

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Based on your experiences, please rate the following development standards (i.e., how buildings/properties should look and feel) in terms of helping the city meet its goals of encouraging new developments that include affordable housing options, various housing types, transportation options, and the creation of exceptional places where people live, work, and play.</p> <p>For any or all of the boxes you checked in Question 6, please explain in general what clarifications or changes you would like to see included in the new code.</p>	<p>Sure that the amount of parking is consistent with how much buildings are going to be used. There is never enough parking around new apartment buildings.</p>
	<p>Subdivisions: overly stylized & too much landscaping; too large of yards - both have too little xeriscaping (right word?) & I know of new owners who spend money changing it to their preferred design / style/ and/or plants & trees & yard. Unless there are builders who consult with the owners ahead of time.</p>
	<p>fewer houses / acre - they are CRAMMED into new developments. It looks awful. Natural / sensitive lands should be protected at all costs.</p>
	<p>Anything like a minimum lot size or a per unit parking requirement needs to be reduced as they lead to developers building for more affluent users.</p>
	<p>Signage should be clarified more. What makes up a sign?? Building design should not have limitations based on "appeal" "Appeal" is subjective. Exterior lighting depends on zoning and impacting of neighbors. Needs clarification.</p>
	<p>Lot & Building: current standards are often jettisoned in what might seem a capricious manner by P&Z. In reality, the priorities have shifted WITHOUT proper notification or consultation. In reality, the lot dimensions are generally NOT respected for new developments. Instead, density is the Holy Grail. Unfortunately, the law still specifies dimensions along with densities. Developers are reluctant to provide proper lot sizes when they can sell more units. The city wants to house as many possible, and ignores these requirements. This transparency and clarity of purpose needs to be incorporated in the new code sections. Subdivision Standards: There is understandably a significant amount of leeway in how a particular area will be zoned. However, as in the case of the Interfaith Sanctuary, the permissions and allowances of a particular zoned parcel are not respected. Instead, they are cast aside so that the NIMBY attitude can win out by casting aspersions on mitigations for various conditions. Sensitive Lands: Time and again, developers come forward with plans to develop in areas where none should occur, particularly in our foothills. Unfortunately, they occasionally sail right through, resulting in tragedies in fire response and slope damage. After decades, the city still will not respect response time requirements for fires in the northwest of the city. Where a station is desperately needed. It has been raised repeatedly in P&Z Commission meetings, and met with "don't question the experts." Well, the experts wrote the regulations which are being cast aside now.</p>
	<p>I like that you are looking to reduce required parking. Please define what surface material is required for off-street residential parking. Does it need to be concrete? Pavers? Gravel? If it needs an apron, what depth does the apron need to be? What material is the apron?</p>
	<p>A primary concern is the side yard setback requirements. Side Yards: Generally, I consider side yards in of 5-10 with to be wasted space. I suspect such requirements are hold over from the time when 20' building separations were predominately used as fire protection system. Although a valid concern, the issue can be better addressed in building code fire rating standards. Another concern has been the need for adequate natural light. This issue may be addressed using courtyards, skylights, and interior building lightwells. Building code standards address natural lighting by by setting a ratio of floor area to glazing, an easy but poor measurement system. Would a better measure be the lumen level per square foot based on climatic conditions? Given the known climate in Boise, seems simple enough! These are in fact old ideas. I was raised in the NYC area...look at those buildings as examples. Harm to children: how can a kid shimmy up between two buildings when the separation is greater then 30." Your are taking all the fun out out it! Energy Efficiency: Set standard for Solar orientation. especially in residential subdivisions! The same model home is built facing South, North, East and West...why allow it? If the majority of the glazing is in the front wall, the south facing unit has lower energy costs in the Winter compared to the same unit facing north? The south facing unit has higher summer energy cooling costs...shade the south facing windows, design the north facing units with a larger amount of south facing glazing...could it be as simple as having rear living spaces? Carry this further...dump the notion of setbacks altogether! Setback from what...the Right of Way, usually. Make the ROW wider, include the roadway, walkways and perimeter open space...front yard setbacks disappear?! Building Shape: Free standing linear building consume more energy than square or near square buildings, simply less wall surface. Can "credits" be provided in terms of building coverage for more efficiently shaped structures? Summary: Forget being an Urban Planner or City Planner...try "Environmental Planner." Open space, light, air, smells, air quality, the visual...lets add energy. Planners are the ORIGINAL environmentalist, no rallies required, support is now high, take advantage of the opportunity! The are no problems to be solved, only solutions. Time to rethink, time to create a better place, time to be an Environmental Planner! David 208.996.1431</p>
	<p>Reduce the density of housing</p>
	<p>More green spaces/parks/nodes (even if small) for pedestrians and incorporation of public art/sculpture/water features.</p>
	<p>I would like new homes to be more affordable including apartments and townhomes</p>
	<p>Boise should focus on larger lots and letting dwellings/buildings take up a higher percentage of the lots. People move here to get away from crowded cities.</p>
	<p>A voice and recourse for neighbors to stop profit-seekers who build poor-quality, privacy insensitive, and out-of-place dwellings in long-established neighborhoods. Developers should be required to help the establishment and improvement of public transportation options and/or pedestrian-friendly access to the most universal needs, e.g. grocery. Homeowners should be free to turn any part of their parcel into food-bearing gardens and/or to keep an acceptable kind and quantity of livestock regardless of "HOA regulations" for any use, personal or commercial.</p>
	<p>In general, too many "exceptions", in order words, here is the code BUT if you do this, you can do that. Just make the language stronger. Also, make the code more detailed so there are not so many requests for variances.</p>
	<p>Make variances for size and height harder to obtain. Maintain current off-street standards. Make consideration of current neighborhood character a prime factor in new development. All of the above were ignored in the approval of the State and Arthur housing project.</p>
	<p>How are "sensitive" lands defined and are there specific conditions associated with managing these lands in subdivisions are associated with subdivisions? Given that the west is in an extensive drought, why is landscaping still heavily depending on irrigated lawns? Why does the city not strongly encourage xeriscaping and adaptive plant species used? There seems to be an enormous waste of water. Also, xeriscaping would reduce lanscape maintenance significantly.</p>
<p>quit putting houses 3 feet apart with no backyards and no side yards and no parking or room for anything besides super dense tiny crap houses that are super over priced.....Exterior lighting should also only be able to shine down not up or out or anything else since you cant even see the stars anymore....</p>	
<p>No to any zoning changes that add high density multi-family housing!!</p>	
<p>Standards are constantly changing and need to be uniform or at the least know what to expect.</p>	
<p>Foothills development standards that can be relied on and letting vehicle access and connectivity be handled by ACHD (not having to appease both parties when they disagree).</p>	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

Based on your experiences, please rate the following development standards (i.e., how buildings/properties should look and feel) in terms of helping the city meet its goals of encouraging new developments that include affordable housing options, various housing types, transportation options, and the creation of exceptional places where people live, work, and play.

For any or all of the boxes you checked in Question 6, please explain in general what clarifications or changes you would like to see included in the new code.

Mixed-use Code section(s): 11-02.13: MX-N LOT AND BUILDING STANDARDS, pages 24-25 Concern/implication: “73 45 foot height limit in L-O and 50 foot height limit in PC near large roads were not carried forward. “ Front setbacks. A minimum of 10ft front setback (and side street setback) in the MX-N is inconsistent with existing examples (e.g., Hyde Park) of this form type. Additionally, this appears to be inconsistent with item (d) of the form and layout standards on page 25, which state “Each building façade facing a public or private street that contains ground floor nonresidential uses shall be constructed within 5 feet of each street-facing lot line and occupies at least 50 percent of width of the primary street frontage.” This appears to imply a maximum of a 5 foot setback along the front. Recommendation: Maintain 50 foot height limit from PC zone. Some MX-N zones in the conversion map have multiple buildings taller than 35 feet already. Recommendation: Eliminate requirement for front setback and side street setback requirement Code section(s): MX-D - 11-02-03.5, Dimensional Standards Concern/implications: Front setbacks. A minimum of 10ft front setback in the MX-D is inconsistent with existing development and design downtown scale, and over time, will create streetscapes that may feel more removed from sidewalks and pedestrian traffic. Many existing buildings would be nonconforming. The requirement of a 15ft interior sideyard setback for buildings over three stories is at odds with downtown scale and buildings adjacencies. These interior side yards may likely create numerous awkward spaces between buildings, with confusing and/or challenging programming. Additionally, this standard appears to rely on large development (quarter to whole block) which shouldn’t be the preferred development pattern throughout MX-D. Many existing buildings would be nonconforming Recommendation Reduce or remove front yard setbacks within MX-D. Allow Form and Design Standards to guide desired urban form. Remove the 15 interior side yard setback for buildings taller than three stories. Code section(s): 11-02.17: MX-S LOT AND BUILDING STANDARDS pages 31-32 Concern/implications: Front setbacks. A minimum of 10ft front setback and side street setback in the MX-S is unnecessarily restrictive. Recommendation Eliminate requirement for front setback and side street setback [unless adjacent to residential districts] Code section(s): 11-02.15: MX-A LOT AND BUILDING STANDARDS, page 27-28 Concern/implications: Front setbacks. A minimum of 10ft front setback (and side yard street setback) in the MX-A is not necessary and over time, will create streetscapes that may feel more removed from sidewalks and pedestrian traffic. 55 foot height limit is unnecessarily limiting in these activity centers, especially in areas adjacent to MX-D zoning; multiple examples of MX-D spot zoning already occur in what will become MX-A near downtown, demonstrating a clear demand and also real world compatibility with these increases. This is a substantial downzone of the R-O zone, which surrounds much of the recent successful apartment development in Boise. Recommendation Add footnote that front and side yard street setbacks in MX-A only apply when abutting a residential zone on the front or street-side yard. Recommend substantial height increases, such as to at least 78 feet in MX-A zones, unless adjacent to residential zones. An alternative recommendation, though likely outside the scope of the zoning rewrite, would be to consider remapping some MX-A areas near the downtown core to MX-D. Neighbors for Boise generally supports the changes to allow additional density to be constructed by right in residential neighborhoods. Often, however, onerous design or permitting requirements present hurdles to the construction of additional housing within these neighborhoods, even when this housing is allowed de jure. We also feel that it is imperative to treat detached housing options similarly to how attached housing options are treated. Here are a few areas of the code where detached units are (de facto) treated differently than attached units. Cottage-style development - limiting size to 1,000 SF where attached units have no minimum (duplex, triplex, etc.) ADU requirements - owner-occupancy requirement is not found with attached units (duplex, triplex, etc.) 75% lot size requirement - incentivizes multi-unit single-lot development over small-lot single-family development. Code Section: 11-03-03 Accessory Dwelling Unit Page 123 Concern/implication: Owner Occupancy requirement reduces incentive to build ADUs. Many peer cities lack this requirement. Recommendation: Remove this requirement. Concern/implication: limitation on size requirement of ADU de facto treats it differently than a duplex. There should be no difference between an ADU and Duplex, 2 units are two units, why make a detached unit subject to additional scrutiny? Recommendation: Treat ADU as a detached duplex and allow by right with no limitation on size. Let open space, height requirements, and setbacks be your guide. Code Section: 11-03-03 D. Dwelling, Single-Family Attached Page 125 Concern/implication: Unclear of rationale to exclude setbacks from the open space requirement, especially rear setbacks if they otherwise meet intention of open space characteristics. Recommendation: Strike the word “not” from this sentence: “Required open space must be at least 12 feet wide and may not be located within a required setback areas” and add “, but shall not include driveways or parking areas.” to the end of the sentence. Code Section: 11-03-03 F. Dwelling, Duplex, Triplex, or Fourplex page 125 Concern/implication: Requirement for each unit to have 375 sq feet of private open space is not consistent with form based approach to code and also will be impractical on many moderate sized lots. Recommendation: Replace the word “unit” with “Duplex, triplex, or fourplex” in the following sentence: “Each unit shall have a minimum of 375 square feet of private open space located in the rear yard.” Code Section: 11-03-03.2G.3 Multifamily Living Uses Concern/Implication: “Within the R-3 district, development of two or more multifamily structures on a single lot or at a density of more than 20 units per acre shall be subject to [a public hearing process]” this is confusing and is no different than current code. Does a 4-plex on .19 acres in an R-3 zone require a CUP? The density would suggest so, but the table of allowed uses allows 4-plexes by right. Why would this code’s new definition of “multi-family” be allowed only by conditional use permit in the code’s only high density residential zone? Recommendation: Strike requirement from code. Allow multifamily uses by right in R-3 subject to form-based code. Concern/Implication: Title of 11-03-03.2G.3: “Standards in R-3, MU-A, and MU-S Zoning

Residential Code section(s): 11-02-02 page 10-11, table 11-02.5; pages 13-14, table 11-02.7 Concern/implication: Requirement for 75% of nearest two lots as the minimum for lot size prevents an overwhelming majority of large lots throughout the city from utilizing the new reduced minimum lot size. In effect, it creates a city with tens of thousands of different minimum lot sizes, determined by the immediate environment. There are a large number of parcels where this standard is much stricter than our current code. A random-ish sample of 10 parcels that are large enough to be split into two lots resulted in 8/10 be prevented by this single footnote. Recommendation: Eliminate this requirement and rely on minimum lot size, width, frontage alone. Code section(s): 11-02.7: R-1C LOT AND BUILDING STANDARDS, pages 13-14 Concern/implication: Three story homes can promote affordability and land utilization; a small increase in the height limit would increase feasibility of diversity of housing options without being dramatically out of scale with surrounding neighborhood. Concern/implication: Requirement for side entry garage setback of 20 feet is inconsistent with numerous examples (such as in the North End) and not necessary. Concern/implication: Alley setbacks from garages are not discussed in this table. This may imply that a 15 foot setback is necessary from the alley for a garage. An alley facing garage setback requirement should be zero, in alignment with many existing and acceptable examples in Boise’s urban form. Concern/implication: Reduced minimum lot size of 4000 square feet is a step in the right direction, however it does not go far enough. The original lot size in Boise was ~3000 sq feet and many homes exist in current neighborhoods on lots of that size, including some delightful homes on even smaller lots that positively add to neighborhood character. Reducing this further and allowing people to own there own home, on a smaller plot of land, is likely one of the most potent ways to improve housing affordability in Boise. Concern/implication: to further allow creativity in lot development and building form, and to more closely align with traditional neighborhood development (see north end, west downtown, east end) front building setback could be reduced to 10’. Recommendation: Increase height limit to 40 feet. Recommendation: Remove side street garage entry setback, or at a minimum reduce to match the remainder of structure (15 feet). Recommendation: Add a note that garages facing an alley have zero setback requirements. Recommendation: Reduce minimum lot size to 1000 square feet. Recommendation: Reduce building setback to 10 feet. Code section(s): 11-02-02, TABLE 11-02.9, pages 16-17 Concern/implication: Footnote 3, rear setback reduced to 5 feet when alley present. There are many buildings and/or garages in the city with zero rear setback when an alley is present, including throughout the North End (R1-C) amongst others. This rule is incongruous with much of the built environment of the city, including in desirable neighborhoods and is not necessary. Recommendation: Do not require a rear setback in R2 when an alley is present. Code section(s): 11-02-02 Table 11-02.11, R-3 LOT AND BUILDING STANDARDS pages 19-20 Concern/implication: R-3 has similar setbacks to other, less intense residential zones. This is especially concerning with side and rear setbacks. This should be the most flexible residential zone, supporting infill and high density development. Footnote 3, 10 foot side setback for buildings over two stories is more intense than cities such as Nampa, Bend, Pocatello, and Spokane. This dramatically decreases feasibility of three story town-home structures in our R3, multi-family residential district. We are concerned that the dimensional standards as drafted may substantially reduce the potential of these lots relative to current code. Recommendation: Eliminate footnote 3. Use 5 foot setbacks, including for 3 story structures. Remove rear setbacks within R-3 and re-evaluate the need and/or extent of side and front setbacks, especially the element of increasing the setback as the building increases in height.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Based on your experiences, please rate the following development standards (i.e., how buildings/properties should look and feel) in terms of helping the city meet its goals of encouraging new developments that include affordable housing options, various housing types, transportation options, and the creation of exceptional places where people live, work, and play.</p> <p>For any or all of the boxes you checked in Question 6, please explain in general what clarifications or changes you would like to see included in the new code.</p>	<p>District” is misleading, as the first piece of text refers only to R-3 zone. Recommendation: Clarify and strike text referring to R-3 (see above) from code. Code Section: 11-03-03.2C Cottage Development Concern/Implication: Homes not more than 1,000 SF - what is the intent of this regulation? This is essentially a detached multi-family option and we do not limit the square-footage of multi-family units. Also, why are these only conditionally allowed in R-3 and MX-N? These should be allowed outright in R-1C and above, just like single-family, attached. Why put these limitations on cottage style developments only? Recommendation: Allow this form of development in all residential zones subject to form-based code. Parking Standards Code Section: TABLE 11-04.13: OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS Page 232 Concern/implication: Higher parking requirements based on number of bedrooms in multifamily inconsistent with form based code approach. Recommendation: Reduce all multifamily parking minimums to no more than 1 per dwelling unit. Concern/implication: The code should encourage the expansion of the P-1 overlay district. Currently, the P-1 shrinks to the downtown core, and the P-2 and P-3 are disbanded. This is completely out of line with a vision of a less car-dependent community that Blueprint Boise envisions. There is no denying that Bown Cross is not Fairview and Cloverdale. Connectivity and development patterns are different in different parts of the city. Celebrate this diversity by recognizing that not all places require the same amount of off-street parking! Recommendation: Maintain and expand the P-1 and P-2 overlays. Explicitly provide a mechanism in code to expand these overlays through the rezoning process - if they cannot be expanded during the adoption of this code. Encourage long range planners to actively pursue these expansions through policy direction. (It’s what Blueprint Boise wants!) Code section(s): 11-04-07, table 11-04.13 Concern/implication: Applying parking minimums to Limited Food and Drink Service is likely to increase the cost and may decrease feasibility. Recommendation: Given the definitionally small size of these enterprises, recommend removing parking requirements for these entirely. 11-04-07.4 Accessible Parking Standards Concern/Implication: “All development shall provide” is very unclear. Does this include Duplexes, Tri-plexes, Four-plexes? (Hint: it does not always but you need to know building code to know that). Recommendation: Strike all of section 11-04-07.4 except for the 1st paragraph. If the building code and ADA applies, let them handle the enforcement of this requirement. Anything else adds confusion. 11-04-07.7C Tandem Parking Concern/Implication: Tandem parking can be an efficient way to park vehicles off-street. Recommendation: Strike section 11-04-07.7C allowing the planning director to determine when tandem parking is appropriate. 11-04-07.6.B On-Street Parking Reduction Concern/Implication: This was previously allowed for multi-family developments (i.e. any greater than 2 units). Now, this excludes tri-plexes and four-plexes and excludes any residential zones. This restricts the applicability of this reduction when Blueprint Boise is attempting to reduce dependence on cars. Recommendation: Continue allowing any development with greater than 2 units, in any zone, to take advantage of this reduction. Recommendation: Include caveat that Fire Code must be met (this was one of the biggest points of confusion for small-scale developers).</p>
	<p>In regards to access and connectivity I would like the city to continue to lean on its strengths and maximize connectivity to the greenbelt as well as explore new connections and trails systems. Parking and loading unfortunately are always at the forefront of any project design. While I recognize the need for parking in this city I appreciate that Module 2 relaxes the requirements. I feel it could continue to minimize or eliminate parking in the downtown core while promoting bike-ability. Quality building design is always important and a challenge working with cost driven developers. Anyway the city can codify high quality design is a bonus!</p>
	<p>Allow 1,000 sq ft lots, reduce lot setbacks, reduce or eliminate parking requirements, increase height in residential and commercial area, eliminate step down in building height between zones, allow for six plexes on larger SF lots.</p>
	<p>Taller heights should be allowed in commercial zones particularly if affordable housing is desired. Podium apartments are typically 7 stories but cannot be built in the majority of commercial districts. Density needs to be dramatically increased as well especially in commercial districts where the zoning can easily handle larger apartment buildings. Parking minimums need to be lessened or done away with altogether. Let the developer determine off street parking needs. On street parking needs should be proactively managed by the city. Read Dr Donald Shoup at Shoupdog.com Thank you.</p>
	<p>No maximum parking limits. Building setbacks in commercial zones in areas where pedestrian activity is encouraged</p>
	<p>We now live in an Urban downtown. Code must evolve to allow for downtown and the city in general to thrive.</p>
	<p>Some of the current code is outdated for what is needed for parking and loading, not enough landscaping is required between uses to protect housing or shade parking lots, exterior lighting is too bright and creating light pollution in some areas. Access and connectivity always need improving in a growing city. Planning for future bike ways and placing sidewalks on the inside of lots with the landscaping strip on the outside providing safer areas for families is important. Removing substandard lots for those that were created before the zoning code - especially corners in the north end and having lot coverage requirements for all areas not just historic will help all neighborhoods. The Duplex code is still too difficult and it could be the easiest way to increase density without ADUs, but right now they are penalized heavily with extra setbacks, restrictions on where open space is and still requiring 2 parking spaces per dwelling.</p>
	<p>I would like to see smaller dimensions on building and significantly increased landscaping along with reduced exterior lighting.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft proposes eliminating maximum dwelling unit/acre requirements in the Residential zoning districts and using minimum lot area, average lot width, and minimum setbacks and open space to limit the intensity of development. These changes are being made because physical dimensions are often a better way to ensure that new development “fits in” with surrounding patterns of development, and because dwelling unit/acre requirements often prevent the construction of innovative new types of housing. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-03.2.A. Do you feel that the proposed changes will help encourage creative housing design and the development of more affordable housing options and various housing types? Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	<p>Why in the world would you propose a lot width of 40 feet if you cared about affordability. 40 feet is a great number to protect elitists ability to be the only ones to afford homes in good neighborhoods. Back when the original plats of the city of Boise were put forward lots were 25 feet wide. If you care about affordability and walkability even a little bit you will go to 25 feet not 40 feet. Don't let the racists who introduced the idea of 50 feet maintain control.</p>
	<p>Allow for flexibility.</p>
	<p>Please see my comments on the previous question regarding lot sizes and subdivisions. This is clearly the way to go. Lot sizes are key drivers of quality of life and safety elements such as setbacks. Density provides no such guidance. In order to achieve the intended result, the regulation must be very specific and constrain the planners and the Commission to narrower leeway. This will mitigate the constant push by developers to "pack" a subdivision.</p>
	<p>I think this is a great idea. Real life doesn't always fit neatly in the grid-centric code world. I think there should also be rear setback exceptions for ADU's. For example, in my Central Bench neighborhood we have no alleys, but are required to maintain a 15'-0" setback. I'd love to build an ADU, but only if that rear setback could be reduced to 5'-0". Otherwise, the ADU is too close to the house and that 15'-0" space behind the ADU is dead space.</p>
	<p>While the goals are commendable, there are still too many remnants of in-the-box thinking.</p>
	<p>I think affordable housing is a fool's game. Just build more apartments, and they don't have to be luxurious. Build places people can live and then build the roads so people can get to work.</p>
	<p>Actually enforce the new requirements. Make variances harder to obtain. The State & Arthur project would not be allowed under these new requirements.</p>
	<p>I support the intended purpose of these changes and believe they will help. It is however essential that we get the dimensions right so that things we want to see built in our city are actually feasible.</p>
	<p>Reduce the setbacks and open space requirements to allow more housing per lot.</p>
	<p>These should apply to commercial districts as well.</p>
	<p>There should still be a maximum lot coverage and a maximum per acre. Single Family home owners want to see a mix, but they don't want to be crowded or lose all open spaces in their neighborhoods. You don't want to push more people to live in Kuna and Caldwell and commute in to the city. Allowing duplexes and 4 plexes to be mixed in especially near the university and in areas where there is great connectivity is important.</p>
	<p>The changes would not achieve the intended result of “fits in” with surrounding patterns of development,</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft proposes eliminating maximum floor area ratio, minimum lot area, minimum street frontage, and average lot width requirements in the Mixed-Use and Nonresidential (but not Residential) zoning districts. Instead, the draft proposes using building envelope controls (like maximum and minimum heights, maximum and minimum setbacks, minimum on-site open space, and similar controls on the shape and size of buildings) to govern the intensity of development. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-03.2.B. Do you feel the proposed changes will help increase the predictability of building forms in the Mixed-Use and Nonresidential districts and allow flexibility to respond to the market needs while ensuring that the resulting buildings “fit in” with their surroundings?</p> <p>Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	<p>I don't really care about building forms. You need 4-5 story apartment buildings on Overland, Orchard, 5 Mile, and Locust Grove. You need 5-lane roads (center turn lane) and sidewalks everywhere. You need to get serious about getting the bicycles off the sidewalks. It's a hazard. Bikes don't pay any attention to traffic laws. Are they vehicles or not?</p>
	<p>I think this 2 part question deserves two separate answers. Yes, i think it will increase predictability. But the rigid building envelopes doe not allow much flexibility to meet commercial market needs. I think this is ok at major intersections where demand is high and supply is low, and therefore the City can ask for more concessions like a building envelope against the street. I think expanding the MXA or MXN building envelope restrictions into areas where supply is high and demand is low will only add another hurdle to development and limit the expansion of commercial services to these areas.</p>
	<p>Enforce the new requirements as written and make variances harder to obtain.</p>
	<p>The pedestrian scale building envelope of the MXA (and MXN) zones are a step in the right direction for the goals in Blueprint Boise, if used in the correct locations. If the zones are mis-applied to the map (i.e. outside of 1/8 mile of activity zones as defined in zoning modules), new construction would not fit in with its surroundings and the logistical/site-planning/proforma burdens of doing MXA development (in what should really be an MXS zone) would limit new development.</p>
	<p>These changes are helpful, but the numbers need adjusting so that we are able to see more homes built in all neighborhoods of the city. Detailed suggestions added on page 1 in main comment box.</p>
	<p>In more dense and established residential neighborhoods should there be some limitation as to how far beyond an adjacent house a new building or addition can be built. I'm thinking rowhomes or long narrow lot configurations, where an adjacent building could impede on the light and privacy of another. I saw this quite frequently working in bigger cities.</p>
	<p>Reduce setbacks and increase heights.</p>
	<p>In all commercial districts... Building heights need to be increased to 7 stories to allow for the most common podium apartment construction heights.</p>
<p>I'm not sure it will fit in, but it will develop a new type. Bring buildings to the front, parking in the rear encourages pedestrian friendly streetscapes for example. I think Design reviews and district planning help developers and architects guide design for the city's vision.</p>	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft includes new provisions that would provide more predictability regarding compatibility between low-density residential uses and adjacent more intense land uses. The draft provision 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. 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 the low-density residential use. Additional landscaping and screening requirements on the higher intensity property. Limitations on the location of parking areas, drive-through lanes, or circulation driveways between the higher and lower intensity buildings. Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p> <p>These regulations are found in Section 11-04-03.4. Do you feel that the proposed changes will help protect existing residential neighborhoods and reduce potential conflicts between residential and nonresidential land uses? Design rendering of a building that is less than 35 feet tall and within 100 feet of a single-family house</p>	Increase the maximum building height permitted in the proposed MXA zone, as noted in earlier comments.
	A single family home in a medium or high density zone should not be protected. Protecting such homes will ultimately lead to higher housing costs. This standard makes sense when talking about a low density zone next to a high density zone, but not when talking about a low density use within a high density zone.
	Yes. Enforce it. Then get City Council to support these enforcement decisions instead of labelling them "arbitrary and capricious" decisions by Planning & Zoning
	Need to address the issue of the age and value of adjacent property. The illustration shows a single house controlling the zoning...tear the damn thing down!
	There's always going to be conflict. That's life. We need the higher buildings so people have a place to live.
	Is it "within 50 feet of low density residential use" or "50 feet of low density residential zoning"?
	Multi-level buildings adjacent to single-level dwellings are significantly detrimental to homeowner expectations. One cannot build a fence high enough to deal adequately with the conflict especially in established neighborhoods.
	Should be allowed only if the zone has been non-residential for a time; not something that was re-zoned after this zoning code update.
	Enforce the new requirements as written and make variances harder to obtain. The new State & Arthur project ignores these standards.
	Setbacks should be increased between residential and commercial properties.
	1. The 100' limitation seems excessive- 50' is adequate 2. 20' light poles are excessive adjacent to residential districts and not necessary for the type of traffic likely in the area. 14' seems adequate.
	I am not convinced that existing neighborhoods need buffer zones from moderately more intense adjacent development. I would like to see more opportunity for new homes throughout all areas of the city.
	Yes. Get rid of this requirement. Houses at the edge of zones just have to deal with the fact that they have a taller building next door. It happens all the time.
	There should be at least 7 stories allowed on commercial zoning districts. Fire access and parking should be allowed between lots.
	It is a good start! Prohibit the light from leaving the high density property, the screening should be dense landscaping to help with noise, including some mature trees.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>This draft introduces incentives for projects that incorporate design elements for more sustainable and resilient development. Incentives include a 50 percent parking reduction in several Residential and Mixed-Use zone districts, and one additional story of building height in several Mixed-Use districts. These incentives can be earned by installing on-site renewable energy sources, significantly reducing energy consumption, and significantly reducing water consumption, or by achieving at least a minimum certification in a sustainable development rating system (such as a LEED Silver Certification or a National Green Building Standards Silver certification). These regulations are found in Section 11-04-03.7.C and are summarized in the table below. Do you think the available bonuses in Table 11-04.9 above are significant enough to encourage the use of this incentive? Table 11-04.9: Sustainable and Resilient Development Incentive. Zoning district R-1B, R-1C, R-2 or R-3 have 50% parking reduction and n/a max building height increase. Zoning districts MX-N, MX-A, or MX-S have 50% parking reduction and increase max building height by 10 feet above the max height otherwise permitted. Is there a way the incentives could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	Find a way for these incentives to be applied to existing homes.
	I think this is a great idea. I also think pervious parking surfaces should be one of the sustainable options for a parking reduction.
	Great! Add building coverage as well, which is a greater incentive in two to three story developments. Very often not feasible economically to provide elevators in low rise buildings.
	The LEED certification is bogus. Oooh, you added bike racks and got your LEED certification, no kidding. You need to stop playing games with this stuff and get serious about building plain old apartments.
	From a commercial perspective, rarely do I see developers/users targeting a reduction in required parking. Commercial users typically need all of the required parking to be viable, if not more (unless downtown where there is public parking). If anything, I think the reduction in parking maximums will be a source of contention between the market and the proposed code (example, big box max parking is greatly reduced which will make it hard to develop groceries stores in new neighborhoods). I don't see parking reductions being an effective incentive for commercial development.
	That seems very generous. For multifamily and commercial buildings, if the parking is reduced that much, I would hope that a good-sized bike storage area is required.
	Maintain the current two-vehicle per unit requirement until public transportation in Boise is viable. The overflow from lack of on-site parking (State & Arthur) will harm existing neighborhoods
	Reducing parking is not encouraging less use.
	There is still resistance to the cost and complexity of LEED qualification, but 50% is quite a reduction- it will be interesting to see how much this is adopted.
	Parking and energy efficiency are apples and oranges and shouldn't even be used in the same sentence.
	Despite wanting to limit parking, market forces will push developers to design with the idea of selling/leasing a building and a commercial or residential building with insufficient parking is harder to sell/lease.
	Expedited plan review.
	Reduce the number of requirements to 2 from the list, possibly add another option, and consult with developers about the incentive list. I would note that a parking reduction is consistent with what we actually want to see for environmental reason and one could argue that reducing parking should be a thing we want to incentivize, not actually a reward. Perhaps allowing more height in all zones, or greater lot coverage may be other ideas.
	I know 10' is a nice clean numbder but is it sufficient to build in an addition story? Typical stud heights are 9'-1 1/8" with single base plate and double top plate. Once you add in structure 12"-18", i feel like 12' would be a more appropriate number.
	I think we should reduce parking, setbacks, and increase height without requiring sustainability. Instead, I recommend allowing six-plexes with zero setbacks if builders meet sustainability goals. See https://www.sightline.org/2022/01/21/cities-bigger-future-can-look-and-feel-beautiful-if-we-build-for-it/ and https://www.sightline.org/2020/11/24/poll-re-legalizing-sixplexes-is-popular-actually/
	Commercial districts should automatically allow 7 stories for podium apartment buildings and condominiums in order to encourage affordable housing which the city desperately needs.
By adding these particular sustainability items just to gain incentives just makes the building more expensive to build and may drive away development	
There are so many out there. Be open to Net Zero, Carbon Neutral, Passive House and who knows what will come up in the next 10 years. Also these must be located in an area with connectivity - busses and bikes preferably.	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>This draft includes new standards to encourage smaller blocks and more frequent street and sidewalk connection points in order to encourage walking and bicycling as an alternative to automobile trips. These controls include new maximum block length standards that limit new blocks to:</p> <p>No more than 25 percent longer or shorter than average length and width of adjacent subdivided blocks (if 50 percent or more of the perimeter of the proposed lot is already subdivided); OR 330 feet in width and 660 in length (if less than 50 percent of perimeter of the proposed lot is already subdivided)</p> <p>New cross-access standards promote more pedestrian-friendly development by requiring shared parking and access points through connecting streets and driveways, 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. Do you feel the proposed changes would encourage more walking and bicycling and reduce the length of automobile trips? Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	<p>It's not clear that these particular changes will get us to the intended result. While beneficial for other reasons, it's not clear that it will encourage these human behaviors. Walking and biking are best encouraged by the proximity of centers of activity or when driving is just too difficult (lack of parking, bollards, etc). I don't see how this helps. That said, the changes are great for more efficient land use and potentially reducing parking congestion.</p>
	<p>Any dimension of sidewalk would help our Central Bench neighborhood. Although we have greenbelt access, there are few sidewalks in our area for walkers. Biking is a great option for us, but many streets are still lacking safe corridors.</p>
	<p>Mixed reaction! Smaller blocks too often increased roadways. Would prefer a system of small Minor blocks within larger blocks. The Major blocks could include ROW suitable for roadways while the perimeter of Minor blocks would include small scale connections. The large blocks in SLC do have value.</p>
	<p>Unless you are putting restaurants and bars in every neighborhood, people aren't going to be walking/biking that much.</p>
	<p>Yes and no. It could help walking and bicycling in areas where walking and bicycling are marginally feasible. There are other parts of town where it is not feasible at all, and will just be another development hurdle. Also, with the reduction in parking maximums, and the requirement to share parking, I think there will be some issues in the future between high-parking users gobbling up all of the shared parking and threatening the business of their neighbors.</p>
	<p>The cross access points sound more helpful to pedestrians than shorter blocks.</p>
	<p>Changing a building code does not encourage or discourage the end user of walking or not walking</p>
	<p>A more typical block size would be better- say 300'x300'</p>
	<p>Although I agree with some of your points about consolidation, I don't think that has anything to do with how people will use the property. I believe that will help from a design perspective but I also see it hindering a project if connectivity is pushed over density.</p>
	<p>Adding more development cost, extra intersections and forcing more car/people interactions will have the opposite affect of getting people to walk or ride bikes (also bikes and pedestrians don't always mix well). I don't know how to socially engineer more walking or biking. Most people won't walk a 1/4 mile for groceries (buying patterns also affect this as they don't want to carry numerous items home) and vast majority do not live close enough to work (due to existing density and old zoning laws that forced the separation of different land uses) making walking impossible for most. If there are wide pathways, something interesting a like a park, water feature or neighborhood center nearby people will walk for pleasure.</p>
	<p>Coordination with ACHD on dedicated bike lanes. I know this is a funding challenge for ACHD as it relates to impact fee eligible expenses, but could be supplemented with income from City of Boise impact fees, perhaps. Possibly a "connectivity" impact fee and some of the funds are channelled to ACHD for construction of bike lanes. Bikes shouldn't ride on the sidewalk (it is counterproductive for encouraging walking), but in many places it isn't safe to ride in the street either.</p>
	<p>I think there is more beyond the scope of the zoning code rewrite that needs to be done to encourage walking/biking/transit, but I think this is a good move to make those other options more accessible if/when they are able to be implemented</p>
<p>Focus should be on how to reduce cost to developers which can in turn be passed onto consumers in form of more affordable housing.</p>	
<p>I think to encourage biking and walking the location of the building needs to be in an area that doesn't have 5 lanes of traffic and high speed limits. The length of blocks is not what prevents people from biking or walking. It is the lack of feeling safe, lack of a place to be because the street is too narrow or the sidewalk is in poor shape or there is no bus stop or cross walk for half an eternity.</p>	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The requirements for vehicular circulation and pedestrian connections during the site development process have been significantly expanded. Vehicular circulation standards primarily address access points, limiting the number and location of curb cuts, requiring vehicle entrances and exits to be located 50 feet from any intersecting street right-of-way and at least 10 feet from an adjacent property line, and requiring primary circulation and access to be oriented toward predominantly non-single-family residential streets. Pedestrian connectivity requirements include walkways at least five feet wide from the main entrance of a building to a public sidewalk or internal walkway, walkways between the principal entrance of each building in a multi-building development, connections to any sidewalks on adjacent properties that extend to the boundaries of those properties, connections to any adjacent open space or park, and clearly distinguished sidewalk crossings within a development. These regulations are found in Sections 11-04-06.5.B and C. Do you feel the proposed changes would encourage more walking and bicycling and reduce the length of automobile trips?</p>	<p>You are fooling around with unimportant stuff. All I see on the wide sidewalks downtown are idiot bicycles swerving around pedestrians every day. Get the bikes off the sidewalks.</p>
	<p>On the projects I am building people prefer more parking over wider sidewalks. They prefer bigger parking spaces over connectivity. I am concerned that the city is trying to change people's behavior with design and all we are doing is making the projects more troublesome from a logistics perspective.</p>
	<p>Bike lanes and a bike rack will increase bike use (for certain uses, eg bar, restaurant, bike shop, coffee shop, etc...). Unless a building is close to dense population, people will not walk to a building; they may drive and then walk around for more than just one thing, but they will drive there then walk (see downtown Boise for example).</p>
	<p>I personally don't think you try to make "drivers" walk or bike by making driving/parking incredibly inconvenient. Instead you try to make walking/biking more convenient. The zoning ordinance is doing that (more housing options closer to city center, more neighborhood commercial, more connectivity). I think these restrictions will have unintended consequences of flooding staff with variance requests from applicants.</p>
	<p>Lack of sidewalks/sidewalk connections is a big impediment in some neighborhoods that makes walking or biking much less safe - these changes increase safety and the chances others will utilize them</p>

I think it sounds like a good start. But as long as we provide parking lots, people will drive.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The Table of Minimum and Maximum Off-Street Parking Requirements has been updated to generally reduce the minimum number of required parking spaces, and to remove most requirements for discretionary parking approvals. For example, the parking requirement for a single-family detached dwelling has been reduced from two spaces per dwelling unit to one space per dwelling unit to encourage smaller, more diverse housing types. The minimum parking requirements for restaurants have been updated to five spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area instead of one space per three seats, because the number of seats in a restaurant may change over time and “per-seat” regulations often result in excess parking. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-07.5. Do you think the proposed changes are sufficient to further the city’s goals to increase transportation options and encourage compact, mixed-use development?</p>	<p>I don't think the city has any business setting this type of goal.</p>
	<p>Again, yes and no. Yes in MXN and some MXA zones where commercial is near residential. But no in MXS where, almost by definition, people must drive to the services but then may not have enough space to park because of limitations on max parking. There has been no discussion or acknowledgement that the proposed code also reduces the maximum allowed parking for many commercial uses. This warrants discussion.</p>
	<p>Delay these changes until the public transportation system is more viable. Using the bus is not now a dependable or convenient source of transportation, especially at night or weekends.</p>
	<p>Again, how does reducing the number of parking spaces encourage the buyers behavior? it just makes it frustrating and a problem for down the road.</p>
	<p>not sure how that change helps the city's goal to increase transportation options, but it will encourage dense (compact) mixed use development.</p>
	<p>Different requirements in different zones. Lower minimums in medium density zones than in low density zones. This is the most politically acceptable solution. Avoid or loosen parking maximums for commercial. All of the committee discussion about lowering residential minimums was in the context of "the market knows what it needs". In that spirit I don't think rigid maximums are appropriate either unless they are in line with what the market currently demands (5 to 10 stalls per 1,000 SF depending on use).</p>
	<p>This is a very important step. ~40% of households only own one car. Even in car centric parts of the city, homes with one parking space may often be the right fit for a large fraction of households. Keeping this element is essential to building a better city.</p>
	<p>Looking at reducing or eliminating parking in the downtown core above what is in the parking overlay.</p>
	<p>Eliminate parking minimums for small neighborhood businesses.</p>
	<p>Boise should remove parking minimums and replace them with parking maximums.</p>
<p>I think it is a good start. Offer incentives for bike parking, bus stops, shaded areas, more landscaping, outdoor eating areas, parklets (mini parks) all to break up buildings so people want to bike and walk. You may need more street permits and regulation and for those tiny garages under new apartments that today's cars can't even get into.</p>	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Again, how does reducing the number of parking spaces encourage the buyers behavior? it just makes it frustrating and a problem for down the road.</p>	<p>The big box thing rings alarm bells that apply to almost all retailers: how do we accommodate holiday shopping? Missteps here will transform the problem of extra asphalt into a pollution problem as shoppers circle the lots in their cars looking for a space. This is already a problem at many stores.</p>
	<p>The city is not oversupplied with parking spaces.</p>
	<p>I think it would make more sense to apply these standards in MXN (near neighborhoods) and MXA (near transit), but not MXS.</p>
	<p>Again, how does reducing the number of parking spaces encourage the buyers behavior? it just makes it frustrating and a problem for down the road.</p>
	<p>I am mixed on this one. Part of me is in favor for the intended purposes that the city sates. Part of me is against as it seems to be pushing people to find alternate modes of getting there. I can see this hurting business in the long run if it is hard to access the site.</p>
	<p>see comments above.</p>
	<p>This is again something that would ideally work in tandem with external changes to things like transit frequency and availability, but I think it's a good plan to implement to reduce dependency on surface-lot parking</p>
	<p>Get rid of all parking minimums. Developers know best how to manage parking for future residents. The city should manage on street parking via parking meters and permits</p>
<p>Multi Family lots and schools tend to use their parking spaces but Big Boxes only use them at Christmas. Businesses downtown have very different needs than those in other areas of the city that you must still drive to.</p>	
<p>The draft includes a new approach to shared parking reductions to allow for administrative approval of reductions based on different combinations of uses and eliminates the requirement to receive a Conditional Use Permit to reduce minimum requirements by greater than 10 percent. Allowed parking adjustments include reductions for the following: shared parking facilities; on-stree parking; motorcycle parking; transportation demand management (TDM) programs; and affordable housing, transit-supportive housing, and adaptive reuse housing that earn the Diverse Housing Incentive Combination of these parking reductions can be used, but no combination can result in a reduction of the minimum number of parking spaces required be more than 50 percent. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-07.6.Do you think these proposed changes are sufficient to further the city's goals to promote more efficient and affordable development? Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	<p>Why limit it to 50%. Planning for parking will sabotage our ability to achieve the city's climate and affordability goals.</p>
	<p>"affordable housing" is just a catchphrase.</p>
	<p>I foreshadow an increase in collisions with parked vehicles or vehicles leaving parking where this zoning rewrite is applied. Everywhere I have seen greater density code applied, a surprising number of cars line the streets.</p>
	<p>Remove affordable housing project from this list so that overflow parking from the project doesn't overwhelm adjacent neighborhoods</p>
	<p>Demand for development is not driven by regulations form the city..</p>
	<p>Has the city removed the parking reduction for providing additional bicycle parking? I feel like this is a lost opportunity.</p>
	<p>ALL parking minimums should be erased. It's not the government's job to regulate off street parking.</p>
	<p>On street parking is only allowing the developer to have more units and make more money. They love the idea of not having parking and then the neighborhood is burdened with it. Requiring every building to have a percentage of affordable- at and below median - is the only way to get affordable units built.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft zoning ordinance supplements current water efficiency standards for landscaping with new requirements to: Use xeriscaping design principles (e.g. using mulches to reduce evaporation, discourage weed growth, and keep the soil cool); Install drought-tolerant or adaptive sod/seed mix; Limit turf areas to 33 percent of the landscaped area; Prohibit invasive plants; and Limit the use of water features (e.g. fountains, waterfalls, and ponds). These regulations are found in Section 11-04-08.3.E. Do you think the proposed changes are sufficient to further the city's goals to promote environmental stewardship through environmentally-friendly development practices through water conservation?</p>	<p>If you want people to conserve water, you need to ratchet up the cost of water.</p>
	<p>I like the intent here. I don't know enough about the application to comment on the effect.</p>
	<p>Reduction and removal of lawn watering systems should be a top priority, in order to sustain our growing valley's water needs. We must do more here!</p>
	<p>I strongly support this zoning ordinance. The rapid development in the larger Boise area is already causing excessive water use in new developments with unimaginative landscaping. Xeriscaping should not only be encouraged but required.</p>
	<p>Enforcement will be very important for these standards</p>
	<p>I think it's a good start but could be pushed further</p>
	<p>Encourage site retention of water with permeable paving materials.</p>
<p>I think it is a beginning. Allow landscape to be watered until established, limiting lawn area and planting shade trees.</p>	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft introduces new screening requirements for both rooftop and ground-mounted mechanical and utility equipment. The standards for roof-mounted equipment require that the equipment (i) not be visible from five feet above ground on any lot line and adjacent public rights-of-way or open spaces OR (ii) be hidden from view using parapet walls or an enclosure that matches the primary building façade. The standards for ground-mounted equipment require that equipment located within view of customer entrances and public rights-of-way and open space be integrated into the overall site and architectural design using a decorative wall, fence, or enclosure and/or landscaping that is of sufficient height and opacity to soften and screen views. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-08.10.D(4) and the (cross-referenced) Citywide Design Standards. Do you think the proposed changes make a meaningful contribution to achieving the city's goal of increasing the visual quality of new development?</p>	<p>This is generally good, but requiring that rooftop screening match the primary building facade limits creative and often better solutions</p>
	<p>Only hiding the outdoor/ exterior equipment! Should be inside building perimeter. When required by equipment, ventilated wall openings are easily included in design. Screening limited to existing structures, ie. a grandfather provision permitted only for replacement when any renovation is minor as is done in the building code.</p>
	<p>The ground units are always a challenge. For example on a four plex that all four front doors face a different direction, the A/C's are all on different sides and are usually right next to the sidewalk. Screening these would be a challenge. That is just one example or many.</p>
	<p>Appreciate this clarification.</p> <p>It probably will, but I don't think these are big issues. We all know buildings need these items. The noise from them is worse than the look of them.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft carries forward the Citywide Design Standards and Guidelines requirements for at least one pedestrian entrance to each primary building that is visible and directly accessible from an adjacent street. In areas with an established pattern of building entrances facing the street, new building entrances must match that pattern. The draft also introduces an additional new standard that building frontages exceeding 100 feet in length with a nonresidential ground floor use include one visible and directly accessible entrance within each 50 feet of building length. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-09.2.B. Do you think the codification and expansion of these basic standards related to street-oriented building entrances will help promote the city's goal of achieving more walkable and pedestrian oriented development? Design illustration of a building exceeding 100 feet in length with a nonresidential ground floor use that has entrances within each 50 feet of building length.</p> <p>Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	If you want people to walk, you better keep them safe from bikes. The bikes on the sidewalks are out of control.
	Yes in MXA and MXN. No in MXS. I also am concerned about staff's ability to keep up with this level of "design review" on all building applications.
	helpful for wayfinding but wont make people walk
	Make these changes mandatory. The State & Arthur project appears to ignore these standards.
	But it will sure jack up builders costs which we be passed on to owners and renters...NO
	For a large retail use, restaurant, theater, concert venue, sports venue, etc...requiring a door every 50' along the street is unreasonable.
	I don't know enough about design to have a point of view. My issue is that the developers can build by right if they comply with the design requirements.
	Other wayfinding/guiding elements, landscaping, signage, path lighting, change in facade articulation.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The current broad maximum parking limits (175 percent of the minimum where 20 or fewer spaces are required and 150 percent of the minimum where more than 20 spaces are required) have been refined to only apply to those land uses that have high likelihood of over-supplying parking spaces. The uses targeted for maximum parking limits includes Multifamily Dwellings, Schools, Hotels, and Large/Big Box Retails uses (and a few others), and the maximum limit for these larger scale uses has been reduced from 175 percent to 125 percent of the minimum requirement. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-07.5. Do you think the proposed changes are sufficient to further the city's goals to increase transportation options and encourage compact development?</p> <p>Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	<p>I would have gone further, but this is a big and important step so I don't want to screw it up buy arguing for more.</p>
	<p>The big box thing rings alarm bells that apply to almost all retailers: how do we accommodate holiday shopping? Missteps here will transform the problem of extra asphalt into a pollution problem as shoppers circle the lots in their cars looking for a space. This is already a problem at many stores.</p>
	<p>The city is not oversupplied with parking spaces.</p>
	<p>I think it would make more sense to apply these standards in MXN (near neighborhoods) and MXA (near transit), but not MXS.</p>
	<p>Again, how does reducing the number of parking spaces encourage the buyers behavior? it just makes it frustrating and a problem for down the road.</p>
	<p>I am mixed on this one. Part of me is in favor for the intended purposes that the city sates. Part of me is against as it seems to be pushing people to find alternate modes of getting there. I can see this hurting business in the long run if it is hard to access the site.</p>
	<p>see comments above.</p>
	<p>This is again something that would ideally work in tandem with external changes to things like transit frequency and availability, but I think it's a good plan to implement to reduce dependency on surface-lot parking</p>
	<p>Get rid of all parking minimums. Developers know best how to manage parking for future residents. The city should manage on street parking via parking meters and permits</p>
	<p>Multi Family lots and schools tend to use their parking spaces but Big Boxes only use them at Christmas. Businesses downtown have very different needs than those in other areas of the city that you must still drive to.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft includes a new approach to shared parking reductions to allow for administrative approval of reductions based on different combinations of uses and eliminates the requirement to receive a Conditional Use Permit to reduce minimum requirements by greater than 10 percent. Allowed parking adjustments include reductions for the following: Shared parking facilities; On-street parking; Motorcycle parking; Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs; and Affordable housing, transit-supportive housing, and adaptive reuse housing that earn the Diverse Housing Incentive. Combination of these parking reductions can be used, but no combination can result in a reduction of the minimum number of parking spaces required be more than 50 percent. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-07.6. Do you think these proposed changes are sufficient to further the city's goals to promote more efficient and affordable development?</p> <p>Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	<p>I foreshadow an increase in collisions with parked vehicles or vehicles leaving parking where this zoning rewrite is applied. Everywhere I have seen greater density code applied, a surprising number of cars line the streets.</p>
	<p>Remove affordable housing project from this list so that overflow parking from the project doesn't overwhelm adjacent neighborhoods</p>
	<p>Demand for development is not driven by regulations from the city...</p>
	<p>Has the city removed the parking reduction for providing additional bicycle parking? I feel like this is a lost opportunity.</p>
	<p>ALL parking minimums should be erased. It's not the government's job to regulate off street parking.</p>
<p>On street parking is only allowing the developer to have more units and make more money. They love the idea of not having parking and then the neighborhood is burdened with it. Requiring every building to have a percentage of affordable- at and below median - is the only way to get affordable units built.</p>	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft zoning ordinance supplements current water efficiency standards for landscaping with new requirements to: Use xeriscaping design principles (e.g. using mulches to reduce evaporation, discourage weed growth, and keep the soil cool); Install drought-tolerant or adaptive sod/ seed mix; Limit turf areas to 33 percent of the landscaped area; Prohibit invasive plants; and Limit the use of water features (e.g. fountains, waterfalls, and ponds). These regulations are found in Section 11-04-08.3.E. Do you think the proposed changes are sufficient to further the city's goals to promote environmental stewardship through environmentally-friendly development practices through water conservation? IS there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	<p>Definitely this alone does a lot of good. Climate change in this high desert? Educate people about the future higher temperatures. Also, since larger, more lavish, more expensively designed & decorated homes are going up, please help cut down on expensive upkeep & maintenance.</p>
	<p>You will only be able to enforce this with new development. However, an awareness campaign along with seed mixes might work really well for other homeowners. Many people have no idea what their yard impacts are. There should be a turf exception for those on passive flood irrigation. Passive flood irrigation is great recharge for our local aquifer. Side note: I want to ban multiple showerhead showers. This luxury trend is so wrong, especially in our climate.</p>
	<p>Encourage use of native plantings and limit sprinkler system installation by area</p>
	<p>If you want people to conserve water, you need to ratchet up the cost of water.</p>
	<p>I like the intent here. I don't know enough about the application to comment on the effect.</p>
	<p>Reduction and removal of lawn watering systems should be a top priority, in order to sustain our growing valley's water needs. We must do more here!</p>
<p>I strongly support this zoning ordinance. The rapid development in the larger Boise area is already causing excessive water use in new developments with unimaginative landscaping. Xeriscaping should not only be encouraged but required.</p>	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft introduces new screening requirements for both rooftop and ground-mounted mechanical and utility equipment. The standards for roof-mounted equipment require that the equipment (i) not be visible from five feet above ground on any lot line and adjacent public rights-of-way or open spaces OR (ii) be hidden from view using parapet walls or an enclosure that matches the primary building façade. The standards for ground-mounted equipment require that equipment located within view of customer entrances and public rights-of-way and open space be integrated into the overall site and architectural design using a decorative wall, fence, or enclosure and/or landscaping that is of sufficient height and opacity to soften and screen views. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-08.10.D(4) and the (cross-referenced) Citywide Design Standards. Do you think the proposed changes make a meaningful contribution to achieving the city's goal of increasing the visual quality of new development? IS there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	I like this.
	This is generally good, but requiring that rooftop screening match the primary building facade limits creative and often better solutions
	The ground units are always a challenge. For example on a four plex that all four front doors face a different direction, the A/C's are all on different sides and are usually right next to the sidewalk. Screening these would be a challenge. That is just one example or many.
	Appreciate this clarification.
	It probably will, but I don't think these are big issues. We all know buildings need these items. The noise from them is worse than the look of them.

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft carries forward the Citywide Design Standards and Guidelines requirements for at least one pedestrian entrance to each primary building that is visible and directly accessible from an adjacent street. In areas with an established pattern of building entrances facing the street, new building entrances must match that pattern. The draft also introduces an additional new standard that building frontages exceeding 100 feet in length with a nonresidential ground floor use include one visible and directly accessible entrance within each 50 feet of building length. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-09.2.B. Do you think the codification and expansion of these basic standards related to street-oriented building entrances will help promote the city's goal of achieving more walkable and pedestrian oriented development? Design illustration of a building exceeding 100 feet in length with a nonresidential ground floor use that has entrances within each 50 feet of building length. IS there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	<p>If you want people to walk, you better keep them safe from bikes. The bikes on the sidewalks are out of control.</p>
	<p>Yes in MXA and MXN. No in MXS. I also am concerned about staff's ability to keep up with this level of "design review" on all building applications.</p>
	<p>helpful for wayfinding but wont make people walk</p>
	<p>Make these changes mandatory. The State & Arthur project appears to ignore these standards.</p>
	<p>But it will sure jack up builders costs which we be passed on to owners and renters...NO</p>
	<p>For a large retail use, restaurant, theater, concert venue, sports venue, etc...requiring a door every 50' along the street is unreasonable.</p>
	<p>I don't know enough about design to have a point of view. My issue is that the developers can build by right if they comply with the design requirements.</p>
	<p>Other wayfinding/guiding elements, landscaping, signage, path lighting, change in facade articulation.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft carries forward the Citywide Design Standards and Guidelines transparency requirements for ground floor, street-facing façade transparency based on the proximity of the ground floor of the building to a sidewalk (e.g. 40 percent of ground floor façade when located within 10 feet of sidewalk) or when residential uses occupy the ground floor (15 percent of the street-facing façade area). New transparency requirements limit the use of reflective glass (visible transmittance ratio of at least 0.60) on key pedestrian facades, and in some situations require the use of glazing treatments such as external screens over glass windows, paned glass with mullions, or glass covered with patterns, to reduce bird-strike incidents. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-09.2.C.(4) and (5). Do you think the codification and expansion of these building façade transparency standards will help promote the city's goal of achieving high-quality pedestrian oriented development and contribute to environmental stewardship? Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	<p>This sounds overly prescriptive, in my opinion. "External screens?" Sounds like a) infringement on innovative design by degrading the view quality, and b) an open invitation to vandalism - one box cutter can ruin an expensive screen.</p>
	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Yes in MXA and MXN, no in MXS.</p>
	<p>Any "requirement" or "regulation" is just code word for higher costs for everyone from builders to renters...NO</p>
	<p>Strongly encourage implementing this zoning requirement to reduce (and preferably avoid) bird-strike incidents. This is of particular importance to high-rise buildings.</p>
	<p>The ground floor transparency requirement is a good idea, but it can be rendered useless by the construction of something opaque just behind the glazing. This is common for businesses that are more used to a "big box" approach. However extending zoning requirements to the building interior seems like a problem.</p>
	<p>Seems overarching to me.</p>
	<p>Requiring too much landscaping between the sidewalk and the building/glazing will result in a poorer pedestrian landscape regardless of the glazing treatment (assuming intent is to see into the windows for interest).</p>
	<p>I don't know enough about design to have a point of view. My issue is that the developers can build by right if they comply with the design requirements.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft introduces building articulation standards for street-facing façades of primary buildings that are tailored by zoning district. In the R-2, R-3, MX-S, MX-I, and I-1 districts, each street-facing façade is required to incorporate at least one of the following elements within each 50 horizontal feet of building façade: Projections, recessions, columns, cornices, change of wall plane a minimum of six inches in depth; Awnings or canopies extending at least four feet beyond the building face with a minimum vertical clearance of nine feet above the sidewalk; or Visible differences in façade material texture and/or masonry patterns. In the MS-N, MX-A, and MX-D districts, each street-facing façade shall incorporate at least two of the elements listed above within each 50 horizontal feet of building façade. These regulations are found in Section 11-04-09-2.D(2). Do you think the codification and expansion of these building façade transparency standards will help promote the city's goal of achieving more pedestrian oriented development and high-quality building design? Is there a way the regulation could be improved to achieve the intended result?</p>	<p>It will accomplish the goal, but the cost in headaches to developers is too high. Why not have the city do something for free for the developer --like make edits to the design and then give the developer something if the developer adopts them.</p>
	<p>Quasi random input: umbrellas are a clear hazard to tall people. People do not even think about our eyes getting poked by their errant parapluies. Please find a way to restrict their use.</p>
	<p>All this helps, but design trends change and you might be locking yourself into something unintended.</p>
	<p>Any attempt to codify design leads to unforeseen consequences. Leave it alone! No legal definition of porn, but you know it when you see it! Quality design is the same, the definition changes over time, you know it when you se it! Leave this issue to planning approval on a project by project basis. Rules never lead to quality!</p>
	<p>Seems reasonable and will discourage bland stucco strip malls.</p>
	<p>I don't know enough about design to have a point of view. My issue is that the developers can build by right if they comply with the design requirements.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>The draft zoning ordinance proposes some relatively simple and objective standards to enhance the city’s regulation of exterior lighting. These regulations are found in Section 11-4-010. Key standards: Promote lighting efficiency by requiring that new fixtures provide a minimum of 80 lumens per watt of energy consumed; Reduce glare by requiring full cutoff/fully shielded lighting fixtures and by limited uplighting of building facades; Limit light trespass by prohibiting lighting levels at property lines that do not front on a public or private street to 1.0 footcandle; and Promoting Dark Skies by requiring that 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 illuminate walkways, driveways, equipment yards, or parking lots. Do you think the proposed changes are sufficient to further the city’s goals to minimize light trespass from developed areas, reduce sky-glow to increase night sky access, and reduce development impact on nocturnal environments?</p>	<p>But, I’m now thinking you’ll have to suffer thru some “10s” of people calling these helpful rules “taking away my freedom” and “govt overreach” (which I’m now writing to most GOP Legislators’ ideas for new laws) and “socialism”</p>
	<p>Require mitigation for headlights blasting through bedroom windows.</p>
	<p>Please enforce this with car dealerships.</p>
	<p>Examine Tucson AZ standards which limit lighting levels due to national observatory, although fifty miles away.</p>
	<p>This is another silly idea. Walkable cities require good lighting. It’s a safety issue.</p>
	<p>Strongly encourage shielding lights (projecting downwards) and other measures to promote dark skies/nocturnal environments. This zoning requirement, in association with dark windows, would reduce bird-strike incidents.</p>
<p>Nice! How will it be verified and remain in compliance?</p>	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2

<p>Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns about any of the content included in Module 2: Development and Design Standards? When possible, please note the section reference of the particular standards for which you offer a comment.</p>	<p>Please increase the maximum building height permitted in the MXA zone. Please consider changing the zoning in the River Street neighborhood between 9th Street and Americana to MXD to accommodate and promote urban growth and development in this area south of downtown and north of the Boise River.</p>
	<p>I suggest a review and rehabilitation of alleys in commercial and residential neighborhoods according to how damaged they are. I've been in a couple that look like a child and a thoughtless adult could slip, fall, twist an ankle; an animal go thru a broken fence, and worse damage will happen from a any kind of storm.</p>
	<p>Lighting is a minor user of energy and talking about this in relation to climate goals is disingenuous.</p>
	<p>Stop including "environmental" anything. Kitsch terminology.</p>
	<p>I recently had a historic preservation project where the house was clearly built prior to zoning setback requirements. We still had to spend the time and money to go through the variance commission hearing process, even though it was a slam dunk approval. There should be some sort of exception for obvious grandfathered cases such as this. It delayed the project by 2 months and cost the client about \$2000. We hosted a neighborhood meeting, tried to get signatures from every homeowner but couldn't due to rentals. It was a huge expensive hassle.</p>
	<p>While public input is extremely important, I encourage the Panning Commission to seek out and include the design community, architects, engineers, signage designers, fence makers, developers in this process. Thank you for all the professional, thoughtful and hard work!!</p>
	<p>While this survey was quite long, I do appreciate that each question identified which City goal (which I'm assuming are from BPB) the proposed change is targeting. I think that is a good way to frame proposed changes in the future so that the spirit of the change is acknowledged.</p>
	<p>Consistently enforce any of these changes that are adopted and make variances harder to obtain. The State & Arthur project would be in violation of many of these requirements</p>
	<p>Stop the push for high density, low income, multi-family housing. Don't ruin. Single-family residential areas.</p>
	<p>Very long survey. I unfortunately could not finish.</p>
	<p>Additional feedback on commercial uses here: Neighbors for Boise is concerned about many of the new restrictions present in the Commercial Use Standards. Many retail uses that fit within residential areas are either prohibited or allowed conditionally. We believe we should not prohibit or condition uses based on where they are located within a mixed use zone, especially because our MU zones are often located only 1-2 parcels (100-300') on either side of an arterial or collector that then gives way to a residential zone. It is a reasonable expectation that if you purchase a residential unit near a collector or arterial roadway that is a commercial thoroughfare, that there will be some activity that spills into adjacent residential properties. Segregating uses in the first place has allowed car-centric culture to dominate the way we plan cities. No wonder every developer wants to develop drive-throughs. We force every customer to drive a car to access entertainment, to eat out, or to shop. No amount of lip service to "walkable" neighborhoods will change this and it is the single biggest failure of this code. We should allow low-impact commercial uses in R-3 and all MU zones, and make them conditional in the remaining residential zones. Alternatively, we should allow small commercial uses outright along all collector and arterial roadways. This would force them to stay out of small, local roadways and truly quiet neighborhoods, but allow them within walking distance of almost any residential parcel in the city. Code Section: 11-03-03.4L Event Center Concern/Implication: Help me understand the difference between a community center, Club, Lodge, or Social Hall, and an event center. Is one a non-profit (what about TRICA?), while the other a for-profit venture? Why are we so anti-events centers in this table? (Answer: probably TRICA) In my mind, it is a question of scale. So, why prevent a community-scaled event center from existing within a community? Recommendation: Make this a conditional use across all residential zones, and an allowed use in all commercial zones. Otherwise, we'll have the most boring City in America. Allow use anywhere along a collector or arterial roadway. Code Section: 11-03-03.4D + F Restaurant and Bar/Brewpubs Concern/Implication: Requiring a CUP for bars within 300' of a residential zone is ridiculous. Rules like these allowed the car-centric culture we are in now to come to power. NO WONDER every developer wants to do drive thrus. We force every customer to drive a car to get to food service. This is the single biggest failure of this code. Recommendation: We should make restaurants and bars apply for a CUP to operate within R-2 or less intense zones, they should be allowed in the rest of the zones subject to admin approval. We should not outright prohibit restaurants and bars in any area of the City. Allow use anywhere along a collector or arterial roadway. Code Section: 11-03-03.4E Limited Food/Drink service Concern/Implication: Limited Food/Drink service is unrealistic at 1,000 SF of gross floor area. Perhaps we set the limit to 1,000 SF of service area. We should not force these to exist only below residential uses. This will kill entrepreneurial users as they will never be able to afford rents that new construction will demand. It will also discourage adaptive reuse. Recommendation: We should not force these to exist only below residential uses in residential zones. Limit to 1,000 SF of customer area, not GFA. Allow use anywhere along a collector or arterial roadway. Code Section: 11-03-03.4Q Retail Sales, Small Concern/Implication: Why can we not allow retail uses to operate in standalone buildings in residential zones? This will kill entrepreneurial users as they will never be able to afford rents that new construction will demand. It will also discourage adaptive reuse. What are the differences between small, medium, and large? Recommendation: Allow small retail to operate within standalone structures in Residential zones to encourage adaptive reuse. Allow use anywhere along a collector or arterial roadway. Code Section: 11-03-03.5A Artisan industry Concern/Implication: Who doesn't want a corner bakery? Recommendation: Conditionally allow artisan industry in all residential zones. Allow use anywhere along a collector or arterial roadway. Code Section: 11-03-03.4O Indoor Recreation Concern/Implication: Why limit this use to places at least 300' from a residential zone. What's the point? Recommendation: Remove requirement to be more than 300' of residential zoning district. Allow use anywhere along a collector or arterial roadway. Code Section: 11-03-03.4J Financial Establishment, Medical or Dental Clinic, Personal and Business Services Concern/Implication: Is not allowed in standalone buildings and is limited to 1,000 SF in R-3 zone. Why can we not allow this use standalone buildings? This will kill entrepreneurial users as they will never be able to afford rents that new construction will demand. It will also discourage adaptive reuse. Recommendation: Allow in standalone buildings in R-3. Allow use anywhere along a collector or arterial roadway. Code Section: 11-03-03.4K Professional Offices Concern/Implication: Offices are way less intense than retail uses and medical office uses and shouldn't be restricted. Recommendation: Remove silly locational requirements for offices in Residential zones. Allow in R-3, make conditional in other residential zones. Allow use anywhere along a collector or arterial roadway. Other uses with no specific use standards: Contractor Shop and Yard: This should be a conditional use in all residential and MX-N zones. A contractor shop and yard reflect the character of many residential neighborhoods in Boise. If the impact cannot be mitigated, the proposal can be denied, right? Art Gallery, Museum, or Library: Why not conditionally allow in Residential zones?</p>
	<p>Strike the owner-occupancy requirement for ADUs and increase their max size to 1000 sq ft. If a property owner can build a 4-plex and rent all the units, there is no reason to prohibit owners of SF rentals from adding an ADU.</p>
	<p>Building heights should allow for 7 stories in all commercial zones to allow for standard podium apartment/ condominium buildings. Parking minimums should be erased Thank you</p>
<p>This is a large undertaking, thanks for your hard work</p>	

Zoning Code Rewrite: Technical Survey Comments, Module 2