bunch of transplants to implement failed ideas from Seattle and Portland here in Boise.
	Yes - stop trying to tell other people what they need to do. Bown crossing type developments will increase if you let other people do what they want to do rather than what you want them to do.
	This requirement will create friction among neighbors. It's fine to encourage smaller, more diverse housing types, but there his no guarantee that this proposed change will have the desired result. I would encourage an off-street parking requirement greater that a single space.
	Reducing parking spaces WILL NOT encourage citizens to ride Bus transportation. Boise needs to UPDATE its Public Transportation System before P&Z changes the number of parking spaces needed for new builds. The only persons who benefit is Big Builders, not Boise Citizens. The Bus system must be updated no person wants to wait 30 minutes for a bus to arrive or walk a mile to a bus stop.
	Don't know
	I am all about planning that thinks "outside the car." We need zoning that supports and encourages more diverse transportation options that are pedestrian and bicycle friendly. As far as I'm concerned, single family homes don't need to be required to have one space per home. Maybe you should do away with any minimum parking requirements.
	Demand developers seek and find tenants, pay for portions of essentials ie: schools, fire/police and other other infrastructure needs like sewer, water, wildlife etc
	Planning and zoneing needs to develop a stronger partnership with highways and roads. Simply saying " transport and congestion" is not our concern is not good enough. The more you adapt these new codes , which effectivly will put more cars on the road and lead to more conjestion makes no sense. Importantly the fact that there are continually efforts by P & Z and the city to find affordable housing options and encourage more housing to be built before "affordable transport" options has been put in place is astonishing to me. Put simply you cant get around Boise unless you have a car.... but the roads cant handle the sheer volume of increased trafic because you can only get around by car. Where are the bik routes, pedestrian areas and the investment in public transport such as bus and trains BEFORE we expand housing ?
	City employees should ask themselves what it would take for THEM to give up using their car to get around. Also, if you drive to a business like Trader Joe's and you can't find a parking place either in the lot or on the street, do you simply circle around waiting for a space to open up or do you leave?
	No. Must build homes close to jobs before people will need fewer vehicles. In my mind this is a fatal proposal.
	keep two space minimum
	Mixed use developments encourage walking and are wonderful. However, parking is and will always be an issue. People avoid going downtown now for restaurants, etc. because of the lack of parking.
	Minimum of two parking spaces are needed, otherwise you will fill the streets with parked cars.
	Get rid of parking minimums. We don't need them. Cars are a choice not a requirement.
	If the building is an apartment there should be at least one bicycle locker or secure parking for one bicycle per unit.
	We need some development in the West Bench area.
	There has be option for people to go to before we take parking spaces. There are hardly any useful and convenient options for people to choose. Limiting spaces isn't going to encourage people to use different transportation if there isn't different transportation to choose from.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>I think it needs to be more clearly defined. Depending upon size of home and the projected cost for new owner. I see areas in north end where the streets are so crowded with cars, it is dangerous to drive through those streets. We need parking for those who do not live nearby but are still driving to do business with Hyde park or Bown crossing. Parking can be difficult in those areas.</p>
	<p>It is dangerous for emergency vehicles to try and go down crowded streets that are narrow. Reducing street parking leads to people Parking wherever they can, this is where the danger for EMS comes in. Parking is also essential for the quality of life of those living in the home, you can't entertain without imposing your guests on your neighbors.</p>
	<p>This is Boise. Public transit is scant with undiversified routes which makes it inconvenient. Most families in Boise have multiple vehicles. Maximum parking limits are ridiculous. With additional parking beyond required minimum, add additional landscaping requirements if the city is concerned with large swathes of asphalt.</p>
	<p>I want to say yes, but with a little commentary. I do think making more areas walkable will help to reduce need for parking. Downtown, southeast, and north end of Boise are very walkable. I'd like to see the bench become more like this as well. So, yes in many cases, but it depends on where the housing is located.</p>
	<p>Boost the frequency and connectivity of bus service and create dedicated bike/pedestrian paths to and from these areas.</p>
	<p>One car isn't going to be reasonable. Parking needs to be part of the equation. It is a fact of life for the foreseeable future</p>
	<p>Off street parking for ALL residents and more substantial parking for mixed use areas like Hyde Park which is assinine.</p>
	<p>Require alternative transportation requirements particularly in the development of whole new neighborhoods</p>
	<p>With the cost of housing, homes may have multiple families, or working individuals living in them, resulting in more cars per household than in past years. Public transportation is useful if you are working downtown but little used for commutes to all other work locations, so it is not realistic to assume it will replace vehicle ownership.</p>
	<p>Bown Crossing isn't too bad but Hyde Park is a mess. People will not give up their cars, plain and simple fact.</p>
	<p>Better public transportation, protected bike lanes and sidewalks.</p>
	<p>Stop trying to turn Boise into a slum.</p>
	<p>One parking space per family home does not seem like it is enough. And I don't think it will impact or encourage smaller, more diverse housing types. They will simply find parking elsewhere or down the road per se.</p>
	<p>Many low income people have (need) more than one working adult living in the home. 2 spaces per home is the right answer.</p>
	<p>Making sure people have access to 2 spots to park for their home or more, since how horrific housing costs have driven many people living in one place, would be essential. Only requiring one spot is just going to clutter the streets. If you aren't going to regulate the horrid greed, then at least let people have a damn place to park their car when they need seven room mates to exist.</p>
	<p>You can't really encourage different transportation choices until sidewalks and pedestrian friendly and things(groceries, stores, ect) are close enough for those alternative transportation choices to be able to travel to. It's more a zoning issue to bring commercial and residential closer than a parking issue. Taking away options wont help</p>
	<p>I'd stop parking requirements entirely. I think there is enough street parking in many places, and I do believe it subsidizes the auto industry. We need better public transportation; we need sidewalks on State Street; we need good bike lanes.</p>
	<p>I think two off-street parking spaces are definitely needed given the propensity for two car + recreational vehicle situations throughout the area.</p>
	<p>Just eliminate minimum parking requirements already. Set a maximum, sure, but minimums are counter-productive to good planning, design and development</p>
	<p>Already, people flaunt the parking rules and keep vehicles on the street for weeks at a time. How about enforcing existing rules to reduce permanent vehicle parking on the street?</p>
	<p>I think we need to get our transportation infrastructure to a point where we can support this. At this time, this seems to spell disaster.</p>
	<p>2 car garage for each 'unit' plus 1-1 1/2 guest space PER UNIT.</p>
	<p>We need to be realistic and accept the fact that people drive cars. We already have public transportation that nobody uses. By reducing the number of parking spaces, this will only increase the on street parking and disrupt the peaceful neighborhoods. Most of the people who rent apartments or homes have families or roommates, which only increases the number of vehicles. We live in a dual income society. People who live here and enjoy recreating understand that they have to have a vehicle so they can drive to get to the place where they want to recreate. Elderly people who are housebound shouldn't be forced to stare at someone else's vehicle when they look out their own front window. We should be encouraging the development of ample parking spaces and/or parking structures to realistically accommodate our needs.</p>
	<p>This plan could make sense. I think the city could encourage a bit more use of buses, biking, etc. One way could be to increase biker/pedestrian friendly roads. Also I really think we need a lot more crosswalks, especially on the bench. I was sad the proposed crosswalk on Overland and Phillipi never came to fruition. I also really think addressing the chronically late buses would also encourage more use. I get being 1-3 minutes late, but I wait at 5-10 minutes past when the bus is supposed to arrive most rides, which limits my using the bus to when I'm just going somewhere for fun and not an appointment.</p>
	<p>I think it would be interesting to have a street parking permit system worked out with permits that could be bought or sold. This could alleviate the fear from current residents that new residents will take up all of the street parking. Also, since pretty much all neighborhoods in Boise have an abundance of street parking, the market price of these permits would be low and would serve an easy metric use to evaluate the current glut of parking in neighborhoods.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Eliminate parking minimums entirely. More space for people, less for cars.
Alreadt there is conflict between property owners of people parking in front of their houses. Reduceing the number of parking places will make more conflict. Most families & couples have 2 cars and will need at least 2 parking spots
Boise largely lacks sufficient public transportation to make a reduced number of vehicles realistic at this time; the change will lead to more cars on public streets, not fewer cars. Best to keep public streets available for carrying traffic than for parking cars. If you do this change, then it should be tied to available transportation - potentially impact fees on developers to expand it, or parking determined in part by access/proximity to available public transport
13th St is crowded. Cars line the street at all hours of the day. Parking is scarce, and visibility for pedestrians / children at play is horrendous because so many cars are in the way. Bown Crossing is better - but only because nearby establishments (like the library, elementary school, and residential streets) can absorb the extra vehicles looking for a place to park. Streets should be for driving / riding. To improve quality of life, make more bicycle- and pedestrian-only streets / rights of way, but do not reduce parking requirements. That only increases the likelihood that parking will spill onto streets and nearby neighborhoods.
We need more parking not less. They need to be off street
People aren't going to give up their cars. You're in for a mess with this reduced parking and people will park on the street and Boise will look like East LA.
A surplus abundance of off street parking is necessary. Cars per family in the US is between one and nine depending on metropolitan areas considered in the equation. The minimum off street parking per family needs to be 3.
Provide 1 and 1/2 spaces per residence. One neighbor can rent the other half from the other who can use the money for fuel or bus fare.
No, our country has a car culture. Limiting parking spots will just create spill over into the already existing residential areas. Not okay!
Smaller homes with less parking do not work for families.
Boise must implement true public transport (improved bus routes and schedules, light rail) and connect its neighborhoods for cycling and pedestrian use.
Not until there is more (lots more) public transportation. Americans love their cars and those cars will be parked somewhere near the housing.
No way. We need parking for houses. 2 parking spots per residence is a minimum! Again, we do not need to create high density problematic apartments. Affordable housing should be included. If they are a couple they need 2 spots. If they have a teen, they need 2 spots, if they have a visitor, they need 2 spots. no need to create hate and frustration bu reducing parking. If there isnt enough space, dont build it!!! Parking can be built up too.
Again, this is not asking if this is what we want. It's just asking how to we arrive at the city government's deaired result.
I agree with the changes but I think there needs to be a lot of work on encouraging developers to support public transportation options. Just providing some spaces for bikes is not a solution. Also, there will need to be better enforcement of on street parking rules,
This is good but eliminating them would be better. Build a city for people, not cars!
Boise was always a small quaint community. By allowing the influx of so many to population, we no longer have that feel. Our housing, roads, and city are not able to accomodate this great influx. Very poor planning. People move here because of the small communities. You have allowed that feel to be extinguished.
Our community will never fully rely on public transportation. This isn't New York or San Francisco. We need new developments (especially apartments and multi family) to be realistic in how many parking spots they are building for these units. Especially when they are building next to established residential neighborhoods.
Boise is not a bikeable city - we need to address connectivity before we limit renter vehicles. People are still going to have roommates, our minimum wage is a joke and unfortunately that's what a lot of people make.
This is not fair to people who already live in overcrowded neighborhoods. It's going to make parking even harder. I do not support this at all
How is reduced requirements helpful, cars in road make it more dangerous for pedestrians and children and pets
This is a great step and should go further. I would strongly support removing parking minimums entirely, as many cities have successfully done. Additionally, if that is not feasible, I would seek to reduce them further at least in select areas such as eliminating them for the limited food and drink commercial zone, and reducing the numbers for multifamily developments to no more than the the above proposal for single family homes. I also want to note that residential permitting is a tried and true strategy that can limit the street parking impacts in areas of the city where street parking becomes challenging.
If we had a good working public transit system this could be very helpful in reducing street parking. The current system is not dependable.
Eliminating parking will not help a neighborhood. Most individuals are extremely dependent on an automobile for transportation. In a perfect planning word people would walk or ride bikes but that is just not reality
Not at all - this is a horrible proposal. This is Boise with 4 seasons... Biking or walking to work when the snow is frozen to the ground because it was chemically "treated" a week ago and now frozen due to the inversion isn't much fun. Not to mention public transit is woefully short of sustainable for the city we have now, let alone new growth.
Encourage rear/alleyway access for vehicle parking in order to limit the potential points of conflict (curb cuts) between people biking and/or walking and vehicles reversing out of their storage location.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>Boise does not have the public transportation means to start eliminating residents car needs. Most people live with family or friends because they cannot afford to live on there own. We need to build more affordable housing geared at the larger population of residents who are seeking 3 bedroom dwelling and have 3 cars; not the smaller margin of residents who live alone a ride a bike because they can't afford a car.</p>
	<p>Taking away necessary parking spaces create a lot of conflict of interest and problems in surrounding areas and neighborhoods. It's important to provide each home with at least two parking spaces. There is a subdivision near me that has an apartment complex with not enough parking spaces and the bleed off goes into their neighborhood and causes a lot of issues. This is not the way to go and appropriate parking spaces need to be accommodated</p>
	<p>The city shouldn't be afraid to remove parking minimums across the board, or at least up to R1.</p>
	<p>If public transit were improved, fewer people would need cars. But as long as public transit is the way it is, people need cars and cars need to be parked.</p>
	<p>Homes with two working adults need two parking spaces.</p>
	<p>Stop trying to turn us into Portland or other liberal city.</p>
	<p>public transportation is the answer. I think EVERY property must be required to support their vehicles on their designated lot. University students pack 6 kids into a 3 bedroom home and the neighborhood has to shoulder their parking needs.</p>
	<p>We don't care! Ship out the liberals and illegals and you will have less traffic</p>
	<p>This is not helpful. How are we supposed to visit friends, stop at the coffee shop on the corner and enjoy our city if we can't park and access it? The only reason people don't have 2 cars per household is people are too poor. With more and more people needing to take on roommates to afford to live anywhere in this city there will be more cars per unit. Vs if there was a spouse who shared a car amongst 2 people. New constructing should be required to provide adequate parking, not this reduction.</p>
	<p>Boise is still a car-dependent community. What ends up happening is those who have more than one car to park on the street end up parking in front of other homes on the street and stirring neighborhood tensions because the last one home for the day has to park the next neighborhood over and walk.</p>
	<p>No, because money talks and people are greedy. Sell more living units in smaller space. Our housing tract prefers all cars in garage. As families grow the number of cars grows. Parking needs to be addressed better.</p>
	<p>I don't think the change will make a difference to developers who want to continue to build single family homes. And yes, ensure the regulation includes detailed transportation and pedestrian-friendly connectivity</p>
	<p>We've owned a house and lived in neighborhoods before, and would like to buy another house as soon as we can, but the cost of housing here is too high. So I think the idea of more affordable housing, but certainly not at the risk of decreasing the value and standard of living that comes with neighborhoods with a limited number of homes. Our last subdivision had houses so close together that we could hear our neighbors phone ring, or a toilet flush. That's way too close. I'd rather encourage more communities, than have communities crammed with as many houses and apartments as they can. People want homes with yards for their kids and pets, where they can create their own private areas and get away from the noise and traffic</p>
	<p>The crowded streets become parking lots and reduce the beauty of our city. This is really just pandering to builders is it not? They don't have to live with the mess that is created by a shortage of parking spaces. Part of the beauty of these neighborhoods is that they are clean and not cluttered with cars poking out of every corner. Homes should be required to have sufficient parking. ADUs should not impact that and reducing parking requirements just increases tension between neighbors who compete for space near their own homes.</p>
	<p>build a railway, actual public transportation that is user friendly, affordable & reliable</p>
	<p>Lack of parking for higher density housing is ALWAYS the biggest problem</p>
	<p>It will just lead to more on-street parking which is more dangerous to cyclist. Unless the reduced parking requirements come with a mandate to provide safe passage for cyclists as they navigate through narrow streets flooded with parked cars and reduced visibility of pedestrians and other cyclists.</p>
	<p>Sidewalk protections and regulations are very important to ensure foot traffic & inclusive design.</p>
	<p>Ensure adequate parking. For example, dwellings should be required to have at least 1.5 spaces for each 1 bedroom unit and a minimum of 1 additional space per additional bedroom. Improve bicycle and pedestrian safe corridors.</p>
	<p>All you're encouraging is street parking versus off street. Off street requirements puts the burden on developers. Allowing for street parking places burden on the neighborhood. If they have to include parking according to number of rooms in the home this may eliminate. But a regulation is only as strong as the enforcement. Take a look at Stewart and 27. Folks own three vehicles and leave one parked on street 24/7. Try encouraging people to not own vehicles.</p>
	<p>I think it's great for encouraging public transportation in most cities, but living in Boise really requires you to have a car, so it's tough to endorse this change until something is done about the public transportation system.</p>
	<p>So where are these extra vehicles going to be parked? Listen if two or three roommates move into an apt. with one parking spot, chances are the roommates have at least two cars between the three of them. So where are the vehicles going to be parked?? Big mistake!!! More underground parking?? It is expensive, but better than lining up vehicles on both sides of a neighborhood street. It will become a huge problem. Yes, many people bicycle, but not 60-90 year old residents. I believe, but do not know know for a fact that many who bike for errands and to work also own a vehicle.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>Bown and Hyde Park are a nightmare. I personally avoid those areas due to their parking and traffic issues. We have many friends moving out of these neighborhoods due to this continual problem. I certainly do not want the same in my neighborhood.</p>
	<p>Not without a better bus system</p>
	<p>Have main transport hubs located in and around those areas people are trying to get to. City bike racks or carpool drop off areas. That way people who park, park farther out and it is easy to directly access those areas if you can for sure get transportation directly to that area.</p>
	<p>I would keep the number of parking spaces available up, we need to preserve parking as Boise continues to grow. Living in Austin, parking was horrible and if Boise is heading in the trajectory of that city, you are going to want to hold on to some of those resources.</p>
	<p>Why would Idaho want to encourage smaller houses and higher population density in a smaller area? This proposal sounds like something that an out of state immigrant would want. Let's maintain more open spaces between dwellings and for recreation.</p>
	<p>Require parking permits for on street parking in high density neighborhoods. This encourages households to reduce the number of cars per household. Use the money from the permits to support pedestrian and bicycle access and safety.</p>
	<p>Increased density! Mixed used developments are viable based on the sheer number of people in walking distance.</p>
	<p>We need more parking or better public transit. Most homes have more than 1 car. We either need to cater to that, or cater to encourage people not to own cars. We need amazing public transportation.</p>
	<p>Wouldn't there be more specific regulations around access that could encourage more transportation choices and mixed use developments, or are you limited to merely limiting parking? I am in favor of limiting parking but I think it's shortsighted to think it alone will get folks to walk, ride, or take the bus.</p>
	<p>Reducing parking seems like a terrible way to encourage more transportation choices. How about improving the connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians.</p>
	<p>Certain areas this makes sense. By and large no. Boise has no reliable public transportation system and people don't generally use it anyway, walking and biking aren't options for most, especially half the year, and so people need cars, want cars, will have cars, and need somewhere to park cars. It's just a reality of life here, especially being an outdoor recreation destination. The idea of no-car or even reduced car use, while noble, is so unrealistic and niche that it is a bit ridiculous to pander to that mentality here. Downtown, maybe.... sure (though how many businesses leave downtown because of lack of parking). Northend, fine. Everywhere else, doesn't make sense.</p>
	<p>Need parking for visitors. Could not visit daughter because no place to park. She lived in east Boise and I in west Boise. Had to find parking in neighborhood which no one wants you parking in front of their hoe. Mass transit from west to east and north to south and to airport would be helpful also.</p>
	<p>We moved here from DC. There was extremely limited parking. It was miserable for families.</p>
	<p>People who are purchasing these smaller homes will likely still have 2 cars... no one wants to car their car on the street. Keep 2 car spaces and allow home designers to get creative. 1st floor is double garage and 2nd floor is housing (for example).</p>
	<p>By reducing the number of required parking spaces, you are creating a parking nightmare. The only way to encourage more transportation choices is to invest in a transportation infrastructure that actually works.</p>
	<p>Encouraging more developments like Bown Crossing and Hyde Park is not desirable as they attract visitors creating a negative experience for residents as they don't have sufficient parking. I don't see any positives to these proposed changes, just creating a bad experience for neighbors who are forced to block off the street so they can park creating ill will amongst all.</p>
	<p>Get cars off the street, make new homes have 3 car parking, it is rare that a home has less than 2 cars, and to only require parking for one is poor planning</p>
	<p>Hyde park needs apartment in it north end seams like it get what it wants and the bench gets screwed</p>
	<p>Different parts of this city require different approaches. What works in Hyde park and Bown crossing isn't practical in other parts of the city</p>
	<p>This is a nice thought but with housing being so expensive single family homes are being shared with roommates so reducing parking in only going to cause more problems for the entire neighborhood. So for a 3 bedroom where are you going to put the 2 additional cars?</p>
	<p>Parking is an issue in my neighborhood with on street parking almost continually in use for most areas. On street parking increases risks for bicyclists and can create fussing matches between neighbors. Boise has not opted for greater busing to decrease the need for individual cars. That change is needed first if off street parking is reduced.</p>
	<p>More vehicles will be parked on the roads if only one space is required.</p>
	<p>NO. Keep the existing code density requirements. I DO NOT want high density housing in Boise.</p>
	<p>Remove all parking minimums and let the market decide where parking is necessary. There is no public benefit - and significant public detriment - to requiring off-street parking. Any and all parking requirements uphold dependency on cars and the City has no business encouraging transportation choices that cause so much destruction to life and health of people and the planet.</p>
	<p>This makes sense in some areas, but not all. There are places in the Northend where people can't find a place to park. There are more cars now because more family members are living together to share expenses, people are working from home. The bus system is un-usable so with no good alternatives, people need cars.</p>
	<p>I think this makes the street more crowded for all residents</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	I think you need to pair this with an improved transportation infrastructure
	Consider underground parking garage in the future
	Cars will be around forever and we're way too far out from having mass transit in this City. A standard home should have at least 2 spots. Apartments too.
	More parking. Boise is a driving city.
	Most single family homes have more than one vehicle, causing trouble with a one-car parking space.
	Without major improvement to public transit, which Boise has dramatically failed on (i.e. state and chinden do not have bus pull outs despite recent widening/various projects), limiting parking spaces per unit will majorly clog up roadways with parked cars. Multi unit complexes should have 2 spots/unit
	Until we have better transit this just fills up our streets. In my neighborhood I'm the only one using my garage for cars- everyone else has them filled with storage. If you drive around some of the skinny homes that have been built on the Boise Bench with alley loading garages you'll see they too are storage. So reducing parking requirements puts too many vehicles on our streets.
	Less available parking encourages alternative modes of travel and I am in full support of that! Less cars, more bikes and buses!
	We already have parking problems as multiple people often live together to afford housing.
	Boise is experiencing an influx in population and with that comes more vehicles. We need to prepare for the future and set the standard for parking spaces high. I wish more citizens rode bikes everywhere, but realistically we need to avoid traffic nightmares in both neighborhoods and commercial areas
	keep the streets uncrowded. do you want all of new Boise to look like the North End with cars parked so closely that it leaves little to no room to drive 2 regular cars side by side? this is also not San Fransisco or Portland. Boise does not have that kind of density problem.
	Make it 0 spots required
	One space per home seems to just create more street parking congestion
	No and based in current public transportation most households need two cars, especially based on the current affordability and where people are having to move and then commute.
	We could be bold and imagine no parking requirements to encourage more high density housing near downtown. What if we thoughtfully used lower foothills for high density apartments with no parking requirements. This eliminates the added traffic concerns for our residential streets, and encourages more bike/walk lifestyle. We want 'access' to our foothills and as long as more foothills development facilitates this, we are better to build in our foothills than continue to lose farmland, housing that works against our climate friendly goals in every way.
	Perhaps provide tiers- a home up to a certain size must have 1 space, a home over that size must have 2
	Encouragement of business areas within neighborhoods is good for the community.
	Extra property taxes on land reserved for parking that goes to public transportation. Charge the people NOT using public transportation in order to pay for it. Autonomous trolleys on tracks and chairlifts/gondolas linking neighborhoods to these mini commercial centers. The issue is getting to bown crossing from Harris ranch. Create the mini commercial center but just as important to remove the need for parking in them.
	Given Boise has poor mass transit and bike lanes have a long way to to fulfil alternative transportation, 2 spaces remain important.
	It's so hard because cars are pretty much required in Boise. Public transport sucks. I know the city has been working on this but limiting parking when public transportation is pretty much inaccessible is not the answer.
	We love our cars and each adult in a household must own a car. It would be good to encourage use of public transportation.
	This is just asking for a fight over limited parking spaces. Until we have a real public transportation system that works people will drive cars.
	Parking is important. The city should also encourage and incentivize different forms of transportation and the use of bicycles.
	Parking requirement should still be intact especially in high density housing area. Or else parking itself will be a while bother problem, street parking encourages vandalism and crime
	Parking is a top issue when it comes to building a home. Several developments have gone up with limited parking for each household and the result is overburdened neighboring streets. Do not reduce the number of parking spaces needed per home. Smaller properties are an issue. Keep the requirements higher to prevent impact to the extended neighborhood.
	I think the infrastructure to support alternative transportation needs to be innplace before you tell people to give up their cars. I'm not sure that it is. I totally support fewer cars, but the necessity of a car to shop, conduct business in Boise and to interact with Canyon and Owyhee counties necessitates a vehicle for most. The necessary infrastructure does not yet exist to support a more auto-free community.
	Hyde Park continues to generate intense conflicts with the surrounding North End neighborhood because it has become a citywide destination (and not just a neighborhood-focused mixed-use development). Parking, noise, and disruption of the surrounding community are problems the neighborhood association has increasingly be dealing with. Why do you not recognize the existing situation?

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>This is Ridiculous! We need more parking requirements. Reducing parking requirements will NOT encourage more transportation choices. Boise has decided to cram housing in outerlying area where there are limited services. Keep infill near areas where there are more options for transportation, typically with-in a 2 mile radius of downtown, and develop more commercial property in outerlying areas.</p>
	<p>More bike/pedestrian friendly options, greenbelt access, bike lanes, speed bumps to help slow traffic around heavy bike use areas.</p>
	<p>I believe people will transition to more ride share solutions in the future. Parking will become less important.</p>
	<p>While we agree that increased density is important, it will be a recipe for disaster if the city doesn't make VAST improvements to public transportation. While I understand public transportation planning and investments are outside the scope of P&Z, they must work in tandem if the goal is to increase density. Specifically, the city must first commit to investing in alternative, more attractive public transportation that middle-to-upper class residents will actually use (eg think BARTs full of working residents and that are safe for adolescents to take on their own-- with lines of service running close to their houses and reaching across the valley, rather than our current state of empty buses mainly used by homeless and/or people with substance abuse and/or mental health problems with few lines of service). That is, we need to make transportation feasible, realistic, useful BEFORE (or at least CONCURRENT WITH) implementing a city P&Z policy that will have the effect of decreasing room for private vehicles as it increases density.</p>
	<p>Definitely appreciate the direction this is going. I would support even less restrictive parking requirements of less than one parking space per dwelling.</p>
	<p>This depends on garage options. Discouraging families from living in Boise will change its character in negative ways. Growing families usually have at least two cars plus cars for teen drivers.</p>
	<p>Public transportation needs huge growth before the loss of parking. A light rail that runs both north/south and east/west.</p>
	<p>stop the forward leading questions</p>
	<p>Depending on what part of the neighborhood you're talking about this could be very effective and other areas not so much</p>
	<p>Really?! The reason there are so many cars is that rent is high therefore more renters per unit which means more cars. Are encouraging the use of ride share, buses, mopeds or bikes. There is an absolute need for 2 spaces on the property and 2 on the street. Shut down the buses again then how do I get from SE Boise to Caldwell?</p>
	<p>PLEASE FEEL FREE TO DRIVE AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND LOOK AT THE NUMBER OF CARS NEW RESIDENTS OWN, THEY ARE USUALLY BIGGER, MORE EXPENSIVE AND MORE OF THEM WHICH IS WHY THEY "NEED" TO BUILD THEIR "MCGARAGES."</p>
	<p>Access to public transportation ought to be considered in this requirement</p>
	<p>This isn't realistic yet and will foster animosity.</p>
	<p>This will inevitably clog street parking with extra cars versus encouraging other modes of transit.</p>
	<p>Just digest the lose- lose type questions in the survey. ITS LIKE ASKING US IF WE WANT TO BE SICK WITH CANCER OR BE DEBILITATED IN A HORRIBLE ACCIDENT!!!! Come on!</p>
	<p>We need a public transit system if you intend to reduce dependence on cars. That needs to be addressed BEFORE reducing parking. Give us a way to get there without our personal vehicles.</p>
	<p>While a reduction to one parking spot is helpful, it would be better to remove the parking requirement all together within a certain distance of downtown and/or transit hubs. Many people would prefer not to have a car. Let the market drive whether or not a developer/builder/family decides to make space for parking. There are so many more options these days -- ride shares, bikes, walking, mass transit.</p>
	<p>Increase minimum parking from 2 to 3 spots.</p>
	<p>There is not enough public transportation and widened availability to limit vehicle ownership. Until each resident can walk 1/2 mile or less on pedestrian paths/sidewalks to a public transport this is unreasonable</p>
	<p>Pedestrian friendly design should be incentivized with reduced parking requirements. Also, redevelopment near existing transit services and the greenbelt should be incentivized by reduced parking requirements</p>
	<p>It needs to go back to 2 parking and to many cars ruins neighborhoods</p>
	<p>I think we need to assure new developments have adequate off-street parking so as to minimize the use of parking on the street. Many existing intersections are already too difficult to navigate because we allow cars to park too close to the intersection. There should be minimum requirements against parking too close to an intersection (or any point of entry onto a roadway, such as roads behind residential buildings that are used for parking).</p>
	<p>It will take years once good public transportation is available before people buy less cars, so until then, adequate parking is a must. It is already hard to park in most neighborhoods because people have 3-5 cars per home, taking up the driveway and streets.</p>
	<p>Is there parking as part of the residential building in addition to street parking? That's a critical factor to answer this question</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Expand the P-1 overlay to more places, including many arterial corridors. There needs to be flexibility for different parts of the city. Fairview and Cloverdale is not Latah and Alpine. Why make developments in each place park the same? The point is not to homogenize the city. Keep in mind that the most desirable (high price = high demand, low supply) places to live in Boise were developed either before the zoning code, or with a completely separate, more liberal zoning code. Parking is one of many things that were not regulated. So, why do we even have parking reqs?
More bicycle parking
Don't touch Hyde park. Don't touch it. It's gorgeous and nobody needs someone to tear it up into apt buildings
Maybe single space parking IF there is available parking nearby or If there is also two off street (garage) parking allotments designed in housing design.
I don't find going Hyde Park a good experience. The road way is too tight for autos and pedestrians and there is no place to park. It's junky looking too.
Convenient parking lots free of fees close to residential neighborhoods
The amount of parking spaces should relate to the close proximity of grocery and other retail and food options within walking distance.
Develop more busing routes and benches
Only if connectivity is addressed. Like Better, more effective buss systems.
Ridiculous!
Parking is every growing cities problem. Any reduction will hurt not improve living conditions
I think reduction of parking has to be married with protected bike lanes. And off-road bike or walking options. Nobody wants the breathe exhaust and have to ride aggressively with kids in tow. Close streets like 13th and make them walking or bike only. The farther away the parking the farther people will bike to "park" close.
Why is this limited to only single family homes? Or is it? One space per dwelling with up to 2 bdrms, the two spaces once you get to configurations that could be 3 bedrooms per unit, e.g. 2 bdrms and a den. Then increase the parking requirements to 2 spaces.
Our car-dependency and lack of affordable housing in walkable areas makes it hard to see less parking as a positive for most people. Smaller homes often still have multiple drivers who work different shifts. What we consider affordable housing is so far from where people work, too. We need more mass transit to make this an option.
The average family owns more cars and recreational vehicles than ever before. Any family who is able to own multiple vehicles will find a way to park them close to their dwelling. Parking then becomes a battle for any space available. Many people living in lower income areas are not able to use public transportation for health, mobility or lack of employment in a public transport area.
Don't make parking a mess like in Portland and Seattle!! People have visitors/workers/etc visit. 2 parking spaces is appropriate.
Do not decrease the arming standard across the board for all residential housing types. If you want to lower it to one space, identify the smaller housing types that you anticipate would have a small enough household size for one car, or use it specifically for mixed use.
No
Public transportation isn't effective and most households have at least 2 cars. This removal doesn't help with proper growth and development
Idaho is not populated enough to limit parking. If you need to leave Boise, you need a car/multiple cars per family
people have cars. they like their cars. there are no transportation options. the transportation options will not suddenly appear if there is less required parking. there will just be more cars parked on the street. which in turn makes alternative transportation even more difficult to introduce.
This won't work unless we get better public transportation. Or developers will still continue to include two parking spaces anyway because everyone here drives everywhere. Or they will not have enough parking and the dreaded parking on the neighborhood streets will happen. I'm fully on board with encouraging fewer cars but there just isn't enough Uber/lyft (which need to parking spots somewhere too) to get people around and the bus system is seriously lacking.
More incentives for expanding use of public transit and expanded public transit. Boise bus system does not penetrate existing neighborhoods effectively. Not sure less parking is actually going to change that.
See above comments on overcrowding and parking issues. The Hyde Park area is already a nightmare to drive through due to the on-street parking blocking visibility when trying to drive through an intersection; encouraging smaller and more diverse housing types is another way of saying "more houses per lot, ergo more people in the space we already don't have enough of."
Too many people
Give property taxes back so citizens can afford a personal organizer and park in garage.
The best places in the world including Hyde park have limited parking and buildings close to the street- we need more of this model
Please provide more parking areas/spaces/lots, bike lanes, sidewalks, and public transportation. This is going to be a big problem here soon.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>All this will create is more dense homes with not enough parking. We already have this problem in a nearby subdivision that was allowed to conduct denser housing within a residential neighborhood. Reducing the number of off-street parking spots required only pushes the people to park in front of other homeowners houses. When trying to create affordable housing, need to plan that the people living in these residences will likely be sharing with roommates (all of which own a separate car) and will have nowhere to park if only one off-street spot is required. Developers will build to the minimum and we will have a mess of trying to park.</p>
	<p>Have you see the parking sh*tshow that is 13th at Hyde park? How can lessening off street parking requirements be a good move? Boise transpo is useless as it is today.</p>
	<p>Really we just need more frequent public transportation in these areas and people would use it more.</p>
	<p>Yes. Provide adequate parking until such time there is a real public transportation system here. Or require all new residential developments to include walkable distance services such as restaurants, banks and drug stores.</p>
	<p>Density is not the answer</p>
	<p>To be honest, ppl will NOT give up their cars unless you live in a high density city like NYC, Baltimore, etc. Boise doesn't fit the bill to proceed with reduced parking. Ppl like to get into the mountains and you need vehicles to do that.</p>
	<p>Work closely with ACHD on this so that connectivity and access to transit lines is easier for folks to not rely on cars.</p>
	<p>This regulation should match current and expected reality, and require minimum 2 parking spaces per unit. I suggest you take a look around Boise neighborhoods and see how much parking is actually on the street, not what is listed in your planning textbook. There is not a single household on my street with less than 2 cars. What are you smoking? The residential parking requirement should be addressed separately from neighborhood commercial centers such as Hyde Park or Bown. If you do not require businesses in such commercial centers to provide parking, their customers will crash the curbside parking and draw opposition from the people who actually live there.</p>
	<p>Need more off street parking</p>
	<p>Reducing parking requirements does not decrease the number of cars. It just places the burden on surrounding streets and neighborhoods where people will park if not provided sufficient parking space at their residence. High housing prices are resulting in more people sharing homes which means parking spaces should be increased not decreased</p>
	<p>This pushes parking onto roads and creates more conflicts. Use of alleys and rear access lots creates a better focus and provides options for secondary dwelling units above garages</p>
	<p>Lower minimum road width requirements in residential areas to increase sidewalk width and get cars to drive more slowly naturally.</p>
	<p>Mixed use developments should have time limits on street parking (eg 2 hours, or whatever is reasonable for the development) while allowing neighbor residents to get parking permits for unlimited parking.</p>
	<p>Stop focusing on solving North end and downtown problems. New developments near five mile or cloverdale have no business infrastructure to support walking and biking. Vehicles will be required to commute and are needed across the city.</p>
	<p>Require more off-street parking. What should the taxpayer/public/ACHD provide parking spaces? On my block only three of 13 dwelling have off-street parking (I don't).</p>
	<p>Yes: eliminate all marking minimums. Allow builders and buyers to determine what amount of off-street parking is needed, not the city. Hyde Park is one of the most desirable places in Boise, but it couldn't be built today because it doesn't have enough parking. Yes, parking is tight on the streets there, and that's ok. The trade-off is an economically and culturally vibrant place. Let's make Hyde Park legal again. The alternative, where parking is "free" and always available, is Eagle Road and the like. There's no reason for the city to tell people how much parking they must have.</p>
	<p>2 per house</p>
	<p>It would be helpful if we had a robust public transportation system. For example, Valor Point is right on State Street, but the number of cars exceed the number of available spaces so multiple cars a parking across the street. Another example is on Ellen's Ferry that now has cars parking on both sides of the street at the 17 four-plex unit development on the west side of Ellen's Ferry. There is no accessible approach to the bus service given that the corner was landscaped instead of putting in a sidewalk where the bus stop is located.</p>
	<p>There needs to be a way to ensure developers do not have the ability to take shortcuts or get parking releases from the city for any reason.</p>
	<p>It is ridiculous to try to reduce households with multiple people to a single car.</p>
	<p>Create a mass transit system. This is pointless unless mass transit exists.</p>
	<p>Almost every home and apartment has more than one car. You cannot take away parking until you have a reliable & functional public transportation system in place. The boise bus system is the only current option and is a joke. The buses don't run often enough or late enough to work for most people's jobs</p>
	<p>Deemphasize garages and parking in encouraged building design frontage to encourage pedestrian and cycle traffic. Move car parking to back of lots or via alley access</p>
	<p>Provide 3 parking spaces for every single home and 2 spaces for every apartment, with an additional space for 3 bdrm apts.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>In my neighborhood some neighbors have invite guests for dinners or parties and have guests arriving in 5 or more cars. Of course they park in front of more homes than the one they are visiting. The same thing occurs for yard or estate sales. Neighborhoods need parking! Too many cars parked on the streets densely creates a safety hazard too. Pets and small children can't be seen easily if entering the street from between parked cars. Parking in Hyde Park is very difficult too. Bus service can't make up for all the issues. The bus doesn't come to my neighborhood. The roads have too many hills and there are no sidewalks so it would be difficult to get to a bus stop, even if there was one.</p>
	<p>This makes more people park in the street which means cluttered streets with frustrated drivers</p>
	<p>Better mass transit. Better/more bike lanes. Require more bike spaces/bike parking. Make it easier, safer, cheaper to bike.</p>
	<p>Expand the bus routes- our public transportation is laughable- if a low income person could live wherever and get into the city to work- that's a plus</p>
	<p>Make the regulation dependent on the availability of frequent, affordable public transportation.</p>
	<p>Well.... Creating incentives for residents to bike would be great along with this. Also, shifting funds to create alternative transportation for elders who can't bike (and shouldn't be driving) would be good!</p>
	<p>It is not realistic. Most homes in Boise have at least two cars. Yes, some have less. Due to weather and because Regional attractions are spread from Nampa to Downtown Boise. Statistics show <1% of people living near these attractions use City Transit. It is premature to do this without a dependable transit system in place or at least making a large stride toward it. Yes, we may leave our cars at home but we will need a place to safely park them for neighborhood traffic flow and safety for pedestrian. Many neighborhoods near transit don't even have sidewalks I ask that this be removed from proposed code at this time as its a mistake to do this now without transitioning with proper infrastructure.</p>
	<p>Who are you trying kid? The normal single "Family" has 2 to 4 cars, boats, RV's. You are going to let builders get by with 1 car parking space, which will allow more buildings per lot and extreme congestion. You need to get your act together and stop supporting junk yard neighborhoods. We pay your salary with our taxes, not the out of State Builders.</p>
	<p>Again, anticipate growth and designate future communal retail areas. Plan, don't react</p>
	<p>Until we get a better public transit system and until the West develops a less car-dependent mindset, we need designated parking.</p>
	<p>Bown & Hyde park need more parking. The only way to make this better is make more areas like Bown & Hyde Park. That way, these places could be for residents who can easily bike or walk to them.</p>
	<p>Again, out-of-state developers don't have a vested interest in Boise other than profit. I believe erstad ARCHITECT's were involved in Bown Crossing design so there was a commitment to making a beautiful, functional community. As it stands now, citizens are invited to comment on development if they live within 300'? 1000'? of the proposed development. For large parcels like the one off east of Vista on Victory, why not ask the developers to garner more city-wide comments.</p>
	<p>This needs to coincide with improvements to public transit- currently to live in Boise you need a car</p>
	<p>I do applaud the encouragement of mixed use areas like bown crossing, but the city needs to pull their share of the weight if this does happen. Calling valley ride "robust public transportation" is an outright lie right now. That would need to be improved as the other part of this equation. I am not sure if requirements for bus and public transportation can be in the code.</p>
	<p>Another polite fiction, that by giving less parking spots, people will have less cars. Kind of like the "get people to build affordable housing through innovative (but not profit based) ideas". You're just going to be lacking in parking spots if you don't require enough spots for a normal resident.</p>
	<p>This will only clog the streets with parked cars.</p>
	<p>This is not a great idea in most cases. Who lives in apartments? Singles sharing rent Divorced dads Students Geographically separated tech sector workers. If you have a 3BR apartment shared among three roommates, that's 3 cars and 3 bikes. That's not one family with one car - that's three adults with separate lives. Those adults need parking. If you have a divorced dad with shared custody in a 2BR apartment, that's a work truck for dad, possibly a tool trailer for dad, a weekend vehicle for dad, possibly on a trailer (side by side, boat, camper) and a regular car/pickup for dad to drive the kids around in. That dad needs parking. If you put all those extra vehicles on the street in an infill neighborhood, the neighbors are going to scream. Give this some consideration.</p>
	<p>Yes, more and frequent bus routes, bike racks, etc would help.</p>
	<p>Lowering minimum parking requirements make sense. Finding more ways to incentivize bicycling and public transit is important too.</p>
	<p>Public transportation is not convenient enough and boise is too spread out.</p>
	<p>Yes. Start building actual neighborhoods. Stop building subdivisions with cookie-cutter homes and sidewalks that go nowhere. Hold developers accountable and stop allowing these poorly designed areas.</p>
	<p>Again you are causing more problems than fixing and in the end people suffer make it three spots not two</p>
	<p>Most families in Boise have more than one car, mainly because there are two working parents or several people sharing an apartment. There has to be somewhere for people to park.</p>
	<p>Tough question. I think people will walk or ride bikes when the weather permits it, but when it's cold, wet or snowy we all drive because the bus system doesn't generally meet our needs.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Everybody likes to fantasize about everybody using bikes to get around, but in reality everybody has a car. Parking requirements are still needed and should not be reduced except on a project-by-project basis.</p>
<p>Simply reducing parking requirements will not force people into using public transportation. We will just have more parking issues with people parking on the streets.</p>
<p>Boise is not Portland, nor should it be. This proposal encourages street parking and congestion.</p>
<p>The only way this works is if mass transit becomes more of a reality here in Boise. Without a stronger transit system, folks here in Boise and those who have been displaced to Meridian, Kuna, and Nampa will continue to drive. And before this is written off as "not our city, not our problem," I'll remind you that it is a regional problem that affects all cities. So if Boise doesn't have a robust, interconnected system that isn't just biking on the greenbelt or taking a car, then this regulation by itself will not be enough. What's more, it requires the commitment of ACHD to enforce sidewalks, cycling paths, and multi use pathways, which hopefully comes to pass - but may only come to pass if political partnership between entities is favored. That partnership, then, is no guarantee. Perhaps working with ACHD and sister cities to improve mass transit could help, but this to is limited as dedicated funding from the state is also needed to sustain mass transit here. And we all know that's not going to happen when there's a strong conservative hold on the purse strings for funding public transit.</p>
<p>Increase public transportation between neighborhoods in Boise so that less people have to drive to get to other developments. Then, less parking would make sense!</p>
<p>Not at all. Any unit made for the intention to be a family dwelling (more than one bedroom) should continue to have a requirement to provide two parking spaces. Particularly in the SW because people who live in this part of town currently have to travel to other parts of town for work and most recreation. And, there really isn't any public transportation in the area. Multiple people in the home (adults or teens) need to be able to park a vehicle.</p>
<p>Make some streets pedestrian only. One space per DU is ridiculous.</p>
<p>We need enough parking for two vehicles</p>
<p>Two car parking is much more realistic. But developments should have an added parking area for additional homeowner vehicles and for guest parking.</p>
<p>So what you're saying is, one person will be able to afford to live in these "affordable homes" making only \$7.25 an hour? Or what the hell, let's just say they are making 15. The average person making that would have a take-home pay of around \$1800 per month. That's based on working full-time. Are you figuring in the new sales tax we are about to take it in the ass on with living expenses regarding affordable housing? Based on these wages, your affordable housing rent could only be around \$600 per month for ONE person. In other words, no kids. I seriously doubt that rent will be that inexpensive.</p>
<p>Reminds me of student housing, one space per apartment. It was a nightmare for parking and led everyone in the complex to clog up the street and shark parking spots from each other.</p>
<p>until we have a much better (more buses running much more frequently) I think this will only result in more cars parked on the street.</p>
<p>You can build as many bike lanes as you want but as long as Valley Ride remains a very mediocre transit system (and that's generous). Boise will always be a car driven town, people will always need to be able to park whether it's at home, in the street or in parking garages. One of the biggest problems is Boise has too many "No Parking" zones that don't allow people to park. Stop living in a dream land where everyone rides bikes and takes the bus, all at the expense of drivers and taxpayers.</p>
<p>More cars parking on the streets makes a neighborhood crowded and dangerous for kids and pedestrians. More noise in neighborhoods and more accidents. On-site parking 2 cars per apartment or house!!!</p>
<p>people will park where they want to</p>
<p>No</p>
<p>Boise is built for vehicles currently. With the economy and price of homes/rentals, there are more people living together to save money. Limiting parking options is not helpful at this time.</p>
<p>these examples are polar opposites: Hyde has historic issues that planning will have trouble fixing, but Bown is a reasonable attempt to create retail and residential balance; but for residential, illegitimate parking is a big problem in the foothills for example. People are not using their garages for vehicle storage; they use it for personal property storage and parking their vehicles on the street creating both congestion and hazard.</p>
<p>Leave parking the way it is</p>
<p>Stop trying to create density. It's a path to more crime.</p>
<p>Fewer cars is wonderful, but will not happen unless the price of energy at least doubles and unless walking, biking and public transit become more available and comfortable.</p>
<p>See above bus idea.</p>
<p>In neighborhoods where homes have garages for parking may be less of an issue but areas where residents rely more on street parking need commercial buildings to have sufficient parking that does not encroach on residents.</p>
<p>There should be NO required parking spaces. There is plenty of street parking, and requiring this adds unnecessarily to building size. That said, one car is better than two.</p>
<p>Do not skip parking spots. They are building apartments that do not have enough parking. Need to figure it out because Boise doesn't have adequate public transportation, must have parking!</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Add more bike lanes!
Those two areas are awesome
Leave it the way it is. Most families have at least two cars.
I am ok with one parking space AFTER the new pathways are complete, but not before
I think being near transportation infrastructure (bike lanes, sidewalks/crosswalks, and public transit stops) should allow for even less parking. And if developers want a variance for even less parking, they should work with the city/achd/vrt to put in this infrastructure so housing is better connected.
I strongly oppose this change. Reducing parking requirements will not make people have fewer cars. Boise is not set up at all for commuting via public transit (or arguably by bike--the random peppering of bike lanes that randomly end all over the place are...inconvenient). Additionally, many rentals on the bench are student rentals, so it's likely there's at least one car (if not two) for every bedroom. Reducing required parking will just push people to park on the street, which is problematic because many of the streets are already packed as it is. On top of that, many of the streets with sidewalks are often too narrow to have parking on both sides, which causes continuous and unmonitored illegal parking--a hazard to drivers and emergency vehicles. Instead of making zoning codes more beneficial to developers, invest in public transit and improved bike lanes and walkways.
We have street parking – let's use it. Wasting potential living space on parking is dumb.
The existing transportation system in Boise is not large enough or cost-effective enough to support no automobile growth. Your vision is also not consistent with The work from home idea where former commuters can now live in the rural suburbs at lower cost and lower stress. Please provide for more housing of this nature. Do not destroy existing neighborhoods
Build better ways to get there that aren't for just cars
Duh! Go to the Idaho historical society and research the old neighborhoods, they were amazing... Then just make it happen. Be creative about a funding program and work with neighborhoods and the people in them directly.
Not sure.... I don't like street parking in residential neighborhoods
It seems like people will just park on the street, rather than be dissuaded by one less parking spot, creating conflict in the neighborhood.
It makes sense if the home fits, if it's a studio or one bedroom place. If it's made to house more than that, it should have more than one parking space available because it is likely a more than one car home. Cluttering the streets with cars isn't going to be a good situation. Public transportation is limited in Boise so you can't expect that residents are using it vs having a 2nd car.
Parking lots should be behind businesses and the front of the business closer to the street
More parking is always better and safer for everyone.
Even if the family only has one car they have visitors and gatherings which would be parking on the street. Most of the people I know have 2 cars. They should not have to park one on the street.
As more people move to Idaho we need more parking options. Until there is reliable, wide-spread, high speed public transport Boise needs to focus on increasing the amount of parking that is available. Find creative ways to provide more parking especially for larger vehicles.
If boise had a decent public transportation system. Would say #9 would make sense. Until that happens peoples choice of transport will remain a personal vehicle. They need parking
You have long time residents that park multiple vehicles on a street(e.g. North End) without any enforcement of residential parking stickers and zones currently. Pretending it will get better, by adding more housing and less parking will not solve the current issue
Remove parking requirements everywhere for all uses.
making parking worse will not help. We have horrible public transport. It will only create more problems
People still rely on driving their cars and we do not have adequate transportation alternatives in ID. We need parking
Build out that sweet pathways plan so more folks can walk or bike to work
I live in a neighborhood on the corner entering my subdivision. Anytime the neighbors have a party or gathering - all parking spots around my home are taken. Why would anyone think eliminating parking spots from 2 to 1 be a good idea and/or make the homeowners happy?
3 car max
Today most families need both parents to work to afford to live in the TV. Generally that means 2 cars.
First provide alternative transportation, then reduce parking
More density means more cars. Off street parking will need to remain 2 per unit so that streets that are narrow wont be clogged with cars parking on the sides restricting flow and making it dangerous for pedestrians

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Should require more off-street parking rather than less especially in residential areas.
Guest parking spaces areas need to be required in subdivisions like they are in areas of smaller lots/townhomes, etc.
As Boise grows the need for parking will get larger. As it stands people just take up their neighbor's parking spots instead of carpooling or other solutions
There should be two parking spots per house on the street.
Yes --- if you increase public transportation, have light rail/tram. The bus system is not always reliable and biking from the downtown area to the Airport bench is next to impossible in the summer when it is 104 degrees out.
I strongly favor this. Other than apartment buildings where developers might be encouraged to cut costs by providing too little parking, I am not a fan of parking requirements. Especially at commercial developments. A store or office has an incentive to provide enough parking for easy access to customers/employees, but not more than necessary, which comes with cost. I think the market is best positioned to dictate the amount of required parking, and as the city becomes more friendly to pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders, the market will dictate less parking.
Most houses have more than 1 car.
As long as developers are required to provide enough off street parking this could work.
ADUs should not be required to have a dedicated parking space if located near transportation lines or within biking distance of downtown Boise.
No, the regulation change will just result in more parking headaches for residents and visitors. You can't make this kind of change before public transportation options are improved.
Many houses in the North End already have one or no off-street parking space, if public transportation is available there should be no minimum requirement.
Better sidewalks, crossings and lower speedlimits are needed. Bown and Hyde Park speedlimits are substantially lower. Take a look at Federal Way coming into Capital Blvd. While it is walkable, it is extremely dangerous with bikes using the sidewalks at fast speed and limited vision to see bikers, or scooters coming.
Not sure
We need decent public transportation before we can get rid of parking.
I would look into what 'pseudo dormitory' parking requirements should be as they tend to demand more parking in concentrated areas but have no place to combat that in code
Public parking structures or parking lots that can be used by residents and visitors. Even if you park and then walk several blocks, it could relieve congestion in the core areas.
Without more public transportation and use of it, there are just more cars trying to find parking. What single family home has only 1 car to park anymore? And if they have 2 cars and teenager cars and their garage is an ADU with a tenant with a car, now you have 4 cars for 1 space.
The further a neighborhood is from a Pathway, the reduced parking requirement makes less sense.
There is no minimum number of required parking space in Hyde Park right now -- confusing as to why this change is perceived to contribute to such developments. This is a question about transporation, walkability, bikeability, etc.
Realistic consideration of public transit options, protected bike lanes and connecting pedestrian pathways.
this regulation does nothing for "encourage more transportation choices". I go to Hyde Park often and don't know what Bown Crossing is... if it's where Lost Grove sushi shack is, then both I only drive to. 95% of Boise drive a personal vehicle or uber to Hyde park. the elites that live near can walk or drive regardless of their number of parking spaces at their home. Every Hyde park neighbor owns at least 1 car. every bown person owns at least car. only city in america I know a carless family is NYC. This housing parking rule will help density, density is needed to have a successful mixes use building... allow business' and bodega's to not need parking and now you are playing with fire. People will still drive to the random bodega or pub, but they will park in front of the neighbor's house, and so be it! Hyde park has that now, and those neighbors get to walk to it in their gold privileged shoes. Get rid of parking requirements all together. Let the market solve the problems it may or may not cause. It a dream scenario that problem is solved by increased transit/buses. We are so far from that though.
You cause fire hazard by not having enough space for cars. Parking complexes are an option,
Parking should be proportional to the homes built; larger homes will attract more vehicles and activity; less parking available could lead to clogged streets, creating nightmares for fire and medical responses. Many neighborhoods have cars parked in driveways and in the street, creating narrow and somewhat hazardous driving. I'm not sure reduced parking is a viable approach in large family style developments. It is a great approach for smaller units near transportation hubs and established traditional neighborhoods like Hyde Park.
this only gives apartment owners the upper hand and restrict the ability of multi-family housing in one location -
Only by funding alternative transportation options and creating better bike lanes and pathways
Parking is a nightmare at bown crossing. I live near there. When they out in the paved walkway on Boise ave btwn bown and law they took away all the Northside parking on Boise ave forthe townhouses on Boise ave. Many of these are rentals with several cars. Parking has been a mess. Bown needs more parking during peak retail/restaurant times.
More bike lanes

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Perhaps with financial incentives ?
We must make owning cars less desirable and alternative modes of transportation more desirable.
Needs to take in to account proximity to downtown/services. One car space in a home that has no other option but auto and is distant from downtown/services will lead to jam packed streets and neighbor conflicts. In addition, if allowing street parking, the streets need to be wider.
Single family dwellings need two parking spaces per family
Since there is no city led sensible transportation plan that is being driven on the same timetable as this rezone, no it won't work. And having bus transportation in the future on a couple of corridors will not solve it either. Reality is that parking is being cut too low. This can be seen with Valor Pointe where there is insufficient parking and it pushes vehicles into neighborhoods and you other properties.
Why aren't we focusing on better public transportation instead. Lightrail, for example.
Only if it is enforced. Good luck with that.
Preserve open spaces
This is the worst idea ever. Saves developers money at cost of fighting with neighbors on parking. Quality of life will go down, which already occurs in SouthEast Boise. The driveways don't fit cars on them without blocking sidewalks. It's ridiculous as if people don't have guest drive over or visits from family out of town. Boise has a parking problem and they pretend it doesn't exist for convenience. The city needs to do a car to sidewalk ratio to determine how people really travel. 99% travel by car and in cold freezing weather I bet it's more like 99.999%. There maybe small spots in the city that is walkable but most of us don't live on the nice river greenbelt. I have to drive to Bown Crossing, Hyde Park, Camel Back or other nice areas. If you have kids in soccer you have to drive to Simplot Sports complex or Optimist Youth Sports Complex (They change each season). Want to Ice Skate well you have to drive to Ice World. Are we saying only privileged people can own cars and have great experiences in Idaho? That's what this change means to me.
Should keep minimum parking to two vehicles
See comments above
Taking away parking spaces doesn't necessarily encourage alternate transportation. Existence of reliable, frequent mass transit does that. When buses don't run after 6 pm (and they do down Parkcenter), doesn't matter how many parking places you have/don't have. You need a car
Again, this just decreases the quality of life for Boise residents.
Flexible zoning
Until you improve more public transportation choices, citizens will continue to have multiple cars creating problems with parking in high density neighborhoods. I believe monies could be directed to increasing public transportation in high density neighborhoods (Barber Valley). I'm concerned with the number of households planned for this area and roads that will not sustain increased traffic.
Provide more bike parking in the downtown core and public areas. Bike garages like in Copenhagen & Stockholm
I don't know. with the cost of housing on the rise many families see the kids moving back home and roommates are having to get roommates in order to afford housing, therefore more parking is needed everywhere.
You might be able to go from 2 required spaces down to 1 if the size of the home is small enough or like 1 bedroom. Other wise you are simply pushing the additional cars onto the street which to me reduces the quality of life in the neighborhood. Like congestion, visibly and safety!
Yes, keeping the parking ratios as is and force funding of mass transit options. the way you currently propose it is backwards. Take away parking and hope that it will result in more mass transit demand. Sorry I don't believe that will be the result... but we may see more cars parked on lawn areas??? Again resulting in economic devaluation of neighborhoods!
Cramming in is not the answer. What can we do to stop unbridled growth is the question we should be asking.
I'm not sure we need more mixed use. People i know looking for housing want a home with room for 2 cars at least.
Linking developments with trails and improving public transportation (access, routes, frequency).
Strongly support fewer parking spaces required, especially for ADU additions
People here want to drive their cars/trucks. They aren't likely to change anytime soon. Please don't make neighborhood parking a nightmare. It's already a problem in many areas.
But, we need functional public transport to go along with this change.
Not many homeowners or renters have only one car. That will create more problems and hard feelings between neighbors.
Build all neighborhoods with Hyde park and brown crossing in mind.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Perhaps a mechanism that based on density of smaller (hopefully more affordable) homes, additional funding could be allocated to public transit routes that serve that more dense area?
	Until we have much better public transportation options, most households are still going to need two cars, so will also need two parking spaces. However, if a garage is included, parking could be reduced accordingly.
	Parking maximums only
	My concern is if adequate parking spots are not provided for new development- the tenants will end up using street parking. We have had many issues with St Lukes employees using all the street parking in the area so home owners have to park blocks from their own homes because St Lukes employees are using street parking. The issue has been helped by RESIDENTIAL parking stickers limiting street parking to 2hrs.
	Parking is becoming ridiculous. With "skinny" houses being shoved in, and some without garages, or garages that cannot be easily accessed, older homes in those neighborhoods are finding their parking is being overtaken.
	Light rail! Just kidding, it's Idaho, that'll never happen. We can't even get a decent library funded.
	You must not allow reduced parking. Residents of these reduced parking areas park in front of driveway accesses as well as mail boxes. Increased parking on the road in neighborhoods cause blind spots and accidents. This is a developer giveaway! I am against this and sick of the lack of respect the city seems to have for neighborhoods. Was this section written by a developer?
	Please take into consideration the residential/suburban dynamics of West Boise. Cars are necessary in this area of town because the nature of 5 lane roads and long distances between available stores and grocery stores for shopping creates the need for residents to use vehicles to access these amenities.
	Just because an area is "mixed use" does not mean that a working family will only have one car. That belief is a fairy tale. If there aren't enough parking spaces then the people have to park on the street. .. they aren't going to walk to work (or bike) just because you want them to.
	House holds avolve as children grow older and want to drive. There should be flexibility in these regulations.
	Public transportation is awful. The roads are not taking care of when it snows or there is ice on the roads. I live only 2 miles from work, but the space between my home and the university where I work is impassable when the weather is bad.
	REMOVE PARKING MINIMUMS. There is so much research supporting the abolishment of parking minimums. They increase housing prices (decrease affordability) by wasting LIVABLE space on CARS. They increase the price of goods and services at businesses that have to use VALUABLE space for CARS. They INCREASE SPRAWL, DECREASE DENSITY, and generally create more polluted, less livable places. Please google Donald Shoop and then remove parking minimums from Boise's zoning code. PLEASE.
	Because Boise is car dependent, this proposal doesn't make sense. If you were to take into consideration and buff up public transportation (buses, a light rail, etc.) to get people out of their cars, then it would make sense to decrease the number of parking spaces
	Is the commission requiring more mixed use developments? If so, I think that's a wonderful idea!! I think most people wouldn't drive if they didn't have to (I know I wouldn't and is the reason I moved closer to downtown). If you plan on shifting the requirement on parking spaces, the mixed use idea should be utilized/more heavily encouraged to improve livability.
	I don't think these changes can be made unless they are paired with a concerted effort to improve alternative modes of transportation.
	No, people here prefer to use their cars over transit, and during winter most people won't commute by bike. An example would be East Jr. High in the mornings. The school buses pull up practically empty, but there's a couple hundred cars trying to drop their kids off. By reducing parking requirements you're just going to cause parking headaches on the streets. See how people actually act instead of how you'd like them to act.
	Not allowing sufficient parking residence results in parking in neighboring spots causing frustration - especially for longer-term homeowners impacted by new dwellings.
	Reducing off street parking doesn't necessarily mean people will get rid of their cars.
	In what fantasy world do you think a house hold with 2 adults and 2 kids only has one car.
	unfortunately some house have more than 2 cars.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>"The Module 2 draft also includes new standards to encourage smaller blocks and more frequent street and sidewalk connection points to encourage walking and bicycling as an alternative to automobile trips. These changes include new maximum block length standards to limit the size of new blocks.</p> <p>New standards promote more pedestrian-friendly development by requiring shared parking and access points, coordinating and linking parking structure and lot entrances, consolidating common service/delivery areas, allowing shared parking structures and lots, and allowing shared driveways for two adjacent lots to minimize curb cuts. These regulations are found in Sections 11-04-06.4.G and H.</p> <p>Do you feel the proposed changes would encourage more walking and bicycling and reduce the number and length of automobile trips?</p> <p>Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?"</p>	People will drive regardless.
	There needs to be more sidewalks and public transportation. Messing with the area and how people are allowed to park at there residence doesn't seem to be an effective way to encourage more people to consider less automobile trips.
	Not crazy about shared driveways for single family homes.
	You can't change the way we live without investing in infrastructure. We don't have a local economy where we live and work in the same neighborhood. Creating more bike paths in my neighborhood doesn't help me get across town! I can't ride a bus when there's not an accessible stop for MILES!
	see my last answer
	I think this is particularly important closer to the downtown core.
	Please continue to write more modules to encourage walking, biking and tree planting to ensure beautiful and walkable neighborhoods.
	People tend to be lazy and it is difficult to socially-engineer selfish human nature. But it will help if all sidewalks are wider than 4 skimpy feet and detached from the road way with a plant berm to create a pleasant experience that encourages, rather than discourages walking. Utility poles also need to be underground and no mailboxes impeding into sidewalk areas.
	Reducing parking with the ideal goal of encouraging pedestrians clearly is difficult as illustrated in many cities. It simply results in congestion for both cars and peds. If you can't provide for unforeseen growth in both areas, don't limit either.
	It's a reasonable regulation but I question whether it will result in changing lifestyles.
	Why are you changing the feel ,of the community. You are creating urban sprawl and all the negatives seen in similar cities where this has been done.
	Yes we need to be transit ready!
	Yes, particularly if combined with regulations allowing neighborhood appropriate commercial development.
	Separated bike lanes
	You promote walking/biking by having a dedicated pathway that is removed from the street.
	New developments are required to have sidewalks but they are often not connected to anything as the older neighborhood around them didn't ever have sidewalks. We need full sidewalk connectivity to be a priority in our neighborhoods! It's impossible to get around with a stroller or wheelchair in many places, and those new sidewalks are wasted when they dead-end at the next lot. We also need connected sidewalks on busy corridors like State St where the sidewalk comes and goes. Bike lanes come and go all over the city as well. We need more consistent and better connected bike lanes.
	In order for these regulations to work, Boise Police Department is going to have to start enforcing parking violations for drivers that park in bicycle lanes, loading zones, and those who block crosswalks.
	Again, require safe bicycle access and bike racks.
	To encourage more walking and bicycling to reduce the number of automobile trips you need closer access to desired destination. Changing the block size does not change the total distance.
	We are not going to rid of the automobile. Idaho has a strong car culture and the majority of the middle and upper prefer to use their private vehicle even when it is easy to walk. Shared access points and parking make sense in promoting connectivity and reducing street congestion.
	Again, I believe there is a huge difference between commercial and residential development needs. The idea of residential developments utilizing these principals is all well and good but with the geographic size of Boise, to try to reduce automobile trips would result in increased gridlock.
	This would be ideal, but the reality is that limiting parking could result in fighting over parking, arguments and difficulty meeting needs in families where transportation accessi-bility is too squeezed.
	All these proposed changes come straight from the anti-American United Nations and organizations such as a ICLEI.
	Keep the traffic slow, by using more speed bumps, reduce the area for cars in the street and increase the area for bikes, sidewalks and other forms of alternative transportation.
	There needs to be a greater mix of residential and commercial zones in order to reduce car traffic.
	Developments with only one or two access points are a ridiculous.
	The biggest impediment to walking and biking are newer subdivisions that are built with curving and looping streets, rather than an orthogonal grid. The size of the blocks has never been an issue, it's the shape of them. The North End is walkable and bike friendly because it's a grid. West Boise is not friendly because it's a maze. Tell ACHD to change their "traffic calming" curvature standards.
	Excellent.
Property owners need to be required to provide much more on-site parking spaces for residents.	
Mandate bike lanes in new developments.	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	It will promote evening walks, but unless there are other businesses mixed in the community like grocery, pharmacy, restaurants, there isn't anywhere people are going to walk to. People will need to drive because they are so far.
	Developers need to fund infrastructure as part of all development projects.
	sidewalks separated from the street by a tree lawn provide a safer experience by shrinking the perception of width, and reduce heat islands by encouraging more shade. Encouraging this style of sidewalk would improve the code. Wide streets directly adjacent to wide open sidewalks increase driving speeds regardless of limits and other traffic calming, decrease shade, and increase heat. Also the code rewrite would be a great opportunity to encourage alternative permeable pathways/paving for sidewalks to decrease run off and cement jungle heat islands instead of requiring non-permeable paving for driveways, etc.
	This would be great in California and/or places with a more mild climate, but I don't think you're taking into account the weather in November-February when it's too cold, slick, and potentially dangerous to be out on the street and sidewalks.
	No.
	No because Boise and Meridian are not close. If you are talking about downtown Boise then sure. It was layed out to be a walking and biking. So sure for DOWN TOWN YES. But once you even get hardly out own down town the biking and walking areas are non existent
	Separate people from cars, fewer people will get hit, being injured or killed.
	See first note for my opinion
	Maybe start encouraging motorcycle ownership, it is smaller than the average car meaning you can fit more in one space, and Boise weather seems Accommodating for them to replace car usage meaning families only need one car then multiple to get to and from work.
	Require through points of subdivisions (no ending at a culdesac), no required parking
	Somewhat but what is really needed is better public transportation. What is being proposed is a band-aid.
	Curb cuts seem to be a one time expense, but cause extended inconvenience. Shorter blocks means more roads which reduces livable structure space. Seems to contradict other measures considered in the code.
	Be attentive to adherence early on and provide examples for people to include developers.
	Make more exit points from the area, not the use of feeder system, where all traffic funnels to one or two exit/entrance points. Reduces traffic and creates a friendlier atmosphere.
	Stop biilding mandate
	I am not sure at this time.
	Widespread requirements for sidewalks, including in existing neighborhoods without them.
	This is a maybe. I don't think people will be willing to give up driving. If they were, they would have done it already.
	This will just increase conflict opportunities between cars and pedestrians. If there's not frequent and reliable public transportat connecting all areas of the city, being able to walk in some parts of it only goes so far.
	The distance from residential to places of employment dictates when walking or bicycling is feasible.
	?
	Smaller blocks make sense. But if there's not something to walk to (e.g. nearby shopping, parks, etc), it's sort of moot.
	Why do you want to regulate everything?
	continue to make biking safer...need to widen bike paths and greenbelt paths for example.
	The intended result may not be the best for the majority. Stop trying to change citizens behavior with Zoning rules and make the rules fit the behavior of the majority of the citizens. Just because the City wants people to park their car and walk or ride a bike doesn't mean they will. Then you have developments that are useless or at least inconvenient for the average citizen.
	I don't have a suggestion for improving the regulation but I worry about the impact this might have on handicap Accessibility. Also these aren't the reasons people choose to bicycle or walk
	as long as 1/2 acre lots are the smallest people are building on i dont care
	You could also provide walking paths and bike trails to destinations that are more direct than the streets. Especially in residential areas, instead of all through streets, create right-of-ways at the end of culdesacs or where shorter blocks should be.
	Increase amenities to encourage walking and biking: water fountains, trash receptacles, public restroom availability and access are all needed to encourage people out of their cars.
	Please put a mandate on the growth

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Require commercial bike parking.
Hopefully it would work. Getting rid of cul de sacs would surely help!
People drive because they perceive it is too far to walk or bike from home to the jobs or services they want to access. Allowing for, and incentivizing, more mixes uses within zones addresses that more than just shortening blocks but having single use zoning
However this needs to coincide with a community feel. More parks, recreation small restaurants and gathering spaces. Otherwise those sidewalks will go unused.
What about the rest of the city? Only new development matter?
Incorporate bike infrastructure for new development, e.g. improving/adding bike lanes in certain zones, add bike storage requirements, add outside design elements to shade and protect pedestrians.
Again, taking away the single residential home's parking and comfort for space between neighbors.
Smaller blocks and more streets are a waste of space and will increase maintenance costs for the city.
Shared driveways do not allow residents to park in the driveway. I think each residence should have their own driveway. I agree with the other items in the change
Smaller blocks means more points to cross traffic which to me would discourage walking or biking due to kids and their safety.
Why cram things together? People will only stop using their cars when the price of gas gets too high. If people are not walking and riding bikes now, why do you think cramming things together will encourage them?
You won't get people out of their vehicles. Cars = freedom.
Do NOT change the zoning code. I'm not sure why you are trying to ruin Boise? You aren't helping Boise residents. You are just putting more money in the developer's pockets and city council pockets.
Your plan means more roads and pavement.
Still need to solve the underlying problem of connectivity for bikes.
Yes, remove your ridiculous bike lane regulations. Put the bikes on sidewalks where they belong.
This sounds like you are cramming homes together to open space for more roads and sidewalks. Walkers like to walk - no need to 'shorten' their walk.
I grew up in Seattle. It is not about trying to force people into shared parking & public transportation. Fix the public transportation, add better public transportation. Big cities have been operating for decades without 'pedestrian-friendly development.'
Traffic calming regulations in neighborhoods and high density housing. Protected bicycle parking areas required (for weather and theft) at apartment buildings
People should not be forced to give up their cars. It won't work. We like our cars. Many people can not use public transportation for a number of reasons. Abilities, age, employment is too far from home and public transportation does not go where needed.
If there is a shopping center or school nearby, you should require subdivisions to put in and require walking and biking paths to these areas. The large subdivision (Millwell) near Pierce Park Elementary school will not allow paths to be put in so residents can walk to the neighborhood school. This should be required.
From the above description, encouraging more shared business parking definitely decreases traffic, accidents, and length of automobile trips. I'm not sure, however, how making any change to parking lots would encourage walking. I don't see the connection there. Wider sidewalks and crosswalks as well as well-lit streets is the way to get people to walk.
Sidewalks everywhere are needed in my area as well as street calming when not a thoroughfare
Consolidated won't work. Instead make sure drivers have clear access to see pedestrians.
This may be friendly for predestination but I don't know that it is for the property or business owner.
People are lazy, so they will always drive more. Therefore the solution is to reward effort (biking/walking) and disincentivize the polluting methods of transportation
If you want to live in LA or New your Move there. Don't turn Boise into one like them. Most people want their cars and not everyone can ride a bike.
Don't know.
Building walking and cycling infrastructure will encourage fewer car trips. Taking parking away only increases congestion and makes people less neighborly.
I am in favor of this rule, but I do not think it will have desired effect. The main destinations in Boise (work/shopping/dining) still require a car. Public transportation is not frequent enough to make it a convenient choice. Distances are too far to make biking/walking a convenient choice (especially in summer!). To reduce automobile trips will require allowing offices/stores to exist within, or close to, residential areas.
People who drive will always drive. To encourage more walking, the city of Boise should create quieter/less urban-looking walking paths or widen bike lanes.
For new development, fine. Changing existing not so much.
It's Not enough. We also need to look at dangerous intersections and engineer to discourage through traffic in certain areas.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>Nope. People in Idaho love their vehicles. Plus we have WINTER and super hot summers. No one wants to ride their bike. And honestly I do not know one person interested in ride-sharing or taking the bus. No one wants this to be Portland/Seattle.</p>
	<p>I'm not sure this will have an impact on car use.</p>
	<p>We should encourage people To walk and ride bikes but don't forget about all the commuters into the city as well.</p>
	<p>Safety would be a concern for shared parking facilities.</p>
	<p>Shared parking lot structures are not desirable to home owners. Having your own driveway to work on vehicles, play basketball, park your visiting relatives trailer in, all make one's home more desirable. Sounds like these changes are really catering towards developers desires to cram more folks into tighter areas to increase their profits at the detriment to what makes the valley a desirable place to live.</p>
	<p>People still have to drive to work, grocery shop, child care.</p>
	<p>This makes no sense unless public transportation is improved. It's often too far for people to walk places they need to go and in summer it is too hot here. Cars are essential and this would only create issues with parking.</p>
	<p>More bike baths, separate roads and sidewalks with trees, slower speed limits</p>
	<p>How about putting in short cuts for walking and biking to encourage walking and biking. Allow mixed use for small grocery store/restaurants. Hyde park is ok example but there are no short cuts... How about narrower streets and make them one way? Make the commercial buildings up close to the street with parking in the back... to encourage walking.... The new Dry creek subdivision will be a good example if people have a walking and bike path short cut to the commercial area to pick up groceries. Otherwise one would have to drive around to Hwy55</p>
	<p>Separated sidewalks. It's very scary to walk on a sidewalk that butts up to the road</p>
	<p>I lived in Davis, CA for 2 years and they are the most bike friendly city in the US. They have protected bike lanes behind subdivisions. It feels a little like the greenbelt. That is what will encourage biking and walking. I don't see how smaller blocks would do anything.</p>
	<p>Stop trying to turn Boise into something it isn't.</p>
	<p>I like the shared driveway and parking, as well as shared delivery. I don't believe that these changes will change the reality that we don't have the public transportation infrastructure or economy in our community that the working class won't need a vehicle to live/work.</p>
	<p>These items may help, but I'm not informed on this strategy. Dedicated Bike lanes are our best bet to promote more biking.</p>
	<p>People don't want government to force less convenient transportation. How is that serving the public? For the downtown core, I think that may make sense having the multiple entrances to the parking structures... but there already exists parking garages with multiple entrances so what is the change?</p>
	<p>I'm opposed to reducing accessibility by automobile. Again, if every new large building were required to build a free parking structure directly underneath it (or somewhere on the property) that accommodates 20% more than its capacity, parking would not be an issue at all in Boise and pedestrian access would be improved as well. Making it harder for vehicles to get in or park just so people can walk or bike is a bad idea and it discriminates against those with limited mobility and those who do not live nearby. The transition should be to require every building to host its own parking, leading in the long-term to city streets which are used primarily for transit, loading, or minimal short-term parking. This simple rule would: allow buildings to be placed closer together, allow many streets to be widened, improve access for pedestrians and bikers, reduce congestion, and continue to allow vehicles to access the city.</p>
	<p>Some of these are good ideas, but as a frequent pedestrian and biker, I really don't see how they would benefit me in any way.</p>
	<p>Only it was city wide & you don't just focus on N. End & SE Boise where you all live.</p>
	<p>Increase more public transit.</p>
	<p>Absolutely not! The City of Boise likes to ignore the fact that not everyone in the city doesn't live in the North End.</p>
	<p>Improving existing areas where there are no sidewalks to make walking safer.</p>
	<p>Questions should not be biased to give you the results that you seek.</p>
	<p>The roads were not planned out well, too much traffic will promote me to ride my bike, but I am close enough to the greenbelt, and other people aren't that lucky</p>
	<p>I think people will walk or bike if they are closer to where they want to be and have better access to resources. I don't think making smaller blocks, with more intersections where you can be hit by a car that doesn't see you coming, is a bonus. Having wider roads and bike lanes matters more.</p>
	<p>No! Again, encouraging high density living areas. Essentially you are proposing apartments or condos instead personal home units.</p>
	<p>When there is a community park in a residential area then the curb side of the parks should have no parking at the curb from dusk to dawn. There is too many people parking on these curbs and living on these curbs.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Everything is too scattered in Boise/Meridian, for the majority to be able to walk/bicycle. Want affordable groceries...have to go to Costco or WinCo. Nobody is going to ride the bus, or walk/ride a bike with a bunch of groceries, and possibly a kid. The stores nearby, most folks use only to pick up a few necessities (milk, meat, etc), so that they don't have to drive a long ways to an affordable grocery store. And the stores nearby are still not that close, even if there was a bike path or bus that would take you directly there and back within a short period of time.</p>
<p>Bad use of community dollars</p>
<p>don't force people to walk/bike to places if they don't want to. they have the right to choose.</p>
<p>People in Idaho love a truck (not sure why) and despite the myriad of alternative transportation available more and more cars are on the road every day. I think the only way to reduce traffic is provide a reasonable public option, similar to Chicago's metra or Atlanta (we are obviously far away from that being feasible though)</p>
<p>Not everyone is able to or wants to bike. Older people need parking.</p>
<p>Again, public transportation needs to be made a priority</p>
<p>More intersections defeats the goal of encouraging walking/biking.</p>
<p>Enable parking requirement discounts for developers that build close to existing parking structures.</p>
<p>All sounds good but in our neighborhood we have a few shared driveways and it is not always convenient...</p>
<p>Walking and bicycling to where? You seem to be ignoring existing neighborhoods, and if you are only addressing new development, there's few good choices for markets and entertainment/restaurants unless they drive.</p>
<p>It would be better to close the streets in the East End (except Warm Springs) to all vehicle traffic, making it more safe and accessible for bicycles and pedestrians.</p>
<p>.. another place where citizen tours might get better comments. I would like better community access, parking in Hyde park, for instance, without damaging the spirit of the place. I don't know if this is possible.</p>
<p>Everything has been so far that walking to another neighborhood easy. Going to more social areas. Still will have to drive</p>
<p>Requirements regarding the number of crosswalks. One of the difficulties for walking on some streets such as Vista and Chinden is the lack of safe crossing locations.</p>
<p>MAYBE it would reduce automobile trips. But it won't reduce the number of cars people park at their homes since they still go skiing, take road trips, need services across town, etc.</p>
<p>Bike and walking paths should be a major priority in Boise and connectivity is a huge factor in reducing emissions.</p>
<p>Until the public transportation is severely upgraded the existing system no point in attempting to address this issue.</p>
<p>Unfortunately, most people are generally lazy. They will always drive when given a chance.</p>
<p>Using this logic, why don't we get rid of all the parking spaces, parking structures and turn all roads into sidewalks? I want people to use public transit and walk more, but this belief that you can take away people's parking spaces and that creates the desire to walk is flawed and again it's not what the Boise residents are asking for (at least the ones outside the Northend).</p>
<p>Curb cuts do not affect anyone's decision to walk or ride a bike. Shared property discourages pride in ownership and generally results in poor maintenance....</p>
<p>Protect curb cuts and stop ACHD from taking access points</p>
<p>We need to move away from an automobile society and develop more trolley or bus systems. We need to not promote more parking lots but more community transit. We vote for an electric trolley system like Portland.</p>
<p>People are always going to drive, especially into areas for shopping or where they live. Choosing biking over driving is more of a cultural issue that is unlikely to be helped by legislation and needs to be changed on a perception level by people.</p>
<p>Stop with the insane bike stuff. Its such a small percentage of the population that bikes that all you are doing is raising everyone elses cost of living.</p>
<p>Use continuous sidewalks where possible with curb cuts to improve safety for our more vulnerable populations like the elderly and the disabled</p>
<p>It seems like calling for shorter blocks would mean more frequent street crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists, which would seem to make it less safe.</p>
<p>What determines my use of public transportation is convenience and safety. I have no interest in turning a 5 minute trip to the store into a 45 minute bus adventure, our public transportation system is just not efficient enough.</p>
<p>The writing is on the wall for local transportation. Cars are getting cost prohibitive and bicycles are becoming more functional for short trips. I use an adult tricycle with big basket on the back for groceries. Wider sidewalks are important to me. But any re-design that promotes bike use is helpful.</p>
<p>Maybe.</p>
<p>Maybe. the safety of the cyclist and pedestrian is what is paramount. If they don't feel safe from road traffic it won't be used.</p>
<p>Walking, biking, and driving are mostly determined by distance to destination, time, and weather conditions. Not by block length or bicycle accessibility.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

In theory yes, but unless apartments limit cars per unit that are allowed, people will rely on cars and off street parking.
That's not what makes people choose not to bike/walk.
More roads with bike lanes
Fix the existing roads, curb & side walks before adding a mess to the surrounding area.
More streets and idle walks will reduce available land for homes
Where are these people walking to? You haven't added anything accessible except a bigger pain to get to parking.
This should not come at the cost of the residents losing the ability to park their cars off-street or require them to purchase a parking spot elsewhere.
Quit spending all of this money on useless surveys like this and spend it on a bus system that actually works for the city.
Again. Who is coming up with this noise? "encourage walking and bicycling as an alternative "... Without alternative transport (e.g. bus, tram, rail..) you can just build small walk-able neighborhoods without some way to support the elderly or disabled residents, and a way to connect the neighborhoods. Whomever is coming up with these proposals has never lived in high density, walking oriented communities situated in a larger, geographically diverse metro. I had a flat in London for years. The only way why those smaller communities worked is because of the public transport infrastructure. I have never owned or rented a car anywhere I went in the U.K over the last 2 decades. On the other-hand, I have owned 2-3 cars in the U.S to get around. Boise is no different than any other decent sized metro. If you want to build walkable bedroom communities in the metro, you don't kill parking spaces and squash the buildable areas without focusing on transport infrastructure. I am speaking as a resident who does ride their bike frequently, or walk whenever I can. But I can't bike or walk into Downtown all the time. I have no real alternative to get anywhere in the valley except my own car or hiring a car.
The climate is what it is here. Unless rail and bus is massively expanded to be actually become useful, cars will remain a key part of things.
It might discourage a lot of people to live there at all
Please do not disregard Boise's older population! Walking, Bicycling and Bussing may not be possible for us all. Cutting car transportation can be a huge detriment !
I think people in Boise drive cars and this is likely to lead to parking headaches. I think encouraging bike use would be things like more safe and efficient routes.
Keep it as is
This works for denser areas of town where people don't expect to drive much. It does not work for the suburbs of Boise.
This will not change human behavior- it will only lead to more conflicts between residents.
If you want to encourage walking/biking, you need extensions to the greenbelt. People don't want to walk/bike next to traffic even in residential areas. A MAJOR push is needed to connect the canals to the Greenbelt on a MUCH MORE urgent timeline. If you can create off-street routes or walking and biking it will be WAY more successful.
Build a tram like in European cities
People will do what they already do.
Limiting parking etc isn't the answer. People will still drive. We need better bike routes and stiffer penalties for drivers.
Improve other transportation options first so people will change their mindset and walk or bike. People in Boise like their cars.
The biggest factors for pedestrians and bikes are 1. the availability of dedicated bike and pedestrian areas connecting them to destinations and 2. distance from those destinations. If you want more of this transportation you need to connect these developments to destinations with DEDICATED infrastructure separated from motor vehicle traffic, and you need to minimize the distance to those destinations.
It will likely improve efficiency of land use, unsure if it will actually reduce driving
Streets should be less wide and more connected. This will encourage greater density, lower transportation times, and ensure pedestrian safety by limiting vehicle speeds.
We are still a pretty spread out area and a better solution is to invest the money in building an actual public transit system. Commuters like we called out from Nampa to Boise. All surrounding cities to Boise and back AND on all days with expanded hours. This is the solution to get folks to stop with the car use
Yes- create more opportunities for small neighborhood markets, restaurants, etc. My neighborhood is considered very walkable because of the sidewalks and small blocks, but there is nothing to walk TO. The closest market is a 30 minute walk away. Create spaces for small bodegas etc., and that will encourage neighborhoods to walk or take alternative transportation. As it stands, Boise is hard to navigate without a car-- it takes too long to get to grocery stores or appointments just by walking.
make sidewalks mandatory on all new constructions so pedestrians can be safe as traffic increases, continue building sidewalks where they don't exist
Especially like bike paths through neighborhoods and between houses
by doing this it is going to create more areas for crime to take place! by doing this it is making more people more vulnerable to personal attacks by the criminal element.
No one but you and your north end friends desire to have a public sidewalk cutting through our property. I think you should just leave well enough alone.
This is a joke. People are still going to have cars and now you are going to force them to park in the road or in front of other people's houses.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

I don't feel all this shared parking is going to benefit anyone. When you come home and don't have a place to park. Then what do you do? I can't park in a commercial spot because it's being shared with another company. Yes you will force people to use alternate transportation. Forcing it doesn't feel right to me.
Stop paving farmland. Period. We live in a desert in case you missed it, water is limited and should go to FARMS. No farms = no food. Food does NOT come from grocery stores. Tell the developers to shove it. Stop lining your greedy, lying political pockets with their money and do your job you putz. I'm from Memphis, I'm not an idiot--more development means higher housing prices, there's no way around that. Stop paving farms. Period.
No, I think people who prefer to drive are going to do so no matter what. I do think it will make those who do like to walk and bike happy though.
Boise already has parking shortage.
I think some of this can be very effective, especially regarding shared access points and bike/ped prioritization. But, shorter blocks also introduces more conflict with vehicles for pedestrians and cyclists.
Yes, it would encourage walking and bicycling but shared driveways create unnecessary friction between neighbors.
Consideration for city-provided all weather bike storage lockers
No
Bicycles are not more important than vehicles. Do they pay their fare share? Do they have to be licensed? Do they pay impact fees? Nope!
People will still be driving their cars. They also need an alternative transportation system in addition to greater connectivity.
You won't reduce auto trips until shopping is integrated into the plans and safe walkways / bike paths on major streets are present. I take my life in my hands walking on Lake Hazel west of 5 Mile.
More space for traffic on roads. The regulation would help with walking and bicycling but more accidents could occur.
Not likely. People that want to walk will walk and people that want to ride will ride. That's just the way it is..
We need bike dedicated streets, and safe places to park and lock bikes
Smaller blocks make sense IF there is something to walk or bike to. If bike commuters don't have easy and safe paths to get to farther away EXISTING destinations then I don't see the point.
It is still Idaho - many of us are commuting 30 or more miles a day to get to work.
Incorporate speed humps. Overhead lit pedestrian crosswalks are safer than the crosswalks with a flashing light on either side. The latter ones need updated to the safer overhead ones. Build walkovers at heavy pedestrian points.
Big wide painted bike lanes with a possible curb divider will encourage more bike travel. Most of all transforming farmers laterals and irrigation canals like the new york canal and paving them and connecting them would do the most to encourage bike travel by linking southwest Boise to downtown and the greenbelt
No
How will this encourage bicycle riding? When work is closer to home, that will encourage this. When stores are closer, that encourages walking.
No amount of regulation can fix laziness. People have to choose to walk or bike on their own. Boise is small enough that anyone can get most anywhere walking for an hour or 15-30 minutes by bike, especially with Greenbelt access.
larger back and side lot parking space
Limit the number of people moving into Idaho... it's a hard balance that we are losing right now the growth is too quick
The area of Boise that I live in has been hard hit by developer ripping out the existing homes and cramming in 2 and three skinny homes into the same lot. This has greatly changed the atmosphere of our neighborhood in a negative way. We have much more traffic on our streets than ever before and much more noise. The city has not improved the infrastructure in our neighborhood to keep up with the increased demand. The idea that one can bike to businesses in our area is wildly optimistic. There are few stores near our neighborhood that are within biking distance. The public transport is spotty at best and is very time consuming to utilize. It is much easier to just jump in the car and go where needed when needed. I don't see that changing much.
I use my bike daily, and I used to live in Portland, a serious biking town. Whatever codes you come up with must include things that make bike storage, parking, locking, access , etc, to be user friendly.
Having ACHD also step in on incentives for clean and green transportation.
There is not as much access to downtown walking and riding from the outside neighborhoods. Please consider the outside neighborhoods in addition to the State street neighborhoods. Thank you!
Stop the building
not in this regulation, but making streets safer to bike and walk (esp. out of downtown -- e.g. Orchard) is important! please put pressure on ACHD :)
I don't think smaller blocks would help as much as pathways, which would take up much less space and be less expensive to build/maintain.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>I am mostly a walker and a biker. I question that making more intersections makes that safer or easier. What would make it safer and easier is more dedicated bike and pedestrian beltways connecting neighborhoods so we don't have to use busy roads at all. For example, the only east-west connection between Pierce Park and Gary Lane that isn't along Hill or State is to travel down Tobi to Gillis. There aren't any good north-south routes that are on major roads. On the other hand, the little paved paths behind Albertsons on 36th are game changers for cyclists and pedestrians in that area to get places without using busy roads. The pedestrian path behind Collister School is another good example. That is what I see as connectivity—not shorter blocks. That is what will encourage more walking and cycling.</p>
<p>People will never be forced to bike or take mass transit no matter how good it is. I've seen that attitude as I worked spent 34 years in the mass transit industry.</p>
<p>By creating smaller blocks and more traffic lights, traffic will nightmare with longer commute time and cars will sit idling longer which creates more pollution in our city. The goal of road systems should be to move cars as quickly and efficiently as possible to reduce idle time and emissions. Sidewalks and the green belt are awesome ways for people to walk or ride their bikes. I do think the city should consider sky bridges for pedestrian use especially over some of the busier roads such as Vista, Overland and Curtis.</p>
<p>I think alleys are great for this!!! All new developments should have them. Then there are no cuts on long streets and only 1 on the side. It also probably helps trash pickups.</p>
<p>The city is too spread out and the seasons are too volatile for people to walk/bike regularly. We will always rely on cars out west, always. Again, stop trying to accommodate developers and their insatiable greed.</p>
<p>Trying to share parking lots sounds like a bad idea, people in this state like their toys and their toy-haulers.</p>
<p>Block size is not relevant to encouraging cycling or walking activities. Adding more crossing areas is useful, but not transformative. I see more costs for businesses and less innovation for a balanced accommodation of both motorist and cyclist within Boise.</p>
<p>Another ridiculous regulation proposal. People will not change their habits in how they commute.</p>
<p>I think these changes have little/no bearing on whether people will choose to walk more often or not. Also, these changes won't really improve accessibility for biking. Increased bike lanes are the best way to achieve this.</p>
<p>Not sure</p>
<p>Having pedestrian walkways make sense for where people want to go.</p>
<p>My Yes is really a Maybe. The infrastructure needs to be there to support it.</p>
<p>None I can think of</p>
<p>It seems reasonable but I'm not sure this really targets what makes an area appealing or scary for pedestrians.</p>
<p>Sharing driveways might annoy each other as one neighbor can take up more space than another and other issues can occur if people don't have their own space to park their toys</p>
<p>This is Idaho, people aren't riding and walking in their neighborhoods/parks. They go to the foothills and actual parks. Go by any neighborhood park and they're usually dead. Go to Ann Morrison and Kleiner park and they're busy.</p>
<p>So important especially since Boise is becoming so dense with traffic and with gas prices going up. Biking and other eco friendly transportation are so vital.</p>
<p>You will make traffic worse because most people HAVE to drive</p>
<p>Again, this is a fantasy world idea. Plan for reality, which is that Boise is not a pedestrian city and most families have 2 cars. I would never want to share a parking space or walk/bike in the cold and snow. Your ideas are not based in reality. Not even close.</p>
<p>Hopefully.</p>
<p>Most people need to drive to commute to work. This regulation wouldn't encourage more people to walk or bike. It would just cause more headaches.</p>
<p>Commuting by foot is impractical in Boise in much of the year because of cold, rain and snow.</p>
<p>Yes I do. However you also need to make it safer to ride bikes and walk by having bumpouts on busy streets and more bike lanes downtown.</p>
<p>Too many aggressive drivers think it's fun to harass bicycle riders. It is barely safe to be a pedestrian in high-traffic areas. Making intersections more frequent will escalate driver frustrations. New developments may have better success with this idea.</p>
<p>You should ask fewer yes/no questions here</p>
<p>Hazard lights don't make parking spots</p>
<p>I realize the council and mayor envision a green utopia in which everyone walks or pedals everywhere they go. Again. This is a N end and downtown mindset. It doesn't make sense for many areas of town, including SW Boise. The commercial development doesn't support pedestrian use, and there aren't any parks or rec areas. Rather than addressing this, the city instead keeps mandating more housing and congestion for SW Boise, such as the unfortunate development on Victory you just green lighted.</p>
<p>I wish we had better bus service here. I live on Maple Grove near Franklin. Bus service is very poor here. I feel we spend too much money for improvements and special stuff for those folks who live in the downtown area.</p>
<p>Idaho and Californians don't bike unless they have a DUI...</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Walking, bicycling and reduced automotive trips should not be part of zoning regulations. Encouraging those behaviors should be done in other, non-compulsive avenues.
This question is another example of you have already made up your mind! You are dead set on more walking and bicycling at all costs, you just want us to give you the least possible plan that pleases the public while getting rid of autos. While don't you just get rid of roads and have bike lanes and sidewalks with bus paths to move people around!!!
This is fine -- to a point. I just don't want to see too much livable square footage carved up and converted to pavement for streets or sidewalks.
So much depends on what type of retail services are within walking distance. Not everyone will or can use a bicycle, not everyone can carry bags of groceries, not everyone wants to be limited to their neighborhood services. Are residents going to be encouraged to ride golf carts? Will the streets be safe for those smaller modes of transportation?
Increase the use of public transportation by making it more appealing
Boise is sprawl. Limiting curb cuts will literally do zip zero zilch to increase the number of cyclists.
Changing how and where cars park won't change how often people drive. People drive because their jobs and stores are too far away for convenient walking and biking. Allowing apartments to be built closer to jobs and stores is really the only solution.
Consider those of us that cannot bike or walk due to physical restrictions.
It's really nice when a driver can drive from one business to another instead of having to go back out onto a road.
Trees that provide shade are large and need more than 5 feet width. If they don't they will become stressed and are more prone to insect and disease. They are also harder to irrigate unless you use a drip system. (you may be thinking of the north end with the 5 ft right of ways. But there are large front yards that provide irrigation and space for tree roots. In high density homes there may be little or no front yard) If they do live they will lift up sidewalks causing more maintenance issues. I live on 39th st and people throughout the year are walking in our neighborhood. We don't even have sidewalks, but the street is low traffic with little noise and lots of mature trees. That what makes it walkable.
Need to decrease automobile use.
This change would have almost no impact on people choosing to walk or bike and will have a large negative impact on quality and livability.
In theory it may, but you are generalizing all populations to think everyone can take alternative transportation or can bike.
Shared driveways should be avoided. They add to congestion, and make off street parking more difficult.
We have good biking and pedestrian access already. Crowding in more taxpayers into our existing city is wrong.
Do family's in Bowen and Hyde park, where these ideas are implemented, take fewer car trips per day?
Allowing residence with business downstairs would also cut down on need to drive everywhere. An EastWest train or trolley system with bike racks, connecting East Boise with Garden City or even Meridian and Nampa would help ease traffic. I understand there used to be one
Change the intended result. I don't want my kids on a shared driveway. I don't trust neighbor drivers to watch out while backing up.
No. People who want to walk or ride are going to do it regardless of block size. People who want to drive are going to drive. You cant regulate everything people do.
This town is full of commuters in cars. We need to address transportation for people to get to and from work. Not everyone is able to walk/ bike to their jobs in Boise.
It seems like the city just wants more density...wherever and whenever, and will adjust the "rules" to accomplish this.
People can't walk and bicycle if they live too far from the places they need to go. Encouraging high density housing with commercial areas nearby is what will encourage walking and bicycling
I would have to see some examples of what the city thinks this would look like. I don't have enough information for an opinion.
Those regulations might be fine but they don't address sprawl
More of this. Everywhere. Provide funds for single-family homeowners to add sidewalks where there are none.
your plan is to make it more difficult to use a car and easier to use a bike but the public uses vehicles 98% of the time and bikes 2% of the time due to having to work, inclement weather, dangerous roadsides.
This is a good opportunity to require bike lanes and sidewalks in all new development. Don't waste it.
We live in a very rural state. Many of us are required to drive to reach the store, work, and kids schools etc. All your proposal does is continue to push out those of us who work out of the house to make a living
You are talking about developing new blocks? How many? 200? 2000? Or are you talking about the one little development you want to densely populate and confusing that with block layouts? New blocks mean sprawl. You mean dense redevelopment without consideration for cars? Reducing trips means teaching people to do all their errands in one trip. That is currently possible.
Barely maybe. There would have to be a gratifying incentive, otherwise the means outweighing the ends. Much like an automobile.
It's too crowded already
It would make this easier.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	This one is very difficult. It seems to me that unless there are alternatives easily available that people just automatically go for their vehicle
	Maybe in the summers, winters probably no. In terms of biking to work maybe, for shopping probably not. This development could work downtown where many of the amenities are close by and no yards etc. People's expectations are a lot less downtown - food is close, job and entertainment and maybe they share a car with a group of people. Sounds like a rule developed by a 25-30 year old who bikes to work and doesn't wear a dress and sits home and plays video games on their time off and rarely goes outside. If you do go outside who wants to be crowded up to neighbors who blare their stereo, or are screaming or yelling at one another or have kids with nothing to do and are just looking for trouble. Packed neighborhoods may look efficient on the drawing board and beautiful and a money maker for the developer, but in reality it turns out like the ghettos when only the wrong people can afford it.
	People aren't going to walk/bicycle, period. Nor should they. Even though Boise is supposed to a bike-friendly city, the fact that 4 out of 10 motorists is constantly using a cell phone while driving means pedestrians and cyclists are in constant danger.
	The USA is addicted to cars. I see empty bike lanes and fewer vehicle lanes everywhere (Main Sreet!). This is the wrong direction other than in the enclaves where people actually ride bikes.
	Again, a shared compromise won't change behavior without incentivizing something different.
	Pathways on all canals and adjacent rail lines as wells as bike lanes on main corridors(at least put in sidewalks along state st and chinden and eagle hwy as examples
	We need more and better public transportation options if you want to cut back on parking
	Yes ! The City of Boise has a population with the mindset to use bicycles for commuting,There must be dedicated paths for bicycles that don't intersect with cars and trucks. The planning should strive to make Boise the best in the U.S. for urban bicycle paths on pavement.Bicycle arterials should be constructed even if they are elevated.For example,if a dedicated bicycle arterial were constructed between the Eagle City Hall to the Boise City Hall,it would be immensely popular.Progressive,innovative urban bicycle path design must take priority over archaic thinking as displayed by the sell cars,build roads,sell cars,build roads mentality.If Boise succeeds in building intelligent urban bicycle paths that are safe from cars and trucks,it would dramatically encourage citizens to ride.Study what cities like Stockholm , Minneapolis and Amsterdam construct to facilitate bicycle ridership.Do the homework! Who is the best in the world at urban bicycle path design then copy them.Fly in international consultants that have no ties to the road construction lobby.
	If goods and seVICES are not within walking distance, this will not reduce or encourage fewer automobile trips. If commercial space is integrated into the neighborhood and it brings the goods and services within walking distance, you'll have success.
	No, I would never move to such a place. I don't want to share my driveway or have a parking lot next to my home. Besides, you can't safely ride your bike or walk to work when the distance is 10mi and it's dark. Also, ACHD doesn't take care of the snow and ice on the streets in the winter. It's very poor.
	Shared parking and access will help. Smaller blocks make no difference, or are worse. If I have to walk a mile to get somewhere, it doesn't matter how long the blocks are. Or, if there are more blocks, then there are more "street crossings" for me.
	Don't force people to have to abandon their vehicles.
	Being a pedestrian downtown is straight up dangerous.
	Protected bike lanes and pedestrian paths and businesses within neighborhoods
	I am a cyclist and I also like to walk for leisure. I think these sound like great ideas. I also need wide, well-kept bike lanes (would be awesome if there was space between the bike lane and the street like the sidewalk or grass median), bus stops, better bus schedules, and LIGHTING! It would be great if there was a way to take the bus everywhere in town and over to Meridian as well.
	Build more roads. Bikes and lanes cause congestion.
	Dumb
	Improved transportation options will reduce the number of automobile trips. Why would less space do anything? The cars will just be closer together causing more problems.
	No this will only increase traffic though neighborhoods where our kids are playing and increase noise making neighborhoods less secluded
	You are encouraging more cars on the street. Which I don't believe makes you excited to go for a walk. Walking through empty streets where you can see yards and trees and space is more inviting.
	Absolutely not, since it will only encourage bad designs in inappropriate areas and just make parking worse.
	We don't need more gd bike lanes,we drive cars.
	WE DON'T WANT YOUR INTENDED RESULT. Keep Boise with space to move around! We don't want to be crowded!
	No, this one sounds beautiful.
	You're on the right track.
	The only way to make anything better is get the people that are running this date and handing out all these building permit taking all these cutbacks handouts and everything else and stop it. Now this is just how I feel and my opinion

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Will there be a way to demand that property owners keep their landscaping from obstructing public sidewalk access? If I were in a wheelchair, I'd not be able to use sidewalks in my neighborhood due to overgrown shrubs and trees.
	Like my previous answer, you don't have the infrastructure to enable a decrease in traffic. I get what you're trying to do, but you have to enable people to get around before you begin to take away driveways. Furthermore, if you truly want Boise to be pedestrian friendly, QUIT ALLOWING THE BLOCKING OF SIDEWALKS. I work downtown, and I cannot tell you how many times I must begin to walk in a busy street because the sidewalks are blocked off. Furthermore, there is no adherence to pedestrian traffic laws, and I cannot tell you how many times I've nearly been hit by someone entering a crosswalk in their vehicle without looking for a pedestrian. You have so, so far to go before you expect Boise to be a pedestrian friendly city. Frankly, it's not safe to walk in this town, and it's barely safe to ride a bike. Even though I could walk the 15/20 minutes to run errands, it's just flat out safer to do so in my car.
	No because our public transportation system is not available for people to get picked up in residential areas. Let alone the times that are available with public transportation or inadequate for those commuting or even visiting cities
	Do not make the decision about whether us older folks can use alternatives to automobile trips! Your imagination about what you think makes a better Boise is not consistent with the life-long residents' needs and expectations.
	People who want to be lazy will be. Keep pedestrian walkways anyway.
	More bike lanes on the streets to help separate bikers from walkers. Better bus services and light rail to reduce automobile trips.
	Only way is if developments go back to more of the old neighborhood markets
	You can't unless you require building communities with designated service areas. And then there is no guarantee that the available service that buys/leases the space will be one that will reduce any of the traffic.
	I don't know.
	We live in car required city. No matter how much you want it to be San Francisco or New York its not going to happen. Walking 10 blocks with groceries is not happening in Boise.
	All I see with that is a lot more hassle.
	No, stop trying.
	Again, this must be accompanied by a commitment to convenient public transportation.
	Stop Californians from moving here
	most trips for vehicles are much further than a person can walk in a reasonable amount of time. limiting access to parking by imposing shared parking will create problems for those who cannot walk, or have other disabilities that require mobility assistance.
	No, because there's nothing to walk to if you don't live downtown. There's no restaurant, bar, etc. in walking distance.
	I doubt it. If where people want to go is within walking distance they will walk. If it's not, they will drive.
	Too much emphasis is being placed on bicycles. Fix our roadways first then figure out the bike issue. Bike riders typically don't use bike lanes/paths properly anyway.
	We spend a ton of money on bike lanes in areas of town that have no interest in them and they unused with sand and weeds. In downtown it makes sense. In areas where biking is part of the culture (bown) it makes sense. In areas with busy roads and no real destination it just accommodates a few rec bikers
	In areas of heavy auto traffic/congestion, install some type of moderate barrier along the edge of bike lanes to warn, and allow for at least minimum protection for cyclists. Similar to the bumps on the highway shoulder.
	GTFO. Fuhrer McLean wants downtown to be a new Portland or Seattle. Just make sure those bike lanes don't get in the way of the homeless encampments. If I NEVER go into downtown Boise again, it will be too soon. Keep the trash you made downtown and SAVE Murgoitio Park!! HAVE I MADE MYSELF CLEAR YET?!
	Mass transit needs within the city notwithstanding, creating safer and more plentiful corridors for pedestrians and bicyclists to use are very important. Better still, making bike paths fully protected by bollards and being on the inside of parked cars would be ideal.
	Make both tenant and visitor parking identifiable and convenient.
	Just don't allow for cars.
	This must be done without narrowing the width of the roads as that will certainly discourage bike use. Also, more crosswalks with the pedestrian crossing buttons (like outside the Cole and Ustick Library).
	People don't drive because of a lack of access. They drive because of what they carry or because they're lazy.
	More street crossings areas would help promote walking. Sidewalk cuts reduced, not sure.
	Leave it alone.
	This will create more traffic. People are not giving up vehicles because you want that.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Curb cuts need to be kept out of pedestrian areas. Period.</p>
<p>Concrete curbs for bike lanes as in Copenhagen for instance.</p>
<p>Some might change but it is hard to get people to do the right thing.</p>
<p>You can not regulate people out of their vehicles. This is an insane proposal.</p>
<p>Also worth mentioning: fewer curb cuts make = more accessibility/better safety for folks with disabilities, elderly people and kids</p>
<p>but it sure is going to crowd the streets with cars. The way to encourage pedestrian and cycling is to have dedicated non-motorized vehicle access areas, like 8th street from the river to Bannock non-motorized</p>
<p>People are lazy. No zoning code will change that. For those who choose to walk, though, the changes make sense.</p>
<p>Do Shared driveways require wider lots to accommodate driveways on lots.</p>
<p>The zoning should be by land use. If city planners want to encourage developments around less traffic, then a substantial design effort should be required to exclude traffic within development boundaries. An equally substantial effort to accommodate pedestrian traffic within the boundaries of the development must be included, with motor vehicle access and parking designed around the development. People aren't going to just give up owning & using motor vehicles because parking and access are restrictive.</p>
<p>Needs to have more parking on each lot per lot, not less. I understand the idea of promoting less driving, but we all know in reality this will result in even more street parking. So many neighborhood streets are already de facto parking lots, if this change is allowed any new development will be even worse. Need to stop letting developers rezone commercial lots into residential, this is happening everywhere!</p>
<p>Riding my bike from SW Boise to my office downtown is pretty much impossible, not to mention dangerous. There would have to be quite an overhaul of the entire city to mitigate bikers getting run over.</p>
<p>It just makes it more attractive to people to move here and push out native Boisean.</p>
<p>Shorter blocks means more money, resources, pavement & tech. which increases costs. I'm not sure I understand the value of shorter blocks. They don't seem to offer anything for my bicycling, as I simply have to make more decisions about safety, traffic, obstacles & hazards increase with shorter blocks ... unless I don't understand this.</p>
<p>Citizens are too dependent on their cars. Until there is mass transit to replace cars, these other ideas are too much too soon.</p>
<p>stop cramming more homes into small spaces it doesn't encourage less it just causes issues.</p>
<p>The percentage to bike and pedestrians are small compared to vehicle traffic these proposed changes would increase traffic congestion</p>
<p>Make the developers pay more of the costs</p>
<p>Shared in Boise simple means more accidents. Boise is not super bike friendly. I have been honked at and yelled at -just biking in a bike lane.</p>
<p>Things should be developed with pedestrians in mind. Whether people will get off their butts and walk/bike is another thing. Boise does not in any way enforce having trees and shrubs encroaching on the sidewalk, so their usefulness is marginal. The sidewalks where I live cannot be used by anyone in a wheelchair, someone blind, or someone with a stroller or wagon. These pedestrian friendly features are pretty useless without enforcement.</p>
<p>No, it will not encourage it, it will force it. Please study history, America is not about force. Yes put sidewalks in. Smaller blocks means more streets, which makes it more dangerous for children to walk and bike. Eliminating safe spaces for kids, creates fewer places for families. Strong traditional families are the most important unit in society, build in a way that makes it more family/child friendly, not less.</p>
<p>I passionately support pedestrian and cyclist friendly development, as those are my preferred forms of transport. Sadly, I am doubtful that such development will induce people to drive less. But at least the people who are walking and biking will be safer.</p>
<p>If yall gonna cut parking yall better get a public transportation system. People need to be able to park</p>
<p>Not sure how this works to increase walking and biking to other locations especially biking.</p>
<p>plenty of walking and cycling opportunities in Boise.. to the point of weekend congestion. what we don't have here is robust public transportation options that makes "not driving" a good option. In the winter our sidewalks in the city are dangerously unkempt so walking is not an option.</p>
<p>Not really. It's too too late to save this dumbass stupid city. It's quality of life stinks it's air is shitty, it's people are schmucks, and getting around town is a pain in the ass. You've already fucked this place over. It's done.</p>
<p>Boost public transit/bike lanes, let's get some awesome transit/bike lanes going so no matter how big our blocks are, people can use a train/bus/bike to get where we want to go. No matter how well these blocks are built, people will still drive IF they can't get there and safely. Bike access is a joke if you don't live in the the Northend or Downtown. Addressing safe biking routes to get to the places is extremely important. I do my best to bike but often times cars are passing me with 1 foot to spare while going 10 over the speed limit. Boise can do better. While I know it is being addressed and the city cares, we can do better, especially for neighborhoods with populations that maybe can't afford a car.</p>
<p>I think there also needs to have more infrastructure in Neighborhood pockets. Roosevelt market for example.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

See response to #9. Also, although we do need to move in this direction, many Boiseans are still car focused for their transportation.
People will always still drive their cars
Take out all the stop lights and have pedestrians hold up point cards as they cross the streets.
I do think that again this should be accomplished allowing planners and development services flexibility to decide if and when this is required based on specific circumstances of each project and whether it is just pedestrian and or vehicular connectivity required.
Anything to make cyclists and pedestrians feel safer is a great way to encourage more people to use those modes of transportation. I especially think controlling delivery areas with better regulation is a good start to discourage short- or long-term parking that blocks pedestrian access, such as in front of ADA ramps.
Too cold for bicycling for many months
Increase bus service and have a mass transit system built in the valley
Be sure to include bike lanes, walking paths, sidewalks
Govt regulation to dictate human behavior and housing desires ?
Eh... Not really? I don't particularly see how these changes will encourage more walking and bicycling, because the changes are all focused around cars. Nothing about this particular regulation makes walking anywhere more pleasant, more shady, less noisy, reduces walking distances, or increases public transit frequency or access.
I work on vista... there are barely any pedestrians at all
Shared parking isn't going to improve walking and bicycling because those aren't options for most people due to lack of public transport and safe corridors.
this will be more likely to impact walking/biking if there are also activity centers (and multi-use spaces) built into block clusters.
Require that connective walkways/bike paths be provided in all new developments on a public easement so that linking the walkways/bike paths to destination points is mandatory and facilitates pedestrian and bike traffic.
No one wants to share a driveway
Better public transportation
It's multiple dwellings such as: apartments, townhouses bring more automobiles and congestion on the roads
This doesn't exactly answer the question but what about smaller buses on designated areas with more frequent stops.
While I think "smaller blocks and more frequent street and sidewalk connection points to encourage walking and bicycling as an alternative to automobile trips" (especially with the addition of an effective mass transit system) is a great idea I also think the prevalence of the rugged individual mindset of Idaho residents will be a stumbling block to the encouragement of more walking/bicycling. I don't think putting these things in place will effectively change the said mindset.
Blocks in the downtown area may be the exception to the rule. Larger block sizes may be allowed there, as is customary with other larger cities.
This is a fantasy land idea ...
I'm concerned that reducing block size will reduce overall housing density due to the area of the street itself. Perhaps the rule could read more like "the block may be up to X feet long if there is a 10ft pedestrian/bicycle path in the middle"
You created the prob. Tough to fix after it's done
The biggest problem for pedestrians is getting across busy streets. You need safe pedestrian crossings, maybe pedestrian overpasses. Parking spaces aren't much of an issue.
The question assumes that the intended result is a good or needed one. It's not the place of city government to encourage more walking or bicycling, or to reduce the number and lengths of automobile trips. That is way too much regulation of people's lives.
Seems like this will just create more parking congestion and pinch points. These smaller connections still need to connect to larger systems (greenbelt, canal system) in order to be fully functional.
Abolish this regulation as it only creates more intersections which are inherently more dangerous. Wide avenues with bike paths and trees make a lovely neighborhood
Make a magical potion so everyone is 20 years old, healthy, no disabilities. Make a magical building next to residences that would be someone's work, daycare, grocery store, pharmacy, doctor's office, dental office, ice rink, school, college, Stadium, and I think you get the point. But everyone drives a car few walk or bike. Once this is realized then we can have zoning that makes sense. All one has to do is drive around the city and neighborhoods and count cars vs bicycles (especially winter) and understand why.
Omg, really?
Sharing driveways is not practical. I've done it.
It will make having a car more difficult, which is probably the real objective
That's not why I drive so it wouldn't reduce any of my trips. Decent bike paths, better public transportation, reimbursed rides home if there is an emergency if you biked or took the bus are the types of things that would help me.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Lower speed limits in some areas,
	Sharing parking and access is important to improve traffic flow and safety. Improving bicycle facilities is hugely important for safety, and should be an integral part of roadway design. This is an ACHD design function. Improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities would be great, but are not likely to change the number of automobile trips. Automobile trips are driven by time and distance, and by the need to carry things in the vehicle.
	I think this would help with safety
	Each developer should provide for open spaces, walkways, OFF STREET PARKING, as well as necessary infrastructure improvements necessary for successfully integrating into the existing areas.
	The Northend/Eastend model works well. Small blocks, small lots and small houses with attention to landscape areas and nearby parks increase livability.
	I don't know but I can hope
	No
	Is there a mentality that "older" people ride and walk everywhere? Or is this city only for the young and perfectly healthy? I like to exercise somewhat but, if I have an errand I'm driving.
	Our town is not laid out in a way to make alternative transportation a viable alternative to cars. Too spread out for effective use of public transit and biking, and walking.
	There is a lot of pedestrian traffic on the Central Bench area even without sidewalks. Have these development changes been successful in other cities?
	Parking structures where and why? Stay away from designated open spaces as written.
	This is a good start, but providing more bus lines would help. Think of WINCO between Myrtle and Front - how does providing sidewalks make that area more pedestrian friendly?
	needs to be spread equitably across all neighborhoods in Boise.
	So long as the access to public transportation is close. Not everyone can ride a bike in our winters so if that is their main mode of transportation having easy access to public transportation would help for the winter months, if they do not own a vehicle.
	Install commuter train routes.
	Smaller block sizes
	Smaller blocks and more frequent intersections can be a hazard to pedestrians, especially children and those with mobility issues.
	Make Vista avenue pedestrian friendly by narrowing Lane with removing median and putting a park strip on each side to separate pedestrians from traffic
	I like this.
	Walking paths are great but don't believe that it will reduce the number of cars that need to be parked. Less car trips does not mean less cars. Most everyone is still going to have a car and need a parking spot.
	Interesting idea. A lot of potential to make the city better for pedestrians and kids on bikers if implemented correctly. Maybe a limit on curb cuts as well.
	Seems good if you can ensure the shared parking will be built. I am not so sure about that. This could be a headache for both public and businesses if not complete.
	This is made much easier by reduced required parking in the first place.
	Gonna drive my diesel
	This will just create traffic jams
	Larger blocks with bike lanes reduce the number of intersections that I, as a bicycle person, don't care for.
	I think extending dedicated urban trails (e.g., Pioneer Trail), dedicated bike lanes, wide sidewalks, extensive set-backs, limited-use lanes, urban parks and building aesthetics would encourage more walking and biking.
	Only a small amount of people bike. Unrealistic to think older population will bike.
	I'm not sure how to improve the regulation to achieve the intended result, but anything that aims for this result is my #1 priority. The piecemeal pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure in my neighborhood (Sunset), for example, is terrible; cars drive way too fast on residential streets. Zone for people and homes, not cars, whether that's in residential areas like my neighborhood or in downtown.
	Secondary greenbelt and thoroughfares for bike commuters for safety reasons. Demand developers provide as part of the building process.
	Boise is not set up to encourage Biking and Walking. The only place it is is around the green belt and north end. Other areas of Boise have to be made more accesable to this modes of transport before you start changing code to limit the use of cars. For example I live in south west Boise and work downtown- there is no physical way I could ride a bike to work safely right now, even though I would love too.
	Boiseans love using their cars to get around. Period. Again, do you drive to work, to get to appointments, to buy groceries?

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	May provide recreational venues but will not reduce traffic between homes and work.
	I think shared parking will invite more vehicle vandalism
	Sidewalks should be plowed. And raised in many cases so cars have to drive over them.
	It's really hard to get people out of their cars and trucks. I don't think these changes will increase pedestrian or bicycle use at all
	The area is too large to walk or bike anywhere.
	It might in that neighborhood but people are still going to have to drive. Our city is set up for driving to get to everything. This could be a step in the right direction for encouraging more walking but people still have to drive for groceries and other appointments. I don't think we should be sprawling if we want people to be using their cars less.
	Regulations don't encourage people to walk or bike more. People either decide to or they don't. Also are we considering the accessibility for handicap people as well? They need a larger space for driveways and walkways. I could ride my bike to the grocery store approx 2 miles away. But I won't because I need to transport the groceries. I don't have the time to go more often either. I need to be efficient with my time.
	Sidewalk connectivity should be a builders responsibility, it limits anyone with any mobility issues to traverse a walkway. I have seen elderly having to use the street with motorized wheelchair due to lack of sidewalk, this is not okay for our elderly population or anyone.
	This is really a broad question that isn't applicable everywhere in Boise.
	More bike lanes! Decrease the parking available downtown and make more streets walk only. Could have larger parking lots on the outskirts of downtown available to people, and downtown mostly walk only
	No. Do NOT expect automobiles not to be used and act surprised when traffic was under planned.
	The city as a whole doesn't discourage driving, this isn't enough to make up the difference.
	Riding your bike in Boise is like a death wish and major gaps between sidewalks is a reality. And, bus service is to high density apartments, think state street west of Glenwood, does not exist. Why would someone think this would be an improvement.
	Do not increase demand for asphalt and concrete.
	Boise is already too spread out. This program doesn't fit our community.
	If people want to drive, they will drive. I think making bike able areas around Boise more safe is more important.
	If the pedestrian friendly connectivity is close to buildings, tree covered and not lit. They are not safe.
	I think the real problem with walking and biking in Boise is that in many neighborhoods its difficult and dangerous to cross major roadways.
	Get a functional less horrid public transit system.
	Encourage use of smaller vehicles and no car zones.
	Please take care of our open spaces. New development is the #1 cause of loss of biodiversity. It contributes to climate change. It's a huge driver of environmental loss. Encourage citizens to build UP not OUT, lest we begin to lose our neighbors and further contribute to climate change.
	I don't think the size of the blocks would make a difference in terms of people getting out to walk. I think it would make development of multi-story properties more difficult because they would most likely be size-constrained.
	This will cause traffic jams. Bikes aren't useful 3-4 months of the year.
	Gas prices are driving people to bike. Let's go Brandon
	The proposed changes will encourage more on street parking and people will still drive their vehicles. It will encourage increased stress because people will be jockeying for the severely limited parking spaces.
	All else equal, small blocks make for a better pedestrian experience. However, my preference would probably be large blocks intersected with an interconnected network of bike and pedestrian paths.
	Shared driveways make sense with multi family housing but less so with single family housing and are more likely to increase conflict between homeowners than encourage alternative transportation
	People most often cite safety as the reason for not cycling more. eBikes have made cycling accessible to more people physically, but ever-increasing crowding makes it ever more dangerous. Boise needs protected bike lanes, ideally not shared with automobiles. This should include people- and bicycle-only lanes along the river and canals, car-free streets downtown, and wide easements along at least 30% of city streets. Eliminate on-street parking (at least for new developments) so we can increase the buffer zone between fast-moving traffic and bicycles (more lateral space on the road). Commercial buildings should also be required to provide convenient bicycle parking (a place to lock up bicycles).
	Trees and the Greenbelt define Boise. Conjoined driveways do not contribute to these characteristics. Greenbelt right of ways along canals and elevated bike highways over congested roadways and regional rail access would do more. Migration corridors must be incorporated.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	All of this sounds good for renting but what about affordable starter homes?
	These street and sidewalk connection points must be made constructed with the safety of pedestrians and cyclists in mind, and not created simply to move more traffic.
	People love their cars. Winter and the shoulder seasons don't allow for weather conducive to riding bikes and walking.
	I do not understand this. I dont see how this encourages pedestrian anything.... We should be thinking widening roads, sidewalks and bike lanes, speed bumps, more than one entrance and exit to encourage safety....
	Probably. Again I have opinions. Why not ask if these intended results are what we want? This one actually sounds like a decent proposal, but you don't ask if this is what I want or not.
	I think these changes would be helpful but would not encourage more walking and bicycling on their own. If a required service is not within walking distance these changes will have little impact.
	Stop trying to cram so many people into our areas. People don't like to be told what to do, especially by government.
	You're not going to force people to walk/bike just by making parking a challenge. That is a terrible plan
	I will help, but if there is no protective bike lanes and appropriate bike parking, it may not work.
	I would not want to share a drive!
	You can encourage alternative transit, but this is still Boise. Mayor, are you riding your bike to the office during a mid-January inversion?
	Encourage more parking in the rear of commercial buildings rather than the front, encouraging the main entrance to be closer to the street and used for those who walk or bike to a business.
	Get with your homies over at idt and whomever else you need and come up with a plan to add more buses and bus stops, and add carpull lanes. Otherwise you're just forcing residents to give up the luxury reliable transportation for at chance at affordable housing.
	Without more diverse groceries options in every neighborhood and start teaching in how to shop for all.
	Walking or bicycling for pleasure or Recreation is fine but it is not feasible to expect many people to use that is transportation to and from places. The focus should be on widening streets to create more flow of traffic,
	More access to the Boise Greenbelt for bicycles.
	This will just irritate people that they don't have sufficient space around their home they're paying way too much no money for
	we just need more crosswalks within blocks and more pedestrian crossing lights. ACHD requirements are too high of a bar to get a crosswalk between major intersections.
	You can't encourage more alternative transportation without a better bus system and some sort of mass transit. We need a rail line as of 7 years ago.. Boise is great about biking, but it's dangerous and not consistent bike lanes anywhere is a glaring problem. Someone call Portland and look at their mass transit solutions.... max, the bus only lanes downtown, expand areas like the pedestrian only 8th street with more parking garages on the peripheral. Make Hyde park/ 13th street pedestrian only and look for ways to find pedestrian only areas on the bench etc. Building areas like live/work like the village is great but takes master planning, and mass transit.
	This only works if all the daily community resources a resident needs to access are within walking distance. What about elderly residents, or those who use wheelchairs or walkers? What about young families with toddlers or babies? What about inclement weather? This cannot be viewed from a one-size fits all approach. I do not see we are at a point yet where we can build in such a way that cars are discouraged before we have the resources close enough to dwellings such that they can truly access all they need throughout the week on foot or bike.
	What happens to disabled and elderly especially during the winter. How do they get around especially on fixed incomes. Let them live in low income dumps after working all their lives?
	I don't think limiting parking will automatically mean someone will go buy a bicycle or take a bus. Not very logical or realistic.
	I like the idea of walking neighborhoods, and wmenciuraginf greater access to walking and bike paths, but not at the expense of losing privacy by having my neighbor only a few inches away. That's not any better than living in the multi unit complex we're in now, and want to get out of
	prioritize installation of sidewalks in older neighborhoods that don't have any
	But it will increase safety for those who do, so it makes sense.
	Encouraging alternative modes of transportation besides cars will always have a positive impact. The more protective these are built & designed, the better.
	Ensure safe connections between all biking and pedestrian areas. For example, there is no safe bicycle route from Gary Lane to the Greenbelt. This is true of many areas north of State St. An alternative would be non-vehicular connections through the NW neighborhoods.
	If you work in Meridian, but live in Boise chances are that you will drive to work. Yes, walking or biking may be an alternative transportation on days off, but not during the work week. Also mass transit (buses) would be a great alternative, but the schedules are poor and it can take 90 min to get to work one way!
	everyone needs a car in this town. this is not realistic.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Again, we need a better public transit system if we don't want people to drive
This sounds like it will be expensive for the taxpayer, and limits the freedom of choice.
Shared parking, etc. listed above is not appealing in any way to me.
How in the world is batching parking helping improve safety for bicycling. We don't need encouragement in Boise, we need help not risking our lives to go places.
The only problem I see related to the much needed shift to greater pedestrian and bicycle friendliness is that Boiseans by and large will not be giving up their trucks, so as a small percentage becomes more inclined to walk or bicycle, our design needs to protect them, which does not mean relying on drivers to act sensibly but integrating real protection into the hardscape as permanent features.
Yes, with a caveat. This change seems to apply to new greenfield development. How much of that does Boise really have left, and where it is, is it really in a place that is walkable to anywhere? But, generally, finding ways to add connectivity through existing neighborhoods is important. Not being beholden to roads, especially within non grid subdivisions, would really help to get from point A to point B quickly and easily.
This depends on where people live.
Sidewalks aren't rocket science, and you shouldn't cut down on space for a house to put in more sidewalks and bike friendly paths. Boise already has excellent sidewalks and bike paths.
Making parking more difficult will not encourage more walking and bicycling it will just result in illegal parking and angry neighbors. If you want to encourage walking and bicycling which not everyone can easily do, you need to create situations where people have access to what they want within a walkable/bikeable distance.
Weather has more of an impact on how people commute than this regulation. Understand that it is often poor weather for walking and biking, plan for the worst hope for the best. Plan for high vehicle traffic, have bike and walking options as a second thought.
Yes we need the bicycle riders need to pay a registration on there bike for improvement for there trails not the rest of us
It's not realistic in a city with 4 very diverse seasons. This is not California
This is great but please tell me what your design will be for the corner of Orchard & Franklin. With the new apartment complex going up how are you working in a bicycle lane?!
Even though this activity is encouraged, no one I know uses a bike as a primary mode of transportation. More emphasis needs to be put on dealing with vehicles.
Nobody uses the pedestrian and bike lanes now.
Sounds like more locations for people to get hit by a car
Still need car to go shopping.
I don't think reducing curb cuts reduces automobile trips. Especially if stores and services are too far away. Look at our subdivisions. Are you going to walk or bicycle down State St to a store? Slow traffic down.
Don't allow huge trucks in downtown Boise.....Charge people money to drive alone in a car. Make the price of gas 10.00 a gallon
no one I know likes apartment parking. maybe you should spend all this money on updating the current lack of proper bike lines,sidewalks and lousy parking in Boise. sounds like the sustainable city model, green city model or maybe an eco city. how about you quit spending money to make your shareholders happy.
unless there's retail close to the residences, I'm unsure how folks can shop while walking or biking. I'm old and depend on my car to get to the stores, so walking or biking isn't an option, regardless of block length . . .
Based on lack of affordability in places where people choose to bike/walk, cars are still needed.
Ensure sidewalks and/or bike paths exist on all major roads (ex: State Street) and that they connect to each other / don't dead-end randomly and connect to neighborhoods consistently.
Driving is still a requirement for the city we have so no, i don't think this will encourage biking. Protected bike lanes and connected routes to many places in the city encourages bike use. Unless people are really committed, the dangers and inconvenience of riding a bike is heavily outweighed by driving a car currently. Minimizing curb cuts just makes owning the required car more frustrating but is still a necessity you have to deal with.
Bike lanes/ walkways are unusable three months a year if not protected from snow. Then habits form and work is for nought. Need to protect lanes from weather and traffic. Portland doesn't get snow. We do. If we want bikeable neighborhoods they need to be plowed and or covered with light roofing as well.
I mean maybe but if there were units with like a grocery store or coffee shop on the bottom floor like a lot of European cities, I think that would make it more walkable.
Smaller is not better. Causes more congestion and less visually appealing as well as less likely to fit in with surrounding structures.
This will work if commercial enterprises addressing the needs ofvthe community are within reasonable walking and biking distance. It might be great formatting a stroll after dinner, but if I still have to go 5 miles to buy my groceries at a reasonable price and at reasonable cost, I'm still going to have my car and is my kids have to go similarvdistances for a place to hang with their friends, they're going to have a car too, and we'll all be less inclined to walk or bike to activities.
require adequate requirements and you won't need more parking structures (that just cost residents more money)

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Focus on making non vehicle travel safer/easier/enjoyable
How does increasing roadway surface area contribute to more housing area? This seems counterproductive.
More bike lanes would encourage more bicycling.
Incentivize people to park their cars. What about a light rail system in the Treasure valley?
Grand plans but not practical! You have an agenda not too sure what it is though. Your wording is not very clear and how many people will really read each section as written into law.
BASED ON EXPERIENCE OF WALKING AND RIDING MY BIKES AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD, I AM ALMOST RUN OVER ALMOST EVERY TIME DUE TO INATTENTIVE DRIVING, LIKE RUNNING THROUGH STOP SIGNS, SPEEDING, TURNING WITH OUT LOOKING, EXPECTING SOME ONE TO WALK ACROSS A STREET IN A WAY THEY DO NOT HAVE TO SLOW DOWN. I ALSO EXPERIENCE THIS ALMOST EVERY DAY WHILE DRIVING! FOR EXAMPLE, BEING PASSED DRIVING THE SPEED LIMIT ON A HILL ON A CURVE OVER THE DOUBLE YELLOW LINES LEAVING ME IN A POSITION TO GET HIT HEAD ON.
If lack of money is not the main reason to do so, no one chooses to walk or bike unless the area is attractive – high density can also be beautiful (see Marianne William’s condos).
Mass transit. Many don’t want to or can’t walk/bike wether it’s because of physical limitations or not having a bicycle. We need better transit to get people out of their cars.
The regulation has everything to do with appearance... which is not going to make me want to bike or walk more, but it would be visually pleasing.
Cars are good. Bikes are bad.
Defined street connectivity standards should be specifically required for new subdivisions. A street connectivity index is an example approach to establish standards
It depends on what services are offered in a walkable region.
Design of individual sites won’t promote walking. Allowing commercial development to be built near residential development will. If it is convenient for people to walk, they will. But only a very small part of that convenience is accomplished by individual lot design. Mainly, if the distance for the majority of customers is too far to walk or bike, people will drive. That’s why you have this problem in the first place- development is built for cars because people have to drive. Why? Because planners separated uses and made mixed use illegal in most areas of the city. This code does very little to change that after reading table of allowed uses and specific use standards.
How will this work when roads around developments are already constructed?
Brighter biking sections. Other states are painting rainbows to be able to see it better
Depends on design and safety
Again...,never reduce parking options. Else, there will be more problems not less.
Include covered bicycle parking and charging stations for e-bikes.
We have a lot of neighborhoods you can't get across on foot. I would like to see a harder push to make east to west travel easier.
Stop trying to use the code to force people to do what they otherwise can't or won't do on their own. Namely walking and bicycling. You cannot codify personal behavior when it comes to living a healthy lifestyle for yourself and your community.
It really depends more on the location of the new structures. Are they close to large work centers?
Most people rush from work to appointments and/or child care car pools. Walking and biking is wonderful for singles or those without children.
My answer is a actually not sure. The examples given all had to do with cars, either parking or maneuvering. They all sounded like good ideas, but unclear how they encourage walking and biking. Non motorized transportation is about sidewalks/paths, ease of access to these and connections throughout the neighborhood. Not sure how the revised standards identified above speak to non motorized connectivity.
I don’t think shared driveways would be appreciated in Idaho, everyone here wants personal space & property. This will cause more property disputes
having more goods and services closer to residential areas would encourage more walking and biking. all these proposed changes do is increase density and take away from neighborhood integrity.
I think that it makes sense in some cases to reduce curb cuts but again these requirements will not change anyone’s habits. However it will make it safer and more enjoyable for those who do walk or bike.
Not clear. Can this kind of connectivity come to existing neighborhoods. Developments of certain size or scope should pay for improved roadways, sidewalks, curbs, etc. throughout the Central Bench.
No
Cutting a road into smaller pieces does not make it shorter. Give back property taxes so people can take time off from work and meander to and fro.
Please provide more parking structures that are multi-level.
Need to improve green spaces to give people in southwest somewhere to want to walk or bike. Like a green belt that is not 30 minutes away by car.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>You are trying to force a change in human nature. It won't work esp here because everything is spread out in the area, ppl like to get into the backcountry, it's COLD here and you can't bicycle everywhere, ppl get older and have less mobility and need a car. You must remember that you have to plan for ppl of ALL ages. Mothers need cars to get the kids around, older ppl cannot bike and walk long distances, it gets cold and icy and dark, etc. Bigger blocks allow more privacy too. I like the idea of the shared driveway, it have see that work in the suburbs around here.</p>
	<p>This is way overdue and happy to see it being considered</p>
	<p>– what do people do when the weather blocks walking and biking? – shorter blocks equals more land used for streets. – require walking / biking connections between subdivisions.</p>
	<p>For more walking/biking the sidewalks would need to be wider to accommodate more than one person and the roads narrower (or with more trees by the road) to make cars slow down. Nobody wants to walk next to a bunch of speeding cars and asphalt even if there are less curbs or parked cars.</p>
	<p>The best way to encourage more bicycling and walking is to make safe bike lanes and sidewalks.</p>
	<p>No, but these will make for better surface parking and reduce having to re-enter traffic in order to navigate.</p>
	<p>Shared driveways good. How does "smaller blocks" and "more frequent streets" encourage walking.</p>
	<p>Abolish parking minimums.</p>
	<p>In fact this generally causes more problems when there are visitors and/or delivery vehicles. It would be nice to have shorter blocks and more accessible pedestrian and bike paths, but they need to connect to somewhere people want to go.</p>
	<p>We need more connections and safe places to ride our bikes. Connect to the green belt. Connect neighborhoods via bike pathways. Give pathways to grocery stores that don't involve going on really busy streets. Require new developments to connect to the existing structure. Zone for safety and social type builds near bikeways.</p>
	<p>Bicycle lanes and sidewalks are enough. Boise should not encourage high density urbanization. It torpedoes quality of life.</p>
	<p>Shared driveways sound terrible for all involved. Boise is freezing during the winter and way to hot during the height of summer to rely on walking/biking as a means of transportation. Boise is not a walkable city unless you live in the same neighborhood you work (very unlikely). Therefore most adults have cars. If you want to encourage people to walk or bike for some trips then they will need a place to park their car. Making parking harder to find isn't an answer and will only create daily frustration, not less cars</p>
	<p>Cars and bikes don't mix. Bikers will get hit, and cars will be blamed even though it is often the bikers fault. But additional intersections only add to the problem. Walkways/ bike paths between blogs is fine, but shortening blocks/increasing intersections WILL create accidents. Also, stop building new tracts before widening rides to accommodate added traffic. Mitchell between Victory and Amity is a little country rode but you've added 100s of homes and a school with no thought for traffic.</p>
	<p>Shared driveways are a bad idea. Homeowners should have full ownership of anything they may be required to do maintenance on some day. I think a shared driveway could lead to conflicts. I would not be interested in buying a property that had a shared driveway. That type of parking arrangement is better suited to a condominium or rental property that has a landlord or a condominium that collects maintenance fees from its residents. As for improving walkability in neighborhoods, sidewalks are needed. A neighborhood is more comfortable for walking when the terrain is flat, or at least no steep hills. The length of a city block is already walkable. I think more people would walk to stores near their homes provided the stores are not over priced. People keeping their dogs leashed and securely confined in their yards would encourage more people to walk, as would better traffic control so walkers and bikers don't have to worry about people who speed through the neighborhoods and use their cell phones while they drive. I still see that from my window several times per week.</p>
	<p>This doesn't make sense in the west bench-we live here because it is residential. We don't want it to turn in to Hyde park or brown crossing</p>
	<p>Without better mass transit this won't help anything. Most people don't want to walk or ride a bike but the city seems to think it's the way to go. It's not. Build a subway.</p>
	<p>In theory, possibly, but sounds like high density expansion into residential areas- not an improvement.</p>
	<p>The standard should allow flexibility when property owners cannot agree on a shared arrangement for access/parking.</p>
	<p>New infill with streets facing established neighborhoods should have pedestrian and bicycle exit into existing neighborhoods but if there is an existing arteriole on the other side of the infill development driveways for vehicles should be designed for vehicles to exit only that way.</p>
	<p>Is this only for commercial properties?</p>
	<p>"Shared" parking is not the answer.</p>
	<p>We have winter in Boise. We have snow in Boise. We have ice in Boise. We have elderly people in Boise. Trying to make us into a bike-primary transportation city is NOT feasible. I have been to Amsterdam and many other places in Europe. The towns that this has worked in have much milder weather.</p>
	<p>The hindrances to walking/biking have more to do with location of stores from the residential area and busy streets such as Federal Way with its limited number of crosswalks.</p>
	<p>The cut-through paths are really helpful as well.</p>
	<p>A great idea but poorly implemented. Yes, we need to encourage walking and biking but by adding more asphalt (smaller blocks mean more streets between them) you are reducing the land available for habitat. Unless you want to go high density which will ruin the neighborhood feel.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>It's the wrong goal. Are you putting a library in every neighborhood? Are you putting a grocery store in every neighborhood? Are you putting a coffee shop every other residential corner? Can you walk to get ice cream? Can you walk to 2 or 3 nice restaurants, have a drink, and walk home? Integrate businesses into residential. Integrate apartments into commercial.</p>
<p>I think this could work.</p>
<p>Anything the city planners can do to encourage more pedestrian and bicycle use is great! There is a ton of academic research on the effect built spaces have on our psychology, and the book Happy City details a lot of this research. Everyone in planning should read!</p>
<p>Depends on availability of needed services and distance to access.</p>
<p>People are lazy and will still drive.</p>
<p>I think it depends on the income level of the occupants and how many working people live there.</p>
<p>People drive cars. Most of the bike lanes are essentially unused. I think it's fine to try out some ideas like these in specific developments, but to encourage them everywhere is not something I support.</p>
<p>Require developer to pay for off-street bike and walking paths.</p>
<p>This would only work in the downtown area. For most areas of town and for most residents, it's not realistic to walk or bike to work, shopping, etc.</p>
<p>While Boise boasts a high bike culture and bike score, currently there are not enough safe (protected) pathways for everyday people (read: not expert cyclists) to bike to the various places they may want or need to go. Infrastructure needs to come first, then housing. By focusing on housing first, we're assuming the problem will resolve itself as more people are near each other and near some completed sidewalks and paths. And yet, much of Boise, particularly the Central Bench, West Bench, Southwest Boise, and part of South East Boise are not very well connected. And so, when new massive housing projects are proposed in Southwest Boise, for example, without the necessary supporting bike/odd infrastructure in place before housing is built, it only further incentivizes more people to do SOV trips from further away.</p>
<p>Not in the SW because there is nowhere to walk to in SW Boise except for the kids walking to schools. And, people here need to be able to drive to work and recreation sites.</p>
<p>It's gonna have to! No one can afford gas or a car!</p>
<p>You can build it and the people that bike or walk will use it, but 98% of the people in Boise need to drive. Not every neighborhood is the Northend.</p>
<p>Everyone wants their own car and a parking space!</p>
<p>no, people are either predisposed to using alternate transportation or not</p>
<p>Stop trying to engineer the behavior of people.</p>
<p>Only if you can change the mindset and worldview of most people. We all know that many think it is cool to FLAUNT their gas guzzling smoke belching trucks. Can you tax excess and stay in power?</p>
<p>More pedestrian streets.</p>
<p>Better public transportation is the only way to fix this. Limiting streets will just use up parking space.</p>
<p>Add a tax credit for biking!</p>
<p>With all the distracted drivers and distracted bicyclist, the bike lanes that pull out into traffic so the bicyclist can go straight are dangerous. you can't see the bicyclist. Don't know what to do about that. Amsterdam has a good system for a Walker's, bicyclists and cars and trolleys. At least in town</p>
<p>This is too crowded. Leave it the way it is.</p>
<p>This sounds like it will make sidewalks safer, but also these sidewalks need to go places. How are they connected to the city at large? Where are people walking to? Perhaps more mixed use development.</p>
<p>Honestly, if people are going to drive, they're going to drive. I can't tell if any of these standards would actually cut down on required parking, but most people on the bench who have a driveway park in their driveway, so if these standards reduce available driveway parking, then they're causing more harm than good by making people park on the street, which inevitably creates hazards for bikers and walkers.</p>
<p>Need to leave these concerns to the marketplace. Some will buy these conditions I speculate most would not if they had a choice between that or a standard single family house in a residential development. Increased pedestrian use an activity seems to increase crime</p>
<p>Some people won't bike unless it's a protected lane. The more you can get ACHD to build protected lanes (even if they are hay bales or a cheap alternative) will help</p>
<p>The way this is written makes it seem like all the pedestrian pass and the parking lots, garages and service delivery entrances will all be commingled. As a woman walking in the city I do not like that nor would I want that for my four daughters. There are lots of reasons cities were built around alleys so delivery time trucks go to the back entrances and not where people are pedestrians</p>
<p>Weather determines walking and biking, not accessibility</p>
<p>As long as the pedestrian areas are safely/easily connected to shopping/recreation/business centers, I think people will opt to walk/bike if they are not too far.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

I believe builders need to consider and provide more funds to abate traffic of all sorts before they build.
This makes sense in very few areas. Primarily the wealthy areas around the foothills and the river. For the rest of the Treasure Valley this is mostly creating significant inconvenience for residents.
See my answer to #9
This sounds like a great idea. Encourage the break up of super blocks.
It doesn't work unless all the cities have the same thing.
Sidewalks in my neighborhood are very often overgrown and not maintained. Fyi
This would work but only in the warmer months. We need our cars in the winter months since Boise does not have very good alternative transportation.
N/A
Decreases home values
People walk and bike when they feel SAFE. Dedicated pedestrian sections away from vehicle traffic would encourage people to walk and bike more.
Unless people start working nearer to where they live, driving is still going to be preferred by most. Combined with our horrible infrastructure for biking, this is a problem. I've had drivers throw glass bottles at me while I've been biking in the bike lanes because they want to pass someone on the right. This has happened multiple times. More/bigger bike lanes aren't going to make that safer for me, it's going to make them more pissed.
Developments like Bown Crossing in Hyde Park should have ample parking in the back.
You know they did this in tract homes in California in the 50s. Amazing that the City is considering this 70 years later.
Who cares? Boise residents need affordable homes not more exercise
There are many people who are differently abled and cannot ride bicycles and/or walk places. My suggestion is to have more transit options like buses, vans, etc.
People who want to bicycle will regardless. People who want to walk will regardless. People who want to drive will regardless.
The locations of businesses and services are already too spread out to eliminate the need to drive. This will only make it easier for pedestrians and bicycles inside the immediate community. It may have an impact in the distant future if everything around the community was built to utilize these changes.
Include access to parking for public transportation stops.
People who can't afford to live in the new areas will still have to drive and park, or not be able to visit the businesses there.
This is absolutely excellent and I am really excited by this change!
not sure - if you have one shared driveway for 4 units, they each have 2 cars - that is 8 cars accessing - who wants to walk and bike on that block? And if there are several of those on a block, the density prohibits a great walking/biking experience.
The closer a development is a commercial zone providing goods and services, the more this approach makes sense.
Some cities are moving to "mega blocks" to move traffic outside of neighborhoods and facilitate safer walking/biking. This regulation seems to be all about cars and not about safe routes for walking/biking.
Might ration auto trips altogether which would be horrible for older residents who are no longer walking and biking distances.
Does nothing for walking and biking IMO. But allows density and with a decade of more density then maybe just maybe you get the walking and biking. If it is harder to get to your car, park your car, own two cars, etc.. then people use it less. Doesn't mean they walk and bike. They may be a hermit and uber eats or uber everywhere. Allow density. allow mix use. remove parking minimum. and wait... eventually, maybe, you will get more of these dream liberal hip gentrified pockets with cool names where your FASA boosted debt goobler college students may hang around and burn more of mom and dads money then 5years of just summers.
Not sure why these design elements would encourage more walking and bicycling. The best way is to close areas to traffic and to limit vehicles to residents only.
Maximize delivery/ride share drop off lanes while minimizing parking
This is best suited for developments near transportation lines and established areas that allow for walking to shops, etc. Large developments surrounded by other new tracts might be challenged to accept a pedestrian friendly focus, if options nearby are limited.
this is only going to help apartments and condos rather than single family homes
Raise the price of gas to an unaffordable rate if you want people to stop driving and reduce pollution.
All of the above sound good, but won't smaller blocks mean more streets instead of fewer?
and what other access ideas will encourage low-income housing
Shared driveways are good, but have nothing to do with pedestrian trips in lieu of vehicles.
A mile is still a mile.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	The problem is it forgets about those neighborhoods that need their infrastructure upgraded to be safe and usable for bikes and pedestrians. And with at least some ACHD commissioners believing it is a waste of money to do that (provide bike and ped infrastructure upgrades to existing neighborhoods on a reasonably quick schedule) and nothing in the zoning draft targeting resolving that problem, it basically amounts to asking some parts of Boise to help new developments get amenities those established neighborhoods don't have.
	no
	Only crazy people ride a bike in -7 or 110 degrees weather. This is just dreaming and not realistic for our city and weather changes.
	Study the City of Irvine CA for this concept to be achieved.... Right now Boise is so spread out no one can just walk or ride their bikes
	Walking is encouraged by placing attractive "end points" (coffee shops, retail, parks, etc. proximate to residential areas, and by making walkways safe, well lit, and keeping them clean. For instance, weeds are often out of control on the undeveloped lands just west of Harris Ranch. These impede use of the sidewalk
	More walking and biking is better
	Making small electric vehicles like golf carts legal on certain streets might go a long way to reduce neighborhood car trips. Riding my bike to the store doesn't make any sense if I have a lot to get. I would prefer to drive something other than my gas guzzling SUV. Why not an electric cart?
	On-site development to encourage cycling/walking will have little impact if connections not there. Southwest lacks bicycle and connected pathways that can be used for shopping/commute/school.
	That change would be horrible
	In my 40 plus years of development and commercial real estate parking ideas like this have previously been proposed and failed especially when mixing residential and commercial uses. With the new hybrid work environment evolving you need to maintain ample parking for each use and probably assume at least a 90 percent occupancy level with each product type in such mixed use developments. Example: person may have a car but also a truck if he is in a condo along with his bike. Where do those vehicles get parked?
	Combined driveways have nothing to do with encouraging alternate transportation. This is clearly just another code being enacted in order to cram more houses/people into smaller spaces. So I guess maybe the increased traffic might encourage alternate forms of transportation.
	Unfortunately, you can't make people get out and walk no matter how easy you make it. And some days, like today with the snow, it isn't practical.
	We have enough people f***** riding around on their f***** bikes getting in everybody's way
	Sub divisions with limited entry/exit hinder non-automobile traffic. More parking below multi-use buildings. Single story strip malls with large parking areas converted into multi-use facilities. Parking below, main level commercial, upper levels for residential.
	Idahoans are accustomed to using their cars. Yes, we walk and use our bicycles, however our winters are not conducive to any mode of transportation other than cars. Our public transportation is not adequate for getting rid of cars.
	This might make sense in new developments that are designed to include grocery stores and other businesses that normally require car trips, but trying to retro fit it into existing neighborhoods won't have that effect. We'll still need to drive to most things, especially as we age in place.
	Make clear requirements not just incentivize and promote
	Depends on the neighborhood. Not all neighborhoods have easy access to shopping. And if you're purchasing groceries you'd probably want to take a car. Also, people mostly do not live near where they work, so they will have to drive. Right now people live where they can AFFORD to live, and that is increasingly difficult to find.
	Boiseans and will NOT get rid of their cars. What you are forcing is more accidents because lack of parking.
	Apartment/townhouse development in West Boise is mostly on 4 lane roads. Parking is not permitted on Ustick Rd., McMillian Rd, etc. Where will those who do not have parking provided by the developer park their vehicles?
	I'm wondering how many people in the Locale subdivision are going to walk to the grocery store. This is just a "wish list" for the way you seem to want to control the way people live. It is simply not realistic. No matter how many times you say it or wish it ... people are not going to bike or walk to work in large numbers. They are NOT.
	Long blocks mean more homes can be built, even low income homes. Build more trails between blocks rather than side walks. Sidewalks take up space but trails take up far less.
	Boise has sold out to the rich. The building development next to me has utterly destroyed my peace of mind and my sense of "home." I don't belong in Boise and the rich don't care.
	Remove parking minimums!!
	When building bike lanes, please provide some form of barrier between the bike lane and the car lanes
	People who are willing to bike in all weather conditions do, but most people in Idaho prefer their cars even when there are other options.
	Provide useful public transportation
	Not sure how you are getting past, new Market Place Albertsons, Wincos, Walmarts and Costcos ???

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Need prohibit parking so close to crosswalks - people regularly park in the crosswalk, sight distance is very important and it is dangerous crossing many intersections where drivers cannot see pedestrians
<p>"The draft Module 2 update proposes changing standards for landscaping with new requirements to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourage xeriscaping (using mulches to reduce evaporation, discourage weed growth, and keep the soil cool); - Install drought-tolerant or adaptive sod/seed mix. - Limit grass to 33% of the landscaped area; - Prohibit invasive plants; and - Limit the use of water features (fountains, waterfalls, and ponds). <p>These regulations are found in Section 11-04-08.3.E.</p> <p>Do you think the proposed changes are appropriate to promote environmental stewardship through environmentally friendly development practices?Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p> <p>Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?"</p>	<p>33% grass limit is too small for single family homes, especially those on smaller lots.</p> <p>I very much appreciate the "limit grass to 33%" idea; this is excellent. I would endorse an even lower limit! At the same time, for people who can't imagine living without a larger grass area (they aren't interested in maintaining perennial beds, for example), there are xeric infrequent-mowing grasses that could perhaps allow larger lawns while getting to the intended reduction of water usage. These grasses can be mowed just once a year, or never. And, once established in the first year, no watering is needed - they are fine with the amount of natural precipitation here. Perhaps those could be a) strongly suggested for all properties no matter the lawn size and b) choices that would let residents have more than 33% of landscaped area be grass. On a separate note: If there's a way to get rid of HOA (homeowner's association) requirements for minimum amounts of lawns, that would be incredibly helpful. Very much appreciating the guidance in the Treasure Valley Tree Selection Guide! And the prohibition on page 268 of impermeable plastic weed barriers under mulch I'm curious why non-permeable materials are required for driveways on page 260. It seems that the city allowed permeable material for Whole Foods on Broadway. If so, that seems ideal. However, while I'm an environmentalist, I'm not an expert on driveway and parking lot materials. For example, perhaps permeable materials end up shifting due to tree roots and therefore become unsafe for pedestrians...</p> <p>Maintain existing open space! Stop filling every bit of space with people. We moved to our current home in part to experience the wildlife that was here. It's all gone thanks to Corey Barton and Trilogy. The homes they're building won't be affordable:they'll sell for market rate. The apartments coming next will only make the property owners richer and the rents will be astronomically high because there's nothing to stop them from gouging the citizens of this city into poverty because they can.</p> <p>If this doesn't come up later in the survey, dissuade ACHD from paving alleys and encourage/require new drives to be permeable.</p> <p>property tax incentives for businesses and residential to remove lawns and use xeriscaping instead (just tearing out the lawns = weeds)</p> <p>PLEASE MAKE FAKE GRASS A NO-NO! Its so toxic and the crumb rubber under it is carcinogenic. It leaches into the surrounding soil and our ground water!!!!</p> <p>Yes - we need more drought measures. Get rid of the lawns.</p> <p>yes - reduce grass to no more than 25% of the landscaped area - normalize less use of grass. It's not yet normalized in Boise.</p> <p>YES YES YES! When I permitted my new construction home on the bench in 2019 it was REQUIRED to have grass with irrigation. We live in the desert! Xeriscaping should be REQUIRED, not optional. If people want to have a traditional lawn, there should be additional fees associated with that, say a few \$\$\$ per square foot of irrigated lawn.</p> <p>Providing tax incentives to switch non-xeriscaped/non-environmentally friendly areas to water conserving xeriscaping. Outlining written enforceable HOA/residential bylaws to enforce continued standards. Fines when bylaws are broken.</p> <p>It would be nice to include not just drought tolerant, but plants that help bees, birds and butterflies.</p> <p>Water features have many issues with are cold winter so simply tell developers not to waste their money on these. As far as water uses, you would get better outcomes by getting humans to learn and understand that many plants and sod do better with less frequent, but deeper watering rather than the common 10 minutes per day method that too many people default to. Mature sod can make it on 2 deep waterings per week even in our hottest part of summer. So limit the sod and educate the public. Hard to prohibit plant material after a home sells but can prohibit plants for multifamily as these residents don't get to be involved in landscaping.</p> <p>Except the very specific 33% grass maximum. It seems a higher maximum percentage would be more aesthetically pleasing and feel cooler to pedestrians.</p> <p>One recreation area with barbecues, tables, swings, etc abaible with grass n trees</p> <p>Limit invasive plants? City council going to send out cops to monitor everyone? Limit water features? Tell people what they can and can't do with their own land that could devalue it?</p> <p>You have gone way overboard in changing the look and feel of Boise in a negative way.</p> <p>I think grass should be limited to 50% of the landscaped area</p> <p>In addition to prohibiting invasive plants, it would be great if the City could specifically incentivize the use of native plants.</p> <p>It is a positive step in the right direction, however could be strengthened with additional building requirements and assessments contributing toward community infrastructure needs in addressing environmental impacts and climate change.</p> <p>Don't allow HOAs to prevent xeriscaping for homeowners</p> <p>Just don't plant grass and pay for materials for whoever wants to xeriscape their place. Using our water to keep lawns green in the desert is coming rapidly to an end anyway, we don't need to help and being first to make that move would be awesome.</p> <p>We need green plants to offset CO2</p> <p>I would need to read more about prohibiting invasive plants and the requirements but I think the intent is appropriate.</p> <p>let's make sure the City does the same thing..and hospitals and business..too much water wasted in this city..</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Remove grass from commercial properties, it's an absolute waste of resources and nobody is using it.
We need to make sure there is an enforcement component to this. Water conservation is going to be a growing concern as we endure more frequent droughts and this thing called Climate Change!
We live in a desert. I support smart water use.
Provide examples for homeowners & builders. See if Suez can offer incentives for this type of landscaping
I would reduce grass even more, xeriscaping can be very attractive and is very much needed with all the growth
We should definitely promote xeriscape as we live in a desert. Most of the landscaping that I currently see in the Treasure Valley is water intensive. A good example of a development with xeriscape landscaping is Avimor in northern Ada County.
If you really wanted to promote environmental stewardship you would place a moratorium on growth until the infrastructure of the area could safely handle the increased growth. While environmentally friendly development practices are notable, they are pretty much conceding that the city cannot meet the demands of the influx on new arrivals.
You could put the dwelling unit per acre measurement back. That way all available space on a lot wouldn't get covered with impermeable surfaces like apt buildings.
Clearly written expectations to accommodate a mental shift.
Leave people the freedom to do what they wanna do on their own property when they pay for it themselves
Grass percentage should be increased to 60 percent...children need play areas for mental and physical health
Outlaw lawn sprinklers
I enjoy seeing water features as long as it is properly maintained.
Also design or components that minimize the creation of heat islands.
Include needs of birds, bugs and wildlife for a healthy urban ecosystem or interface with the rural borders
This is imperative.
Some of the suggestions might work, however, limiting grass seems counter productive to maintaining green space.
very much controlling
The regulations are going in the right direction for responsible stewardship, but take it a bit too far. Fountains and waterfalls can be eliminated, but 33% lawn is too restrictive. Start with no more than 50% grass and see how that goes. Much more importantly, require a 50% tree canopy at landscape maturity.
Please consider incentives for productive landscaping as well, to encourage community food production, such as various vegetables or fruit trees. Gardening is such a big part of the community here. Let's make it more widespread. Perhaps more clarification is needed for landscaping screens/fences, such as a grape vine or shrubs being used as a "fence" or property boundary barrier. Does these have height limits similar to built fencing for example?
Research should be done to evaluate the benefits of having rainwater cisterns to collect rain water to be used for lawn/garden maintenance.
We need more trees to balance out the amount of concrete, rock, etc that is reflecting light and heat. Summers are miserable and if there aren't trees, you will kill any chances of getting people to walk or use alternative transportation. Have you been on Linder/ McMillan area in summer? No one wants to be on that sidewalk.
additional incentives/requirements for single family residential to reduce lawn and use xeriscaping.
As a licensed landscape architect in Idaho, I can agree to all of these items except for limiting lawn to 33% of the landscape. This would force landowners to invest a lot of money in plants since the city, I believe, also requires a 60% vegetative coverage of all planter beds. That's a ton of plants and quite a bit of water and maintenance to water all of those plants. I would instead mostly push for low water species of grass (fescue) and incentives for using high efficiency sprinkler nozzles like MP rotators, which use 30% less water than tractional sprinkler heads.
I believe that the limits for water fountains and ponds should be loose, as i believe that they are calming, and nice looking, whilst not being too harmful to the environment
Eliminate ornamental lawns, limit them to parks
Over regulation on development makes the developer raise the costs to the tenant or buyer.
I presume this is not retroactive so it wouldn't apply to current subdivisions with HMOA's that require specific landscaping using grass?
Yes, especially the xeriscaping point.
How about we use landscaping plants that are native to our desert area and not grass everywhere and wasting water on that. Or even planting clover, i know everyone thinks its a weed but it is was more sustainable then grass.
See first note for my opinion
Education, access and an individual's investment in there neighborhood will lead them to make these choices. Instead of making it for them.
Less lawn does not need to mean less property. "Encouraging" xeriscaping, drought tolerant plantings, and limiting water features can be done without limiting size of lots.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

I like grass.
This imposes values of code developers onto land owners/developers and is too restrictive. A minimum code should be generated and allow the developer to embellish as they see fits the surroundings/buyers/leasers. I personally will frequent businesses that "feel" comfortable. These restrictions would cause me to avoid the area as a consumer. The proposed requirements maty be appropriate for some areas, but not as a city wide code.
This is urgent and efforts to compensate HOA's and homeowners and businesses to do this would emphasize a healthy use of taxes.
I do worry about limiting ponds - the sight of which is very stress reducing. Also, I have a small catchment(?) pond at the end of my apt. breezeway with a small bubbling fountain. The sound, and the cool breeze coming off it in hot summer is very lovely.
Follow through
I am all for xeriscaping and promoting planting native plants!! We live in a sage brush steppe ecosystem, grass lawns should not be the norm here. I understand people like their grass lawns, but new homes built in Boise should not have grass lawns. We must be more mindful of our water usage and do our part to protect and promote the growth of native plant species.
Encourage pollinator landscaping!
Tax breaks to businesses that remove lawns
Continue to encourage desert landscaping.
The ideas are good but I do not think people will appreciate additional rules on what they can do with their property landscaping.
I see pros and cons. I tend toward letting people do what they want to do (if you want a big lawn, why not? that's your choice).
If people can afford it let them do it. Spend your time teaching thous that don't take care of there yard how to zeroscape
Watering g plants and lawn to be scheduled for nights not during daylight hours.
Limiting water use in boise in the name of environmental concern is nonsense. The green belt floods every summer. There is no shortage of water supply, and water feature water evaporates for the most part, therefore it mostly ends up back in the river.
If this is for new large developments like apartment buildings I agree.
this sounds like a great idea
people should be able to landscape however they want
Agree with encouraging xeriscaping
If fountains use recycled water, they don't waste water and are pretty.
i believe that native trees should also be encourage on properties
Encourage food producing plants and trees to be planted.
Highlight native species. SW Idaho has incredible natural beauty that Boise's landscaping generally fails to celebrate. Our landscaping practices privilege landscapes that are more typical of the eastern US or Europe and teach people growing up here to devalue native landscapes.
How about developing some sort of potable/non potable water system so we're not putting expensive, treated water on lawns and gardens?
feel this is too much meddling by the city in Property owners rights
More shade tress are necessary to address rising temperatures. So please add regulations that encourage protecting and promoting large trees along with these ground level focused rules.
I think water features can be required to recycle water rather than restrict them. Also, limiting the amount of concrete/pavement is also environmentally important to reduce temperatures. Incentivizing use of native plants and requiring Green Building Standards should be focus.
People should get to choose their landscape!
Require xeriscaping, limit grass and water features more.
There is fine line between promoting environmental stewardship and over regulating homeowners. We need to respect homeowners property rights. Personally, I don't want the City of Boise telling me how much or what type grass I can have on my property or that I have to limit water features. Hands off my lawn man!
Maybe limit grass even to 25% of the landscaped area.
clarify that mulches and native plants and grasses are preferred over gravel, to minimize the urban heat island effect.
Please use non-toxic, non-chemicals if we use down this path.
It never helps anything or anybody by making everything a law.
Provide financial incentives for residents to convert grass to xeriscape and reduce water intensive plants in their yards.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>People don't maintains their yards now and use them as storage. People need to be encouraged to get rid of all the crap they think they will somehow need in the future and then their children have to dispose of.</p>
<p>Xeriscaping results in increased heat due to less vegetation and is unattractive. If you're worried about environmental impact, limit housing. Everyone who moves here will only add to traffic, use our limited water and natural resources, as well as increase pollution.</p>
<p>The only good thing is put in drought tolerant sod/seed</p>
<p>Beautification is important, there are ways of recycling water to cut usage and beautifying.</p>
<p>Remove these restrictions. Allow people to choose.</p>
<p>This is very constrictive. How are you going to enforce this?</p>
<p>Limit grass to 10%</p>
<p>I am 100% for xeriscaping and the reduction of water usage as we have entered into a drought. Less green lawn and more native plant species promotion = less need for water, maintenance and pesticide use = more environmentally friendly.</p>
<p>In new developments, require use of southwest Idaho native plants/shrubs/tress from a city-approved list. Require 100% xeriscaping for non-playground shared community areas in developments (medians, entrances).</p>
<p>Let people do what they want to do on their property. I can't believe I have to write that.</p>
<p>Do something to encourage desert landscaping to avoid wasted water use for grass and landscaping</p>
<p>People get too "creative" and this often looks terrible. Encourage drought resistant grasses in yards.</p>
<p>I don't know about that, but reducing grass area and cool features like waterfalls or fountains definitely discourages people from walking. No one wants to walk on rock, wood chips, etc. If you're trying to increase the amount of people walking around, this is the wrong move.</p>
<p>Prohibit HOAs from regulating landscaping! My friend wanted to put creeping thyme around his mailbox because mowing and maintaining the lawn around it was too much, but we was barred from doing so from his HOA</p>
<p>We need more convincing evidence to show how the regulation will get the end result. The regulation comes with additional costs to the city for policing every property for violations. Encourage and promote. Don't make more rules.</p>
<p>I don't agree that it's governments role to tell me how much grass I can plant and pay to water. I have irrigation so I don't use drinking water, maybe this is considered?</p>
<p>Regulation wont cure anything. Education will.. Build gardens not lawns</p>
<p>Discourage replacing non-landscaped areas with rock.</p>
<p>Eliminate Water features, etc. They improve property value and desirability and thus more property tax.</p>
<p>Yes.</p>
<p>I absolutely think xeriscaping should be a part of Boise's future. As much as we all love our lawns, sustainability and water for our city should be of far more importance than large, water-consuming greenspaces.</p>
<p>Produce more knowledge about native gardening on top of passing laws.</p>
<p>Forcing this is not the answer; encouraging it is</p>
<p>Definitely agree with discouraging high water practices in a desert.</p>
<p>More trees will cut evaporation, and keep concert and asphalt from being heat sumps.</p>
<p>We really need to get away from green grassy lawns in Boise.</p>
<p>I enjoy water features. If we are having water issues then We need to stop building and stop Encouraging growth. Water features are gorgeous and awesome.</p>
<p>Allow grey water, stop using potable water for landscaping</p>
<p>Prohibit non-native trees and shrub species. Grass, should be up to the property owner. The rest I agree with.</p>
<p>These changes don't go far enough. New construction should have very little or zero high water foliage.</p>
<p>Love all of this. I'd rather see water going to a shade tree than bushes and lawn</p>
<p>Stop trying to be a liberal city.</p>
<p>Grass is not bad, green space is not bad. People pay for water from suez and it isn't cheap. They are already financially incentivized to not plant green plants because of this. This zoning requirement goes too far</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>These are pointless restrictions limiting personal landscaping choices and are pretty obviously drafted from people who haven't done any landscaping themselves. Ponds and fountains recycle their water, the only grass that grows decently enough for a yard in the valley has to be more drought tolerant, and restricting the already crowded housing landscaping to only being 33% yard wouldn't even hardly allow citizens to enjoy their own property and be forced to take a trip to a park (something it sounds like you're trying to avoid?).</p>
	<p>Again only if it was city wide & you don't just focus on N. End & SE Boise where you all live. The rest of the city needs live too.</p>
	<p>They are appropriate to promote environmental stewardship however, the local government shouldn't interfere with the landscaping people want to use on their private property. That is what home owner's associations are for.</p>
	<p>I eventually plan to tear out my small front yard and do xeriscaping to cut down on my water bill. I would like to see more garden space or community gardens and fruit trees.</p>
	<p>Questions should not be biased to give you the results that you seek.</p>
	<p>any building in the foothills or WUI should be limited to firewise plantings</p>
	<p>Focus on more native plants and fireside landscaping</p>
	<p>No! Why have a home under these conditions if you are eliminating many enjoyable aspects of owning a home. Have you considered what your proposals would do to wild life in these areas if these proposed changes are adopted?!</p>
	<p>When there is a community park in a residential area then the curb side of the parks should have no parking at the curb from dusk to dawn. There is too many people parking on these curbs and living on these curbs. When people live in their cars on the curbs they dump their trash into the parks and waterways.</p>
	<p>This is a great improvement. Do need to be careful with this though. Lived on a farm in Meridian, and it was hotter and dirtier than he**, where it was gravel and dirt. And farmers used lots of poisons/sprays to keep weeds at bay, which went into the ground water, irrigation, etc.</p>
	<p>Native plants!!!!!!! Not just xeric. Local bugs and birds depend on native plants.</p>
	<p>Let people decide. Do not force housing apartments or private residences to have a bullshit code. To much regulation and control</p>
	<p>The majority of people here do not believe in climate change and won't make the changes</p>
	<p>Add a clause to bring older homes to the new standard over the next 20 years.</p>
	<p>I love all this!!! Water conservation is such an important issue!! We have lovely parks to get your grass fix, we don't need it in our yards.</p>
	<p>My HOA currently requires that I grow green grass on my property. I would appreciate an updated zoning code that banned that sort of stipulation.</p>
	<p>There must be a way to grandfather in existing areas with good tree canopy. Don't change the landscaping standards for existing neighborhoods in historic areas.</p>
	<p>Maybe have a reference compilation of good examples available for us to get inspired? Could be a photo or video..</p>
	<p>YES! I absolutely hate the current system of over-grassing and watering. I want more xeriscaping options and more resources for understanding how to xeriscape.</p>
	<p>Landscaping and upkeep of such is vitally important to the look and feel of the city it does no good to landscape and then not take care of it for example the on off ramps on the connector coming in and out of the city were redone and now are full or weeds so was basically a waste of money. Waterfalls etc...provide enhancement to the feel of the city and are very environmentally friendly in this day in age.</p>
	<p>again, that is not necessarily what Boise's are wanting</p>
	<p>I think a financial incentive for reaching water usage targets would be more effective.</p>
	<p>But "xeriscaping" by slapping down gravel and three plants, including a tiny tree that will never provide shade, should not be allowed like it is now--especially when large shade trees are cut down for new apartments/homes. Less green space = higher temperatures.</p>
	<p>We should be able to landscape within our means</p>
	<p>We live in a desert so we need to embrace that!</p>
	<p>Simply a resounding YES, good job on this one!!! However please do not unintentionally limit the possibility of food production – as our outlying agricultural areas are turned into more neighborhoods we risk loosing resilience in our local food resources.</p>
	<p>This will make Boise very ugly. Very opposed to this.</p>
	<p>If it is not attractive who is going to live there?</p>
	<p>We need to plan ahead. With all these people moving here water will be very hard to come by. less grass is best.</p>
	<p>Forgive my ignorance but perhaps sage brush and other native plants could be mixed in with lavender and other colorful flowers. Pay homage to the area. You're on the right track - yes to drought-resistant measures.</p>
	<p>If you don't mandate a grass limit or limit water features, this is a great idea. Honestly, this is yet another area that doesn't require a mandate; It's super expensive to water a yard that is mostly grass. Just help residents by "overriding" HOA mandates that require lots of grass and are unsupportive of xeriscaping. It's super easy and a huge win.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Deal with water rights and water intensive farming
Plants consume CO2 and heat and produce oxygen, cool air and shade. Shaded homes use less AC. The trees in the city of trees need water. Boise does not have low water problems... Even in "drought" years and poor water management there is still massive amounts of water intentionally drained from the dam. Every city that has went to xeriscapes have gotten hotter, had less rain and use more electricity... DONT DO IT.. USE A BIT OF SCIENCE. Invasive species plants included should be prohibited but should be a part Game and Fish.
Reduce lawn to <20%. Unfortunately, reducing ponds and water features would reduce evapotranspiration and Cyanobacteria blooms. Grass belongs in parks and sports complexes.
Incentives potentially for zeroscaped properties
Love this! Although some water features can be environmentally beneficial - maybe an exception could be made for aquaponic agriculture and similar models.
I think there should also be a minimum require amount of grass to avoid having a lot have only gravel, turf, or mulch. This does not seem to be a neighborhood feel in residential areas and makes it seem slum-like or similar in nature. Some houses in my neighborhood have probably a 4' x 20' patch of grass in the backyard and less in the front yard.
HOAs should not be allowed to require grass lawns or to require that those said lawns are watered to any level in drought conditions.
Xeriscaping Shouldny be "encouraged" it should be the flat out law. We live in the desert.
At this very moment I'm contemplating whether to turn part of my yard into xeriscaping or grass. The problem my face is that xeriscaping is very expensive.
The government should not have say in how I manage my property.
Yes. "Lawns" were created by English aristocrats as another way to display wealth. Some how is became the status queue in the States. It makes absolutely no sense. We have more important uses for water. The more grass-free (or limited grass) homes we have, the more the concept will be accepted. People don't want to be out done by their neighbors, so they install sprinkler systems to water lawns. These proposed changes will help eliminate some of the neighbor competitiveness that literally throws water into the wind.
Encouraging these practices is a step in the right direction, but it's still a long way to go.
There should be tax incentives to get this part accomplished and penalties for not following it!!
YES you need to implement this. The current lawn regulations make no sense IN THE DESERT.
Not just appropriate but necessary. Make tax incentives for all home/business owners to do so!
Fix the existing roads, curb & side walks before adding a mess to the surrounding area.
I'm all for getting rid of grass. Put in community gardens. Lessen HOA restrictions so people can have edible gardens. Plant native plants to our high desert climate. Birds and bees still need access to water.
Most "xeriscaped" lots I have seen locally in subdivisions do not actually contribute to lower water use because they are still designed and built with sprinkler systems instead of drip systems. Furthermore the wholesale cutting down and mowing of native grasses and species is a huge problem for pollinators. I would really love to see more encouragement of native and pollinator landscaping, since that is also part of the city's longer term climate goals. But I worry because a great deal of the xeriscaping that I see involves large amounts of stone or gravel, which contributes to the effect of urban heat islands.
Excellent ideas. Encourage the use of micro-clover rather than grass as it needs less water, fertilizer, and herbicides than grass. High traffic areas can mix clover and grass to improve durability while still reducing water consumption.
It won't match what REALLY needs to be done, having regulations all specified
I'm all for using less water, but remember you do have quite a large contingent of landscaping companies, who do the commercial lawn upkeep all summer. Jobs mean growth, not lack of jobs.
I think this is a good idea to limit water usage. However, we also need more grass, flowers, trees to prevent climate change and losing the bees. Setting a value of 33% is too simple. Similar to requirements being set based on the development landscaping should also be considered on a case-by-case basis.
You should not be regulating what people plant in their yards and whether they can have a pond or fountain.
There should also be regulations around how many trees must be planted to reduce temperature associated with huge swaths of cement or asphalt.
Xeriscaping is AWESOME, however, we need TREES to reduce carbon dioxide. How about roof top garden requirements? How about solar panel requirements? THINK BIGGER. Developers are coming here, lets make them pay for something that actually makes us different than other cities.
Ban gardens that use Roundup & give away plants that are pollinator friendly
NO
Also ban any grass lawn maintenance requirements where they exist.
Additionally work in items like solar, bee houses, flowers for said bees, etc

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Prohibit invasive plants in the landscaped area, not on undeveloped areas
People will be angry about limiting grass, but I think it is important to do so! Please also include options that encourage people to plant their own produce gardens-- limits on watering or water features should not infringe on gardening.
All are good but I don't agree with the water features limit as they can help wildlife and they reuse water not waste it.
I would like to see this happen, and many are trying to change the landscape of their property to more drought resistant landscape. It is expensive to do, provide a grant or something for individuals that wish to reduce water use, drought tolerant plants etc to do this
Until the new subdivisions have to abide by this they are creating spaces with too much grass and we don't have enough water for all that space.
Offer a tax break for residents that use reduced watering landscape systems!!
More trees, more green spaces, universal design in all green spaces. Include community garden spaces in the design that is also accessible to people with disabilities.
Developers and their exparte meetings with city 'officials' always find a way to get out of landscaping anyway, it doesn't matter and neither do public hearings.
Limit grass to 20%
We all need to remove some of our lawn if not all of it. Water shortage is a serious issue.
Stop paving farmland. Period. We live in a desert in case you missed it, water is limited and should go to FARMS. No farms = no food. Food does NOT come from grocery stores. Tell the developers to shove it. Stop lining your greedy, lying political pockets with their money and do your job you putz. I'm from Memphis, I'm not an idiot--more development means higher housing prices, there's no way around that. Stop paving farms. Period. AND some of those "weeds" attract beneficial insects--maybe you should talk to the Uofl extension office.
Ponds and water features allow habitats for certain animals. Since we would be taking away certain lands and habitats we should create spaces for protected places to maintain wildlife safe havens.
Do you not understand the Idaho way of life. Have you ever heard the saying, "KEEP IDAHO GREEN"? We have lawns to reflect the sun so the rays do to shine onto your house. People are just getting lazy.
More limitation on grass
Boise is "The City of Trees" and wonderfully green. Too much xeriscaping will turn this city back into a desert and turn Boise into places like Winnemucca. Keep the foothill natural but the inner city should be green.
I think these regulations are awesome. The greatest irony of Boise growth is the fact the entire west is in a mega drought. We're increasing the draw on water resources while the volume of snowpack is steadily decreasing. Explosive growth in the desert I just kinda dumb in 2022 without serious consideration for water.
Be thoughtful about existing residential areas. Only for new development.
I want to emphasize the importance of this. Very important indeed.
You aren't going to listen anyways.
Would like to see more requirements for insect friendly plants for bees and butterflies. Would also like to see fruit bearing trees in public spaces to help feed people
Many of these proposed items only increase the cost. If this is implemented the cost will only be passed on to the tenant. Makes no sense at all if we're trying to reduce rental costs.
PLEASE do not allow trees to be planted in parking areas that drop berries or sap. To many of the developments are terrible messes and causes people to have to wash cars frequently. Terrible idea to plant a tree in parking areas that branches hit cars, block views when turning or produce a mess,
More trees!!!
No
Why limit what people can do on their own property? Stop putting rules in place to force people to do things.
This is an over reach of government. Government entities should not be regulating a homeowner's choice of landscape. The proposal will make the City of Trees look like the city of dry indigenous weeds. Because let's face it; Xeriscape and indigenous plant life is dead looking 10 out of 12 months of the year.
HOAs would have to allow these changes otherwise people won't be able to do them.
require proper upkeep of streetside property areas as opposed to landscape choices
Picking Idaho native plants
So less grass and fewer trees, right? I thought we were going green?
decrease the amount of asphalt and concrete
If you tell people how they can and can't landscape their own land you're going to piss people off, just saying

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Stop the building!
Please consider adding something that encourages bird-friendly building design. Collisions with windows are one of the leading causes of death for migratory birds and it is very preventable! Advocacy about this fell on deaf ears with regards to the proposed library -- and we have an opportunity to do something about it now with the code rewrite.
We should be encouraging more trees being planted. Trees that don't need a lot of water have benefits outweighing the costs.
xeriscaping encourages more weed growth if not maintained even though grass requires more water it still is the easiest to maintain
The city should not be able to tell owners what kind of landscaping or limit water features. What's next telling us we can have a hot tub or pool?????
Leave space for mature trees. The canopy is being phased out as density increases. All indications are that the city is getting hotter.
I think there is a need to promote environmentally friendly and adaptive landscaping. However enforcing it as part of a zoning code is problematic. People are lazy and their interpretation of xeriscaping will result in dry dead rock patches filled with weeds. Yes a reduction in landscaping requiring heavy irrigation is needed, but we need to do it in a way the still promotes green habitats. Water features if done correctly provide water to birds, and wildlife and should not be discouraged. We are supposedly The City of Trees... we need to keep it that way.
Plants naturally through photosynthesis encourage rain. We do not want to create a city without trees or plant life. We must preserve the City of Trees as a natural habitat encouraging natural/droit resistant plants and discouraging wasteful fountains is a good idea but I think we must ensure that nature doesn't suffer for the sake of higher density.
I have doubts that "encourage" will have any effect. It should be a requirement. If the regulation has no concrete requirements then it will probably not be too successful.
There is no reason to support golf courses and grassy fields with our precious water... IN A LITERAL DESERT! People's wells are going dry and I honestly don't feel bad about it because they have been using well water on GRASS like it's an infinite resource.
Encourage local plants necessary for pollinators like bees and hummingbirds. Keep in mind that some kind of modest water feature would be helpful if the intent was to support bird and bee drinking--not just wasteful design. Bees particularly need cool water with areas to rest within the water as our summer temperatures continue to climb every year.
There is no mention of promoting the use of native plants. Prohibiting the use of invasive plants in new construction is half the solution.
Way too much regulation here. What the heck?
Not sure
PLEASE limit the unnecessary use of water!
none i can think of
Idaho is based on agriculture and crop growing, and trees- this is not Arizona that requires drought needs, Idaho has water sources- unless housing neighborhoods continue to take over areas where water is abundant
Cut the fountains and ponds. Add more open grass areas. Use the water to irrigate the grass instead.
I'm ok with allowing a higher percentage of grass to grow than 33%.
There's no reason that grassy areas need to be limited in size, or that ponds/fountains need to be limited if recycled water is used.
Hopefully
Keeping more green space would help the environment versus continuing to overdevelop areas that are already heavily trafficked
Many HOAs prohibit alternatives to grass yard covering and would need additional incentives to remove their prohibitio
It is key that important changes regarding environmental sustainability be accompanied with educational and financial assistance if they are to be effective/successful.
This almost makes sense... New developments, but how does this impact existing neighborhoods? The problem with this survey is mixing old and new areas. What may be good for new could destroy existing...
Enact it faster and make it expressly supercede HOA agreements.
Fountains and water features can recycle water and can add to the overall attractiveness of landscaping. Incorporating these features into xeriscape shouldn't be discouraged.
Fines for trash around property's
Greenery is much better to look at than concrete. Encourage tree planting and shrubs rather than limit it to 33%.
Give people freedom to build beautiful spaces.
Limit the lot percentage for high pressure irrigation (i.e. sprinklers), but not for low pressure (i.e. drip) irrigation.
I agree that this should promote environmental stewardship, but Boise is a city of parks and the Greenbelt. A delicate balance will need to be considered in order to maintain Boise's green spaces.
We didn't need this before why do we need it now? The more we do to the soul the worse it gets!
Stop allowing lawns on new houses. Force buyers of existing homes to convert to xeriscape. Make the requirement built into the real estate contract.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Yes increase heights of fencing. You guys allow nine story townhomes three story townhomes go up around my house and I have no damn privacy because you allowed special exceptions for them you're allowing them to build closer to my house my property you shouldn't be able to do that
	People should be free to landscape according to their taste including water features. Xeriscaping and other landscaping choices should remain choices (albeit encouraged). They should not be compelled in the zoning code. They are choices.
	This is great. I'd like to see education for occupants of existing homes on how to xeriscape, etc.
	Simple enforcement
	Honestly, I think you'll just embitter Boise residents if you send the environment police out to bully residents into new landscaping codes. Many residents chose to buy into neighborhoods without HOA's just so they could have the freedom to do what they wanted with their own private property. I would let the cost of city water determine what people want to do with their yards. I desert-scaped my front yard because I didn't want to pay the water bill for the grass. Less water was used, and it didn't require any government force so there's no resentment.
	I don't think it's your place to tell me what I can grow on my property. The city of trees shouldn't look like a desert.
	Increase water prices. Let people decide if they want to spend \$ to water their lawns. Idaho soil is vastly different and this isn't inclusive.
	Just keep in mind, where there are large trees providing shade, grass and some xeriscaping may not do well. In our neighborhood we have bare dirt on one side of the street where all the grass has died due to shade. Gravel there would be lower maintenance.
	Don't throw the baby out with the bath water. If you are promoting drought tolerant grasses that may allow for larger areas of grass. Grass is cooling and can be easy for the home owner to care for. Great place for the kids and dogs to play. I have seen too many xeriscaped landscapes with few plants and lots of rock mulch. Rock mulch just heats up the soil which can be difficult for plants and trees. And you lose the cooling effect of grass.
	Water conservation of any kind needs to be looked at.
	I don't agree with the pond limitation as they make habitat of which we need. You need to define better "invasive plants." If people don't care for their yards then almost everything is "invasive." And we lack plant diversity in Boise.
	This is needs to happen regardless of size.
	Require power lines be underground - our city streets are hideous in that the beautiful sky is obscured by power poles and line.
	Children need large lawn areas for creative play. Limiting areas of open lawn limits play space. So does xeriscaping of large areas. Wise use of water is important, but so is development of our smaller citizens. Balance is needed.
	Agreed in principle. Does this mean elderly people with older homes in the same area with larger lots need to take out most of their grass? or would this apply only to new construction?
	Quit regulating the hell out of everybody. No one will want to live here.
	No. Stewardship implies choice and responsibility to care for your property. Dictating how many plants or whether someone has a water feature is not "good stewardship", it's fascism by definition. Most of my street has moved to a xeroscape mind set without regulation. Further regulation restricting homeowners right to manage their property in a way that best serves their individual need is totally unnecessary.
	We need to focus on water conservation and left planting of non native grass that require lots of watering in our hot summers.
	This is excellent. There should be neighborhood parks and common areas so people have access to grass fields without having huge lots of water intensive grass in their homes.
	I can only speak for the North End and the North End Frontier (west of 28th). Currently, developers of existing lots have exceeded this requirement; to see any new residential development from the air, I would guess only 10% is in any form of landscaping, as 90% is consumed by a black roof or cement. Huge loss of green canopy, of cooling, and of wind reduction.
	Limit grass to 20% not 33%.
	The hewlett packard site tried this and it was a disaster so it all depends on the planning. Whoever did the HP site made a mess.
	Provide funds for single-family homeowners to make this change too.
	It is one thing to teach and encourage good practices and behaviors, it is another thing to force rules and regulations according to one set of opinions.
	If you currently enforced landscaping requirements then this might be possible. You should not attempt to limit preferences but to assure that landscaping is installed.
	Frankly it needs to be more regenerative forward. Aka more aggressive in its nature. Any kind of non xeric implementation should be highly discouraged. Almost all turf/blends are inappropriate for our region/growing zone, and should fall into potential penalties if use is persistent. And not all water "features" are a bad thing. I'd even say they should be highly encouraged, if the design, and implementation is in concordance with logical, and natural methodologies.
	Limit grass grow? Sounds like a great park
	All except ponds, fountains & waterfalls. They promote wildlife habitats.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	You are now changing the theme of our city - from the City of Trees to what? Maybe you should keep your regulations for development within a radius of 3000 ft. of city hall and with the mayor's residence within those boundaries.
	Nice thought, but probably won't have much effect. At a minimum, you need some kind of economic incentive to influence public to move towards xeriscape and conservation.
	Reduced water use is increasingly important- yes!
	Provide a true definition and description of xeriscaping, that it includes native-adapted, low-water plants in addition to mulching. Otherwise, you'll just have residents and businesses putting in seas of gravel mulch.
	People do not want to be over regulated, especially in Boise Id. You can provide options, but making it code is not acceptable.
	Reduce the regulations so we dont have to put in so many trees and grass in which is more maintenance and water consumption long term
	There is high maintenance in desert landscape design.Low maintenance in desert landscape design is a myth.Desrt plants litter much !
	This is America, people should be free to do what they want with their property (within civil bounds). It isn't the cities job to "require" that a homeowner do something with his personal property. If I want to build a moat and I can pay for the water bill, I should be able to do so.
	I don't care how the landscaping would look on something I'm totally against.
	Drought tolerant grasses should be required, not just encouraged.
	Anything to help the planet and keep our water supply healthy and robust is a top priority for me.
	I would hate to see most landscaping void of flowering plants. This sounds like it will encourage a lot of gravel fill.
	Great ideas!
	Native plantings
	There should be incentive to use trees strategically in landscaping to provide shade. Lawns using native grasses and pollinator-friendly lawns should be encouraged.
	Water features add to the quality of life. State dam projects to store more water.
	Use plant species that native to the treasure valley area. Rely less on non-native grasses.
	Do no you really want to dictate what plants can be planted? This seems to cross the line
	Good luck getting people on board with this one. People love grass.
	Prohibiting invasive plants is already part of the zoning code and is not new. However the rest of this is ridiculous. Again it is not the city's job to determine how much grass is appropriate for my kids to play in.
	Offer some sort of incentives to bolster desire for xeriscaping
	Don't allow grass at all
	Absolutely not, since it will only encourage bad designs in inappropriate areas and add ugliness to the whole thing by decreasing green spaces and making no places for children to play but in the middle of busy streets.
	Regulate less grass for gravel alternatives to use less water,less mowing pollution and easier maintenance.
	I'm not opposed to being stewards of the land but cramming more people into housing areas is not doing that. Limit the population that can occupy an area and you limit the resources that it uses. Jamming more people into the same area Will used the same amount of water as a less densely populated area with more grass.
	If possible, require HOAs to allow xeriscaping and native plants.
	You guys can't fix anything look how many times you rebelled connector look how many times that you had to redo Curtis you people do not know what you're doing you couldn't plan a driveway to a dog house that's how inept you guys are. Just my opinion
	Add incentives for water saving measures like rock lawns
	Require xeriscaping
	This is excellent.
	Some of these things are great! No invasive plants, drought tolerant, and discouraging weed growth. But who are we to say you can't have a pond? Or as much grass as you want? And just how controlling are you going to get with xeriscaping? We are a tree city! Relish in that! What, you want this place to look like Phoenix? Do you plan to list the types of bark/mulch/rocks people use? This is pushing boundaries a bit. Plant more trees. Protect the trees you have. Let Boise be green. Maybe instead work with the developers to offer ideal plants and landscaping, but let the owners decide if they want eight ponds or fifty yards of grass.
	With the fact that we do not have enough water for who have already moved here and who have lived here their entire lives. Grass should not be a priority.
	None of those specifications make any difference, with the exception of invasive plants. The landscaping regulation should just be "No invasive plants."
	Require the use of native plants.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Try putting in native plants to the area. Also wildflowers in areas to help pollinators like bees thrive
Don't just focus on new landscaping. Current developments over water an unnecessary amount of unused grassy areas.
Encouraging reduced water usage for landscaping is more responsible and reasonable, but I don't think it is our place to regulate that aspect of landscaping. Trees, as the city of Trees, is something I wouldn't oppose regulations controlling development.
I don't know.
I think property rights trump anything put into code. It should be voluntary options not required by code.
Quit trying to control people. If someone buys property they should be able to landscape it as they are fit.
It is not your place to mandate preferences for landscaping. This used to be a free country, where owners of the real estate do what they want with their properties.
Stop Californians from moving here
The city should have standardized options for storm water runoff controls. No irrigation runoff should leave landscapes. Every lawn should have an infiltration trench next to the sidewalk or road. Xeriscaping and these other standards are great for new developments, but is there a way to help pay for existing homeowners to make these changes? Are there city services that can help homeowners with storm water runoff installations?
Stop allowing developers to use SO MUCH GRASS. And require all new HOA to allow artificial grass!
Many HOA rules require real grass. Is there a way to encourage HOA changes?
regulate the amount of water used on each property. create heavy fines if water usage is in excess of a certain amount allotted for each property. based on number of people and size of property.
I hate to see this minutiae specifically outlined and regulated more than it already is.
It's a choice and should be left a choice. Far too much overreach going on here.
Mandate recycling of water in water features. Limit open pond-type features that evaporate, and also allow mosquitoes and other potentially infectious vectors to breed.
Working with local nurseries, landscapers, and businesses to provide guides and materials to meet new standards and help with plant selection.
You know what changes would promote environmental stewardship?! KEEP LONG STANDING PROMISES AND KEEP Murgotio Park an OPEN SPACE
Highly encourage (subsidize?) home, or even shared garden spaces. Food gardens and ornamental gardens both add an incredible amount of character to buildings.
Fake turf is also a nice option to give that look and feel of grass. It's nice for kids to play on and to feel more inviting than rocks/gravel/wood chips.
A property owner should steward their property as their conscience dictates.
Our neighborhood co-habitates with each other and we decide how to maintain our lots, not the city's business unless it is an environmental disruption.
No. This is not California, Seattle or Portland.
the rapid rise of water cost is promoting xeriscaping very well
This is Social engineering at its worst.
Too restrictive, especially limits on ponds and water features. Restricting lawn to 33% is too restrictive of private use of private property. Rather than require limits, perhaps some type of tax reduction could be given to owners who agree to limits.
What is the definition of "invasive plants" within this? I would consider that as too subjective, subject to uninformed opinion.
PLANT MORE TREES , limit cutting of healthy mature trees, Require developers to build around healthy mature trees
Would like to see minimal use of grass to limit water usage
These changes would require less grass to allow for more buildings. Grass is better. Let the developers decide what they want to plant
This is a long time coming regulation. We live in a desert and need to start building and landscaping accordingly!
Limit grass to 50% of the landscaped area
YES, YES, YES. We have to stop with all this Kentucky Bluegrass shit. I lived in Utah 20 years ago and they were tightly rationing water (water only overnight, every other night based on house number) and it is ridiculous bullshit that in Boise it is a free for all. People run sprinklers at noon with half of running into the gutter and the city does nothing. Are you aware we live in a desert?
These just give more control for fake environmental causes. Just leave it alone and let people decide how to landscape.
Planting pollinator friendly plants would be a great addition.
Require native plants and pollinator friendly plants
Free will my guy free will

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Come do my yard please from a former Arizona that has lived here for 42 years. Ridiculous amount of water used in a desert here.</p>
<p>You're stupid instructions will be ignored and dodged by every fucking developer and the real estate agent pals in this town. You can't do anything to stop those crooked bastards from ruining the town further. So fuck you this town is a wreck</p>
<p>Grass % should be less and be more trees.</p>
<p>In the WUI zones, mulches cannot be of flammable material, like wood chips. But who is going to police this. We do live in a desert so we shouldn't be watering so much. But many people still like grass. We need more fake grass companies. I've seen some great fake lawns in California but the ones I've seen here are poor.</p>
<p>I answered "No" because any savings in water would need to be converted to instream flow rights for the Boise River to be a conservation of some type. Otherwise, it simply goes to another or increased use. Or worse, it allows more storage, which can then fuel development somewhere else (Anderson Ranch Reservoir). More storage, without opportunistic development would be a good thing by offsetting demand for new, or expanded, reservoirs.</p>
<p>We need to protect an owner's ability to maintain his or her yard as he or she sees fit. Xeriscaped lots generally look horrible.</p>
<p>Leave people alone and stop telling them what they can and cannot plant on their land.</p>
<p>Boise should scale back the current landscape requirements for projects as the amount of trees and locations within a project are onerous and expensive. Again, I think that design review planners should be given more autonomy to work with a developer and be able to relax some of the requirements where appropriate.</p>
<p>Xeriscaping is great and grass is unnecessary</p>
<p>Trees should still have priority. Although they can be water-intensive when they're first planted, the long-term effects far outweigh xeriscaping. In Boise summers I much prefer to visit and bike or walk through Hyde Park (large trees and shade) compared to the Harris Ranch area. We are the City of Trees after all!</p>
<p>Water needs to be conserved or we will eventually run out.</p>
<p>****Emphasize saving old growth trees when creating new developments, especially in downtown areas...the "city of trees" lately hasn't been valuing these trees which regulate temperature, mitigate air quality, and contribute to the aesthetic of Boise that we love. Encourage use of native plants, pollinator friendly options, etc.</p>
<p>Welcome to California</p>
<p>Do not regulate what plants I can plant. A green grass the American dream! Xeriscape City buildings if you want to be a steward for the environment</p>
<p>Limit grass to less than 33% - the lower the better.</p>
<p>i presume this is for new development, and also believe there could be incentives for existing areas to re-landscape to meet these standards.</p>
<p>I just love that this is being addressed. Encouraging food production in city could be a good next step for coming issues as well.</p>
<p>Turf should be limited to 20% of the landscaped area. Pervious paving should be required. Encourage water collection systems for reuse of rainwater (rainwater collection) Plants that are poisonous to wildlife (Japanese Yew) should be prohibited! (Deer, elk, antelope are all threatened . . .) Native plants that feed our wildlife should be encouraged (birds . . .) Require irrigation systems for all new development to ensure effective use of water. Consider using recaptured water for use in all irrigation systems (California has done this for years). Encourage planting and use of native species that are naturally drought-tolerant. Require that all development landscape plans be reviewed and approved by a landscape architect. It is not necessary to limit the use of water features! Simply require that they be designed with recirculating pumps to re-use the water.</p>
<p>Implement eco roofs on new builds - or make new builds have rain water harvesting abilities</p>
<p>Keep the real green</p>
<p>Find an incentive to do this for homeowners used to other types of yards</p>
<p>Promoting the importance of using native plants to enhance Idaho's natural beauty. Perhaps offering clipping/starts of native plants.</p>
<p>Again, this needs a community intervention to accompany the change, especially in a culture that has operated as a person's land is his/her/their castle....anything goes. No more, if we want to survive. Large existing developments need to undergo change as part of the roll out of this new concept. Grass has no place in the high desert. Require phased change in every development in the city for water conservation. Refill the aquifer.</p>
<p>When you start deciding how much lawn people can have... or limit their ability to have a pond or fountain you are approaching totalitarianism. This is the City of Trees ... we love our landscaping.</p>
<p>Allow vegetable gardens and orchard trees in front yards, raised beds with drip irrigation, removal of grass in the parking stops between sidewalk and road</p>
<p>Maybe instead of grass percent of area, it could be an absolute value, like "grass may not exceed 500 ft^2"</p>
<p>Prohibiting invasive plants is obviously a good step - how are you going to enforce it? Limiting water features is also good. The grass area shouldn't be a percentage, it should be a value. 33% of two acres might be too much, 33% of an eighth of an acre is tiny.</p>
<p>also limit the plants that kill deer</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	If the city wants to implement these kinds of measures on city property and around city-owned buildings, fine. Otherwise, steer clear of telling property owners what kinds of landscaping they must have or may not have. Implementing an "environmentally friendly" agenda and forcing it upon private property owners is not the job of the city government, or any government for that matter. That is way too intrusive.
	I would like to see WAY more of this in Boise. There should be limits to how much grass and inefficient landscaping you can have. I think restrictions on commercial properties should be even more stringent. In my neighborhood, there is a ton of unusable landscaping that requires tons of water each year. It seems like a total waste.
	Many wood mulches are environmentally negative. It is NOT the role of the city to determine what kind of landscaping is being done as long as it is not trashy.
	I love this idea. Best idea (besides simplifying the code) in the updates. I think the best choice is to include it and make zoning adjustments, if any or needed as a whole. I really dislike exemptions and this would probably be the most exempted item.
	Vote out whomever is coming up with this shit.
	Include flowering plants in design, use drip irrigation, reduce/eliminate round-up and other pesticides. I think the traditional landscape model with lots of sparse ground can be changed up - more plants and shrubs planted closer together. That creates more pollinator habitat, crowds out weeds, and looks more naturalized/less sterile. It can still be water-wise if you use drought-tolerant plants and drip irrigation. More plants also shade the soil to bring temperatures down and reduce evaporation.
	Generally I agree. Boise is in a high desert environment and conserving water is good planning.
	They seem superficial
	City-wide law(s) to override HOA rules for lawns, etc. Traditional grass lawns are wasteful and do not encourage native horticulture & species.
	Recognition to sustainable homes/neighborhoods. Encourage/facilitate HOAs to reduce unused grass areas to more sustainable vegetation.
	Landscape requirements are going way outside the scope of City government. Market forces will make developers create visually appealing structures, and nobody can make owners maintain the landscape, fences, etc. poorly maintained facilities will look bad no matter what.
	I honestly don't know
	Require trees and other landscaping that produce oxygen for the planet.
	I don't necessarily agree with limiting water features. Some fountains (like I have in my back yard) recycle the water and I do not have to replenish very often.
	less grass unless it is fake grass
	Yes with an exclamation point but even grass for 33% is too irrigation demanding.
	Use drought friendly plants, ground cover, not more cement.
	Consider the City of Boise leading the way by reducing the amount of turf at city parks, using xeriscaping and drought-tolerant plants.
	Make sure any watering that is done is done during the early morning hours. I hate passing businesses that are watering in the heat of the day. It's a waste of water.
	I like this plan.
	Concern that limiting grass will affect drainage and run-off, if not off-set by additional xeriscaping and other low-water landscaping. Too much hard-scaping (pavement, etc.) exacerbates the problem, as does building to minimum setbacks that leave no room for mature trees in the future.
	Don't make Boise a sea of sod even if it's water reduced sod. REQUIRE native plants and force developers and new homeowners to install 30% xeric plants not just sod. Look to bend Oregon for guidance. THE WORD ENCOURAGE IN GUIDANCE MEANS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING.
	Great idea. Encouraging more xeriscaping is awesome! We should look into making the "Goat head" aka Tribulus terrestris plant an invasive species that requires homeowners to get rid of or face a penalty. This plant is rampant in Idaho / northwest and the sharp seeds that fall from the plants cause many flat tires for bicyclists and sharp pricklers for dogs. The Boise bike project has advocacy programs against this plant because it is so bad here and discourages cycling when people repeatedly get flat tires biking around.
	Will there be a specific list of invasive plants? Some items at local nurseries could be considered invasive? Almost all of our landscaping in this city is non-native.
	Please ban HOAs from requiring grass. Don't ban waterfalls.
	If there's a way to allow xeriscaping that precludes the need/requirement for irrigation would also be better for the environment
	Limit turf sports fields.
	Except for the grass. Grass can be an important flexible outdoor space, I think you should encourage drought tolerant (possibly native) grasses instead. Other landscaping plants take a lot of water too.
	Eliminate the use of water features based upon the reduced amount of water available for other essential uses. Water features are not essential or environmentally friendly.
	Change the intended result and we can chat. Increasing the cost of water for landscaping will drive the landscaping to what is more environmentally acceptable.
	"Yes," but with a caveat. Water fountains, etc., can improve the aesthetics of a development, if done within accepted environmental 'best practices.'
	Developers could care less about environment.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Boise's code enforcement system for the Central Bench area residents is practically nonexistent. Educate, enforce and provide incentives for clean up of trashy properties and monitor neighborhoods in lieu of putting burden on homeowners to police each other.
Promoting environmental stewardship = Leaving A2 Permanent open space coded land alone. This proposed changes mean nothing, if you keep building on land specified to be permanent open space.
The real way to promote environmental stewardship is to limit population growth. Also, we live in a high desert area. We should use native plants that can survive in our environment, but most people would view that sort of landscaping as very ugly.
You will force much hated HOAs on everyone!
Again, it is important to maintain existing trees for shade and privacy.
Well done. I would reduce the grass to 25% maybe even less. With climate change and continuing drought conditions in our future, water shouldn't be wasted on turf.
Should be for commercial spaces only
No.
More native plants could be used too. Less watering of grass and plants. By using plants that are meant for this area then less water will be used.
Give discounts to construction that uses native plants, solar and other environmentally friendly landscape
Gras is awful! This is great.
Limiting the types of plants to ones that grow well here in a high desert in public streets and landscaping buffers will help in that plants will be healthier and grow better. They'll less maintenance and will act as better buffers and screens.
Provide city resources (free mulch, planting plans, etc) to help people transition to drought friendly landscaping.
I would love to see this zeroscaping!! I think people feel like because their neighbors have a green yard, they have to as well even if they wouldn't want to.
The city should not dictate what anyone chooses to plant in their own yard.
It will work if the city stops giving out variances to every builder who asks.
Encourage food producing perennial plants such as chestnuts and elderberries.
Limit lawns even more. Provide funding or incentives for existing homes to convert lawn to xeriscape.
Quit stealing our water for transplants and let us enjoy the community we have had for the last 75 years.
This is a great idea.
These regulations need to be required for all buildings not just residences. And should be retroactive to existing homes.
I think some kind of incentive to xeriscape or plant drought tolerant plants, etc. might be more effective than restrictive zoning.
Less cement/pavement areas. More natural protected paths.
Maybe? Focus on more native plants, stop allowing subdivisions with covenants to require lawns and allow for more eco friendly options. Plant native species and allow for a more wild look.
Allow an exception if served by an existing canal or lateral. Canal irrigation is different from using city water.
Provide tax break for "above the code" construction that provides the desired result.
I would appreciate guidance from the city on the best environmental practices with landscaping.
I like this change and thinks it's very feasible.
This is unnecessary, but still a nice idea. Suez already has access to cheap and accessible additional water supplies, so municipal water supplies will remain cheap well into the future. If people want to spend their own money for their lawn, whatever, that can be addresses with higher prices if we ever need to implement demand management for water.
This is arbitrary. Why not require astroturf? If you're really worried about the environment require a certain amount of plants per lot.
I think property owners should be allowed to do what they want with their property. If they want greater than 33% grass, and it is their property, they should be allowed to do that - at their cost, of course. Please consider recycled water irrigation for Boise.
YES Also, could we try to make the landscape near the freeway exits on the bench less disappointing? Some native, drought tolerant plants like sagebrush, rabbit brush, stuff like that could be nice.
I think grass is a wasteful use of water and have converted most of my yard to xeriscape. Nonetheless, I think a cap on lawn size seems too heavy-handed.
Prevent plantings which are toxic to wildlife, incentivize plantings that provide habitat for native wildlife and birds
Allow the use of trees to provide shade / reduce evaporation for grass and water works. Allow more water features if they recirculate their supply.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	But why are you encouraging more people to live here if water is a problem? Sounds like CA, where they complain people use too much water but they keep building more to encourage people to live there. Stop building if you don't have adequate water.
	If people have already landscaped their property allowing them to be grandfathered in. Having to re-landscape would be very costly for owners.
	Allow water features if they promote symbiotic support for native aquatic, avian and game species.
	Limit population and building. The exponential growth is the problem.
	Even though I said yes a good example of how hard this can be is the lawsuit out there now that is trying to get artificial grass removed from a house because the neighbors don't like it.
	I like the idea of using non invasive plants. We need to use more evergreens and such to keep things alive and green all year. Less leaves to invade other yards and to upkeep.... but definitely need green spaces and include walking paths.
	Again, probably, but I think that determination should be for the individual, not the city. If someone wants to xeriscape, great. We shouldn't be forced to.
	Anything that can be done to discourage the planting of water thirsty turf is a win!
	Stop the building. Leave open spaces like we have and more parks.
	STOP ALLOWING HOAs TO TELL PEOPLE WHAT THEY CAN AND CANT PLANT. To protect Idaho's water, we need to be as conscientious as we possibly can about planting drought resistant native plants.
	This is not a place for regulation. Are people going to be punished for installing a fountain? This is absurd
	Solar panel discounts
	Who is determining that mulch is discouraging weed growth? I got mulch installed by a professional landscaper 2 years ago and now I weed my yard more than ever. Encouraging Xeriscaping and limiting grass is a great idea, but fr site your claims.
	Less grass lawns and start teaching people properly how to develop a great landscape using a lot less water .
	Xeriscaping is hideous, low-budget and reminds me of trailer parks. I don't agree with how it looks and it takes away from the beauty of green landscape.
	Let us be free and stop regulating everything
	I think increasing the cost of water will do a lot for landscaping choices. most water features is have seen recycle the same water.
	Initiative for native plants with educational signs about them. We live in a desert, let's own it.
	I would love to see front yard food production and fruit trees encouraged over lawns and ornamental plants in City's code, and that HOA's be encouraged to allow their neighborhoods to follow suit. Quality of life is greatly enhanced through a connection to nature's cycles and meaning in life is deepened through meaningful work - such as growing a garden. Many homes with tiny lots especially find that only the front yard receives enough sun to sustain vegetables and fruits, and freedom to dispense with the traditional (and useless) grass lawn in favor of garden boxes and mulched pathways would be a beautiful way to improve neighborhoods and be in line with Boise's values of environmental and human stewardship.
	With the recent increase in wildfires affecting urban/suburban communities, you really need to re-think the use of mulches. They have been shown to trap smoldering fire brands from wildfires which in turn can burn down homes. ALL landscape designs need to follow firewire landscaping. As a botanist who is concerned about invasive plants and water evaporation, I'm now more concerned about effects of climate change on wildfire risk to housing communities. See https://www.ijpr.org/wildfire/2021-09-08/the-alme-da-fire-one-year-later as just one example of what can happen, especially to low income housing.
	I don't like the sound of the way this is going. Why limit grass? Greenery and water places add such beauty to a community. Trees and shrubs shade, add texture and beauty,, connect people to nature, improving oxygen and creating unique places to live, instead of living like a robot in a row of boxes
	ensure that landscape companies install projects appropriately. Often the installation is poor to begin with
	Grass is one of the WORST landscaping tools ever. I'd love to see more extreme verbiage on curbing mowed grass in our city. Also landscaping to protect fire prone areas is incredibly important to consider. Tax kick backs for this approach, 100%.
	Definitely encourage xeriscaping and drought resistant landscaping. I'm not sure how a recirculating water feature is unfriendly to the environment. Water sounds are soothing and block noise pollution. This, creating less stress. Denser populations lead to more stress amongst neighbors which leads to conflict. Adequate parking, landscaping, and fences help alleviate conflict.
	Bottom line-less grass and trees and more cement and buildings is a negative. Read Telemere effect for scientific proof of this.
	Only if the xeriscaping is done well and kept up. I have seen too many landscaped done with this that become overgrown and infested with weeds.
	maybe in the areas where the City is responsible. you will never be able to regulate this when it comes to developers.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>These seem a bit extreme if for the individual home owner- while grass can be a high water user- xeric plants can take some work to maintain- more than grass- I suspect people will neglect areas not in grass, leading to bare ground, weeds, etc. if this comes with education and support during transitions, it is a fine idea, I just worry it will be challenging to implement and enforce.</p>
	<p>I think we need to move to imposing city regulations on water use and limiting lawns. The snow pack has gotten so low, we are heading in the direction of California drought wise. If you could impose lack of lawns in certain new developments, that might help with our water crisis.</p>
	<p>The more I read through these proposals, the more I see an agenda. Stop, just stop!</p>
	<p>Leave the water features out</p>
	<p>Make sure that xeriscaping is defined so we don't end up with expansive areas of crushed rock and gravel devoid of vegetation. The definition of invasive plants is very tricky. The city will need to develop a specific list and update it regularly. Also the requiring that any seed mixes used by developers are certified weed free is essential. How about promoting the use of drip irrigation? Prohibit use of wood mulches around structures in foothills and foothill adjacent areas.</p>
	<p>Some plants labeled as invasive are actually herbs and emergency food. Purslane, for example is fire wise **We need fire wise landscaping. It's edible and it prevents weeds. So many things are helpful, but it requires a change in how we look at things. We need Regenerative Landscape designers on the planning committee.</p>
	<p>Absolutely do this, and more. There is no reason a home with a larger plot, say comprised of 3 buildable lots, should have the loophole of allowance for 33% grass, meaning an entire lot size worth, in this instance. The city's goal of carbon neutral by 2050 (I think that's the date) in accordance with the fed's own date is just too late. We should strive to be carbon neutral by 2030 and be the first to do it. Why not be a city of environmental distinction?</p>
	<p>I am okay with this, so long as we continue to be the City of Trees and make sure those trees have water.</p>
	<p>Wasting water is a morally unjust thing during a drought, but I think the 33% regulation on grass is a bit too excessive. We aren't Arizona for crying out loud.</p>
	<p>Less landscaping is not desirable, we need more landscaping. I am so tired of the approval of parking lots with buildings, with just token landscaping.</p>
	<p>You are going in the wrong direction you are trying to make this great state like California</p>
	<p>Landscaping is an important way to make people feel better. This needs to be encouraged not discouraged.</p>
	<p>Do not limit grass to allow developers to build more buildings. If the developers want to install water features for the public to enjoy and enhance the property, let them do it.</p>
	<p>Perhaps the city could require certain species of grasses known to be drought tolerant where appropriate similar to how certain species of street trees are required.</p>
	<p>I am a landscaper by trade and xeriscaping can be very complicated and look horrible if not done correctly. It can be very hard to maintain. Growing veggies in boxes in a front yard can use the same amount of water as a xeric yard, if on a drip system, and be much easier to maintain. Adding some flowers encourages nature, pollinators, and more, so I think you should allow more than just xeric or you will have some pretty ugly and unmanageable, useless projects to contend with. Let's encourage sustainability!!! That is your ticket to offsetting climate change.</p>
	<p>Let people do as they wish with their property and only require the minimum: shoveling sidewalks, etc.</p>
	<p>I like this but The did % is too high. The only sod that should be allowed is drought tolerant grasses. Also there needs to be regulations requiring minimum tree planting. Something along the lines of no less than x trees per x space.</p>
	<p>Encourage rooftop landscaping to grow more plants</p>
	<p>We're the City of Trees. We must have lots of trees and lots of areas for landscaping. Think smart and low water, sure, but make sure that there is still lots of landscaping and bushes and trees and flowers.</p>
	<p>Grass needs to be limited further (but 33% is a great start). What a waste of precious water. Our yard is 90% grass and we can't afford to rip it out but the water use pains us. To see new builds or renovations just throw in a yard full of sod is such a waste.</p>
	<p>Less regulation less public employees would be good for Boise</p>
	<p>I agree. However many xeriscaping requires weed killers which are bad for our environment and health. I doubt you could control the use of it or oversee the use of thicker mulch. Not to mention the protection of our bees.</p>
	<p>There should also be planting restrictions in high wildfire risk areas as well, if there are not already. E.g. new plantings of flammable plants identified by the fire department are prohibited in the WUI</p>
	<p>As much as I love seeing the greenery, we cannot keep up with the amount of water wasted on watering lawns</p>
	<p>Include trees as a landscaping requirement. This would have so many benefits to human health and climate as they provide shaded areas for walking/pedestrian activity, clean the air, and reduce heat island effects/temperature, etc.</p>
	<p>all of this xeriscaping in a city paved within an inch of its life sure will help.</p>
	<p>This is a good start - we could encourage more rainwater collection, food production and native landscapes</p>
	<p>Prices should dictate what people spend on their property and discourage from using water. Arbitrary rules on what you can do on your own property is frustrating.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>More trees!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Fruit trees!!!!!! Gardens in easements! We have enough water, we just shouldn't waste what we have on grass!</p>
<p>Try getting every nursery, landscaping business, and yard maintenance company in Boise to sign onto these standards. You won't be able to do it. We can't even get local arborists and the flood of newcomers to the North End to even respect our existing tree cutting ordinance and regulations. (Even our mayor sanctioned the illegal tree cutting on Harrison Boulevard this past Christmas for the state Christmas tree.) So regulations on invasive plants and limitations on grass may be good in theory, unattainable in practice.</p>
<p>What is Boise thinking? You are trying to ruin what makes our city great. Limiting grass? and how can you regulate if a property owner wants to beautify their property with water features?</p>
<p>Boise is a desert! Limit the use of grass. This doesn't mean it has to all be dirt/rocks. Low water, regional plantings still look great and lush, and can greatly reduce the strain on water usage as more people move in and need water. Please ask for not just landscape architects input, but also landscape designers, Botanical Gardens, local nurseries.</p>
<p>By reducing green mass you contribute to more heat soak in dense urban areas, which increases energy usage and reduces air quality. Boise isn't Phoenix where xeriscape is necessitated. Plant more trees & shrubs, not less.</p>
<p>Especially if increased urban density is the goal--unless you intend to build more neighborhood parks next door as well, which would of course undermine the goals of density and environmental stewardship--you need to allow for better balance between how open spaces are capable of being/ expected to be used. What happened to Boise being about "livability" and being "the most livable city"? That is why we're all here. That is, xeriscaping requirements may make sense for some strips of land, but what about more trees (shade) that people can sit under? If we're going to have fewer local parks, what about requiring businesses to maintain small-scale park-like green spaces available for public use? THAT is Boise. We may be a high desert, but we're also no Phoenix, AZ.</p>
<p>No grass!</p>
<p>The city should have checkboxes on the permit process and follow up with irrigation districts to see if surface water (canals, ditches, laterals, etc.) are available on the proposed development site. Idaho code requires new developments to use surface water. The city should follow this code through implementation, inspections, withholding C of A, etc. to make sure it gets done. The fruit is hanging so low on this that it's dragging in the water and it's the most ignored sustainable feature we have in the valley.</p>
<p>We live in a desert. This is a common sense regulation. Fully support!</p>
<p>Other cities that have done this have created arid spaces without shade that aren't used especially in summer. Water features are attractive and out healthy ions into the air. The City of Trees should have more mature shade trees.</p>
<p>outlaw grass and only allow native landscapes</p>
<p>I WOULD BE MORE INTERESTED IN SUGGESTING PEOPLE PLANT POLLINATOR PLANTS, PLANTS GOOD FOR BIRDS BEFORE THE SUGGESTIONS ABOVE. ALSO, WHAT HAPPENED TO STRONGLY ENCOURAGING PEOPLE TO STOP USING POISONS THAT RUN IN TO OUR RIVER?</p>
<p>It's unfortunate that this is probably the right way forward (considering water needs in Boise) but I personally prefer lots of greenery and open space.</p>
<p>Provide tax incentives for reduced water use</p>
<p>This is an excellent idea.</p>
<p>If we must do these things maybe it's clear evidence you ought NOT allow so much building????</p>
<p>I think Boise City needs to be careful about limiting fountains and waterfalls until it does a better job of offering more accessible & safe water features in its parks. The city of Bourdeaux has an amazing water feature along the river that brings the community together for picnics, cooling off, etc.</p>
<p>I think we also need t pause on the development of the land in the foothills. We are displacing many natural inhabitants and destroying pure land. There has been an increase in deer wandering through the city looking for food. We are doing that to them by taking over their land. Our city has grown enough and I think it's time we focus on meeting the needs of what we have instead of developing/building more.</p>
<p>ugly</p>
<p>Provide a financial subsidy or kickback for existing Boise residents to also comply.</p>
<p>Drought-resistant Shade trees throughout the city and improved riparian habitat along the Boise River. Pollinator habitats are also very important</p>
<p>Prohibit planting of plants toxic to wildlife, such as Japanese yew, and include firewise practices in the wildland/urban interface.</p>
<p>prohibit private pools given that climate change is going to create more problems with our water supply</p>
<p>This will barely move the needle. But it's not bad! The most environmentally friendly thing you could do is to allow neighborhood- oriented development again so people don't have to drive everywhere.</p>
<p>Remove irrigation mandate</p>
<p>Have more sections throughout the city dedicated to plants like the rose garden. We need more of that in our lives</p>
<p>Unsure but makes for very ugly city</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

These aren't 'encouraging' environmentally friendly practices, they will mandate them. Idaho is all about outdoor people which includes plants, trees, water etc..... limiting any of that for hard scape is a huge error.
Good ideas. But don't get rid of fountains and water features. They are nice for mental health. Also don't encourage plastic turf. Grass is nice.
Can drip systems be given some sort of boost when planning or zoning a property? And can slowing water in appropriate areas be encouraged to allow infiltration?
More solar opportunities in design
Why does the planning dept of the city of boise think it has a right to tell someone how much grass they can have? Or the size or number of water features they can have? Mind your own business. People can come to these solutions on their own, once they start paying for the upkeep and then decide what they are willing to install and maintain.
Great idea!
LOVE THIS
People should be able to plant as much grass as they want and are willing to pay to water. Kids need grass to play and get outside.
Are these environmental friendly standards? These are water conversation standards, and while that serves to help minimize the use of water resources, there is an argument that increasing vegetation with more trees and shrubs helps improve tree canopy and this is also environmentally friendly. Irrigation would be needed to achieve that goal. So not exactly sure what environmental stewardship these standards are achieving?
I value this, but it is a drastic change. The only concern I would have is related to trees, I hope the planting of trees remains important
you cannot force people to change their landscaping through regulation or mandate. they have to be educated on alternatives and see financial reasons to make a change. all these changes would do is create bad feelings between neighbors.
Is this just for new development or any size? I'm a little confused on the audience.How will this be monitored or enforced?
Underwrite plant costs or subsidize growers of desired plant species.
I personally feel both yes and no on this one. No doubt, our aquifer is disappearing and we are in a drought that is likely to only continue to get worse, especially with Zuckerberg moving part of his empire into Kuna to better line his pockets with Idaho's cheap power. So yes, drought-tolerant landscaping is probably wise for Treasure Valley residents. However, reducing the amount of water that we put into the land creates a hotter, drier microclimate which then pushes the drought a bit further along. An unfortunate catch-22: putting more water into the ground helps reduce the effects of droughts, but we're in a drought because we're already struggling to get enough water to put into the ground. I don't know what the best solution could be, but I worry that reducing grass coverage will increase ground evaporation, bake the soil into unusable hardpack, and snow-ball the overall dryness/drought conditions.
No
Allow for gardens, especially to grow food, in place of lawns.
We need mandated vegetable and fruit gardens, and BEES that do NOT get sprayed with pesticides!! Remember—we're all broke because of the property taxes? Feed us, Boise!
This is great
Yes. Encourage planting of native plants not just drought tolerant commercial plants.
Ppl like grassy areas to sit, play and get out of their houses...why would you make ppl not be able to enjoy that aspect of high density living. lets not go all concert and mulch.
Impossible to enforce. (Think about the recently failed attempt to stop the use of deer-killing yew plants in Boise.) There is a big difference between a small burbling garden fountain and a pond. Xeriscaping, a great idea, is not the same as mulching, and does not necessarily call for mulching. Incentives, such as a water bill rebate, for planting desert yards might work better than this regulation.
Some of these are but the use of recirculating pumps and low water grasses can meet this standard with out harsh restrictions on % of area planted in grass/turf.
Great
Teach renters, homeowners how to WISELY, and EFFECTIVELY water (lawns do not need to be watered everyday!)
Again, context is key. If you dictate specific types of landscaping you may end up creating heat islands, and not allow enough greenspace in areas where parks, community gardens, or other types of social spaces are limited. Engage neighborhood associations to have meetings to help plan better development. And please leave open areas for urban farms and wildlife.
Require more xeriscaping and less parking.
Landscaping with less water use is a prudent idea.
Create a booklet of recommended designs, material, plants, etc.. and mail it to all citizens
Limiting fountains and ponds reduces water for birds, animals. Recirculating waterfalls/ponds saves water and provides for animal life.
I assume the requirement applies to new construction. This type of landscape renovation for an existing home is very expensive.
Control weeds but don't limit grass

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Impose fines for those who don't comply. Offer grants/free design/help to those who want to convert
Make sure new code allows for these environmental controls to be applied to existing HOAs CCandRs that prohibit such practices
We're a desert. All for this.
Invasive plants should come with penalties!
Who's going to do the maintenance? this is just the start, someone has to pull weeds and keep things up.
Not all xeriscaping is attractive. Lawns encourage outdoor activities for kids and families. A gathering place for neighbors and friends. Just because we are high desert doesn't mean our yards have to look like deserts. I hope you have included landscape architects in the planning process.
Require new tree or mitigation for each new ADU
DOGS! People have dogs. Lots of people have dogs. They need the grass. Kids need grass to play in. This is the part, "Limit grass to 33% of the landscaped area," I am talking about.
Limit grass areas even more for "ornamental" landscaping. Grass should be reserved for park and activity areas only, and discouraged entirely from areas where it does not actively serve a purpose. This will reduce pesticides, water use, and increase space for beneficial flora and fauna.
Limit the amount of money made from grass/pesticide sales
All that will happen is the conserved water will then be sold when more houses are built. You want to conserve, stop building houses. Stop subsidizing large families by taking away tax exemptions/credits for more than 2 children.
Is this really the business of government? Sheesh.
Absolutely! Thank you for making this change, particularly as the west will continue to face water issues.
I am a botanist by training and the best possible landscaping requirement is plant natives!!! Native plants are already drought tolerant, often have limited maintenance required, and provide important ecological services to insects and wildlife like birds. Plus they are beautiful and would give Boise a deep sense of place. After all, the Snake River Plain ecosystem is one-of-a-kind, and it's part of the unique story of Boise. In an era of increasing ecological degradation, sustaining and promoting native ecosystems, even if they are as small as a median in the road, as much as possible. Every flower counts for bees and butterflies, and healthy pollinators means everybody benefits.
Drip irrigation and spray heads only when necessary.
Will help to reduce water consumption because in 10 years at the current consumption we are going to be with out water. Quit being friendly to developers.
Good ideas!
LEED
This MUST happen to conserve water.
As long as the remaining 67% of the landscape is not concrete or similar 'dead' ground cover.
This will likely work. I do wonder, however, how this will work for those who are rich enough to subvert the guidance, regulations, and rules. Will there be enforcement? If so, who will enforce this? The city has a poor track record with enforcement in the way of historic preservation, in particular. And while design review tends to be pointed, what's stopping someone from NOT abiding by these proposed regulations? This needs to be spelled out in the code or else it creates an unfair set of standards that will likely be most notable in the Northend and Eastend neighborhoods compared to all others.
Adding to this, access to compostable areas in more neighborhoods in Boise would absolutely promote environmental stewardship.
The answer is yes, but I don't like the wording of the question. Would water features add to quality of life? Yes. Especially for those who do not live right next to the river or foothills. I think about communities like the one right by the Bethine Church River Trail with their wonderful lush grass and ponds. Personally, I think the main things that would be most helpful but still allow freedom in ideas and creating amazing communities are to try to use grass varieties that use less water and to try to minimize invasive species.
I guess the least you can do is plant some little drought friendly flowers since there probably isn't gonna be much water left now that the Californians have it in abundance. I literally heard a Californian on an airplane right next to be say that he loves living in Idaho because he can use as much water as he wants. Way to think ahead!
The city has no right to tell home owners if they can install a pond or not. Concentrate on staying out of peoples lives and stop trying to regulate everything people do!
Add trees
Unless this will be required of schools, churches, and golf courses, this is puts the burden on home owners and smaller properties.
it would be great to educate the public on beautiful xeriscape and incentives to neighborhoods that create Xenical common areas
these a typical minimum criteria, but should not be all inclusive. The plan should fit the location, development and existing conditions/developments
Allow fake grass
Stop trying to infringe on the rights of property owners. Are you trying to re-create Portland in Boise?

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Fuels need to be reduced, lest Boise go up in smoke. This includes wooden fences, coniferous trees, junk, outbuildings, and shake roofs,
Grass limits no more the 10% area.
Makes sense given drought conditions in recent years
No, stay out of regulation of personal property landscaping.
Water restriction on lawns to even or odd days based on address number.
Idaho does not have a water shortage. In fire prone areas there should be appropriate landscaping but in downtown dense areas there should be no landscaping restrictions.
Allow the trees to get tall to shade our parking spaces and parking lots, that will cut down on the heat. That's why Phoenix is so hot to this day.
Hardscapes should be utilized too along with zero maintenance scapes.
Wouldn't specifying and water-resistant native trees help this, too?
A step in the right direction and curved beak encouraged for existing developments. Not forced on existing developments, required only on new.
Though I understand the extreme importance of water in this desert climate, I think a city loses a lot of character when we take away the water fountains and any water features. It's a known fact that cool calm places with water calms people down and that is what is needed in the heart of any city. don't pass the buck onto the small municipality, They are not the biggest users of water, look to who uses irrigation ir to power their meta-plants, whatever product they are growing or selling
Stop all the "climate change" bullshit
YES!! I've been hoping for requirements for xeriscaping/lawn reduction. This is hard to do in established neighborhoods, but is easy to just require new developments to do. City of Boise needs to do the same for public spaces - medians, non-recreation (parks) areas.
Eliminate grass. Move away from 1950's lawns. Increase and encourage trees.
Perma bark (rock mulch) leads to climate change/warming and should be discouraged or regulated
I would LOVE to xeriscape my yard but it's prohibited by the HOA. I think pushing for xeriscaping is the right thing to do. Is there anything you could do about HOAs not allowing you to do xeriscaping? :)
Let people build without setbacks and have the city implement its policies in nearby parks.
No more grass. We live in a desert and should ONLY plant native plants. Golf courses? Huge water sucker.
N/A to lengthy to state.
Continue to explore natural, low water grasses and trees
No this is a good idea! More parks though please
Water restrictions for landscaping should be implemented. Odd numbered addresses water on odd days of the month, even numbered days water on even days of the month. Landscape watering should be restricted during the summer to before 10am and after 8pm to prevent evaporation during the hottest hours of the day.
I am fully in support of these regulations, but I don't think they go far enough. I would like to see more incentives for xenoscaping/going grass-less, but I don't know if that would be in the regulations or through legislation or city council or what. A small tax break maybe for going that direction?
If people want grass, they shouldn't be limited to 33%. Boise gets windy and if you have open areas of dirt it gets into the air. Maybe give people an incentive, but don't require it.
Same as above. Not the City's business
Reducing grass and increasing native plants is always good in a desert environment.
I think there should be an option for folks to utilize more than 33% of their area as grass (For example our landscape area is probably 66% grass but that's because we have a large yard for the dog and future kids, with no parks nearby.)
Yes, let's do it! We live in a high desert climate!!!
Great idea ... we attempted to zero scape our front yard to reduce the need to irrigate but our neighborhood assoc. said no.
I would reduce the grass to not > 25%.
Is it possible to encourage the use of permeable pavers or other types of surface treatment that help to filter and clean water (particularly that polluted by oil and gasoline runoff from the traffic). What about prohibiting dangerous chemical/pesticide treatments e.g. roundup?
Too much govt control. I doubt it would stop with encouragement and expect it would deteriorate into mandates.
Promote transition between existing and new landscaping to encourage adoption of water wise design in older neighborhoods.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Yes they promote that, but you shouldn't have a rule here one way or another. I had no idea this was even a rule... must not be enforced outside the downtown liberal zone. Limit grass? GOML city you have parks everywhere... No Pond? GOML city I've slept the night in CW Moore park and your fountain is wonderful. Prohibit invasive plants... seems fair and a BLM issue. My neighbor zeroscaped last year... good for them! They want a pool in the back now... seems like a weird balance equation.. but good for you!</p>
<p>home owners should be free to choose their own landscaping</p>
<p>I'm not familiar with the requirement to include trees in landscaping. Adding more trees to landscaping makes communities cooler in the summer and could make an area feel more lush, since you are asking landscapers to reduce the amount of grass.</p>
<p>improvements...water reuse should be a priority</p>
<p>limiting water features in a desert will negatively impact wildlife. recirculatory water features are a benefit.</p>
<p>Provide incentives for existing or neighboring developments to "retrofit" these new standards, providing uniformity and additional savings of water, etc.</p>
<p>the reality is we need more water with more growth and live in a desert-this should have been a concern years ago</p>
<p>Give tax breaks for faux lawns, they are getting better and better quality.</p>
<p>Subsidize or create low cost xeriscaping ideas.</p>
<p>encourage and make it easier for folks to raise their own food even in small spaces</p>
<p>How will this be enforced in existing neighborhoods with HOA's that specifically prohibit many of these features?</p>
<p>Freedom trumps eco enforcement. Offer incentives for desired results, not mandates.</p>
<p>Are you really trying to tell us what we can plant in our own yards. You aren't even thinking about what this explosive growth is going to our water supply police and public needs. All you are seeing is \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$</p>
<p>Not really yes, because inventing developers to have more size or less parking because they are solar conscious or water wise keeps trading off more and more quality of life for what winds up being a small gain. Think about a tall building getting incentives for this, while the houses next to them could wind up being shadowed so they then get little sun or solar benefit.</p>
<p>enforcement?</p>
<p>This is one of the good changes I see in the plan. Help the environment by realistic goals. This has done well in other cities also to reduce water usage.</p>
<p>I don't think limiting fountains, waterfalls, and ponds on private property is appropriate. Limiting on larger commercial areas maybe- golf courses, apartment complexes, office complexes.</p>
<p>Teach and encourage rather than regulate. People want to help. Help then.</p>
<p>All I see is a concrete jungle and more air pollution</p>
<p>I think it is appropriate to encourage this but not make it mandatory.</p>
<p>Xeriscape = yes, it is ridiculous to require lawn in yards these days. How about investing in a city wide recycled water system for landscaping??? How about providing residences with rainwater collection systems either above ground or underground instead of seepage beds? Water features are wonderful and should use recycled water / filtration systems.</p>
<p>Unless there are regulations about the amount of concrete that can be used, these requirements will have the opposite or a negated effect. How about requiring more trees (shade) vs. concrete (boiling heat).</p>
<p>emphasize native bird-friendly plants</p>
<p>I think they go too far with the limit at 33% of grass. 50% would be better.</p>
<p>NO lawns!</p>
<p>In general, do not support more regulation.</p>
<p>Sounds hotter actually if people landscape with rocks. Could be really ugly.</p>
<p>Flexible options for people. Types of grass that require less water, etc...</p>
<p>I would question the water features limitation. Hopefully, it concerns features that require high water use, not the typical small backyard fountain. Those can be great attractions for birds and help mask the sound of nearby traffic. Otherwise, I think it's a great approach.</p>
<p>I think people in Idaho will use the very last drop of water in a drought to try and save their lawns, so no.</p>
<p>So now people cannot have a fountain or pond Awesome.</p>
<p>Encourage existing homes to install desert landscape with tax or monetary incentives.</p>
<p>Prohibit non-native plants. Even native plants can be invasive.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>I believe enough is being done to save water or energy. This is a critical issue in Boise. I want solar cells but I don't want to depend on rich outsiders to control my roof. People water their lawns as much as they want all over the place. I have lots of weeds due to the big development taking over my lot.</p> <p>Mandate native plants for landscaping</p> <p>Existing homes should be grandfathered. Consideration should be given to providing incentives for xeriscaping and other improvements besides saving on watering costs.</p> <p>No more grass , only dry scape with drip for bushes like Harris Ranch</p> <p>I do not agree with limiting waterfalls and ponds</p> <p>Small scale water features can provide wildlife habitat and likely don't pose a problem in terms of water usage. Pools yes, fountains no. Very much support xeric and native landscaping portion.</p> <p>Enforce the rules</p> <p>People plant what they want.</p> <p>Reduce % of grass even further. Given our drought conditions 33% grass is still way too much.</p> <p>Good luck getting people to give up lawns</p>
<p>"The draft introduces new screening requirements for both rooftop and ground-mounted mechanical and utility equipment. See examples below.</p> <p>The standards for roof-mounted equipment require the equipment (i) not be visible from 5 feet above ground on any lot line and adjacent public rights-of-way or open spaces OR (ii) be hidden from view using an enclosure that is designed to match the front of the primary building.</p> <p>The standards for ground-mounted equipment require that equipment located within view of public and open spaces blend into the overall site and architectural design using a decorative wall, fence, or enclosure and/or landscaping that is tall enough and solid enough to conceal the equipment.</p> <p>These regulations are found in Section 11-04-08.10.D(4) and the (cross-referenced) Citywide Design Standards.</p> <p>Do you think the proposed changes make a meaningful contribution to achieving the city's goal of improving the look and feel of new developments?</p> <p>Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?"</p>	<p>I believe this improves the look of things, however feel funds should be used in other ways of improvement first, ie. building maintenance/updating oldoutdated equipment to more energy efficient options, etc.</p> <p>I wonder if there's a risk that children, pets, wildlife could get trapped in the enclosures.</p> <p>I get why this is in place, but it only encourages more resource use - i.e., it takes concrete and metal to create these structures, which are directly related to climate change to produce them. So this actively goes against the city's goals to reduce reliance on fossil fuels, etc. Yes, green energy could be used to make these materials, but again, it uses up the earth's natural resources to create these. Perhaps the standards could be changed so that the bins, rooftop items are less unsightly to begin with. That would really solve the problem.</p> <p>I think this should be required in residential zones. I could care less about the looks in commercial and industrial zones.</p> <p>Quining written and enforceable bylaws to uphold standards and fines when bylaws/standards are not upheld.</p> <p>If this would apply to dumpsters behind things like restaurants, etc I would suggest making the structure semi open. As a young college student working as a barista we had an issue with a creep hiding in the garbage area targeting the young girls that had to take trash out at night/very early in the morning and since I've worried about workers safety in situations like that.</p> <p>Absolutely for ground mounted. Roof issues look nice but my guess is the BCA will complain that this creates too much additional cost.</p> <p>Absolutely!</p> <p>This isn't a priority for me</p> <p>Does the roof mechanical equipment include solar panels? If this would require additional costs for those considering the installation of solar panels I would strongly oppose it.</p> <p>Make an exception for solar panels, if not there already.</p> <p>Require green coverage to offset carbon foot print and noise pollution</p> <p>Ensure they are wildlife friendly, escape ramps if needed</p> <p>Cost</p> <p>I believe that these are proper requirements.</p> <p>This is a dumb thing to spend time on when there are so many other poorly written aspects of module 2.</p> <p>Clearly define expectations to help eliminate violations.</p> <p>Rooftop structures no big deal but screening around the garbage containers OK.</p> <p>My only concern is, with it covered how accessible is it for being worked on. Especially winter when there is a lot of snow.</p> <p>How do utility lines fit into these scenarios?</p> <p>Roof screening makes sense. Ground screening is more complicated. Sometimes these types of enclosures become trash and rodent traps, undermining the intent of what they are trying to achieve. I would much rather see natural screening like hedges than a bunch of walled ground enclosures. Or get the trash companies to paint their dumpsters in earth tones.</p> <p>These changes can also provide a higher level of safety for people using or walking by such screened equipment areas.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	It would be unfair to develop city code that enforces the screening of HVAC for commercial landowners, but not homeowners. Everyone can see each others electrical panels and gas meters, yet no one complains. In order to keep cost of development down, I don't think we should add additional restrictions for business owners. They are the ones paying the most taxes and providing jobs for our community.
	I think the trash is a good idea to make it have its own area.
	See first note for my opinion
	This seems like a waste of time and money. Looks more like a grab for power than aesthetics. you may encourage it but mandating it seems like a misplaced effort. Maybe ask for them to be decorated instead?
	Make sure that the ground ones, if used by tenants, are not too far so disabled residents can get their garbage out with reasonable exertion. And require they have recycling bins as well.
	We need affordable housing, even if it impacts aesthetics. People are literally becoming homeless because housing is too expensive. If this leads to higher development costs and therefore higher rents, then this policy should be scrapped. Thanks
	n/a
	in some cases some sound barriers/noise regulations would also be helpful
	while this does make the appearance better, I think it will be an unnecessary burden to implement
	this just makes building more expensive.
	They certainly improve the look of developments, but I would encourage, not require them.
	Add an exemption for solar panels.
	Maybe but all these regulations just add cost that will be passed on th property owners so cost must be weighed in also
	Screening just raises costs for aesthetic concerns. There are more important issues, like density, mixed uses, non-car alternatives, and shade trees, than if I can see someone's air conditioner.
	Why it is more beautiful yes imposing more regulation and fee on businesses is never good for the economy if the surrounding living facility wish to do something the cost should be given to them.
	While I prefer this look, its adding a lot of money to a development project. CMU trash enclosures can easily cost \$10,000 - that's a lot of money added to a development or project.
	Exceptions should be made for low-profile roof-mounted equipment such as solar panels.
	Adequate areas need to be identified for trash and recycle in all new deveopments.
	Ensure noise sound is very minimal for any equipment and commercial properties that are near residential properties.
	Go look at Cannon Beach, OR to see what they are doing right.
	Is this also applicable to current businesses and properties? It would be very expensive, especially for small businesses to get up to code if this is the case. I do not agree to adding an additional financial burden on these folks at this time.
	Eh
	This adds unnecessary cost to low cost owners and developers. Remove these requirements. Allow for choice.
	It looks nicer but I don't think this is that important to change.
	Use natural resources such as trees, plants, landscaping, rooftop gardens, etc. to enclose areas and improve the look of screening installations.
	Seems like a waste of money and time.
	Ensure maintenance of landscaped screenings
	I do think it makes everything look nicer. One problem that I observed when I was the manager of the Pizza Hut on Federal Way that I'd like to note is that with the screening around the dumpster behind the building, we constantly had homeless people sleeping in it to shield from the wind and elements. It makes for a good hiding spot where no one can see you. I had to make a rule that we took out our trash in the morning, and never at night. So the lesson is that the screening for a dumpster should EXACTLY fit the dump-ster(s), and have no other room in it. It should also be well-lit.
	Probably not. Im dont reading these nonscene ideas. Shit doesnt change just cuz the law does
	No.
	No comment but like the idea!
	This is good to see, but not a major factor to me and my appreciation for Boise.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Yes, but it's a balance between access and efficiency. You don't want to require walls/gate around trash bins if that takes waste company 4x as long to access and empty.
I think this sections is irrelevant to the benefit of our city and sound like more similar to communist ideology
For new buildings, fine. For existing, forcing improvements would be wrong
Though the large garbage units tend to still look unsightly because people can be lazy and not actually get their trash in. Also they can be points of violence if not lighted and visible for safety.
Not seeing it will make it pretty looking but seeing it doesn't hurt I don't think? I don't think I care either way on this one .
Still allow solar to show
Additional business cost passed on in retail cost with little to no benefit.
How about solar panel requirements for every new building, commercial , apartment, homes. Make development pay for some of it...
Why not promote using the roof for gardening, entertainment, etc. such a waste of space. How about solar panels?
When dumpsters are locked away, then people can't dumpster dive. I think dumpster diving should be encouraged as part of the reduce and reuse campaign the city is starting. It keeps stuff out of the landfill.
I like the ground screening, but not too concerned about roof screenings.
Do you understand the cost to do this? This just causes prices to go up for everything.
Thus again, isn't bad, but most design already does this. Why is the zoning code moving to require it? Is this a serious problem that needs to be solved with government oversight? I feel like the zoning code has many more serious areas that impact quality of life to address.
Particularly with the new development project near me, the proposed design would put the rooftop mechanical at eye level with Sunrise rim homes. For these cases, I would include the screening in the height restriction for the development and potentially consider a noise evaluation from the mechanical units as well. For the ground screening, I see most businesses already employ such design to hide dumpsters and such. I would forego that restriction as it potentially could force more walls and/or make a property feel more closed-off if such screening is required.
Make sure rooftop screens are required for mechanical retrofit projects as well. The new rooftop units on the RiteAid at 16th and State are an eyesore.
Oh my god who gives a shit, can we focus on affordable and dense housing options please?
We all know that there have to be trash and recycle containers. It is nice to have them hidden and not in the open
Least of the city's worries
Questions should not be biased to give you the results that you seek.
I am not sure if solar panels are included in this. Solar panels should not have very few limitations.
Keep fire and EMS in mind, they will be the ones that have to access this parapet
When there is a community park in a residential area then the curb side of the parks should have no parking at the curb from dusk to dawn. There is too many people parking on these curbs and living on these curbs.
I can understand the garbage but the roof top thing is stupid. unnecessary cost.
These requirement will raise costs...
I agree that it looks better and cleaner, but don't think it's the city's place to regulate that action and increase the cost to business owners. Would be better to incentivize doing this, instead of regulating.
Seriously? Who gives a shit about seeing an Aircon unit on top of a building? This is just added regulation for the sake of regulation.
Visible trash cans aren't a priority for me.
This is okay, but the buildings are getting to elevated and blocking our views of the mountains and landscape
I'd be fine if it was for new developments and I agree it improves the look and feel of developments
All this looks ugly
Lumping trash cans and AC units into one category is ridiculous. Mechanical units, placement, etc... Should be up to engineers with the expressed goal of improving efficiency and reducing waste... Your regulations may crush brilliant ideas that improve efficiency and reduce greenhouse gases.
Enforce existing laws to prevent litter
Ground transformers could be art panels and not sure they need screening.
Maybe some accomodations could be made for local businesses in their first year of operation, giving them some leeway to make the revenue needed to cover these costs before the requirements go into effect.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

This is unnecessary extra cost, maintenance, and effort for something utterly pointless. If it could block the smell that would be different, but is just ascetic wastefulness.
Makes buildings look more imposing and unfriendly
I don't think roof screening is necessary
This increases construction cost and no one actually care about this
The screens are not expensive, and if designed correctly, reduce maintenance for the mechanical equipment on the roof. The mechanical works in open view, diminish the visual appeal of the area.
I think increased screening by drought tolerant trees and bushes should be encouraged.
I believe we could help the city by encouraging businesses to place solar panels on these roofs. Going green or greener could be a way to improve the look and feel of the city
Superfluous. Unnecessary
Fix the existing roads, curb & side walks before adding a mess to the surrounding area.
Trees -- Please add/require more foliage -- everywhere! Normal "screening" sucks -- use nature!
It's probably increasing the cost immensely.
catching sight of a building's utilities on a roof should be the least of our worries. the sight of garbage dumpsters and the inherent mess around them is perhaps an unpleasant sight, but do you really think putting fencing around them will change that?
These brick walls can begin to feel a bit like concrete jungle if they go too far. Consider allowing foliage to act as this barrier as well.
Require a wall mural for any large, plain surface. Use tall shrubs for natural fencing.
Encourage businesses with tax incentives to plant pollinator gardens & limit lawns & hardscape that limit wintering spaces for caterpillars.
However, these improvements tend to be cost prohibitive.
Who cares
Add in factors for noise and the setback distance from residential homes. Screening is insufficient if they are too close to residences.
Visible equipment is not what makes a city ugly. Blank, boxy buildings that give absolutely no consideration to how they contribute to the built environment are what makes a city ugly. I guess you could ban those or require legitimate architecture or something. I don't know, but I just don't care about visible equipment.
Yes but this is minimal. More concrete just = more concrete. I would encourage shrubs, trees, etc
I dont really care about visible equipment, it doesnt seem necessary.
can also support green roofs?
Screening very important
leave it open so that criminals can't use it to better their position for committing crimes!!
Landscaping surrounding the screening
Does it matter where they are located or screened? I would think its more important NOT to hear them. For example all we can hear now is the high pitched screaming of industrial vacuums and echoing music, including wall shaking bass. You and your friends clearly have never lived life before or been out of the north end.
Stop paving farmland. Period. We live in a desert in case you missed it, water is limited and should go to FARMS. No farms = no food. Food does NOT come from grocery stores. Tell the developers to shove it. Stop lining your greedy, lying political pockets with their money and do your job you putz. I'm from Memphis, I'm not an idiot--more development means higher housing prices, there's no way around that. Stop paving farms. Period.
Add a public art requirement to ground mounted options!
I could not give less of a \$@%^ about this one.
Again, this only increases the costs.
In addition, all large buildings should be required to have roofs covered with solar panels which power the building or contribute to the grid for affordable power.
Require green roofs on all new commercial buildings.
Get over it. It's adds unnecessary costs. The city does not need to regulate EVERYTHING!
These are great, thank you
No
Looks better
This doesn't seem important at all.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Boise has a dumpster/garbage can problem for sure. I noticed it when I moved here.
Make sure they are locked and high enough people can't get into them.
It would be great to incentivize the use of drought-resistant landscaping specifically as a barrier (rather than a concrete wall) where appropriate.
This is a stupid waste of money. Help homeless people instead of hiding trashcans from view
Stop the building!
I could not find anywhere else to put this, but prohibit any more billboards on city streets. I do not know how any ever got approved for streets like State St. Billboards really make an area look trashy and they are unnecessary within the city.
I think that industrial zoning shouldn't have as strict of a requirement.
Is this just for shielding view from public spaces? It seems like it should also have some shielding from residential spaces. If a giant building got built next to my house, I would hope that those items would be screened so I would t see it from my windows.
I'm not trying to hide the ugliness of development by putting a box around it. Let the world see what it takes to support the facilities instead of trying to protect us from the damaging effects of more people.
It does make the look and feel better, but it should not be an imposed requirement upon development - less regulation is better
Screening is prettier but I don't know that it means that much
Seeing pictures helped. I think it does add a cleaner more welcoming feel.
Ground mounted equipment screening for dumpster can se a security concern, easy for a predator to "lay in wait" for a victim, require security lighting.
Other than cost - how will this be financed?
While think the "look" WOULD be improved I think these changes are unnecessary and will cause increased cost to new and existing business owners.
Not sure
Anything to encourage more trees.
none i can think of
For residential areas, these regulations seem reasonable. For light industrial buildings, like the ones pictured, it seems pointless. You still have an ugly building with brutalist structures at the end of the day.
Sometimes a trash bin and equipment needs to be easily accessible for convenience not sure if this will be a big cost or inconvenience for businesses though
Don't allow these kinds of developments around neighborhoods in general. Problem solved!
Just increases cost of construction
I think this is a waste of money. Who cares if they see an airconditioning unit or Garbage bin? What I would like to see is garbage cans at every bus stop and more downtown. Littler ismuch more unattractive than the previously mentioned things.
Only for the ground screening
I think this is over-kill and unnecessary regulation. Sure, large and established businesses may be able to easily afford this, but so-called "mom and pop" stores may not be able to quite as easily. This puts a burden on local businesses.
I like it
It might be a real hassle to move those garbage dumpster back and forth.
Require the buildings to not be so boring! All the architecture in these images makes me want to take a nap. Zzzzz. The screens have no impact on the blase exteriors.
Who cares about seeing this? There isn't an issue here. Putting up more walls to make everything look the same...
It's just going to make things more expensive. Only rich people care about this crap.
While that may help reach the goal of improving the look and feel of new developments, this change should not be a requirement.
While improving look and feel, this will add additional costs to developments including apartments and multifamily housing. I thought you were trying to reduce housing costs.
All new regulations would be improved with simple regulation and enforcement
AC condensers are more efficient and environmentally friendly when they can access the breeze on the top of a building. Dumpsters that are more accessible will also allow garbage services to operate more quickly with fewer running trucks, which will also benefit the environment.
Shouldn't be the cities opinion

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	The ground mounted equipment would make a significant improvement. I am not sure that the roof screens make that much of a difference. I'd rather use funds for more trees, shrubs and plants.
	Allow developer to decide their design not the city.
	Presuming these changes will be in force for construction to existing structures These changes give rise to a concern of a financial burden on local businesses that are already struggling as well as a trickling down of cost to the public at a time when costs are already rising
	I don't think rooftop screening is necessary. Ground screening is.
	I get it -- screening does LOOK better...but can we assess if this is REALLY where the city needs to be spending money? We are on the cusp of having a homelessness situation that will tailspin itself into what Portland is experiencing. On a base level...do you prefer screening the industrial fans on the top of a building or out of control homelessness and the aesthetic issues that come along with that -- how are we going to screen that from view? Not to mention that's NOT how we should be letting Idahoans live...we're better than that!
	On large industrial and store buildings, promoting roof top gardens and green spaces, would help with energy efficiency, bird nesting and dampen the visual and environmental impact of square boxy buildings. This would make, for example, the Fred Meyer on Chinden and Glenwood not an eyesore
	Looking good doesn't mean anything when compared to functionality.
	Screen dumpsters but I don't really care about screening mechanical equipment.
	Either way, they are ugly
	This should be a lower priority. The goal should be to get people into affordable homes.
	There are more issues which need this attention, not whether or not you can see a roof fan, which adds to energy efficiency.
	Screening is a waste of resources.
	I commercial development it is good design.
	I think it's trivial and excessive, even though I prefer higher aesthetic, it's a small fish to fry. I'm almost in the way of thinking we should be subject to observation of the unsightly reality of industrialism. Forward thinking is even less likely if we just brush everything under the rug. Lets face it, that's all this regulation is actually accomplishing. Q
	Why would people from Boise agree with this liberal propaganda ?
	Aesthetically it's a good plan. A concern is those screens hide the criminal element.
	While improving the appearance it will be costly. Who's going to pay for it? Cost versus gain. Don't like it, don't look! This is Idaho not California where such things are complained about..
	Yes, this one probably does; however, most rules generate additional cost in construction as well as service cost for pick up. (a utopian idea from the draftsman living in the high towers) The structures around the trash containers look beautiful when new but usually get bunged up, the doors and latches get broken from the trucks backing into them. There are more costs than meets the eye. Maintenance is a continuing headache with doors being left open and banged up and trash being dumped in and around the dumpsters and other dumpsters parked beside the walled in group. Never the less it starts out looking good and hopefully regular maintenance keeps ahead of the mess. Regarding the roof mounted screening for the HVAC units - I doubt the average person see them and if they do it doesn't matter to them. Again, we need to make changes that make sense rather than to solve draftsman's ugly roofline on his drawing board.
	Some setbacks from intersection areas - these frequently abut intersections and create hazards due to lack of visibility due to an 8' wall on a corner.
	It will only cause burdensome regulations and increase costs for everyone
	Polishing a turd might be just that.
	No if all parapets were built 39-42" above the insulated roof deck heights and equipment was kept back 10' from leading edges it would act as a screen and also meet osha regulations for safety and fall protection for proper building maintenance.
	Not worth my time. Focus on housing for people.
	Doesn't City Hall have better things to be concerned with?
	Better access to the screened areas for dumpsters will be needed. It looks better, but most of the screened dumpsters that I've seen and used have egress and ingress issues. Multiple wide accesses would make these more functional.
	I don't care as much about the stuff on the roofs, but keeping the dumpsters wrangled looks nicer and is SAFER!
	It seems like government over reach. But I agree that it should encourage keeping the areas tidy and clean.
	This provides only minor aesthetic improvements with no tangible benefits (environmental, cost, efficiency etc.) Required regulations like this however only serve to raise costs for development and discourage investment. Participation in such a scheme should be voluntary.
	I don't care if I see a trash can or air conditioning unit. Adds more cost to the jib plus takes twice as long to dump the trash containers.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Trivial in my view.
This is great.
Stop all the building. What you going to do that because it lines your pockets doesn't it at least that's how I feel and that's my opinion
Require building wiring to be placed underground to improve sightlines
Roof screens seem to be an unreasonable regulation and expense to a property owner
Stop trying to make Boise be someplace other than Boise. If you are not proud of Boise being Boise, move.
"look and feel" could be immediately improved by picking up litter, and discouraging the tarps and litter from homeless camps, the piles of destroyed items in front of high turn apartments/rental houses, and otherwise dealing with the trash that you see all over town. I am not worried about someone's HVAC or seeing the dumpsters. Heck, why not put more public trash cans around so people would be less likely to just toss garbage in the street? That would go pretty far for "look and feel."
Your arbitrary ordinance for screening requirements is irrelevant. When the builder holds a community discussion on the matter, the people in the area that are interested will drive the design, not some imaginative newcomer to Boise.
Just make more regulations to squeeze the mom and pop shops out.
Should require grey water be used for landscaping, maybe green roofing for a place for it to go
I don't know.
The screening creates more obstacles for the disposal service. Opening the enclosure then pushing the dumpster out the actually dumping the dumpster. This seems like it would increase the labor and cost of disposal services.
No, once again you are mandating expensive new building methods and not respecting private property rights.
Make a reasonable accommodation rule for certain instances that the builder cannot achieve the screening withiut spending more than a certain percentage of the buildings cost?
Stop Californians from moving here
these screening option provide cover for clandestine criminal activities. High crime potential with these types of blinds.
Dumpsters, yes. Rooftop equipment, no.
Roof screening is nice. Just make sure it can be easily accessed by maintenance/repair personnel who have to work on these units.
We live near a school with rooftop units and the glare from the metal vents is blinding at times. Always an eye sore
Add regulations related to noise of the equipment. Barriers should help dampen sound on all sides, not just visually hide equipment
SAVE MURGOITIO PARK!! Stop being liars and working shady deals to line your own pockets!! KEEP OPEN SPACES AS PROMISED.
You should spec out requirements for roof mounted solar panels and UV water heaters.
As long as legal and safe, a property owner should maintain property as they please.
unintended consequence of residential renewable energy resources. Would they have to be screened? this is not desirable. Dont discourage installations of renewable energy resources.
This is a low concern issue. Imposing it will drive up costs for something most people don't care about.
Developers probably aren't encouraging of this bc higher costs. May affect affordability
as long as the cost burden is on the owners and not using our tax dollars to improve private infrastructure
This should be encouraged but not codified.
This is a waste of time. Seriously, worry about a dumpster while Boise's homeless population rises. What a joke.
This is not necessarily a "yes" or "no" answer question. I know this is intended to be aimed towards new developments, but Boise City has been known to bully existing businesses and such with new codes which force additional costs to do something that they shouldn't have to do due to the law changing after the use of the space began.
This regulation is will only cost business owners more money. Most businesses will elect to put their garbage bins behind screens to avoid people going through their trash, but it should not be regulated.
Don't be snooty! All this does is make us snooty and make development harder and more costly. I thought the goal here was affordable housing. Also this design makes it harder for the super heroes to catch the bad guy, because there are more places to hide.
Some people may use those exposed ones to put their garbage in instead of on the ground or road maybe.
This is the bullshit idea. Really stupid. What's your desired result? To pretend that garbage and junk doesn't exist? You are stupid fucking idiots.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

In addition, Look at the historic architecture of downtown. Look at the buildings that are going up, especially next to the river. Boise is losing its feel, and is feeling like a commodity.
Leave people alone and let them build their buildings how they want to.
While this is aesthetically pleasing, it doesn't make sense for our taxes to go to covering up garbage cans.
I don't think it matters.
What about sound standards for these units? They can be quite loud and that's a more pointed issue than what they look like, whether they can be seen.
Improves the views
I really don't find the presence of air conditioners on a roof or dumpsters to be at all offensive. So I'm kind of indifferent on this one.
Regulations that add to the cost of building and or upgrades. Just another tax on the consumer
It's just a different kind of ugly. Doesn't really do much to address the depressing industrial zones or strip malls that they inhabit.
The ground maybe.... But why worry about roof unless it has lots with view property above it...
Wasteful and unnecessary.
design requirements so that screening either blend into the buildings or are landscaped in a way that makes them more aesthetic. (the above example of ground equipment with screening is singularly ugly)
Don't stop at mechanical systems! All rooftop facilities should be screened (antennas, satellite dishes, etc.)
Rooftop gardens
Why? Ridiculous
Except it adds to the building costs that will be passed on the everyone else bringing about an increase in the cost of living here. Perhaps the required screening could be given some material and artistic latitude.
While I think they are good options to beautify the city, I think there are significantly more important factors at this point in time that needs more of a focus (affordable housing).
There is no doubt that higher aesthetics bring beauty to a place. This is a no-brainer.
It adds to cost of doing business.
It's a bit unclear in the code draft, but it seems this should only be required when inside/adjacent to residential areas or areas of consumer-facing business. Light industrial or heavy industrial shouldn't need this.
Who cares
Noise produced by equipment is more important than looks. Screening the dumpsters is good, but making sure there's no safety problem is better.
not all businesses can afford this extra expense. Not worth the cost.
Not the city's business to do this.
Na
This isn't an item that really matters. How about limiting growth to keep our city sustainable at it's current size. That's the real issue!!!
This would be a positive change and should not be excessively expensive
seems unnecessary
Makes no sense to enclose the garbage container from the landfill employees
penalty, ha ha, for not keeping the area around the enclose "screened" area. Just look around town where businesses have screened areas. The majority are dirty and always open usually around restaurants and grocery stores.
This is a pretty minor element in design. Does the City really need to get this specific in design requirements?
Why use resources that are unnecessary? This just costs money and depletes our environment.
Developers pay not taxpayers.
There can be incentive but a person shouldn't be require additional expense
Less cement look
Concern about access for maintenance and drainage. Will screening increase noise echo to neighbors?
Mandate the inclusion of solar panels in development agreements.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Not really. But I am not apposed to this option if others wish to see it. Reducing parking lot minimums would go a much further way to make our city look nicer as we would not have massive lots of land dedicated to cars that just sits empty and dilapidated 95% of the time. More density is the key to a nicer city.
	Absolutely. Love the garbage/recycling enclosures. Question: are there any (STC) sound transmission controls/standards for air handling and HVAC equipment? Residential/commercial. With reduced lot sizes, and even with our current structural setback standards, a poorly placed air conditioner can REALLY be an annoyance to a neighbor.
	I dont think this is really important.
	Most of this isn't important. Please don't require anything too expensive in this regard, since the benefit is negligible.
	The equipment must be accessible in all seasonal conditions and the area inside the structure must be kept free of debris.
	This is more attractive but, in my opinion, not important enough on which to spend huge amounts of city money. Maybe give businesses an incentive or have the Chamber have contests or something.
	Does the person need to hide their solar panels ? How about solar rolls for how water ? Why do you want to tell others what to do ?
	I'm not sure.
	Educate and enforce codes.
	Looks like a giant wall to me :)
	Permanent trash containers should be built by the city. We shouldn't regulate design here.
	Unknown.
	It does look more aesthetically pleasing and organized but it takes more resources to complete that so I don't know if that is a good exchange.
	It is more prudent and productive to encourage rooftop gardens and environmental screening than just blocking eyesores.
	Just because a mechanical unit is blocked from view doesn't necessarily mean it looks better. I think it's important to include in the language that the screening needs to be integrated with the design of the rest of the building, and encourage creative solutions. Often screens are done in the cheapest way possible and they end up being almost as unfortunate looking as the unit itself.
	Rooftop hot tubs
	Such a regulation increases the cost of building.
	Only if city planners hold developers to the codes and not grant variances for every request.
	You have already gone too far.
	electric devices should not be screened as it can reduce the efficiency of the device and cause early failure.
	Make them fit in with a more natural look to the environment and less height if possible.
	Make the requirement from where people usually view the equipment, rather than just 5'. For example, when you come into Boise from the Connector, you see everyone's rooftops.
	Add requirements about green spaces. How will these buildings impact wildlife? What are these developers doing to address those impacts?
	Appearance is enhanced with added screening. I would recommend you consult with a structural to make sure that screening added on top of the building is feasible and doesn't create a burden to developers to spend more money on structural design to support the screening.
	This really doesn't matter and adds costs to any project.
	Rooftops are wasted space. Patios, decks and or green spaces must be incorporated unless the rooftop space is dominated by (uses more that 80% of the rooftop footprint) solar and/or wind energy production and electricity storage equipment.
	Keep in mind that efficiency is more important for the planet than looks.
	It looks nice, but this should totally be voluntary. Encourage people to do it, but not forced.
	That's pretty standard everywhere else and does make a difference
	Until Idaho power and all utilities are underground plus have every place connected to the internet underground this isn't a good regulation.
	Stop having so many regulations
	this is ridiculous. there are more important things to focus on . who cares if I can see a building's ac?
	Yes, studies show that the way a space looks and feels encourages humans to treat it in the same way. A clean, well ordered space (as with screens) encourages proper use and respectful behavior more than a more industrial-looking space (without screens).
	As long as you don't plant any flammable vegetation as screening.
	Regulations to judge appearance are why Karens flourish.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Always to include recycling with waste storage/pick up. What about options to add art or visual blockades to hide items on roofs as an option. Get creative :)
Boise is a beautiful city and much cleaner than most. The screening requirements will help retain Boise's pleasing aesthetics.
While I appreciate the intention, You're trying to control something that is minute compared to greater effect. Furthermore these regulations add to the cost and will negate the affordable housing outcome.
As buildings age many managers of apartment & commercial buildings do not keep up cleaning up areas! This would need to be enforced.
More regulation is not the answer when the city is already over regulated.
This is just an extra unnecessary cost for developers
Personally don't care about the roof but I do like ground screening
I think this is the lowest change on the totem pole. We need to address homelessness before we address hiding our trash.
No further opinion.
Gardens, walkways, seating and parks on rooftops,
I think the roof mounted equipment regulation makes perfect sense and shouldn't be too much more expensive. The ground equipment requirement is a joke. People need access to garbage, plus the upkeep and maintenance for that regulation would be so tedious for the people that actually use the garbage.
Make it safe and not just approve certain builders, have inspect
I have seen ground mounted equipment with screening and the screening is left open or door removed, so does not work as shown in the picture. The regulation itself would not do it, teeth requires use would.
That is overreaching by gov. Allow people to make their own decisions, if forced and unwanted those enclosures aren't maintained and look worse.
I do heating and cooling we have been doing this for years their codes on the book for this now
It's unnecessary
No regulation. Hopefully right choice will be made by owners.
What about the new Ronald McDonald building at the end of Main? Look at their equipment facing what's left of one of our historic streets?
Please require recycling bins!!
we all know garbage and equipment is an eyesore in some places. how about making the persons who have the properties with garbage issues be responsible to clean up. as for a multistory building, is there a need for an equipment screen?
We should discourage mechanical units from going on the ground, better to put them on building roof
Include public art requirements. Include solar power requirements. Along with the landscaping requirements, green roof requirements.
seems like extra, unneeded expense
These just add to the cost and use more resources purely for aesthetics. Dumpsters and mechanical equipment are the realities of our chosen lifestyle.
...and then enforce it.
I'd prefer this to not be a requirement as it doesn't add or detract much in my mind and may detract development due to increased costs - really outside my understanding though.
Looks good who is going to pay for it?
THIS LOOKS LIKE AN IDEA THAT MAY BE AN IMPROVEMENT OR IT MAY BE A BURDEN BECAUSE IT COULD FORCE FOLKS TO PAY MORE IN AN ALREADY WAY TOO EXPENSIVE ENVIRONMENT DUE TO UNCONTROLLED GROWTH
Both seem hideous in my opinion, but screening helps (a bit).
Too invasive on business owners.
ugly
The enclosures around dumpsters and trash bins help to collect wayward waste that doesn't make it into the truck.
I don't think most people give a rats ass about this and we are punishing developers who do a good creative job by forcing them to install expensive, unwarranted "improvements". There will always be developers who can make the minimum standard look like crap. I am sure they won't disappoint here. Leave the screening standards alone.
Nobody notices that and it wasn't a problem until the you guys made it a problem. Regulate what plants they have in their parking lot. Nobody cares about their vents
Is this for commercial properties only ?
Don't build in our beautiful area ruining our landscapes

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

These are very useful standards and will help mitigate the visual impact on rooftop equipment and dumpsters.
Seems like money could be better spent
if done thoughtfully. but if just the bare minimum is done to meet the requirement, it will look the same or worse.
Provide incentives for existing buildings to include screening.
Who cares
Lower property taxes and let property owners handle their own eye sores.
I'm not sure this is a topic people are losing sleep over
Make sure the standard requires these to be compatible and consistent with the build design, colors and materials
This is fluff. We produce garbage and ease of access, as well as limiting the number of areas junkies can hide is a good thing
Screening makes ground mounted equipment more aesthetically pleasing, but I would defer to the service people affected by such a treatment. If the roof mechanical screening blocks more of the skyline, then it may be less desirable depending on the proximity of the adjacent buildings.
Be real. What is the best way to maintain this equipment for the people who work on them and the environment
As long as it's for new construction only.
Possibly
I don't feel that it's necessary to make businesses hide their dumpsters. That seems like an unnecessary hassle for employees when they need to take out the trash. Also, wouldn't that add time for the garbage truck routes to access those?
The rooftop screening language is a bit ambiguous.
Need to incorporate mandatory solar into roof design.
Not without enforcement at construction inspection.
require more trees in parking lots. Trees soak up CO2 and provide shade to keep asphalt cooler and they are inviting, making development less obtrusive.
You want affordable housing and then you make it more expensive with all these regulations. Cut it out.
If this is just cosmetic, I don't think it is necessary. I don't think many people care what they see on top of a building. Now, if you required more solar panels or green roofs to help environment, that would be great.
Good ideas; I generally support but don't feel strongly about. Personally I think dumpsters laid out bare look kind of nice. Real urban grunge. It looks honest instead of some superficial beautification. Trash is trash and we should prioritize minimizing waste streams instead of hiding them out of sight.
I have frequently encountered dumpster screening walls that block parking lanes and obscure view lines.
Just makes it cost more
The roof mechanical screening requirement is not that important and expensive. The ground mounted screening is good and there are places that have it. There needs to be regulations to keep it clean and closed. Look around at some existing ones they are worse than the equipment without...
You are going to spend money on a screen around industrial equipment? Seriously? How much are those? If you put it all together could it have bought someone an actual HOUSE with their advanced degree and two children?
Does it look nicer - yes - does it drive the cost of living her up - Yes
I personally would focus more on things that improve affordability rather than aesthetics. Without knowing much about the existing code and how the new regulations will impact the cost of new construction, its hard to have a good opinion
The consumer ends up paying for this. Inflation is through the roof and this is unnecessary.
Remember how it looks at night! We don't see the mechanical equipment, just the glare of excessive lighting that is pointed at our eyes, actually reducing what we can see in many cases.
Roof tops should be used for more outdoor space for tenants, customers, etc. Mechanical rooms are better maintained at ground level.
Looks better
New construction should be held to this.
Citizen advisory panel, once again.
this would be low on my priority list - seems purely aesthetic
Seems excessive to have a regulation about this. I don't mind the look of dumpsters here and there.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Rooftop solar? Rooftop gardens?
	N/A
	Unsure if the ground mounted screening is necessary
	Not only screening but placement also matters. Don't put a dumpster at the back next to someone's house.
	I just don't think these things are important in an urban environment, and only add costs to developers that would be better spent elsewhere. There are certain givens to living in a city, like garbage bins and A/C units.
	I don't care to see waste receptacles or heating/cooling units and their noise when walking/biking. Look at the new Ronald McDonald facility on Warm Springs - all the air conditioners face Warm Springs with no screening. Not so attractive.
	Roof top screening dimensions must allow sufficient space to maximize operating efficiency to reduce energy demand.
	Roof equipment wouldn't matter if we had livable neighborhoods and welcome green spaces. It is the buildings themselves that are objectionable.
	Encourage and reward new energy options in design plans as well.
	the roof one is silly IMO, nobody has ever said "Calle75 tacos is cool, yeah that mural though.. yeah i love it.. you love it? even when you can see the AC units above... oh no, you are right, gross, I hope they close them down. Trash one is great to deter public dumping and share trash for easy of pickup and makes sense. A person lived for a few months in the enclosure at my work though, so that is a double sided sword. IMO the less rules your give the developer then the the lower the cost and lower the sunken cost to re-develop.
	Take Chicago's model and build in service and refuse access in the plan.
	Again, provide incentives to encourage existing units to adapt the new standards, allowing for overall improvement of larger areas and more uniformity with newer units.
	How does this really help anyone -
	again this kind of elitism for white middle and upperclass people makes spaces/housing more costly. not needed
	Enclosures help provide places for people to "hang out" without others seeing them and could easily violate CPTED best practices that could meaningfully reduce crime. Boise would need to add requirements to prevent that from happening. As to rooftops, I don't think the screening a big deal.
	Also reducing the amount of paved surfaces, and requiring the roof material of commercial buildings to be a light color to reflect the sun and reduce the heat island effect.
	But you need to enforce maintenance of these structures especially trash enclosures.
	Fully support the ground mounted screening, the roof mounted screening is unnecessary and too large an expense. Just going to raise costs and rent.
	Feels like too much regulation
	Trees are always good. This isn't really our main problem. Rooftop areas should be used for water collection to make use of non-potable water.
	If the new screening doesn't require too much upkeep. Whenever additional upkeep is needed, the improvement could become an eye sore. The requirements should be something that requires little maintenance.
	Seems like the least of our problems.
	When you raise the cost of doing or starting a business..... you lose businesses or raise the prices of the product or service that business provides. These changes raise prices without doing much good. People expect that businesses look differently than residences.
	Screening is as ugly as the equipment
	Incentivise for doing so and require where rooftops are visible from higher residential vantage points.
	great idea!
	There are supposed to be screens around dumpster now Go look at Boise State, there are dumpster everywhere.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>"The draft zoning ordinance proposes some relatively simple standards to enhance the city's regulation of exterior lighting. These regulations are found in Section 11-4-010.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote energy efficiency by requiring that new fixtures provide a minimum of 80 lumens per watt of energy consumed; - Reduce glare by requiring fully shielded light fixtures and by limited uplighting (placing light fixtures directed up at the base of a building); - Promote dark skies by requiring all outdoor lighting fixtures remain off between 11:00 P.M. and sunrise in Residential, Mixed-Use, and Special Purpose zoning districts except for security purposes or to light walkways, driveways, equipment yards, or parking lots. <p>Do you think the proposed changes are sufficient to the impact of development on nighttime environments?</p> <p>Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?"</p>	<p>As long as people can use lighting how they need it for security purposes, the regulation sounds good.</p> <p>There have been news stories in the last decade about the color tone of LED lights, in some cases being disruptive to humans (such as night workers) as well as wildlife. See also relevant comments from question 8. Also, my answer to this question is "mostly" rather than a "yes" (which would imply 100%). So, "no" isn't the correct alternative. Perhaps have one or two additional responses for the questions...?</p> <p>Because the developers dictate what they build and where regardless of the citizens' voices, I guess this makes it a little less painful when inappropriate development is forced down our throats.</p> <p>Yipee!!</p> <p>No, I think that is pretty good. Reducing lumens, outdoor lighting 'curfew', and shielding/hoods would help with reducing light pollution</p> <p>Require exterior lighting to utilize solar so as to contribute to protection of environment. Also, again reinforcing standards with written requirements that are enforceable by fines.</p> <p>Tradeoff of safety is a concern, especially as population increases. More people always leads to more issues in society. Since there is no where else to comment, this is not a sufficient feedback option with forced choice questions for a 380 page document. Most citizens will have not read the entire 380 pages of this module, yet understand it, and will be misled by what these overly-simplistic questions ask in comparison to what these code changes will actually allow to be built by them. This top down process is not a democratic process and furthers the issue of distrust that the Clarion diagnostic report initially identified.</p> <p>All commercial outdoor lighting, regardless of its purpose, should be dark sky compliant.</p> <p>Allow ONLY lighting that promotes night skies and prohibits light pollution.</p> <p>Hopefully without eliminating exterior home lighting currently common to Boise.</p> <p>Do not allow developers to rely on individual homes for lighting sidewalks because homeowners just let their lightbulbs burn out and then there is insufficient lighting for sidewalks. See Harris Ranch for example,</p> <p>Exterior lights should be off between 10pm and 6am and should always have top coverings. They also shouldn't be more than 10' off the ground. We're already losing out night ski. Commercial lighting that is left on all night "for safety" should have a maximum lumen output to reduce light pollution.</p> <p>It's better than nothing.</p> <p>Encourage current buildings to turn off lights to reduce birds hitting windows. No more reflective buildings to reduce bird deaths.</p> <p>I think screening is very important so lights are pointing down and not out or up</p> <p>All night security lighting may infringe upon residential dwellings. The all night security areas need to be located far enough away to eliminate this possible problem.</p> <p>Cost?</p> <p>Safety of our citizenry should be these regulations number 1 priority and this could compromise that objective. It's too late to be considering these changes give the size of our existing community.</p> <p>Start by having the City comply with these regulations voluntarily at your own buildings.</p> <p>We need more ways to reduce light pollution.</p> <p>Yes, but would public safety be sacrificed?</p> <p>You'll never achieve "dark skies" in a city unless any and all power is shut off completely. A city is not a national park. Dark skies in a city is an oxymoron and utterly unachievable. And unnecessary.</p> <p>Please reduce outdoor lighting. It is so intrusive in my neighborhood we have to use blackout curtains year round.</p> <p>Except for security or safety, reduce the intensity of the light. (Some areas could land an airplane they're so bright.)</p> <p>I definitely do not like uplighting and don't think it should be permitted at all. It contributes to light pollution.</p> <p>There is a concern about no lighting as well as direction and types of lighting. Security and safety is always a big concern in neighborhoods and business locations.</p> <p>This is overly broad and generally unenforceable. Lighting for security, which ought to be a key desirable consideration in most areas, is too nebulous of an exception to an otherwise dark skies position. Who decided we wanted a dark skies policy in the first place. I go camping when I want dark skies.</p> <p>there are many areas that need some additional lighting</p> <p>A study should be done to see if the use of security cameras would be appropriate to increase neighborhood safety.</p> <p>more incentives to choose motion-sensor lighting for security and accessibility purposes between 11 am and sunrise</p> <p>Make sure that the lighting is dark sky lighting compatible.</p>
--	---

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Here are the rest of my comments since I didn't see a space for them. Trees on sidewalks between the road and storefront are a great idea! Plant trees, trees, trees! Keep Boise the City of Trees. Plan for parks & open space whenever you can. The valley will get built out eventually so please plan for parks to keep the city livable. In 20,30,50 years when the valley is much more populated, parkland will have much much more utility/value than another apartment building. Look at Ann Morrison, it's WONDERFUL. What if we had 2 or 3 more parks that size? Think of how much better life would be. Make city for people, not cars. Put parking behind the building, not in front. Maybe it's worth adding a comment/line/etc to your final proposal or presentation explaining the idea of "induced demand" as it relates to roadbuilding & housing. Essentially, building more roads (without giving people non-automobile alternatives!) makes traffic worse b/c it encourages people to drive. No one likes traffic (regardless of political affiliation) so to get people off of the roads we need to give people alternatives. Building more houses (suburban) makes us more dependent on cars, which means more traffic. Emphasize quality building instead of just quantity. We are all going to have to live our lives here with whatever gets built, so lets at least put in some effort to make it nice. Encourage developers to make an effort! Must take care of landscaping and trees after planting! As long as Boise remains nicer than Denver/LA etc, people will move here, so prices on housing are sure to rise anyway. Please zone for what we know we all want (parks, open space, etc), b/c we're going to get more than enough cookie cutter houses 5' apart from one another. Pre-approved designs for ADU's are a great idea. Lower the fees & streamline the associated with paperwork so individuals can build ADU's not just big \$\$ developers.</p>
<p>YES I LOVE THIS!!! I know Boise wont be a dark sky area but even reducing the light pollution would be amazing its gotten so bad here. Even if you put lights at the base of the building you should still try and make sure they are not letting light shine up.</p>
<p>See first note for my opinion</p>
<p>It would be good to explicitly disallow ALL uplighting between 11:00PM and sunrise. Safety and security lights should only use fully shielded fixtures.</p>
<p>Use on high efficiency lighting and led or softer light effects.</p>
<p>As long as neighborhoods have enough light to keep everyone safe</p>
<p>You're really going to tell people when to turn their lights off?</p>
<p>Excellent as this supports nature.</p>
<p>Create a maximum limit on major outdoor lighting on a street or residential area. Allow for either exemptions on entry lighting for disabled people, or simply require reduction of total wattage per single property, and warmer spectrum LED lights. No fluorescent lights. Obviously allow for more during holiday season.</p>
<p>Is solar power an option in areas?</p>
<p>Continue to promote darker skies.</p>
<p>n/a</p>
<p>Just more regulation Almost all light is LED now. Recommend down light.</p>
<p>Should also consider impact on nighttime bird/insect impacts</p>
<p>Promoting dark skies by turning off lights at 11pm might encourage more nefarious activities. As a single woman I like living in a house that is next to a street light that shines all night long and would hate to have it turned off from 11 PM till sunrise</p>
<p>let people use whatever light they want. if they choose inefficient lights they will pay more in electricity costs</p>
<p>I think this is a great start and would like to see dark sky requirements for all new security lighting fixtures.</p>
<p>Streetlights getting turned off at 11 p.m. would increase crime everywhere. Criminals love the dark. People who don't like the lights can buy blackout curtains.</p>
<p>My only concern with lights being off from 11pm to sunrise is safety. Will people still be able to walk safely at night?</p>
<p>Correct lighting to be non polluting lighting</p>
<p>The all-night lighting restrictions are very loose. It should be harder to run a light all night, and those that do should have special requirements.</p>
<p>With all the allowed exceptions to the dark skies requirement, people who keep lights on all night will continue to do so. Lighting is a security blanket. BY THE WAY! One thing I want on the record. Maybe we're not there yet or maybe it's been covered already. I believe all new multi-story buildings should have some bit of rooftop greenery/gardening requirement!</p>
<p>again too much meddling by the city so you don't even feel you live in a free country just too many regulations</p>
<p>Eliminate uplighting completely. It is pure waste.</p>
<p>I think these lights however should be motion or timers. It's crazy how lit up a city is at night when the vast majority of people are sleeping. The light pollution will only get worse</p>
<p>Final comment....please improve park situation. You have allowed so many apts and mini homes with no place for people to recreate nearby! Make Boise great!!!</p>
<p>Limit lighting more. Reduce lumens in streetlights.</p>
<p>Safety will be compromised</p>
<p>I like the idea of lights off during the night but for buildings that have employees there at night the lights need to be on and bright so improve security.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Maybe add motion-activated lighting for security purposes to further reduce light pollution.
Yes, however, night lighting discourages theft
Include color temperature limitations on outdoor lighting to promote dark skies! IDA recommends using lighting that has a color temperature of no more than 3000 Kelvins. https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/lighting-for-citizens/lighting-basics/#:~:text=Color%20Matters&text=Because%20blue%20light%20brightens%20the,health%20and%20endanger%20wildlife.
Hello crime invitation.
Why not use solar where it can be used
This sounds ridiculous
This sounds great, thank you.
I am concerned that limited lighting at night may deter walking/biking after dark. Also, need to be cautious of safety issues.
Have a maximum Lumen/Candela per square meter rule.
Apply regulations to outdoor signage
Again, stop telling people and businesses how and when to use their resources.
There needs to be lighted public areas all night for safety reasons. Especially in residential neighborhoods. Alleys and other secluded areas should be well lit to discourage foul play.
If this is anything like the current street lights, I would have to say no. They are useless unless you are directly under them. I miss the older street lights and felt much safer. I do like the current lighting used at night located on the property attached to the building at the Fred Meyer Franklin and Orchard location.
Concerning areas of residential lighting, ask yourself if you would be comfortable walking, living in an area with this light ordinance. Dark skies may not be the best choice for areas of parking, ingress/egress. Cost/Benefit ratio must be considered. Just my thinking...
Schools and commercial buildings adjacent to residential neighborhoods MUST be toned down so as NOT to encroach into residential homes. Look at Pierce Park Elementary School as an example of HOW NOT TO DO IT!!!
Yes, EXCEPT residential properties. If I'm told that I can't have any kind of light on my residential property between 11pm and sunrise, I'm going to be pissed. That's definitely over-stepping (provided that I'm not pointing a giant spotlight at a neighboring home, or anything ridiculous like that). Night-time is literally what exterior lights are for.
Lighting that is capped on top to protect dark skies.
Cuz nothing ever gets done
Turning off lights at night in residential, mixed use, and special purpose districts make it feel unsafe to travel in those locations at night. I would not support that change.
Our outdoor lighting is there to promote safety. We wouldn't want it off at night.
Lighting at night provides more security in residential areas where most crime occurs. Dark skies in Boise are a thing of the past regardless of what an ordinance is proposed to do.
No.
As long as it is required of private business, rather than just residents.
Reducing glare on City providing lighting is fine; for private users of night time lighting, no
Would like to see 11 pm shut-off shifted even a little earlier (with same exceptions)
Motion detection lighting for the late hours will be safer than no lighting.
It's a good start!
Keeping public safety paramount 24/7.
Seems reasonable
Sensor activated for mall areas
Except for security purposes defies the time limit and also be promoting dark skies.
Love this
Again, I don't see why the zoning code seeks to change/address this. Is it a serious problem? What financial/consumer based incentives exist to address this that don't require a bureaucratic zoning process/approval??
Remove the 11pm rule. It will lead to more property crimes. Or clearly define what doesn't qualify to be on at that time.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	I would include some restrictions to the brightness of displays at nighttime as well. Some LED signs have blisteringly bright lights on and it actually makes it more difficult to drive (like cars having their high-beams on).
	There should be a provision for residential back yards for lighting to be allowed at night on an infrequent basis. Reasons for this could include occasional outdoor gatherings or taking care of homeowner needs that go beyond security and driveway lighting.
	Add a section that lighting may not glare into adjacent residential living areas.
	10 PM
	Some street lighting at night should be maintained for safety. People still work and use residential roadways after 11pm. Limiting use of any lighting that is primarily decorative is appropriate.
	Questions should not be biased to give you the results that you seek.
	Foothills development should require all lighting to be "Dark Sky" compliant and all lighting (including landscape lighting) should be down lighting. If a home on a hilltop does not have "Dark Sky" compliant lighting it glares into the windows of lower homes. Also, street lighting should be "Dark Sky" compliant for the same reasons. Wild animals in the WUI are disturbed by excessive incorrect lighting as well as migrating birds.
	No! You're promoting more crime by adopting these changes. By the way, why doesn't this survey have any space for opposing arguments or is it because you don't want to hear negative comments about these misguided zoning proposals?
	The street I live on has problems with people parking on the curbside of the Shoshone Park on Malad St. It is dark and people driving have rear ended park cars that should not be allowed to stay on the curb 24 hours a day.
	Reduce night lighting even more. More down facing and no visible external lights after 10
	I like the first two, but disagree with the requirement that all outdoor fixtures remain off from 11 to sunrise in residential districts. Eleven is way too early, especially in the summer. And I don't think it is safe, and believe everyone should be able to put lights, that are shielded, and don't face up, that are on as all night.
	More lighting in darker areas.
	Require "warm" or filtered LED lights on all new fixtures to reduce light pollution. Shielding light sources would also minimize glare and light.
	I think it would be great to encourage more dark skies and less light pollution, but the list of exceptions seems long enough that most outdoor lighting use as it exists today would still be allowed
	People like to keep heir porch lights on a night for safety reasons.
	Activity-related lighting for bikes, pedestrians along walkways near schools or in parks?
	I don't like there being reduced lighting at nighttime. Sure, you can see the sky, but it's more dangerous when it's dark.
	dark skies vs public safety? crime is already rising...dark places foster that
	Allow motion-sensitive lights?
	Everyone will claim and exemption for security, making your efforts moot.
	Where is the safety of employees at, does anyone care who will be working there?
	This is ok. I think there needs to be some flexibility to the regulations. I would support solar-powered led's when it's cost-effective and environmentally friendly. I think promoting dark skies is fine as long as we accommodate security lighting given the rise in minor crimes in Northwest Boise lately.
	I feel that if you start turning off lighting fixtures at night you are inviting a dark haven for illegal activities and making things unsafe for pedestrians who may be forced to walk at night or early in the morning.
	I prefer dark at night, fewer street lights especially in neighborhoods. Lights should be required to point down. Lights should be requested to turn off when not in use... Not required. Your watts per lumen sounds like a good idea however it does not take into consideration available technology or that technologies ability to light a given area or pierce through low visibility conditions. There are a lot of considerations that engineers have to think through for appropriate lighting you have dumbed it too far. You are requiring lights be turned off except for the only reasons that lights are used. No one is out burning electricity just because...
	We need more creative lighting solutions that support the overall design in each area and incorporate how people interact with unique spaces after dark. Lighting changes the culture and values in certain parts of the city after dark. Crime reduction and safety should not be an afterthought. Some areas should be illuminated all hours, and others need requirements for safety. We need to stimulate some areas and decrease/increase traffic to different spaces depending on the type of area. The only outdoor lighting that should be required to be off during any hours at all should be advertisements and safety hazards.
	We are not for the lights off within the city. All light fixtures should be required to broadcast straight down. In city we should lite the foundation and light shielded so they don't go beyond foundation.
	11pm seems pretty late, I would prefer the cutoff time for lights to be 10pm instead.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Not sure how our friends in law enforcement would feel about these changes. However, I am sure that rapists and muggers would give you their favorable vote.
I would love more dark sky initiatives but it seems a security risk for citizens, especially women.
Yes, more thoughtful lighting is great
Less outdoor lighting the better
No
regulations should go beyond just new construction.
Isn't the nighttime why we need lights in the first place? Isn't turning off lights at night kind of defeating the purpose?
Do NOT encourage "dark skies" mandates. This is a horribly eerie feeling; we regularly visit family in California who live in a "Dark Skies" neighborhood and it is horribly susceptible to burglaries and break ins. It also encourages residents to pull all their window coverings closed as soon as the sun sets- because criminals and mentally unwell street wanderers have dark protection to gawk and peer in on residents in any building where lights are on inside. Massive cover-your-windows mentality leads to "Dark Skies" neighborhoods feeling isolated and deteriorate the sense of community very fast.
Solar bulbs
Having well lit areas prevents crime. This is dumb.
We are going to set restrictions on lighting? Who will enforce this? The city doesn't enforce school zones so I feel this is just too much.
Making things unsafe for women by trying to keep it dark at night, terrible idea
Stop the building!
These are really inspiring recommendations!! Boise is setting the bar high
Good step in the right direction
should push for more solar lighting cut down on electrical requirements
Yes, yes, yes! There is no need for people to light up an entire neighborhood with their exterior lights.
Thanks for this.
This seems a bit much and an overreach of power. Also seems hard to enforce - whose to say what constitutes security? Perhaps it should be more aligned with light trespassing onto a neighbors property. For instances a new light fixture cannot be installed that would shine into a neighbors window.
The new street lights are SO bright. I agree with the energy efficient bulbs but can the bulbs be a different color instead of blinding neon white? Also, the new streetlights recently put in we're not shielded. We had to ask for a shield to be put on the one by our house so it would stop shining in our house. Are you going to go back and shield them all? I hope so. As for requiring lighting to be off by 11, I like the idea but all of the exceptions are essentially all of the lights that are out there. It seems like k let Christmas lights would be outlawed which are the only fun lights there are. How about there be limits on the amount of lumens on lights used to light equipment lots, driveways and walkways? I am not so opposed to parking lot lights because I do think that is a safety issue.
As long as an exception for "security" exists, people will just claim that as a blanket immunity. Sort of like cops when they shoot someone's dog here, it's always because they "felt threatened." Boom, blanket immunity.
Lighting is important to safety and security
Lights being off at night is hard. Love the attempt to save our dark skies but consider safety corridors for women walking alone at night, particularly from street parking. How do we ensure safety of residents and kids?
This is a safety issue. Keep it as is. I moved here away from CA for more freedom. Not this BS.
Not sure
Definitely promote dark skies. Many birds and insects need dark nights, too.
If street lights could still be on in major crossways like Orchard, Vista, etc...that would be nice because as a woman I feel a lot safer with light when I have to walk at night
none i can think of
Many students in Boise walk to school before the sun is up in total darkness, turning lights on earlier in the day within a certain distance of a school zone will keep these kids safe.
Promoting or requiring dark-sky friendly light fixtures is a great idea. There is too much urban light pollution.
Does this affect home owners from turning on outdoor lights
Motion sensor lights?
Problem is what if John Doe forgets to turn off his porch light? How much are you going to fine him?

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	This is a safety issue.
	It is dangerous to even consider limiting the use of any exterior lighting at night. Crime is on the rise in Boise as in many metropolitan areas. This would worsen the problem.
	I think turning lights off on businesses at night is an invitation for crime and a dumb idea. Using energy efficient lighting is a great idea, having streets dark for crimes is ignorant.
	Not sure who or how this will be enforced...
	The idea of promoting dark skies in this area is a joke. We are a city. It's important to have lighting so we can get around safely.
	Lights out after business closes or on sensors
	This is unnecessary regulation.
	Anything but LED lights, PLEASE!!!!
	We will leave our porch lights on if we choose to do so. It is a personal choice. Encouraging led bulbs is great.
	The City can encourage with incentives exterior lighting goals but developers should not have new regulations requiring them.
	You sound like you are wanting to have a dark sky look by limiting lighting but there is no way Boise could ever be a dark sky city with all the existing lighting as well as most of the lighting is installed for security reasons. It's a joke to require lighting to be off from 11pm to sunrise!
	Once again, I would let power bills drive people to save money by shutting off their lights. Allowing more of these regulations is just going to create more awkward situations where neighbors can call the police on each other for minor zoning violations.
	Ada County Sheriff told me THE NUMBER ONE WAY TO PREVENT A HOME INTRUSION IS TO KEEP MY HOUSE LIT AT NIGHT. This was part of a concealed carry class. I'm a single mom with 2 kids. With the influx of population changes and growth, security should not be compromised, and lighting is key.
	Consider the color of light.
	I want to make sure that you are requiring down-shield exterior lighting to eliminate horizontal glare and all light directed upward. Also the use of motion detectors could reduce the lights in areas that require security.
	Yes don't allow them
	We need more lights
	I know the new City buildings currently don't do this. Lead by example. I still think it's a good idea.
	Promoting "dark Sky" will promote crime
	Why are we worried about glare? As for night lights, it seems to me they all are for security. I wouldnt want all the light around my house to go off at 11. It seems to be inviting crime.why not just send an invitation to crooks and vandals saying "free time starts at 11:00, come on out". The safety and security of my home and neighborhood are more important than a light bill.
	Lights off at 1000 pm
	I would love to see more public parks and less subdivisions, we are maxed and the over development is not good for Boise.
	It seems like the city just wants more density...wherever and whenever, and will adjust the "rules" to accomplish this.
	I like to see the stars. I think this is important.
	Please email me any time if you would like the opinion of a 4th generation north end tax payer.
	We don't want to live next to bright lights & parking lots! No thanks!
	I think the wrong issues are being addressed. More people means more nighttime lighting, period. Creating or changing codes is only going to cause problems for the people who already have lights and cannot afford to update to new codes
	I do not agree with having dark neighborhoods from 11 pm to sunrise due to security issues.
	This is fantastic except for the last one. We live in a city, lights should be on at night, maybe on a dimmer setting. Safety > darker skies.
	We are fighting an increased crime rate. Taking away outdoor lighting removes a safety measure that women depend on when out past dark. Light helps to act as a deterrent and give them a sliver of safety. Leave outdoor lighting.
	You cannot simultaneously build buildings and build dark skies. This should manage itself because people probably won't pay to keep unnecessary lights on.
	This one actually seems pretty spot on. Good job!
	Discourages crime.
	This sounds unsafe
	Who are we catering to? How many houses turn off exterior lights for security at 11:00 P.M.? What silliness. Let's get real. You must not see any of the videos of what happens between 11:00 P.M. and morning. Lights do help prohibit crime. Where is your leadership, did it leave with the last administration?

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	This idea has too much restriction to be applied across the board. It makes sense, but unfairly penalizes owners of larger properties where lighting wouldn't be problematic for neighbors. Also, is the 80 lumen per watt limitation reasonable? Can it be achieved?
	A moderate brightness (dim) down light option needs to be available for safety/security. But wall-wash certainly can be restricted
	Too much regulation!
	Safety has to be a larger concern as the city crime rate will increase if we go dark. Consider down flow lights and lower ground emitting lighting as an alternative
	This does not improve safety in residential areas.
	Provided it doesn't entail a substantial cost increase to already overburdened property owners.
	Sometimes people have to work the night shift, and it's terrible having to drive without streetlights. You're compromising safety to save electricity. Someone will reap the benefits with tax breaks, big contracts for businesses and developers, some politicians who appear like they really care about the people, but who care about only benefit for themselves.
	Street lights should angle downward to enhance the viewing of night sky.
	Anything to help the planet is a top priority for me.
	Good ideas.
	Less lighting required or allowed
	Decreasing lighting while allowing overcrowded development seems very dangerous.
	Boise city streets are dark already. I fail to see what this change is going to accomplish
	Not sure how you manage it, but if you walk at night, or leave early in the morning. Some small amount of light is nice. But I agree there is too much currently
	Same thing. Don't put more people into an area you want to stay dark. The less people in that area, the less need there is for lighting.
	Please also require all street lights to be a warmer color temperature in instead of white, which inhibits quality of sleep.
	None of this matters cuz you people don't care don't you care about is making money and adjusting property lines and boundaries to get who you want it office so you can raise the prices of everything that's how I see it that's my opinion and my opinion only
	Add incentives for solar panels
	We don't need rules to make us turn off our outside lights at a certain time. The cost to control it would be astronomical. No new regulations. Best way to save tax dollars would be to stop spending time on changes and enforce the ones already in place. The city council should not be paid off in order to get "special" building permits. If I'm doubt, follow the money source!!!
	This would be really nice. The street light diagonal from my house is bright and floods into my bedroom at night. I know they're going to put in 8 units in the acre behind my house, and I worry about how much light pollution we will have from that complex. We still like to stargaze in the backyard. I would value this highly.
	Lights are necessary for security all night long.
	Any arbitrary requirement of lumens will not be relevant in just a few short years. You cannot govern green or "lumen" output. You cannot require "dark skies". As we age and our eyes become dim, we are more concerned about lighting and safety in all areas. You want to take away one of the best safety devices by turning off the lights during the period of time that criminals love to operate. DON'T TURN OFF THE LIGHTS. If you really want to know what I think, feel free to contact me.
	No other place for comments? Fine. Stop making locals pay California prices for housing! Give us a break! I won't be able to buy my grandma's home when she dies because of this market! My grandfather built that house. You all suck.
	Boys in the surrounding areas has a large community of birds of prey the dark skies are very important for a lot of them hunt at night
	I don't know.
	Lights reduce crime. If you want more property crime make it dark
	Whatever you do don't encourage more crime.
	If someone wants to waste their money on electricity, they should be able to. The City is not our nanny.
	Proper lighting is very important for safety and wildlife alike. Promoting lights that don't encourage insects is another great thing
	Stop Californians from moving here
	Energy efficiency is great. Solar-powered would be even better. My first impulse is that prescribing a time for outdoor lighting fixtures is too restrictive. Too police state.
	Concerned that "for security purposes" would give businesses in a residential area a reason to keep lights on after 11:00 pm.
	This does not address excessive lighting practices. Excessively bright signs and lights in commercial areas can cause issues.
	Lights are there for a reason. Mostly security.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Prohibit decorative uplighting on vegetation and trees. Add regulations on light wavelengths allowed to reduce negative impacts on birds and insects. Establish downtown Boise as a "lights out" bird friendly city during spring and fall migration (see examples like Chicago and Toronto). Establish more limits on light near the river. This would benefit aquatic insects, which would benefit birds and fly-fishers as well.
Yes, I would love to give you my name and email address... I want everyone to know that I am ashamed and disgusted by that shady, greedy, lying POS McLean. The Boise City Council needs to DEFEND OPEN SPACES AND FOLLOW THROUGH ON PROMISES THAT WERE MADE YEARS AGO!
Prohibit uplighting over a certain amount of lumens.
Good lighting is important for safety and security, especially in dense areas. Blue emergency lights in dense areas could possibly improve safety without causing too much light pollution.
If lighting isn't needed why have it. If it is needed why limit it. I don't limit my outdoor activities because the sun is gone. I am a libertarian who feels once a person buys a piece of property they should have rights to use it safely and legally. Even though I hate ugly buildings and messy yards, if my neighbor is happy that way, I shouldn't have the right to object.
LED streetlights. No useful comparison on 80 lumens per Watt. What counts is light on the ground and how landscaping impacts that.
City should assume full responsibility for street lights
these regulations are getting sillier by section. Who thinks this is a pressing issue for Boise?
Led replacements for mercury vapor street lights often causes more lighting glare onto adjacent property. Energy reductions are great, making street scapes more illuminated is great, but not if the light spillage onto residential property illuminates the house.
So residential areas can have lights on at night "for security?" I assume that means our motion-sensing lights. More people are using lights to assure security & allowing cameras to get pictures of intruders. Conflict?
Fewer lights more crimes
If someone wants dark skies, they can drive out of town. Lighting is safety, With the Mayor's insistence in pandering to the homeless, we need to keep our other citizens safe and lighting helps this!
I CANNOT FIGURE OUT HOW TO INPUT MY RESPONSES. THIS IS NOT VERY USER FRIENDLY. THE CITY APPROVED A BUILDING NEXT TO MY HOME THAT HAS COMPLETELY DESTROYED MY HOME, MY RELATIONSHIP WITH THAT NEIGHBOR AND ANCHORED THE NEIGHBOR ON THE OTHER SIDE WITH A COMPLETE DISDAIN FOR THE ONE IN THE MIDDLE. THE CITY HAS DISREGARDED ITS OWN REGULATIONS AND LET THIS MAN BUILD A PLACE THAT NEITHER FITS THE NEIGHBORHOOD OR THE LOT. I AM SO FRUSTRATED WITH THE CITY AND THIS SURVEY. WHEN I FINALLY CAN AFFORD TO LEAVE THE CITY OF BOISE, IT WILL BE BECAUSE OF THAT GAWD AWFUL BUILDING AND THE AMOUT OF BUILDING HUGE BUILDINGS ON TINY LOTS COMPLETELY DESTROYING NEIGHBORHOODS. JUST BECAUSE THEY CAN, DOESN'T MEAN THEY SHOULD BE ALLOWED. THE CITY HAS DEFINITELY LOST ITS APPEAL AND CHARM. I AM AN IDAHO NATIVE.
No lights at night? Are you trying to create more crime? Oh yeah carbon footprint is more important. Carry on, but don't whine about crime rates when everything is dark. What's the point of outdoor lighting anyway if you can't have it on at night? Did anyone think this stuff through?
More motion sensor solar would be wonderful
Again free will. Let people do whatever they want smh
maybe consider motion lighting? I have been in cities where the road lights dim considerably when there is no traffic .
The only idea in this packed it's worth a damn is the shutting off lights from 11:00 till daylight. That's a good idea. The rest of the stuff is bullshit. You mean you're going to go around making people with 80-year-old houses replace all their fixtures? Get lost you dipshits.
Safety would be my concern shutting off at 11. Any ability to have lights that turn-on with movement in certain locations?
I think the lighting at night needs to be across all the city.
The third bullet allows for too many lights. One or at most 2 lights should be sufficient to be on all night. One new house near me looks like an airport runway: about 10 lights going up the front walkway, about 4 by the driveway, another 2-4 on the other side of the house. We have lost our dark sky in our foothills area.
Turning off lights promotes crime and I fail to understand why you would encourage such behavior.
It seems like this will need to be monitored and regulated often by Code Compliance.
I think lighting should be on at night for safety
Increase regulations to promote dark skies (type/direction of light in addition to the lights out after 11 requirement)
It's a safety issue to have the outside of your home or business unlighted after dark.
Lights equal safety. Do not turn them off. I want to be safe at night. Have you ever walked down a dark alley in a big city. Are you crazy?
Inthink some lighting needs to be on.... Maybe alternating light fixtures to turn on and off To discourage criminal activity

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	<p>i expect "security purposes" in the 3rd bullet could justify almost anything??</p> <p>Driveways do not need to be lit. Equipment yards do not need to be lit. They can be secured with cameras, alarms, motion detectors. Parking lots should not be lit after 11 p.m. - they can also be secured with cameras, alarms, motion detectors. Dark skies are not protected with half-measures. If the City truly seeks to protect our night skies then put some teeth into the ordinance and write it with intent to protect our starry skies.</p> <p>Additionally, limit blue light omissions, per International Dark Sky recommendations.</p> <p>There needs to be more lighting in sub divisions to creat a safer environment at night</p> <p>"Promote dark skies by requiring all outdoor lighting fixtures remain off between 11:00 P.M. and sunrise in Residential, Mixed-Use, and Special Purpose zoning districts except for security purposes or to light walkways, driveways, equipment yards, or parking lots." Don't you think the second half of this sentence will prevent the first half? Maybe the use of environmentally friendly colors of lighting would help with such things as interfering with bird migration.</p> <p>It may not give people peace of mind having lights off during the evening as it may encourage theft, break ins.</p> <p>While I think they are good options to beautify the city, I think there are significantly more important factors at this point in time that needs more of a focus (affordable housing).</p> <p>However, this is far too vague to be easily interpreted and too much lighting provided, ie. for security purposes. Increase the specificity of this code addition to limit the security lighting to 2 fc, just as interior exitway lighting is required to exit safely.</p> <p>They are more than sufficient.... they are over reach.</p> <p>I would love for Boise to be like Sedona where light pollution is restricted after 9 pm, neon lights are not allowed, etc.</p> <p>I'm definitely no expert on this, but it seems like the 100W exemption should be a much, much lower wattage. 100 watts of 80 lumen-per-watt lighting seems like a lot of light, especially if not properly controlled. Also, using a min/max of lumens per sq ft along the ground seems a better way to regulate lighting, in addition to the angle requirements.</p> <p>More left wing BS</p> <p>Again, too much regulation. Not the city's job to "promote dark skies."</p> <p>Just curious if there have been any impact studies relating to increased crime rates in lower lit areas and if that's a factor in this regulation. Light pollution stinks, but so does crime under the cover of darkness.</p> <p>I also think that street and parking area lighting should be shielded so that the light is directed to the ground. All of Boise's street lights should be changed to this. Light pollution is terrible. I am a 3rd generation Boisean and hate that I can no longer see the stars at night because of the glare of lights all around us.</p> <p>I don't like the restrictions on residential lighting between 11pm and dawn.</p> <p>Light is used at night to discourage criminal activity. This is a bad idea and doesn't belong in cities.</p> <p>Na</p> <p>Promoting "dark Skies" in a city and metro area the size of Boise and the Treasure Valley is wishful thinking (dreaming?) and over regulating / micromanaging. Building and project designers should not be constrained with the exception of requiring LED lighting where feasible.</p> <p>you should require the types of light that do not illuminate upwards at all - isn't the exception the reason all lights are left on at night - which lights do you think would be turned off.</p> <p>There needs to be more well lit areas if we are encouraging people to walk/bike everywhere.</p> <p>The intended result does not take safety into consideration.</p> <p>Lighting should stay on</p> <p>Eliminate the energy requirements. The market is already going in that direction. Fully shielding lights and limiting up lighting is a good idea. The night-time limits on lighting has so many exceptions that it is useless. The exceptions cover virtually all places where lights occur. Some of the worst offenders for lighting are commercial and industrial facilities, where unshielded lights are large, bright, and obtrusive from large distances. Addressing these in the regulations would be beneficial.</p> <p>Turning lights off at 11pm will create an unsafe atmosphere for citizens</p> <p>No lighting between 11 pm and sunrise, except for security - is silly to say because the reason we leave our outdoor lights on all night is for security. So the results would be everyone would still havr their lights on!</p> <p>Signage for businesses still need to be illuminated and visible</p> <p>50-50</p> <p>I think all lighting should face down. All should be solar. we typically have 300 sunny days a year. Why are we still on the grid? all new construction should require some sort of passive solar.</p> <p>limit lighting and make it mostly motion activated. Insects are dying by going to street lights.</p> <p>I think that equipment yards and parking lot lights should also be included. Statistically it hasnt been found to make a difference</p>
--	--

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

The exceptions pretty much void out the 11 pm.
You have to turn off unused parking lots
Downlighting is good, but requiring all outdoor lighting fixtures to be off after 11 pm is a safety/security issue. Neighborhood Watch encourages lighting at night. Have you discussed this with police, fire other emergency services?
Much needed and thank you
Actually enforce the the dark sky ordinance... leave downtown lit.
Ensure turning off lights doesn't impact safety first
I like the dark sky idea. Flagstaff AZ has this and it is very nice touch.
I wanted to rate this higher on the 1-10 ranking earlier in the survey. I wish that section would have allowed equal ranking for certain items. I would have ranked Lighting and Landscape equally, as well as Signage and Landscape Maintenance.
Please ban very bright led lights. Some of the newest signs are blinding.
Grat idea. Maybe something about color temperature as well. Those blue heavy LEDs are so intense at night.
Does this impact safety? I would like better lighting is safer.
Outdoor lighting is very important. These regulations or more are needed.
I would need more data to know if these ideas are sufficient.
There is too much light pollution going on now. I see housing areas lighting up trees within the landscape at night. Wasteful and unnecessary light pollution. Lighting is only necessary at entry and exit routes, not plants.
Retrofit existing fixtures that are not compliant with these standards.
This may need expanding based on geographic needs.
I would like my neighbors to shield their "spot light" front porch light fixtures now! This is a real problem. How will you implement this? There needs to be more education like inserts in city's bills and opportunities to put Dark Sky yard signs in neighborhoods. I can't find one anywhere.
No.
I don't understand exceptions. Businesses in residential areas could still light up their business at night for security purposes? That doesn't help.
Encourage the use of solar!!! Make solar more affordable to reduce the load on our water dependent electrical system, hello, we are in a drought!!!
Does these lighting proposals protect property of neighbors from receiving unwanted light from adjacent lights?
Again, no variances!
This is very important to keeping the city free of light pollution. It is also very important that we continue to address the safety in putting up 5G towers near schools and in residential neighborhoods.
Regulate all of this much more aggressively so that development doesn't destroy Boise's night skies. Please aggressively promote/require retrofitting existing infrastructure to restore and improve Boise's night skies.
Many jobs require people to walk home after 11 pm. No bus service. I prefer first level lighting to always be on.
I like the 1st two but the third one confuses me. I thought light helped stopped crime. does lighting fixtures include street lights? Reducing light is fine but I would want a study to make sure no safety is reduced because of it. What's the difference of car crashes on a similar trafficked road with vs without lights. I don't mind the change I just want to make sure it's very well thought out. (You might of all done this before I just want to double check).
Yes!!!! I love the dark skies requirement. Yes!!!!
I fully support this and appreciate the ability to see the sky at night.
Unless it's applies to existing lights it doesn't have much impact
Not enough. All lights off after 10-11pm. Motion sensors only! No lights to be left on !!!
Will this include street lights in the neighborhoods? Street lights are important for safety purposes.
I wouldn't mind having motion activated street lights too.
Consider motion activated lights so that there is security in residential neighborhoods - lights do deter crime
I like most of the proposed changes, but this one feels the most like regulatory overreach. Lighting should make business & safety sense. Whether lights are efficient should be a business decision. Knock-on effects of regulations like these produce outcomes like increased heavy metals (e.g. mercury) in landfills from CFL bulbs, increased red tape and compliance costs, and increased enforcement costs - all to provide dubious benefit (dark skies) that most people don't care about.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	My housing development has all lights wired to be on over night for security purposes. If you require all lights to be off what happens to security? Is the city going to pay to rewire everyone in the whole housing development? People deserve a choice whether they have lights on or off. All lights off sounds like a burglar's dream come true.
	Each fixture adjacent to public spaces an right of ways must incorporate solar energy capabilities.
	Requiring lighting to be off after 11:00 will allow for unsafe environments and criminal behavior. It is the norm in my central bench neighborhood to keep lights on all night because there aren't enough street lights to keep area well lit to discourage criminal activity. Please don't turn the few street lights we have off or require us to turn our outdoor lights off.
	Make it the Minimum, not just promoted.
	No red lights either. Hate the commercial buildings with red lights...
	I would say, any public, taxpayer funded lighting should be phased out with these new ideas, and encourage businesses and residents to do likewise, but not forced.
	You need to enforce this. Many businesses leave lights on all night to determine from theft. This is blinding to the residents that live near by.
	How about not letting existing residential neighborhoods get denser.
	100 lumens per watt is easily attainable. I do not agree with 11:00 pm shut-off. This only encourages vandalism, regardless of the district. Suggest multi-level motion dimming
	Providing a maximum lumen reading in parking-lots an hour after the business has closed.
	Every house or apartment needs better lighting or your creating neighborhoods with higher crime rates.
	These are okay, and it's a start, but with a large street light installed right across the street from my backyard and back window I will tell you these bright LED lights have ruined my enjoyment of the backyard and nighttime sky. I would prefer all street lights to be lowly lit and pointed downwards so that they do not disturb the nighttime sky. This goes for lights at schools and school parking lot as well as they are like broadcasted beams that eliminate a dark sky at night.
	Rather than turning lights off at 11pm in certain areas, there should be a requirement that lighting is fully shielded to avoid uplight, similar to how it's done in Flagstaff
	Stop controlling everything
	we need to reduce the glare of all the lightning .. commercial and residential. There flood lights throughout the neighborhoods and these should not be legal. We have wildlife that needs nighttime.
	I am unsure, I would need more context here. Is this aimed at minimizing light pollution? I can see the pros in that, as far as enhancing enjoyment of the starry skies or reducing impact on existing homes near new commercial or large residential facilities. In that case limiting night lighting makes sense. I would worry that in certain areas, requiring lighting to shut off at 11PM would encourage deviant behavior and we would see crime rates rise and a general sense of unsafety in our community at night. For example, would a single woman still feel safe walking to her car downtown after the lights turn off at night? Would she still feel she could let her teenage daughter walk home from a nearby friend's house late at night on the weekend? So far the answers to those are generally YES in Boise. I would not like that to change.
	Just make sure safety is Number 1
	Glad to see. Boise should work towards a Dark Sky designation.
	The exceptions for outdoor lighting will exempt almost all outdoor lighting. Instead, let's ensure the lights meet dark sky standards https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/lighting-for-industry/fsa/fsa-products/
	Dark skies, especially for migratory birds is so important. I fully support this, incentives for motion & timed lighting as well.
	Mixed - safety should be the number 1 priority. Area roads and intersections are poorly lit.
	As theft is increasing in the area not sure what the positive outcome will be for individual homeowners. Again, regulations only as good as ongoing enforcement.
	I would drop the time from 11 to 10pm
	Again, more senseless regulation that is unnecessary.
	Forcing "dark skies" could make our streets less safe and more conducive to crime. Limiting or eliminating outdoor lighting in residential neighborhoods could compromise safety, as residents, sometimes teenagers would have to navigate dark streets when accessing residences. Residents are less likely to be able to enjoy the city or their neighborhoods. A more flexible approach is needed.
	I love that you're promoting keeping our skies dark at night. This is vital for on going health.
	...though I wonder if this includes existing Idaho Power-maintained lighting in certain residential neighborhoods – we have a "streetlight" on our property with an LED bulb that keeps the southeast side of our property brighter than most streets downtown.
	We should require exterior lighting in new developments to be entirely solar. There is no reason not to. The city has a good green goals in mind but they should be implemented now in instances where it is possible. These small details add up to a city that can proudly boast of the steps it is taking that surpass the expectations. Why not do more where we can? The cost is often negligible.
	No further opinion.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Less lighting would be nice so we can see the stars.
I love energy efficiency, but putting a curfew on lighting fixtures seems ridiculous. Why not just target the lights you specifically want off after 11pm? Like billboards....signs for building that are closed by 11pm... I mean common, are you going to enforce this during the Christmas season? No. So it's a misguided regulation.
Lights off after 11? How is this even a thing? People work late shifts, hang out with friends until the bars close, etc. This is a very real security concern. And how are you even going to enforce something like that? Have the police ticket anyone who left their porch light on because they plan to get home after midnight?
People work day and night with all different hours I think it would be illegal for you to say people can not have a light on in the dark.
The minute the phrase, "except for security purposes or to light walkways, driveways, equipment yards, or parking lots" was added it allowed all lighting in dense housing at all hours as these types of developments are just walkways, driveways, and parking lots with buildings. Remove that exception.
Safety needs to be considered! Darkness = Increased Crime
if lighting is needed, then it is needed, don't limit hours it can be used, quit mixing the types of building built with one another instead.
LEDs are the answers
I love the idea of people turning off their lights at 11:00 PM Great idea. This is very helpful for the environment and bird and bee migration.
Lights off at 11 sounds unsafe
I think with technology, more requirements for lighting that is motion activated would be appropriate
Need lights to prevent crime. Darkness is a time for crime. We live in a COTY with criminals. If you want dark skies move to the country.
Let the neighbors decide
yes! Dark sky lighting only. and Birdsafe glass in all new buildings
Concerned about the dark skies component and would seek to clarify how that might promote less safe outdoor spaces late at night, especially as it relates to people who work late shifts and utilize person-powered transportation. Exceptions are mentioned, but provide clarity as to what areas of lighting would be turned off at 11pm
safety lights are going to be necessary in the Boise you want. with all the sun we get here, solar is the way to go but lighting during the night is my choice not yours.
While I strongly hope dark skies can be achieved, I'm also concerned about safety if folks are walking after dark without sufficient lighting to discourage attacks/robberies.
Require motion activation so they're not on when they don't need to be.
This should be expanded to residential properties esp. in tight areas like the N. end. Lights shining into our windows was one big reasons we left the n. end.
Please don't cheapen the significance of this survey and the gravity of your proposed zoning changes by luring respondents with the promise of \$25 Visa gift cards. People shouldn't trade their civic duty for a gift card. It's almost liking paying people to go vote. It sends a terrible message -- that people can be bought off by giving the "right" answers in return for a gift card. Bad practice for a city government to be engaging in such "quid pro quo" trades.
hard to regulate lighting requirements when you have mixed-use dev. Uplighting is appealing on buildings.
It would be better to reduce the amount of lighting to what is absolutely necessary and don't allow uplighting at all.
enforce it.
Some energy efficient led lights are very white bright and glaring even from far above in the foothills. Light pollution is an important issue.
Require bird friendly lighting solutions.
Who will monitor the new fixtures that they are up to code? Are you going to hire more city employees to do that?
PROMOTE AND REQUIRE DARK SKIES LIGHTING FOR ALL DEVELOPMENTS OLD AND NEW
But, what do you have against uplighting? When plants and trees are up-lit, they can look spectacular.
Provide a means for neighbors to address situations where lighting affects them adversely
Again, too invasive.
Require dark sky lighting, wherever safety does not require otherwise, for driveways, walkways, equipment yards and parking lots.
Reducing lighting increases burglary.
More shade and water-permeable surfaces through the city
Impact to safety???
I don't know, I don't know the current details of our impact on night skies.
Who is enforcing this? What is security lighting?
Honestly a Black Out night would be awesome. Turn off every single light that can be turned off so we can all see the stars n stuff.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Allow outdoor lighting at night for residential sites for safety
The third billet makes no sense. Mandate lights off between 11pm and sunset except for security and lighting of sidewalks and roadways? What else is there?
Whose idea what this? This is a terrific example of someone's personal wish list within the planning dept. It is ridiculous and should have never made it past the first draft. Eliminate this nonsense.
There are many light pollution lighting options
this opens up security concerns.
The exceptions are the only lights that would be on after 11 anyway and they are all potentially bright. I don't think this will help very much.
Again, yes and no on this. Great that we're aiming for energy efficiency and reducing glare. But requiring residential and mixed-use districts to have lights off at night when massive business complexes, car lots, and industrial buildings with their 100 light poles per acre are a-okay to keep their lights on all night? Kind of like blaming a mosquito for biting one of your arms when there's a bear chewing on the other. A great way to preserve our nighttime environment? Leave open space open, and don't rezone rangeland to favor asphalt, light pollution, and more traffic pollution. Thanks.
No lights needed
Where's the question about daytime lighting?? We want regulations that incentivize developers and property owners to create ample south-facing windows and driveways. Natural light in home design should be a top priority for energy conservation and mental health.
We do need to encourage but not require lights that don't cause light pollution.
Not sure if it would be sufficiently safe but also unintrusive
Another loaded question, which presumes an agreed public goal. Promoting "dark skies," which sounds so environmentally sensitive, is not possible in an urban setting. Everyone who wants the lights on will say it's for security. This is an annoying reality; pick your fights.
Use motion sensing lights whenever possible instead of lights that stay on.
The 3rd bullet is extreme. How is it enforced? What happens when you have late guests arriving. That bullet is too much.
Light pollution is a serious issue and we should mimic other desert communities to prevent excess light pollution.
I Don't like this section - Promote dark skies by requiring all outdoor lighting fixtures remain off between 11:00 P.M. and sunrise in Residential, Mixed-Use, and Special Purpose zoning districts except for security purposes or to light walkways, driveways, equipment yards, or parking lots.
Anyone who leaves lights on all night is likely to claim it for purposes of "security." My neighbor travels extensively and his front has three or four onmi-direction flood lights (downward facing) on 24/7.
Dark skies - YES!
No up lighting. All street lights should be shielded
Yes Yes Yes - the sky does not need to be lighted! Direct light where it is most effective
The change may not be positive though, especially in higher crime areas where additional lighting may be desirable. These should be guidelines and not hard and fast rules that everyone should have to follow that may not make sense for the location. Again context, context, context!
There should be no allowance of high density apartment buildings in areas they were not previously allowed.
Get serious be energy efficient or don't care one or the other
Security lights are important because as you add apartments and cheap (CBH) housing, you add crime. It's getting worse all the time.
I'm not sure I understand the proposal. I keep an outdoor light fixture on at my front door when it is dark for security. I don't want a city ordinance telling me when I can't have my porch light on. I wouldn't have a problem with a rule against massively bright lights, but I don't have a concern with people using a standard light bulb or having a yard post light that turns on when it gets dark. These lights also make it safer to be out after dark, especially when street lighting is so inadequate.
Prohibit lights that shine into other residences.
The first standard could be difficult to enforce.
Many residences have multicolor lights that are unattractive. Maybe include something about yellow/white light only for outdoor fixtures?
But are you addressing early morning lighting when children walk to school? Lighting shouldn't be obscured by trees. Shoshone is a current problem.
Go further: incorporate mandatory solar.
How will you ensure you are properly lighting walkways?
A way to improve this would be that every two years there is evaluation/research do to make sure that the light fixtures and implications made are still the most efficient way to improve nighttime environments.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	I think downlights on houses are ridiculous and an eyesore. (See the two newest houses on Schmeizer.) It used to be a bucolic little street, and now those two houses glow like a spaceship. The "security" argument is pretty weak. Nobody is going to break in through their walls, if they want to be secure they should light up their own windows instead of just mine. Or put them all on motion sensors.
	This is a bad idea. Safety requires light. People walking home from a restaurant meal require streetlights. It's homey and cozy and much safer. You want walkable neighborhoods but you switch the lights off. Bad idea.
	Promoting dark skies is great. I worry a little about neighborhood car thefts, as even in our safe north end neighborhood, we have had people getting into our cars if accidentally left unlocked, and keeping our porch light on makes us feel safer.
	Absolutely these are great changes. Turning off lights at night and limiting up-lighting are awesome!
	Security lights are the most invasive of nearby homes because of height and angle.
	Quit being big brother. What's next coming inside my house to make sure I shut off my interior lights while at work? Your proposal is why people hate boise city government.
	I don't see how safety and security can be maintained with lights off. Most lights are for security purposes.
	This is a step in a good direction, and more standards could be added later if needed.
	Commercial parking lots and car parks need to turn off and save energy
	LEED
	Way too many blinding lights.
	this question is poorly written. It doesn't make sense
	Safety is still a concern. Lighting should be even to a typical pedestrian walking in that area. On a different note: We need a much better definition of affordable housing. Affordable housing should be targeted to home ownership and aligned with average pay in an area. Affordable rent is nice, but that is insufficient and does not support the building of a stable, housed community and tax base.
	Who cares? We are already last in education, vaccinations, environmental protection and God knows what else? We might as well light up the night like a beacon of idiocy to the rest of the planet?! Let's make Russia great again!!! Light it up!!!
	Once again, Boise leaders are living in a dream land - we are a city and some tiny place in the middle of no where. you might as well promote muggings and rape because everything will be dark after 11pm. Another regulation at the cost of taxpayers and the rights of property owners.
	Extend it to existing neighborhoods.
	what about the wildlife
	Light bulbs should be animal friendly and reduce the amount of light pollution at night.
	I think shielding and directional light is a great thing. However, I would be wary of requiring all outdoor lighting to be off after 11pm. This could significantly negatively impact outdoor entertainment businesses, particularly in mixed use areas. Being outdoors on a warm summer night is a great part of living in boise and no outdoor lighting would kill patio spaces in bars and restaurants after 11pm.
	Stop trying to limit the rights of property owners to do what they want with their property.
	Regulation should also include Christmas light displays. Remember that even downward-directed shielded lighting can be annoyingly bright as it reflects off cars in the dealers' lots and things around homes. Check with Tucson AZ--the city has been trying to preserve dark skies for decades. Remember too that greater lumens per watt just makes it more affordable to be a big light polluter.
	Have light poles dedicated by name to contributors via plaques.
	No
	I think exterior lights should remain on - this provides additional safety and allows for people to be out later - walking and biking freely.
	You all need to figure out this housing crisis. My husband is a physician and we can't afford to buy a home here. There's already physician shortage. We're going to leave because we can't start our lives here. He's a physician! We should be able to afford a home. He's worked so hard. It's ridiculously over priced here.
	Porch lights reduce crime including package theft. I don't like walking down dark neighborhood streets.
	Yes, yes. I did mention this earlier in the survey. The lights at Pierce Park are not correct. The covers should be deeper covered more. You tell me
	Lights should stay on a night for safety. Why have a light if we can't use it at night?
	Statements are too broad, how is security define, who enforces, the light pollution police?
	I love this, I am so in support of dark skies, it is essential to human and animal health. I love that they will limit the times from 11 PM to sunrise etc. and that is definitely a priority, along with shielding existing light structures.
	YES!! I agree with fighting light pollution, but I feel this would be very difficult to enforce.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	This is pretty good but low intensity lighting should be required for those places that are exempt from dark sky requirements.
	Neighbors who have overly bright porch/garage lights.
	N/A
	This regulation should include restrictions on back yard lighting which intrudes on another neighbors home or yard.
	Stop regulating homeowners
	Require downlighting and not use bright LEDs that you see all over the City.
	Not important
	There need to be security lighting. Otherwise, we will have more accidents, criminal acts, such as rape, etc.
	Apply to existing structures (Idaho Power's new LED street lights are far too bright and invasive!)
	The other regulation I'd like to see is to ban signs that face screening and can not be seen outside of the property. There are those in our area that serve no advertising purpose because of being unable to see them from anywhere off the property, but create horrible light pollution as they shine through the natural vegative screen that was designed to help neighbors around them.
	Let's help our environment.
	What about bird strikes of windows? This is an ever increasing and serious problem that I don't see addressed here.
	How about a stricter sign ordinance that prohibits the posting of signs on power poles, roadsides, etc.
	Regulation of residential outdoor lighting is overreach. If we don't have commercial interests in the residential neighborhoods, we don't have a lighting problem.
	All lighting fixtures and areas should be part of the dark sky requirements.
	Light it up! brighter the safer. I'd rather not see the stars and feel safe walking home then have all these rules and remain car dependent. My wife doesn't walk alone in Boise now. Density and darkness is a death sentence to your walkability hopes.
	This is also another area where incentives could be given for older developments to adopt the new standards. Reduction of light pollution, and energy savings, are among the easier targets to reach for positive impact to climate change initiatives.
	we need lighting for those that go out at night to work or shop - some people like to walk at night - do not sacrifice safety
	Everyone will claim they need lights on 24/7 for security purposes. Folks should be encouraged to take a flashlight, headlamp and/or reflective vests and not rely so heavily on light at night.
	Maximize dark sky requirements
	dark spaces created without extra costs. Extra costs discourage mixed, inclusive housing
	I'm for energy efficiency & minimum illumination standards. A neighbor's back floodlight glares into my windows, and I'd love to have them turn off at 11:00p. However if it provides them with an enhanced sense of security, I'll grin & bear it. If this regulation is passed, there will need to be a whole new enforcement department formed, that will result in terrible public relations with the City. If it's unavoidable, then at least make it midnight or 1:00a to 1 hour before sunrise. Low voltage lighting should be exempt. Restricting liberty by mandating lights-off is against the spirit of Idaho I embraced when leaving California. The influence of California planning & zoning consultants is apparent throughout the new proposed regulations.
	Are you telling this to the vandals criminals and the ones out in the dark. Makes no sense
	This is a tough problem because lighting is key to avoiding crime. But require all lighting to be downward. This may require MRE fixtures and ultimately may require more power to drive. Do not push businesses and residences to not adequately light their properties for security. No energy goal is worth trading off safety of residents to achieve.
	It's a fact that crime likes to be where the light is not. So what this will accomplish is specifically allow residences to know where safe spots will not be. After a spike in crime in dark areas the lights will remain on so this is a useless regulation. Again I ask what research has been done to promote bad ideas that can be see as cause and effect in other cities.
	In lieu of blackout between 11 pm and sunrise, perhaps you should require the use of motion sensors to activate lights and turn them off. I don't like the idea of a completely dark neighborhood.
	The new fixtures should be LED, Why are you giving a minimum? You should be setting a maximum. Agree with reducing uplighting. The amount of light the Treasure Vally has on during the night is ridiculous. I am retired and work at Bogus Basin grooming trails at night and drive up to Bogus Basin road at 3:00a. I think of this every morning about sending a picture to the Mayor saying "Hey Boise, Why so many lights on at 3A?"
	The last bullet point is basically a loophole for everyone in town so I would say more needs to be done to regulate the number of lights allowed per development instead.
	have fixtures off by 10:30 at the latest.
	If all landscaping lighting must go off at 11:00 pm his does that affect the safety of people leaving work for evening shifts?

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

	Office buildings should turn off interior lights (except for security/necessary) at night. Simplot building an obvious example of huge waste.
	How are you going to truly regulate these standards for new development, but especially for everything that is already built?
	I strongly agree with promoting dark skies by requiring all outdoor lighting fixtures remain off between 11:00 P.M. and sunrise in Residential, Mixed-Use, and Special Purpose zoning districts except for security purposes or to light walkways, driveways, equipment yards, or parking lots.
	Dark skies are an invitation for crime. NOT successful, ask Tucson, AZ
	We have a huge light in our neighborhood that is on ALL the TIME and it is terribly annoying. So I am all for this!
	I'd love to see more dark skies initiatives here.
	In addition to turning lights off between certain hours in certain districts, the Zoning Code should require Dark Skies certified lighting fixtures are use, which direct light downward to reduce ambient light pollution. Additionally, requiring yellow or white lights rather than blue lights should be considered.
	Mixed feelings. Maybe require motion sensor lighting where feasible. Lights in my immediate neighborhood are on at night for security. Motion sensors would cut down on overall light pollution, while also making potential criminals aware that they cannot operate in the dark.
	Sick of being blinded by obnoxious, rude, thoughtless placement of lighting.
	I am concerned about not having enough lighting for security purposes
	Fantastic.
	Enforce the new rules; require downtown buildings to implement dark skies rules

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2

Zoning Code Rewrite: Community Survey Comments, Module 2