



# HOUSING BONUS ORDINANCE PROPOSAL

## PUBLIC COMMENTS



## SUMMARY

Choice in housing matters in our community. We must offer housing choices that make our community more affordable, and diversify housing options for all who wish to call Boise home. To help achieve these goals, the City of Boise proposes the following amendment to Boise City Code Chapter 11-06-03.4 to offer property owners a housing bonus in exchange for helping improve housing affordability, housing options, and transportation choice in our community.

The proposed housing bonus ordinance offers five incentive options that include various modifications to zoning standards such as a streamlined review process, a parking reduction, density flexibility, and increased building height. [Click here for more information.](#)

The city initially received 74 responses. The form was then extended for approximately a month, resulting in 99 responses. Of the latter number, 30 selected “yes,” 22 selected “maybe,” and 47 selected “no” in response to whether the proposed incentives made sense for Boise. Specific comments are provided hereafter.



# COMMENTS – YES

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
NICHOLAS JEZIERNY	451 E. Thurman Mill St.	Yes

Affordable housing is an issue and anything that requires less parking is good as that will eventually lead to alternative ways of getting around other than single-passenger car rides.

SHAUN HAMMERSMARK	1107 N. 20th Street	Yes
-------------------	---------------------	-----

My main concern is the accessibility of affordable housing - it should be clarified that, at least, 20% of new (multiple) housing is designated low-income - low-income should be clearly defined, as I feel so many people think it means drug addicts, homeless, et al - this has been a point of contention for years

JEFF BLACK	2013 N 7th St	Yes
------------	---------------	-----

Given the significant growth and rise in prices over the past several years, these are good incentives to provide a balance of housing for more to live and work in Boise, and reduce the risk of falling into homelessness.

CINDY RAHN	2015 S Denver Ave	Yes
------------	-------------------	-----

We should offer every available incentive to property owners to help keep Boise an affordable place to live! If we do not work at fixing the housing issue then Boise will find many natives priced right out of town (which is already happening). We will lose much of what makes this city the great place to live as we lose our diversity. It's the people here, the culture of the city and it matters quite a lot! If we don't fix it, we will be like the place everyone is moving away from, like San Francisco!

MARIHA GAGE	9480 W Sloan St, Boise ID 83714	Yes
-------------	---------------------------------	-----

We low income senior housing and we need it ASAP!

ANDREW BARTON	7525 W Maxwell Dr.	Yes
---------------	--------------------	-----

We should slow down urban sprawl and the car-centric design that leads to. Mix-use and mix-income supports everyone. Income restricted housing mustn't be isolated lest we exacerbate other social issues.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
DON GRIFFIN	5201 W Denton St Apt 102	Yes

It does take into consideration of those on fixed incomes or budgets. Seniors are a growing part of the Boise demographic and provisions should be made for their not being priced out of the area.

NEYSA JENSEN	1809 North 7th St.	Yes
--------------	--------------------	-----

I think this is a good start. I would be in favor of even more aggressive incentives, but we can look toward that if these get through.

ANN L LEADBETTER	2291 N 31st St, Boise ID.	Yes
------------------	---------------------------	-----

I don't feel as if the draft proposal is lay-person friendly, but I feel strongly about the need for affordable housing in Boise. We desperately need places for people to live who are making wages that are way out of line with housing prices. Without housing that is WAY more affordable, young people, service workers, and artists can't afford to live here and Boise becomes a mono culture of older white rich people. Vitality and creativity are lost – gone to somewhere that isn't as "cool" but is affordable. And then Boise loses the qualities that made it the cool place that everyone wanted to move to. The housing prices are insane – out of control.

CAILE SPEAR	920 N. Balsam St.	Yes
-------------	-------------------	-----

I like the idea of reusing buildings because as our economy changes it makes sense to reuse what is already built. I think we should also look at reducing the size of older parking lots. The buildings along River Street haven't used all of the parking lot in at least 5 years and converting asphalt to green space/green walls/places to grow food would make sense.

The old Kmart on Americana has a huge parking lot for a call center and a big chunk of that could be used for a building for the farmers market or a better place for people who are forced to live out of their cars that are parked around that building and by the post office. Interfaith Sanctuary needs more space maybe another innovative building, like the shipping container homes could be placed in some of the largely unused parking lot.

I know Albertson's is using the old Kmart/Gordmans but across the nation and in Boise strip malls are being converted to schools and housing. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-06-30/a-case-for-turning-empty-malls-into-housing>  
<https://www.aprio.com/whatsnext/transforming-abandoned-malls-apartments-hotels/>  
<https://www.cnu.org/publicsquare/2019/10/08/malls-mixed-use-centers-and-other-opportunities>

BEVERLY CHANEY	4414 S. Axiom Ave.	Yes
----------------	--------------------	-----

I'm no expert, but we need to do something to promote mixed income housing! This seems reasonable.

ROSA CARNOT	4196 N Blue Wing Pl, Boise 83714	Yes
-------------	----------------------------------	-----

The price of housing has dramatically increased over the last 5-7 years. It has priced out younger, lower middle class renters and buyers. We have also torn down existing low income housing and replaced it with high end housing. This has increased our homeless population creating serious safety and health issues. It has also contributed to the growth of surrounding cities. There is a delicate balance and certainly creates a challenge for the city but I'm confident that with our current leadership we will get there.

TAYLOR TANIGUCHI	3333 N Pepperwood Dr Boise ID 83704	Yes
------------------	-------------------------------------	-----

We need to help keep housing options affordable in our city so that every income level has an option for a place to live. As someone who has benefitted from help from some government programs when times were rough they do make a difference and help. We should not deny this help to others. This can be the difference from a step out of their current situation to a better place in a few years.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
DAVE KANGAS	1715 W Canal	Yes

I appreciate specifying the different zones that will receive different bonuses, mostly protecting the r-1 zones.

MILTON T REYNOLDS	6310 W Butte ST	Yes
-------------------	-----------------	-----

Public transit and parking are on a sliding scaled, each on a different end of the scale. When public transit options seem affordable, convenient, safe and clean, the need for vehicle parking should be much less. Thanks for the thoughtful plan!

CHARLIE ALLEN	881 N 31st ST	Yes
---------------	---------------	-----

I think it could definitely incentivize in the current market streamlining processing. My question would be, is the incentive enough?

RACHEL GROSSO	1621 N 6th St	Yes
---------------	---------------	-----

I absolutely support the City of Boise using our development code to incentivize the re-use of structures (an excellent 'recycling' exercise) and increase the height (and therefore density) of certain zoned uses. However, I think it is in our entire community's benefits to eradicate parking minimums, and therefore while I support the inclusion of a parking reduction as an incentive for smart growth development, I believe it should be further reaching. Additionally, the City of Boise should investigate using city development code to funnel impact fees towards Valley Regional Transit. There is a stated desire (from the suggestions above) to increase access to transit and increase housing stock near existing transit stops - this incentive could reach so much further if VRT were receiving funding to adjust existing routes or add new routes where development is planned to occur. I would like to repeat my general, ardent support for using the development code to support housing density and housing affordability in our gorgeous, livable city. We can continue these efforts by eradicating parking minimums from the code, and dedicating development fees to VRT. Thank you!

HENRY GOETSCH	7341 N Parkcrest Ave. Boise, Idaho 83714	Yes
---------------	--	-----

"Affordable housing is one issue of many issues boise faces that lay within concentric circles. We cannot tackle these issues without a revised, encouraging approach to density. Parking reductions, increased building height, infill and the rest of the strategies presented are the most direct initiatives toward the type of dense development that Boise must move towards as a growing metropolis.

No other major city has solved affordable housing, transit and other issues without this type of approach.

The fact is, the greater Boise metro is growing like crazy and will continue to do so well into the future. We cannot stop the growth, we can only shove it westward toward Meridian, Nampa, Caldwell etc. which will still result in massive impact on the CoB proper. Vancouver Canada is an excellent metropolitan area to look to as a model, and this proposal follows in it's spirit."

KIARA ZHARISSE KATOR	977 N Maple Grove Rd #206	Yes
----------------------	---------------------------	-----

I have lived in Boise for nearly all of my life and it is very sad to think that natives are getting pushed out of their homes. Wages don't increase enough for people to keep up with rent payments and affording a down-payment on a home is nearly impossible.

GANNON KOLDING	9732 W Cory Ln	Yes
----------------	----------------	-----

I don't see how anyone could argue against this, unless they just hate the poor? Housing prices have been rising steadily for years, while wages stagnate. I make close to twice minimum wage and I can still barely afford to live even 6 miles from the city center. We need more affordable housing, or Boise's sprawl is just going to get worse and the downtown area will just be dominated by the rich.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
LOGAN BARCLAY	3000 W. Stewart Ave.	Yes

I fully support promoting the construction of affordable housing in Boise. I live in the west end, in an area zoned R2, and I realize these changes will affect my neighborhood, and I still support them 100%! We cannot allow NIMBYism to continue to hold back Boise. The population will continue to grow, and we need to do everything we can to grow with it.

LUCI WILSON	2214 W Idaho st	Yes
-------------	-----------------	-----

As a dual income household with one child it is becoming INCREDIBLY difficult to afford housing despite all the work put into finding a home. We will soon be forced out of the city of Boise and forced to commute for much longer distances. This puts a strain on the transportation infrastructure and air pollution. If you make living in Boise cheaper many other issues may receive some relief.

JACOB LARSON	4285 bristol street Boise	Yes
--------------	---------------------------	-----

We need affordable housing in this city. The parking restrictions incentive does cause me some concern as we don't really have a good public transportation system here so there are a lot of car owners.

BYRON FOLWELL	23 N. Roosevelt St.	Yes
---------------	---------------------	-----

I am completely in support of this ordinance, however, I would love to see a few changes (I am an architect who makes use of the City Code on a daily basis) 1. I would love to have a different set of incentives provided for small in-town lots (50x120 and 100x120, and others), since development on those lots follows a very different model than large-lot apartment complexes. 2. Further incentives provided for 60% AMI and below projects. 3. HBO extended into R-1C zones, ensuring equity in neighborhood housing availability. THANK YOU for this initiative. I am optimistic that this will be the first step in providing affordability and variety to Boise's neighborhoods.

GARY HANES	992 E Riverpark Ln, Boise, ID 83706	Yes
------------	-------------------------------------	-----

I think it's worth trying these strategies with the knowledge that more relaxation and bending of the rules may be required to produce more affordable housing. Also, the City should be prepared to modify the conditions of approval. Perhaps economic conditions would change so that these same bonuses would have a bigger impact at times and smaller impacts at other times. Be flexible and willing to revisit this again and again.

STACEY ALEXANDER	1519 W Fort St	Yes
------------------	----------------	-----

With the increasing gap between AMI and rents in and around Boise, we need every incentive possible since we are limited on state tools for affordable housing.

LAURA WILLIAMS	4618 W Freemont	Yes
----------------	-----------------	-----

Because Idaho is limited in requiring affordable housing, it makes sense to encourage it through other means - like density bonuses and parking reductions. The City has to start somewhere to promote affordable options, and this seems like a great starting point.

WADE DORRELL	6533 W Kangaroo Ct	Yes
--------------	--------------------	-----

It seems inevitable that Boise will grow in population, especially accelerated now due to increased adoption of remote employment. So, it makes sense to begin to allow Boise to grow "up and not out" and these zoning changes seem to be both in that direction (height increases allowed, paired with reduction of parking allowed as befits a city where people tend to cluster near commercial they use, and where they increasingly do not commute at all to work.) Thanks for making these changes.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
JESSICA DURHAM	488 E. Lake Rim Lane, Boise, ID	Yes

We need more affordable housing in Boise and the Treasure Valley. It is an absolute necessity for attainable housing to become a reality for Boisian's.

SHELLAN M RODRIGUEZ	529 N Hillview Drive	Yes
---------------------	----------------------	-----

"I would like to voice my support for the affordable housing density bonus incentive. I work in affordable housing development and I have worked for both public, private, non profit developers as well as for public agencies in partnership with private developers. I've worked in Idaho but also in many other western states including Montana, Nevada, California and Hawaii. Creating affordable housing is hard. There is no silver bullet, and no solution is the only solution.

For this reason, I think the density bonus is a tremendous first step for Boise. It won't be perfect, and it will not turn the tides and "solve the need for affordable housing" overnight. Instead it will likely take time and it is a single step in the right direction. Be pragmatic, gather data and analyze regularly... review the ordinance in a year and determine what worked and why, more importantly determine what did not work and why.

A few suggestions for the ordinance are listed below -

- Section F(2)(a): Clarify how you are measuring distance for the transit portion, as the crow flies or walkable.
- Section F(1)(a)(i): Consider creating a template Annual Report that you can show developers/ applicants to help them understand the expectation, make it simple, make it a form and make sure it will not put them at risk by incorporating resident's personal information. Reach out to property management firms to review."



## COMMENTS – MAYBE

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
LINDSEY LOCH	2604 S Kerr St, Boise 83705	Maybe

Boise needs REAL affordable housing. Last September the north end duplex I'd lived in for 12 years sold. A two bedroom, my rent was \$745, water sewer trash included. I searched daily for an entire month to find anything that wasn't filthy, or falling apart. My brother moved with me, he has a full time job \$11 an hour. Me, I get about \$890 from SS. Every place we applied wanted us to be making 3 x the rent per month. By pure luck we found someone willing to work with us and it's a decent place but I worry if we are asked to move again. We are in the Vistas area and there is new housing going up everywhere, NOT APARTMENTS AND NOT AFFORDABLE! What happens to all these folks living in trailer parks when the people on all these nice new homes declare their homes an eyesore? No one in Boise is looking out for these people. REAL affordable housing should have all the niceties that everyone else wants. No one wants to live next to the highway listening to traffic day and night or breathing in the tons of diesel fumes that comes with it. Take care of ALL your people!

MATT BARBEE	4905 W. Greenbrier Dr.	Maybe
-------------	------------------------	-------

Using HUD's Average Median Income (AMI) number to define "affordable units" is an incredibly poor choice because it includes homeowners and has been drastically driven up by significantly wealthier newcomers. But let's break this down: at 100% and 80% of AMI, the thresholds for this ordinance, any new apartment buildings built under this program would limit twenty percent of rents at \$1,870/month and fifteen percent at \$1,495, respectively, for a family of four. In most of Boise, this is already way above market rate and would be considered luxury housing, not 'affordable housing' as this ordinance claims. In the North End, Downtown, or the East End, this might provide some 'relatively affordable housing' but it won't really do so anywhere else in the city, and this is really just allowing developers to be rewarded for the status quo. A lower income cap is what the rest of Boise needs (ie. the part of Boise that needs the most help here), an index of 60 percent of AMI would actually start to benefit these people (rents of \$1222 for a family of four). Even better would be 50 percent of AMI (\$935). Even if the percentage of units at these rates would need to be reduced it would be a night and day difference and would address the real problem here. If you aren't willing to consider lowering the AMI citywide, maybe ya'll could consider pegging it to a lower percent of AMI only in certain parts of the city like the Bench? Because if you aren't willing to do this this ordinance is pretty much pointless here, and won't really help anyone.

Thanks for your time and I hope you will consider these alterations to the ordinance,  
 Matt Barbee, District 1713 Precinct Captain

ROBERT COATS	6799 E Warm Springs Ave	Maybe
--------------	-------------------------	-------

The City is allowing developers to build 100s of homes on tiny lots. But there's no way to enlarge our main transport arteries. Warm Springs travel is backed up for blocks at traffic lights. It only makes sense to allow more dense development downtown.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
MARISA KEITH	3279 S Cloverdale Rd, Boise, ID 83709	Maybe

I think one of the biggest confusions I have with this ordinance is that Boise is right now beginning the process of a zoning re-write, yet this is being moved through the process in advance of that. It makes more sense to me to include this as a possible measure to take within the broader re-write and to send this out to public comment at the same time as the new zoning code.

I do not support making some housing projects director level approvals. One of the major talking points of Mayor McLean’s platforms is public engagement. Limiting some projects to director level approval robs residents of their ability to address concerns in a public hearing and limits their ability to affect change for the better. If this ordinance had already been in place and the developers had met the quota then the Music Subdivision may still have a private pond area instead of a publicly accessible place thanks to President Clegg. The project off I-84 and the freeway may not have been required to connect the walking path which was off-site of their development, which again was possible due to City Council involvement.

I am supportive of the term of income restriction to 30 years, anything less would just be a band aid at this point. However, I think the AMI % should be lowered to more appropriately reflect the income level of those people who are being priced out. Maybe a certain number of homes can be at 60%, then a certain number at 80% and then 100% to be able to target a variety of income levels. This would also lead to more economically diverse communities.

Another area that concerns me is the parking reductions. Overall, I support parking reductions in areas where there are other modes of transportation or where the primary job market is within walking/biking distance. Lowering the parking requirement for an area in SW Boise where pretty much everyone needs a car to get to their place of employment, dentist, school, doctor, library and virtually any other service or amenity means that people will be parking on streets or in adjacent neighborhoods. There is a good example of a development built without adequate parking on Maple Grove just south of Lake Hazel. I believe this was a public housing project in the county. I am not sure what the parking spot ratio was here compared to code today, but I know it was approved under an old parking code. As a result each night 30-50 cars park along Maple Grove, this may be mitigated by a new parking lot provided by a developer who wanted to have a new subdivision approved and was denied due to the parking problem. Reducing the parking did not reduce the need for these people to rely on cars in SW Boise and now additional parking spots are being created off site to deal with the situation. I think more information is needed on how parking needs vary across the city.

The city may be better served to focus on methods to incentivize housing being built as soon as possible after the public hearing process concludes. SW Boise has around 5,000 lots approved between the city/county and ready to be built but for many reasons developers are waiting years, sometimes decades before actually starting construction.

Thank you for your time  
Marisa Keith

KATHLEEN COSKEY	2321 W Pleasanton Ave	Maybe
-----------------	-----------------------	-------

I have tried to read and understand the proposed ordinance to the best of my ability as a lay person. I would love some clarification if I am at all mistaken. I see in R-2 which I believe includes my property, you can have an adaptive reuse parking reduction bonus. This seems a bit arbitrary. Could I build another structure, then a couple years down the road use it for adaptive reuse? Why not just allow the parking reduction if I built an ADU immediately? Further, I live on a corner and find I have way more parking than I need already, as we have 1 car and put it in the garage. The other thing I think would be helpful would be if I could build an ADU and rent out both my house and the ADU. I think this would increase (relatively) affordable and flexible housing, rather than requiring the owner to live on the property and therefore be very well off. It would also add to our ability financially to maintain the property as we would have income coming in. Thank you.

DANIEL MALARKEY	3416 W Meadow Dr, Boise ID 83706	Maybe
-----------------	----------------------------------	-------

I think the ordinance should lower the period that units are reserved for low-income from 30 years to 5 years. Five years would provide an immediate benefit to households with moderate incomes and also allow enough time for the city’s builders to add enough housing to better match supply and demand. With enough housing, Boise’s rents would naturally adjust to make the city affordable for those with moderate incomes as happens in other cities. The foregone revenue to building owners from the proposed 30-year affordability requirement will overwhelm the value of the incentives and the city will not get new housing supply nor any new affordable units..



FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
<b>DANIEL OREMUS</b>	1390 W Howard St	Maybe

If you limit parking the neighbors get people parking and blocking their homes. You must limit the amount of cars per home to match the parking lot size. Do not let them own too many cars as to overfill the parking lot.

<b>JOAN DERRICK</b>	2025 Tooele Place	Maybe
---------------------	-------------------	-------

The incentives do not clearly state where the proposed housing would be. More info needed on the impact to the area such as increased traffic, the need for more traffic lights, impact on schools in the area and general increase in congestion. Plus, where is the financing coming from for the construction of additional affordable housing.

<b>BETTE HOVEY</b>	609 North Liberty St.	Maybe
--------------------	-----------------------	-------

Noted affordable housing is needed, as is "quality" low income housing. We are seeing some of the rentals out here in very poor condition and it is shameful for people to have to live in these conditions. Parking can be an issue, one-family units generally need 2 car parking. Generally, Working folks have two vehicles to get back and forth to work and need parking at home. And, I surely don't want to see a 3-story building planted next to single story homes.

<b>CATHERINE LEWERS</b>	3011 S Brookridge Way	Maybe
-------------------------	-----------------------	-------

They do, except the parking waiver should only go with transit supportive development.

<b>JUSTIN R BROWN</b>	3925 N Mint Avenue, Boise ID 83703	Maybe
-----------------------	------------------------------------	-------

Overall, I think there is a lot of good incentives for developers, and we do need to do something about housing prices in Boise. The concern that I have is a reduction in parking requirements. Early on in life, my wife and I lived in an apartment on a street with lots of high density housing. The lack of sufficient parking led to a lot of people parking on the street, which led to more vehicle theft and vandalizing (I actually had my car stolen, but I don't think that is typical). I don't know if there's a way to look at the permits on a case-by-case basis, but transportation is going to be important, and without sufficient parking or transportation, you may end up with transit/parking issues for years to come. Boise is unlikely to get smaller, and if I was a developer, single bedroom apartments would be the way to go, which would move closer to a 1:1 ratio of units to cars. There should definitely be a requirement for guest spaces as well.

That's a long way of saying, mostly agree, but the parking reduction requirement is too generous.

Hope this helps, thanks for the opportunity to provide input

<b>WIL GEHL</b>	1605 N 27th St	Maybe
-----------------	----------------	-------

I think in general the proposals make sense for Boise and address developers concerns. I would encourage you to revisit the proposal from future resident's perspectives particularly around parking. We all know our public transportation options are less than adequate so most families, low income or not, rely on personal motor vehicles. With too much parking reduction, it's likely the units allocated for low income residents will lose out due to the high cost or unavailability of off street parking. When designing mixed income housing I think it's important to consider the building/community values you're encouraging by creating clear different classes of residents. Parking is just one visible sign of this. I think parking reductions should only be allowed if a transit supportive bonus is applied.

<b>LINDA PAUL</b>	1715 S Grant Ave 83706	Maybe
-------------------	------------------------	-------

I like the idea of these incentives. However, It seems that this entire proposal is putting the cart before the horse. What happens to this AFTER the updating of the city zoning ordinances?

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
TAMMY IKONEN	1249 W. Grand Ave	Maybe

first of all there has been no increase in wages in any way shape or form The cost of living has risen and if you build affordable housing that's great but there's no way to pay the rent since there is no pay incentive in any place shape or form in Ada county mediocre jobs that pay minimum wage barely covers the cost of rent we need to go back to the table and discuss salary increase in minimum wage

EDITH JONES	2100 N 31st	Maybe
-------------	-------------	-------

I have a particular parcel in the N End with under-developed square footage in the rear lot. Limitations on setbacks, etc have historically incented any development to be a tear-down, and conditional use approval to build two "skinny homes". My goal has always been to consider an IndieDwell or other affordable unit in the rear, with preservation of the home originally built in 1940. I'd love to spend 10 mins chatting with a planner to understand if these and the other proposed changes would open up possibilities for development?

GERALDINE CHASE	5490 S Veronica Pl, Boise, ID 83716	Maybe
-----------------	-------------------------------------	-------

Happy to see that steps are finally being taken to slow down and get a handle on out of control growth that is causing a hardship for people who live in work in Boise. Also glad to see incentives for incorporating existing structures! However, 10-20% of units being income restricted is not nearly enough to meet current housing needs of working class families who are struggling in Boise/Ada County. Some of them barely miss being eligible for subsidized or affordable housing and the wait time for those types of units if they do qualify is 2-3 years! Because they have to spend 50-60% of income on ever increasing rents, it makes it hard to save for a down payment on a home purchase, if they haven't already been completely priced out of the housing market. While this is a starting point, it is not enough and it will only help a small percent of the ever-increasing working poor demographic in our city. Developers and builders need to be incentivized to build homes/apartments at entry level prices that are more in line with Idaho's wage base for those just above the poverty line who don't qualify for income restrictive housing, but whom are still struggling. Thanks for the hard work and effort you are all making to address a really impactful issue in our community.

MATTHEW SCHULER	3606 S North Church Ave	Maybe
-----------------	-------------------------	-------

Will parking become so reduced that it will discourage people from going downtown? Does streamlining mean important protections will be overlooked?

NOA MURPHY	522 N Maple Ave, Boise 83712	Maybe
------------	------------------------------	-------

Each of the bonuses makes sense to me except for the Approval Process. It makes me wonder why all approvals are not already streamlined. Or, on the flip side, why the planning department would not want to give the same thoughtful consideration to affordable and diverse projects as all other projects. I would be more in favor of a bonus that would prioritize approval for affordable and diverse projects, kind of like "These projects get to skip to the head of the line no matter what else is in the queue at the moment."

RICHARD LLEWELLYN	9170 W HILL RD	Maybe
-------------------	----------------	-------

"November 24, 2020  
Re: Housing Bonus Ordinance

I've attempted to submit my comments here, but the form does not accept an adequate number of lines. I will submit directly to Andrea Tuning.

Thanks,  
Richard Llewellyn"

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
<b>BRIAN CHOJNACKY</b>	2516 W Bannock St., Boise ID 83702	Maybe

“It really depends on where exactly you have in mind for these bonuses to occur. For example, in the West End neighborhood, there are many lots/properties along the Main-Fairview corridor where this makes perfect sense. Also the current land that ITD sits upon. However, the residential core of the neighborhood, where the original historic homes exist, (mainly east of 27th st.) does not make sense. While I understand the need for more housing options for people due to our growth as a city, I don’t think we need to do so at the peril of losing our coveted thriving urban neighborhoods. Thank you.”

<b>ERIK KINGSTON</b>	1010 E. Jefferson	Maybe
----------------------	-------------------	-------

“I’m not convinced that a 10% minimum is an adequate condition, or that proposed rent restrictions will be within reach of the vast majority of essential workers, seniors or people with disabilities on fixed incomes.

70% of jobs in Idaho pay less than \$20/hour; this means that a small percentage can afford anything over \$1,000/month. The vast majority of child/elder caregivers or retail, hospitality and service workers can afford between \$377 (minimum wage) to \$800/month.

It’s not clear that the rent restrictions will help any of these households. Boise can’t squander this opportunity to create housing types and price points that meet the actual needs and incomes of Boiseans that have been displaced in droves owing to speculative investment and flipping.

If the city ignores this reality and continues to put the financial interests of developers ahead of the larger community interests, local government will lose credibility and support.

I saw the following post shared in multiple FB pages. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/thenorthend/permalink/3815994015101445/>

I would like a response to the allegations (some that seem exaggerated/misleading), and strongly recommend the city respond to these posts with factual/verifiable information.

You have an opportunity to correct decades of ineffective housing and development policy that have contributed to our current housing crisis. I want this rezone to succeed with the confidence of residents and taxpayers. You’re asking people to give up their right to weigh in on development that dramatically impacts their property, neighborhoods and traffic impacts. It’s critical to demonstrate to them that the trade off is worth it in the long run, and that they, their children and our essential workers can be part of their neighborhood and community now and into the future.

Thanks for all your work on this; I know it isn’t easy. “

<b>MICHAEL QUINLAN</b>	11719 W Arlen St	Maybe
------------------------	------------------	-------

I don’t understand what the rationale is for the parking requirement reductions. It is a fact that in Boise most people need to have a car in order to get around. If you reduce the parking requirements then people will just have to park on the street or use other area parking and I don’t think that is desirable.



## COMMENTS – NO

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
LORI DICAIRE	7154 W State St	No

This comment is on behalf of Vanishing Boise. We have always encouraged the city – straddled with limited tools at its disposal - to leverage its approval process contingent on getting something in return from developers in the public good. However, as always, the devil is in the details – in this case, with the rental thresholds. We have four concerns with the program:

(1) It doesn't actually require housing affordable to traditional Boise, giving these bonuses to developers that 'limit' just twenty percent of units to \$1,870 rent per month, for a family of four. The city is using HUD's Average Median Income (AMI) number to define "affordable units", a number that i) includes homeowners, and ii) has been drastically driven up by wealthier newcomers, and astonishingly now sits at \$74,800, which is likely an underestimate, as it is based on data from several years back. In Boise we really have two populations now, and the AMI doesn't reflect either.

At 100% and 80% of AMI, the thresholds for the city's HB ordinance, any new apartment buildings built under this program would limit twenty percent of rents at \$1,870/month and fifteen percent at \$1,495, respectively, for a family of four ('affordable' rent is capped at 30 percent of one's income). In most of Boise, this is already above market rate. It might achieve 'relatively affordable' housing in the North End, Downtown, or the East End, but for the rest of city, this is just allowing developers to be rewarded for the status quo. A lower income-cap might actually help traditional Boise – the Boise that needs help. An index of 60 percent of median would actually start to benefit this population, yielding rents of \$1222 for a family of four or \$786 for one. Even better – 50 percent (\$935 or \$655). Even if the overall percentage of units at these rates were reduced, at least it would start to address the real problem.

(2) In exchange for these 'affordable' units, the developer gets to circumvent the normal Planning and Zoning process and have the Planning Director approve projects that meet the program guidelines - essentially fast-tracking their application process, with only one stop at Design Review, which is based on the assumption that the project is already approved in concept, and only the details such as facade materials typically require approval.

Remember that Boise hires developers for the top job at Planning and Development, so now developers will get to approve more of fellow developer's applications with limited public input. There has been abuses of this power in the past – recall Blue Valley, in which the Planning Director at the time (Derick O'Neil) deemed a neighborhood meeting unnecessary before an Administrative Decision to allow a 100 bay diesel trucking terminal 150' away from the Blue Valley community. We all know that in privileged parts of town, there would have been a neighborhood meeting if a resident wanted to build a car port.

(3) Another concern is how long the developers are required to price them at this "affordable" rate. Often these sorts of programs have expiration dates (5-30 years) so that they are not affordable in-perpetuity – which we maintain they should be if they come with any kind of public subsidy.

(4) Our final concern is more of a question: why is the city hurrying this proposal ahead of the actual zoning code overhaul when people aren't really engaged in the process??

What could be a useful ordinance will instead incentivize developers to essentially build a product that they are already building like mad: market-rate units; instead of using their power to get the product that the profit-driven development industry ignores – units prices for actual low-income/working class/people living on Boise salaries. Housing Bonus Ordinance could be rescued by changing the numbers from 100 and 80 percent of AMI to something that would actually help, such as 60 and 50 percent.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
<b>DARCY HORTON</b>	1701 N 12th St, Boise, ID	No

I am strongly against anything that involves parking reductions. Parking requirements are there for a reason. I don't want owners forced to find parking on surrounding streets. This will hurt already struggling merchants. Also, if parking is reduced, how will people get to work, to the doctor and get their children to school? I've lived in areas where cities granted reduced parking to developers and it never ended well for anyone but the developer. Please don't do this to Boise.

<b>GABRIEL J IACOBONI</b>	2982 East Nahuatl Drive	No
---------------------------	-------------------------	----

What is deemed affordable is really unaffordable for the vast majority of non - property owners. Lowering the income thresholds to allow developers to qualify for the program would make a difference.

<b>TIM BREUER</b>	3824 N 33rd St, Boise, ID 83703	No
-------------------	---------------------------------	----

The intent of this proposed ordinance makes total sense. But there are many ways to achieve the goal of increased affordable housing. Given the ordinance update effort is embarking it seems premature to rush on piece of the puzzle through before much public engagement is achieved. The Citizen Committee recently appointed should be a first cut at a reaction to the proposal, followed by robust community input. This was the approach that was articulated early before the committee was reconfigured. Either use the committee as the sounding board or focus group it is intended or do away with the citizen committee and focus on community engagement. This Housing Bonus Ordinance deserves more input and thought from the community, including developers, neighbors, citizen activists and housing experts. I appreciate the effort. It is needed. But this initial effort is half baked. Thanks for your good work, regardless. Tim

<b>CAROL MENGES</b>	306 S. Roosevelt St., #204	No
---------------------	----------------------------	----

At the VERY least, fast tracking zoning changes for projects like this leaves out suitable time for public input. Also, reduced parking is a disaster in the making for average families who need and WANT at least one car, and who are not at all interested in doing without them for the sake of the City's unBoise-like mutation plan. Time's getting short, but those two points are huge for me. I want to spend the rest of the couple of hours advising friends and neighbors to get on board to object to this plan that clearly comes out of what I and other Boiseans call Mayor McLean & Co.'s Manifesto.

<b>CHRISTINE RUNION</b>	219 S Phillippi St, Apt 104	No
-------------------------	-----------------------------	----

I have read about the "affordable housing" rents, they are way above affordable. I would never be able to afford one of those. I currently live in a 1400sq foot 2 bedroom very nice apartment in boise, which is \$925 monthly and barely affordable for a single mom on a single income with no child support and no option of getting child support. We need real affordable housing. Not only is the current rental situation unaffordable, but the requirements of moving in are to earn 3 times the rent, which is the part that really makes places unattainable. Most single moms don't make 3000/month, and with these new "Affordable housing" prices of 1400-1800 a month, that means someone would have to make 6000-7000 a month. If we made that much we would buy a house....

<b>STANLEY SCOTT ARMSTRONG</b>	1706 S. Piney Creek Rd.	No
--------------------------------	-------------------------	----

The city of Boise claims to want to be a city for everyone. However, I don't see how these proposals will help me or my family. We desperately want to buy a home so our two young children can have a small back yard to play in. However, with the housing market as it currently is, it is impossible for us to do so. Every home we have made an offer on in the last several months has sold for \$20,000 or more over asking price and appraisal. I don't see how the proposals made here will help people in my situation to get into a home. I grew up here, and have served this city as a paramedic for the past five years. We just don't make that much money, so how are we supposed to come up with an additional \$20,000+ to compete with home buyers from out of state. Right now it seems to me that the City of Boise wants to be a city for everyone from out of state who can bring their money to the area, but has no desire to be a home for those who have called Boise home for their entire lives.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
<b>MARK HATFIELD</b>	1703 North Raymond Street	No

Your definition of average income in Boise is nowhere near reality and those who truly need affordable housing will not be able to afford the units built under this. We need real affordable housing this is just a boon to developers

<b>GRACE GALVAN</b>	9275 w Austin St, Garden City	No
---------------------	-------------------------------	----

I had to move 30 min from my work downtown because of housing developments that eventually increased our rent. My family is low income and 700 for a two bedroom in the north end was affordable. This is not low income. I am low income and can't afford these shitty apartments. You'll destroy equal housing and push working families out unless they are forced to go on housing welfare. How is that a good idea?

<b>MARIE LEVITON</b>	6904 W. Petrie St., Boise 8370r	No
----------------------	---------------------------------	----

The AMI of you're using is not realistic for working class people of Boise. Even those of us who may make that much cannot afford such high rents when coupled with health care and other rising costs. Fast tracking helps developers make more money, builds housing for other developers to snatch up and increases housing costs to unrealistic levels.

Further, reducing required parking spaces to only one makes no sense in a community with poor public transit and pedestrian routes of travel. A person using a wheelchair cannot safely navigate most of our city sidewalks due to driveway slopes, broken and uneven sidewalks and sidewalks that abruptly end without curb cuts.

You should be using 60% and 50% AMI to determine what affordable housing is. You should be ensuring that new development includes neighborhood infrastructure improvements, including parking, sidewalks, safe crosswalks and improved public transit.

Boise's unchecked growth with little concern for the people who make the city hum - grocery store workers, janitorial, food service, delivery - they are forgotten.

The city has seen unprecedented increase in property values and property taxes. Yet, still few improvements to public transit or pedestrian routes, because developers don't add to the community or enhance neighborhoods. They get breaks and move on.

People are who need the breaks. Affordable housing means real people who make the city what it is have a safe and affordable home. \$1800 a month is not that.

<b>PEG RICHARDS</b>	6419 W Russett Street, Boise Idaho	No
---------------------	------------------------------------	----

We need housing for 30 to 50 percent median income. Offering bonuses for full median income does not provide the housing option that is missing in our community.

<b>TREVA KEETON</b>	1090 S Leadville Ave Apt 36	No
---------------------	-----------------------------	----

It will only help those with a medium income. Low income tenants would still not be able to afford it.

<b>AMY GANNON</b>	1281 e Greensboro st	No
-------------------	----------------------	----

Look, you have to make decisions based on what's best for those who need it. Who needs your help and protection now, actual low income renters. Please consider an incentive that would help those who simply cannot afford rent (read as "ability to have a basic human need, adequate shelter) over 1,000. And, realistically, most of us could barely afford 500. So if you are not actually protecting the citizens who actually need that protection, what is you're job, really?

<b>ROBERT HART</b>	2805 N. 32 St.	No
--------------------	----------------	----

This is not low income housing. High income apartments are not the solution for Boise. And giving developers even more free reign - without anything on their mind but luxurious amounts of wealth - is a sure fire way to destroy what Boise was before this unchecked growth began. Patience, thoughtful infrastructure for the future, quality of work, and producing something worthy of the land you've taken - this is how we should proceed.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
<b>GERI CHASE</b>	5490 S Veronica Pl - Boise, 83716	No

As a single mom making 3 times minimum wage, there is no way I could afford almost \$1,900 a month for rent and still have enough for groceries and utilities. Your “affordability” equation is not in line with Boise’s actual working class wage base. Besides the “fast track” concerns mentioned above, which just invite more developer abuse, where is the path to home ownership in all of these plans? I don’t want to continue to rent, but I’ve been priced out of the housing market. There is never any talk about incentivizing developers to build entry-level homes/condos at an affordable price that’s in line with Boise wages for young couples and single income families. Home ownership can provide a level of stability for families that renting doesn’t provide.

<b>MARY DRAGONE</b>	1420 E jefferson St	No
---------------------	---------------------	----

Absolutely. No higher buildings should be allowed. The rent is not affordable for anyone if it is over 900 a month for a single person. Wages are not that great here. An index of 60 percent of median would actually start to benefit this population, yielding rents of \$1222 for a family of four or \$786 for one. Even better – 50 percent (\$935 or \$655). Even if the overall percentage of units at these rates were reduced, at least it would start to address the real problem.

No fast tracking for developers.

I’m not pleased aesthetically with much of the new construction downtown Boise. It all looks like post war Soviet block buildings. Tall and hideous.

<b>MARTHA LANE</b>	1003 E Greenwood Circle	No
--------------------	-------------------------	----

The median income should be at 60% to make sense for Boise. Our income levels are such that the average affordable rent that is proposed is beyond a family of four. Please rethink! Also, not requiring sufficient parking without a good public transportation is ludicrous. It will just make parking in the activity zones impossible. An example is the construction of the two condos with only one vehicle per unit around BCT has made evening parking very difficult. If people cannot find parking for a night out the restaurants, theaters, etc will suffer. Who will be checking the annual compliance of the income restricted apartments? Please remember everything is connected to everything else. Changing one component might get you some relief for affordable housing but have disastrous effects on other areas.

<b>ROD SQUIBB</b>	5442 N Forbes Ave	No
-------------------	-------------------	----

Building more apartments that people cant afford does not solve the housing crisis. Also allowing less parking is a hazard to kids, pedestrians, and the safety of our strrets. It also makes it difficult for emergency/trash/mail service to provide their services when people are parked in neighborhoods streets when they cant park at their apartment complex because the parking is limited.

<b>DAVID KLINGER</b>	1404 North 24th Street	No
----------------------	------------------------	----

“Fast-tracking” of the review process for new construction is fraught with problems and warning signals, the most glaring one being the ability of a city’s planning director to administratively approve projects that were formerly subjected to a more thorough public review. This is not governmental transparency and responsiveness – it is a government giveaway of the public’s right of consent.

<b>PETE BARNES</b>	4077 West Plum st.	No
--------------------	--------------------	----

You just gave developers incentives nothing to do with normal homeowners. God what do we have to do to get through to you we’re sick of California developers.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
<b>SOUTHWEST ADA COUNTY ALLIANCE</b>	10800 W Smoke Ranch Dr	No

Southwest Ada County Alliance opposed the Housing Bonus Ordinance. The city has zoning classifications and requirements in place to insure consistency and equality, unfortunately the granting of variances and exceptions has evolved into the norm. Once a variance is granted, other applicants piggy back on it. That does not mean it is right or effective. The dramatic increase in variances does not constitute the need to change zoning, it means that the requirements are not being enforced. Reducing parking requirements should only be allowed in certain areas when that area has a fully functioning and usable transit system. As for density flexibility. Why? This just leads to more and more variance requests and further deviation from the plan. Why have rules & requirements when they are not going to be followed or enforced? We oppose the Housing Bonus Ordinance. The incentives being offered are already offered on regular basis.

<b>VICKI SULLIVAN</b>	3601 E Shortleaf Ave, Boise, ID 83616	No
-----------------------	---------------------------------------	----

The City of Boise has been unaffordable for many years, primarily due to the high rates of taxation. Working families have opted to move to other areas of Ada County because of the tax rates, leaving Boise to become a city of either high income or low income people. Many businesses have left Boise (Louies, Jakers, Dunkley's etc. ) because of increased opportunities in Meridian. We need to make Boise affordable for ALL citizens. My sewer and trash utilities have increased annually, my taxes have doubled on my home, I could save \$1,000's of dollars a year by LEAVING Boise. Is this what you want? A healthy community supports all of its residents, let's work on REALLY decreasing taxes and keeping our businesses and working families in Boise.

<b>BEN HOWELL</b>	4355 S Timridge Way, Boise ID 83716	No
-------------------	-------------------------------------	----

putting low income housing in neighborhoods will drive people away from those neighborhoods and make other neighborhoods more expensive. This policy hurts the middle class, has no impact on the upper class, and benefits the lower class. If you want to increase the divide between upper and middle class and income inequality in Boise, you will implement this measure.

<b>ELAINE HULDERMAN</b>	5631 East Bay Trail Ct, Boise 83716	No
-------------------------	-------------------------------------	----

The second sentence of "we must offer..." is a false premise. It is not the role of the city to provide assistance to build affordable housing. Not everyone should have a house. People who don't have enough money should get roommates or rent a room because there are tremendous costs for upkeep in a home. So, in conclusion, the city shouldn't offer incentives.

<b>KRAIG A GRIEBENOW</b>	2608 W. Stewart Ave	
--------------------------	---------------------	--

"For R2 and R3 neighborhoods dominated by single family dwellings, the proposed ordinance will encourage very high density development and building heights out of character with the neighborhoods. In the west end, proposals have already occurred in R3 zoning that scrape single family dwelling neighborhood properties, proposing (with P&Z approvals) high density housing that is not affordable for low income citizens, but very profitable for developers. This ordinance would turbocharge that behavior; significantly altering (urbanizing) the character of historic residential neighborhoods with significant R2 and R3 zoning areas.

The rationale for exclusion of R1 from such an initiative seems to be more a matter of zoning and class privilege rather than consistent zoning behavior; if this is appropriate for other zoning areas, it should also be reasonable for R1 zoning areas."

<b>RENEE P</b>	4000 S Federal Way, Boise	No
----------------	---------------------------	----

Stop trying to cram everyone in one city. This isn't fair for those who bust their ass to afford their mortgages. Free or discounted hand outs are not fair to middle class who did everything right and struggle because they are not considered low income. DO NOT TURN BOISE INTO ALIBERAL SANCTUARY CITY!! The new mayor doesn't align with Boise values.



FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
DAVIN STRANG	1204 W Howard	No

I am completing a complete renovation of a previously existing outbuilding. This structure was nothing but unpermitted stick on slab. The process for a homeowner to complete this project was onerous, expensive, confusing, and (based on feedback from neighbors) encourages dishonest practices. This proposal provides additional bureaucracy, additional confusion, and does nothing to simplify existing guidelines/process. Heck, I'm just trying to understand your streamlined chart. What the heck is 1/8 or 1/4 mile? What about 3/16 mile?

IDAHO FREEDOM FOUNDATION – MATT TOBECK	802 W. Bannock St., #405 Boise ID 83702	No
--	--	----

Incentives are a backward idea that have the opposite effect to that intended, namely, creating affordable housing. I do not believe these incentives will work, despite being well-intended, for the following reasons. City leaders often default to a position where it is more important in the short term to show they are “doing something” fix a problem like affordable housing than actually doing what works for people in the long term. Enter this incentive program.

Rather than simply allowing the free market to work, yes, it really is that simple, and allowing developers to build more housing with less restrictions, rather than taking the default position that developers have a profit-motive which disciplines them to build what people want and need in an area, rather than liberalizing zoning (which really has the effect of offering people more choice), and rather than for the most part getting out of the way, too many local leaders perpetuate increasing housing unaffordability by restricting land use, restricting zoning, and as is seen here, picking winners and losers with things like incentive programs.

Why would a city, when there is a housing shortage, only permit things like density flexibility, additional building height, and a streamlined administrative process, in select situations, rather than making those things policy across the board for all builders?

In doing so, local leaders are attempting to bribe developers to take part in this or that public policy goal, all the while ignoring that allowing more housing flexibility in zoning and building codes would accomplish the same exact public policy goal in a less roundabout way. This incentive program shows the ability by the city to loosen restrictions.

The top of the open comment page states “Choice in housing matters in our community.” Yes, it does. Liberalizing land use in zoning preserves options for everyone. Restricting it does not. Promoting rent control as an alternative to allowing the free market to be free decreases supply. This decreases choice in housing. Please resist the desire to overcomplicate this issue.

Consider what the city council did just a week or so ago. Rather than allowing a developer to create much-needed student housing immediately adjacent to BSU and allowing almost 500 additional beds to be built on a 3 acre parcel, the city council opted to disallow more housing in order to have a few dozen currently existing affordable housing units. This attempt at stopping growth in order to preserve affordable housing has the opposite effect in that it disallows much needed housing units. It makes housing more unaffordable rather than more affordable.

In that case, if more students were allowed housing, which they were not, more housing units in the surrounding neighborhood would open up. Yet, members of the city council, in part, denied this project because it was not diverse enough as far as housing uses. In trying to preserve affordable housing, the council disallowed a need in the community, thereby increasing it.

Rather than starting with the rebuttable presumption that developers have that profit motive which will satisfy the needs of the area in which they are building, city leaders restrict growth, disallow private property owners the use of their property for much-needed uses, and substitute their personal preferences, under the guise of following Blueprint Boise. This all increases housing prices in the long term by stalling or even disallowing growth.

Don't overcomplicate this issue and in so doing unnecessarily restrict growth. Respect private property rights. Respect the free market. It works in every other commodity. It will in housing prices if you simply private citizens more choices in building.

These incentives go out of the way to try and accomplish that which could be accomplished if city leaders relaxed regulations and zoning across the board. That, however, is not as sexy as some new program, unfortunately.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
MATT TOBECK	2450 W. Canal St., Boise ID 83705	No

Incentives are a backward idea that have the opposite effect to that intended, namely, creating affordable housing. I do not believe these incentives will work, despite being well-intended, for the following reasons. City leaders often default to a position where it is more important in the short term to show they are “doing something” to fix a problem like affordable housing than actually doing what works for people in the long term. Enter this incentive program.

Rather than simply allowing the free market to work, yes, it really is that simple, and allowing developers to build more housing with less restrictions, rather than taking the default position that developers have a profit-motive which disciplines them to build what people want and need in an area, rather than liberalizing zoning (which really has the effect of offering people more choice), and rather than for the most part getting out of the way, too many local leaders perpetuate increasing housing unaffordability by restricting land use, restricting zoning, and as is seen here, picking winners and losers with things like incentive programs.

Why would a city, when there is a housing shortage, only permit things like density flexibility, additional building height, and a streamlined administrative process, in select situations, rather than making those things policy across the board for all builders?

In doing so, local leaders are attempting to bribe developers to take part in this or that public policy goal, all the while ignoring that allowing more housing flexibility in zoning and building codes would accomplish the same exact public policy goal in a less roundabout way. This incentive program shows the ability by the city to loosen restrictions.

The top of the open comment page states “Choice in housing matters in our community.” Yes, it does. Liberalizing land use in zoning preserves options for everyone. Restricting it does not. Promoting rent control as an alternative to allowing the free market to be free decreases supply. This decreases choice in housing. Please resist the desire to overcomplicate this issue.

Consider what the city council did just a week or so ago. Rather than allowing a developer to create much-needed student housing immediately adjacent to BSU and allowing almost 500 additional beds to be built on a 3 acre parcel, the city council opted to disallow more housing in order to have a few dozen currently existing affordable housing units. This attempt at stopping growth in order to preserve affordable housing has the opposite effect in that it disallows much needed housing units. It makes housing more unaffordable rather than more affordable.

If more students were allowed housing, which they were not, more housing units in the surrounding neighborhood would open up. Yet, members of the city council, in part, denied this project because it was not diverse enough as far as housing uses. In trying to preserve affordable housing, the council disallowed a need in the community, thereby increasing it.

Rather than starting with the rebuttable presumption that developers have that profit motive which will satisfy the needs of the area in which they are building, city leaders restrict growth, disallow private property owners the use of their property for much-needed uses, and substitute their personal preferences, under the guise of following Blueprint Boise. This all increases housing prices in the long term by stalling or even disallowing growth.

Don't overcomplicate this issue and in so doing unnecessarily restrict growth. Respect private property rights. Respect the free market. It works in every other commodity. It will in housing prices if you simply private citizens more choices in building.

These incentives go out of the way to try and accomplish that which could be accomplished if city leaders relaxed regulations and zoning across the board. That, however, is not as sexy as some new program, unfortunately.

BURKE RACE	1108 W Highland	No
------------	-----------------	----

Making changes to housing in this environment makes no sense. We don't have a base line. Interest rates are at historic lows to boost the economy during this historic time. The low interest rates have allowed a select group nationally( although it is a huge group in Idaho) To cash out and buy finance and run up housing prices to all times high. A longer market perspective is needed. As we are already starting to see cracks in the current process

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
<b>BETTY BERMENSOLO</b>	1970 Canonero way, Boise 83709	No

I have lived in Southwest Boise since 1987.

Over the years I have seen developers granted density exceptions and variances at the expense of existing residents who have testified opposition based on level of service deficiencies of overburdened roads. As long as the city does not have control of building needed transportation, this ordinance would continue to allow even more density that threatens the safety and integrity of existing neighborhoods.

This ordinance would also encourage densities that are not compatible with existing neighborhoods without language that requires transitional lot sizing.

This city ordinance ceases to Equally protect existing neighborhoods that have purchased property with recorded restrictive covenants when the increased density would encourage violation of those covenants.

I urge you to carefully review these concerns and not adopt this ordinance.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Betty Bermensolo  
SWACA

<b>JOHN K</b>	23 S Garden St	No
---------------	----------------	----

Income restricted housing does not improve the economic vitality of a city.

Indirectly subsidizing housing thought market restrictions leads to problems we have seen again and again across American cities.

<b>AUORE MUSY</b>	2324 W Bannock st	No
-------------------	-------------------	----

My neighborhood is a quiet beautiful area with older homes and larger yards than the north end. We have already been negatively impacted by “affordable housing” projects that not only impede on existing hoses, but raise taxes, increase congestion, and degrade the historical quality with modern buildings. The units themselves are being rented or sold for exorbitant price points that in turn are not reflective of the advertised affordability. If the city chooses to incentivize affordable options then they should concentrate on newer emerging areas of boise not older ones and stick to already busy streets.

<b>A WATSON</b>	4974 E Woodcarver Dr	No
-----------------	----------------------	----

We should be extending out towards Mountain Home with a trolley system for free transportation, funded by the developer. Then the planned neighborhood will give more than just housing , but build a community.

<b>MARGARET WOODWARD</b>	5228 S Hakkasan Ave	No
--------------------------	---------------------	----

“Good Day, I am a long time resident of Boise. I do not believe that our housing should be dictated by incentives to developers. This should be something that is solely managed by the city and not incorporated into housing developments that are seeking approval. Also changes should not be allowed to be made to existing housing lots. People bought based on a fully developed area, not it changing due to someone coming in and knocking down a neighboring home/area and building high level apartments. Peoples life savings are invested in homes and this should not be allowed. There is plenty of land in Boise for the city and area to develop for low income housing . This would create much needed jobs as well. The growth of Boise has to be carefully managed to not destroy our beautiful city. I am not for this housing bonus ordinance and I hope that you will not pass it. Developers are not in it for the people they are in it for profit.”

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
JONATHAN GUILLEN	2049 S Hills Ave, Meridian, ID	No

Property values weren't this high in 2004. Jobs were plentiful across multiple domains; e.g. health care, fitness, technology, service. The population wasn't as dense. You people are stuck on the idea that to we must keep growing in order to flourish. I'm under the impression that you would have a building on every available piece of land if allowed to. Too many people are moving here. Housing demand goes up, while availability and affordability is decreased. My point being that life has been good for so many years, but we allowed our growth to sky rocket now we're starting to see signs of gentrification.

Let the growth stabilize in Boise and Meridian. Work with Nampa and Caldwell to make those areas more desirable to work and live in. Improve the public transportation between these three cities, so commuting isn't such a pain. More people doesn't equate to a better way of life. There has to be a balance.

E.B. SCHOFIELD	7363 W. Limelight Ct., Boise	No
----------------	------------------------------	----

This bonus program does not support any form of ownership housing, such as incentivizing developers to build small single family homes in the 1,000 to 1,300 S.F. range. The City's own record shows that developers see no profit in this type of "product", which is why small homes are not being built, even though the general public would greatly benefit from this option due to low interest rates and the ability to establish a set future price for the roof over their head. If the City really cares about addressing issues, this element needs to be included, otherwise more and more of the population will simply be debt slaves forever - as the cost of renting will continually escalate, leading to a future that lacks any form of stability and safety. And ultimately, as more of one's disposable income is consumed by rent, less is available to afford basic items such as food, health care, and the cost of utilities, which means more public resoures will be required to subsidize these costs. Incentivizing only rental housing - which inlcudes "townhomes", as these re rarely sold individually - is shortsighted and will have adverse outcomes in the future.

E.B. SCHOFIELD	7363 W. Limelight Ct., Boise ID 83714	No
----------------	---------------------------------------	----

These following comments are a continuation of my first reply, as this survey limits the word count, which essentially restricts public participation.

A transit support bonus near a designated Activity Center should have additional language that specifically states bus service is currently in full operation serving the Activity Center, as an Activity Center does not automatically mean bus service is occurring (whish is the transit issue). This needs details, otherwise every developer will simply want the bonus even if bus transit service does not serve the Activity Center.

A more "robust" transit system from what currently exists should be in place before handing out incentives, otherwise you are giving a benefit at a tradeoff of potentially never having the end result. This will simply add more traffic congestion to the already inundated roads.

Adding density while failing to include ample space for a very large dog run area results in numerous apartment/ townhome tenants allowing their dogs to defecate on the lawns and common areas of the nearby subdivisions where they choose to walk their dog when their own apartment/townhouse complex has provided a postage-stamp size dog area. This has been the adverse impact on my subdivision once the Kensington complex was constructed. The tenants let their dogs use our common area on a daily basis and do not pick up after their pet. In addition, the feces is on the sidewalk which ends up in the Boise River.

We are the most popular kid in the country, why do we need to artificially incentivize for more? We do not have the critical and necessary infrastructure in place to keep up with the rezones and increased demand that has already occurred, yet alone add more demand. Does the City actually look in-depth at such issues or is it simply the lust for more revue to keep up with the escalating cost of payroll, benefits and promised retirement pay-outs? Boise has actually become much less livable, rather than more livable in the past 6 years.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
<b>E.B. SCHOFIELD</b>	7363 W. Limelight Ct., Boise ID 83714	No

It is not very effective to ask for input when the simple concept of a basic explanation as to how the incentives will apply is not provided. Will all incentives in a particular grouping get applied to a project or is it a menu where a developer would have to choose one of the incentives, but does not get all of the incentives? If a developer were to receive all of the incentives listed in a group, then I do not support any of this, as that is far too much of a giveaway and will severely impact the existing nearby property owners where such a development would occur.

Specific Incentives:

Streamlined Process – I fully disagree with this incentive, as this is simply a code term for limiting public participation. If it were up to the developers, they would eliminate the public process completely.

Density Flexibility – What exactly does this mean or is it a catch all for anything and everything that a developer will push back on? This is way to vague.

Additional Height – This will adversely impact existing neighborhoods if additional setback distance is not also part of the equation. A four (4) or more story building towering over a single or 2-story home, or other apartments, with only 15 feet to the fence line is a major adverse impact on the existing residential. A minimum of 35 feet should be required for 3 stories and 50 feet for 4 or more stories.

Parking Reduction/Additional Parking Reduction – Should only be allowed when a regular funded bus lines is in action and will remain in action. It should not be allowed if only a future plan for a bus line “someday” is shown on paper only, as this may never occur and once again the City will have just given away the farm, as it has done with promises on paper to build fire stations for 26 years.

Additional Related Incentive Issues:

The Transit Supportive Bonuses should not be eligible for State Street/Hwy 44 west of the Glenwood/Gary Lane intersection, as the Idaho Department of Transportation that controls this roadway is on the record clearly stating they have not signed off on supporting Transit Oriented Development (TOD). This is due to the fact that Idaho law, with the exception of very small cities, does not allow HOV lanes, a basic necessity for effective and efficient bus transit. Until this law changes, the Boise City Code should align with this restriction otherwise the City would be giving a bonus for something that they have no control over ever being able to implement.

Transit supported bonuses should only be applicable if ADA compliant sidewalks are fully constructed from the housing project all the way to the Activity Center where bus service is being provided, and safe signalized crossings exist if needed to reach the other side of a road.

Transit supported bonuses that add increase density should not be provided when a designated Neighborhood Park is not readily available within the half-mile Level of Service Standard as adopted by Boise’s collection of Park Impact Fees. Otherwise the City would be collecting impact fees, or replacing any waived fess for the affordable housing category by using money from the General Fund, while not actually providing the Level of Service being paid for by the fee. This is critically important as additional density will consume more of a project’s land, thus leaving nowhere for residents to have a quality place outdoors which adds to quality of life and helps create community by getting to know your neighbors throughout the area. The majority of the Northwest Neighborhood and the entire Pierce Park Neighborhood do not have a designated Neighborhood Park within a half-mile of the State Street transit corridor. The existing undeveloped parcel on Gary Lane has been slated to be the Neighborhood Park in these areas, as it meets the Level of Service standard that that Neighborhood Park Impact Fees have been collected for since 1994, but has not been built.

- Limiting the word count is restricting public input.

<b>BARRY BRUNYE</b>	2708 N Lakeharbor La., Boise 83703	No
---------------------	------------------------------------	----

Waste of tax payer money. Boise and Idaho as a whole is a free thinking, caring community who in conjunction with charities ensures proper housing and health care for it’s citizens. Good intention programs such as suggested turn into a bloated bureaucracy that spends more on running the program than effecting positive results. Keep government as small as possible and less intrusive in our lives.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
TERRY FITZGERALD	1718 N. 28th St, Boise, ID 83703	No

1. This is a “plan” within which the bureaucrats in charge can mix and match criteria to suit their social engineering purposes.

2. Could not find any mention of the amounts of the grants.

LEAH MCFARLANE	11363 W. Woodhaven ct	No
----------------	-----------------------	----

I vote no because many many areas of our fair city are under appreciated and need a boost. Instead of adding to sprawl, how about helping existing neighborhoods reclaim their sense of community? Include incentives to update current homes so their neighborhood is attractive to newcomers, bring revenue to neighborhood shops, students to neighborhood schools, and a sense of pride in their little slice of Boise.

I feel incentives for building new affordable housing will backfire and the wrong people will find all the loopholes. Then the Boise taxpayers end up paying twice!

CHERYL SIMON	1415 E Summerheights Dr	No
--------------	-------------------------	----

Have lived where creative affordable housing means housing projects for low income non productive people To live off of the incomes of hard working people who Never get a government benefit if they were starving. What are you trying to do Ms McClean?? Pull that sorry old “Boisei is too white Crap on a good city that the Dems are targeting to destroy next?? We recognize your “dog and pony show”

TANNYA CLUFF	10800 W Smoke Ranch Dr	No
--------------	------------------------	----

Boise needs to stick to and enforce it’s existing code. Too many exceptions and variances are granted. The code requirements are there for a reason and the application needs to be consistent to be affective. Offering additional bonus’s will result in extreme deviations to the rules and requirements established for healthy growth. Nothing offered in this bonus hasn’t already been offered and approved as an exception or variance to prior and recent permit applications. Strictly abiding by the current code will ensure healthy growth.

SCOTT SOUKUP	14078 W Cayon Creek St	No
--------------	------------------------	----

“Flexible Density- Where in the proposal is the current density of the surrounding area considered? Is there adequate school capacity? Can the current transportation system handle the added traffic? Are there local services to support higher density? Each of the city and county agencies or departments will comment on these questions, but I’ve seen so often that their comments are ignored, their approval is automatic or their approval is given based upon loop holes. Please build in a rigorous review process that will actually ensure that the development is appropriate for the infrastructure as is, not as wished for.

- Additional Building Height- The proposal does not seem to address the possibility that additional height could destroy some views, shade adjoining properties, block solar easements, eliminate privacy in adjoining properties and be out of character with the established neighborhood. Are sight lines to be considered? Again, each project is unique and I ask that the proposal be amended to require consideration of these situations before approval.
- Parking Reduction- The city cannot realistically force people out of their cars by reducing parking without providing an alternative. There are many areas in the city without public transportation, bike paths or jobs and services within walking distance. In many areas of the city on street parking is just not available or viable. Reducing parking in affordable housing units will hurt the residents most in need of personal transportation and least able to afford alternative options.”

LYNN BRADESCU	919 N 21st St	No
---------------	---------------	----

Because it never pencils out for the residents. Builders JUST add the extra costs on and renters or buyers pay.

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
SUZANNE M TROJE	1408 N 15th St	No

I am wondering why the Housing Bonus Ordinance Proposal is on a faster timeframe than the Zoning Code re-write. There seems to be much overlap and the consultations envisioned for the Zoning Code re-write have only had their initial “kick off” with the public. Advancing the Housing Bonus Ordinance would appear to circumvent the consultations foreseen for the Zoning Code rewrite.

MARI RICE	2516 W BANNOCK ST	No
-----------	-------------------	----

This proposal will do very little to truly address the affordable housing crisis given that only 10-20% of the proposed units are required to be low income and only for a set time period. This proposal in effect would hand over significant power to the developers, many of who are from out of state, at the cost of losing the vitality of many of our neighborhoods such as the West End where I live, which is currently zoned R-3/R-2. It feels like upzoning rather than a true investment into affordability or addressing the root causes of the housing crisis. Has the city been working with housing programs and policy to guide this decision given the potential long term consequences to the vitality and livability of the city? Why is the city so anxious to give the developers the upper hand? I would argue that we don't need to do that - how about make having affordable units a requirement of ANY development? We would like to preserve the historic core of this neighborhood (which is already higher density than most other neighborhoods). In addition, the distribution of affordable housing should be shared by ALL neighborhoods, not just those of us that live in R-2/R-3 neighborhoods. People of all incomes should be able to live in ALL parts of the city and there should be real efforts (not just a 30 yr limit) to make sure people are not forced out in the future. Also this survey is written in confusing language and does not collect actual data from residents - I'm not sure what the purpose it except to confuse residents. This is far from transparency. I LOVE my neighborhood - it is historic and cohesive and unfortunately zoned R-3, a remnant of days when the area was fronted by car lots pre-connector. We have plenty of vacant commercial lots in our neighborhood suitable for this kind of development but please do not level historic homes to create “affordable units” that really are not truly affordable. The city can do better than this and should not shy away from public involvement. I would like to see the city work with local neighborhoods and other key stakeholders collaboratively to discuss options before this moves forward. If the houses around us get developed into large apartments, we do not have the income to move any where else in the city because it is too expensive for use.

MATTHEW J GERMINO	2516 N 27th St	
-------------------	----------------	--

“Boise needs to dis-incentivize high-density housing within most of its existing neighborhoods. We have reached our “holding capacity”. Developers should not get any incentives to chop up existing house lots into many small units except on the non-farmland periphery of Ada County. The increasing density of housing is getting really problematic and the quality of living is deteriorating for those already living in these neighborhoods. Parking is becoming an issue, and traffic problems in the neighborhoods are becoming serious, and the issues are accumulating often without any effort to mitigate them.

Boise has already made large contributions towards affordable housing, including prime close-in real estate. Can the City show the return on investment to the economy of the town? Is that housing contributing to the community need for low-paying service workers, i.e. one of the intended effects?

Development of the peripheral areas of Boise (along I-84) seems imminent and will happen anyways. I would rather see low-income and high density housing focused in new peripheral areas that have the high-capacity road infrastructure, and investments into public transportation to connect those areas to shopping and work.

I am very frustrated that the cost and impacts of development are borne by the existing population of Boise, and developers are making obscene profits at everyone else's tax expense and/or hassle.”

FULL NAME	ADDRESS	Do the proposed incentives for promoting the construction of additional affordable housing make sense for Boise? Please explain.
KIMBERLY COE	5212 Bel Air St	No

“If I could attach a photo I would show you how an infill house impacted my property this past year and privacy in my back yard. I called the city and asked why none of the neighbors were notified and was told we don’t get to respond to infill development or design in our neighborhood as we weren’t in a “”design review neighborhood””. Based on a prior city plan. So I now have a almost 3 story house looming over my once private yard- this house has no drain off from their driveway to keep whatever drains off into my property- theirs is about 12”” higher than mine. A huge gaping RV garage that is usually open with assorted ATV and trucks spewing exhaust onto my garden. Their front door faces into my yard as does their balcony where I can hear every conversation as well as their radio talk shows streaming from the garage. It is wrong to have the same set back requirements on a one to three story height!!!

Having an upzone with no input from adjacent property owners is wrong. Look at examples across other cities. Especially with no design review requirements! Explain to us why some areas have design review and others don’t! The city has almost ruined downtown with huge gaping parking lot holes on our once beautiful Capitol Blvd. No height set back restrictions to mitigate light on the streets or other buildings.

I speak as a a several generation native. Our family home was where the Grove Hotel now stands. My mother fought city hall when they proceeded to tear down the city and now this is what you come up with???”