

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Cover Page: Listing of Comment Questions and Number of Comments Received

# Comments	Question
47	Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?
295	Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification? (If yes, write in letters corresponding to the values, along with any comments you might have. If not, leave blank.)
155	Q.6 1st Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:
102	Q.6 2nd Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:
68	Q.6 3rd Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:
11	Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? (OTHER)
304	Q.7: Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?
25	Q.8a: Which of the following statements best represents your preference regarding the future growth of jobs in the Boulder Valley? (OTHER)
40	Q.8b: Which of the following statements best represents your preference regarding the future growth of housing in the Boulder Valley? (OTHER)
60	Q.9: Which of the following best reflects your views regarding the rate of housing unit growth? (OTHER)
47	Q.10: Which of the following best reflects your view about the rate of new commercial growth? (OTHER)
23	Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? (OTHER)
148	Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?
50	Q.12: Which locations should the city emphasize for planning for redevelopment and future mixed use concentrated activity? (OTHER)
80	Q.13 1st Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:
41	Q.13 2nd Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:
30	Q.13 3rd Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:
112	Q.13: What additional examples of "community benefit" not listed above do you believe are important?
18	Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? (OTHER)
118	Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Cover Page: Listing of Comment Questions and Number of Comments Received

# Comments	Question
298	Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?
53	Q.18: What do you like MOST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that should be preserved or protected? (OTHER)
109	Q.19: What do you like LEAST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that you would most like to improve? (OTHER)
248	Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?
67	Q.21: The city is revitalizing its neighborhood outreach and programs with the new role of a neighborhood liaison. What neighborhood programs, improvements, or outreach services would you like to see emphasized by the city? (OTHER)
191	Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?
37	Q.27: Where do you work? (OTHER)
19	Q.28: Do you ever work at your home? (OTHER)
12	Q.30: Please check the one box that most closely describes the type of housing unit you live in. (OTHER)
3	Q.31: Do you own or rent your residence? (If you own a mobile home but pay a lot fee, then you own your residence) (OTHER)
11	Q.36: Which best describes your race? (OTHER)

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ 1% a year is adequate. However, I am opposed to office space and banks on the first floor or buildings in high pedestrian areas downtown on the Hill, etc.
- ◆ Again, commercial growth that is required to abide by community values of sustainable building and maintaining the character of neighborhoods. Look at the Ft. Collins model! They've reduced urban sprawl while increasing the economic and cultural vibrancy and rigor of the community.
- ◆ Again, smart growth matters. We need business mixed with housing. No strip malls, no remote business parks. Build places to work within walking distance of places to live.
- ◆ All commercial growth should provide some form public benefits, if it doesn't, it should be limited. Upper stories below market rate rentals, convenience centers, etc.
- ◆ allow different commercial growth. our hotel / meeting space sucks and we don't need another office condo with a coffee shop. we need a theater down town, a meeting space and a second center
- ◆ Allow managed growth
- ◆ attract solid commercial jobs that have housing benefits as noted above
- ◆ Because we have had recessions, we should be aware of the potential for overbuilding. I wouldn't call it limiting growth so much as I would be concerned about empty buildings if the economy goes south.
- ◆ city needs to stop commercial growth
- ◆ Commercial Growth should be inextricably tied to residential growth and remain within the character of the type of City that is identified by the goals of the BVCP
- ◆ Development for regular people. Big new Google expansions are not for regular people.
- ◆ empty store fronts and boarded windows are beautiful
- ◆ Encourage moderate growth of businesses
- ◆ I think mostly the top option, but I do have concerns about so much tech growth.
- ◆ I want to say not managing it, but I want to limit the number of people daily driving to Boulder to work
- ◆ I'm fine either way as long as more parking is available
- ◆ If housing availability can't keep up with jobs, maybe there should be some limit on commercial development.
- ◆ Increase commercial growth by allowing new commercial retail, industrial and hospitality, structures to replace old, 1-story structures with new structure max 3 stories.
- ◆ It is difficult to regulate housing stock but not commercial, creating a larger pressure on in-commuting during growth periods, such as we currently have. However, strict regulations on commercial growth have other negative unintended consequences.
- ◆ Let the market handle this.
- ◆ Like Aspen, the city should encourage/require new commercial entities to hire locally whenever possible.
- ◆ Limit commercial growth and also exert more control over the style of commercial development
- ◆ Limit commercial growth based on environmental restrictions (e.g. require solar panels)
- ◆ limit only through land use
- ◆ Limits to commercial growth are unnecessary and send a bizarre message to potential new businesses. Land use is better tool to manage growth rather than a growth management system.
- ◆ Manage a way for middle class Income full time working residents to affordable live and thrive in BC
- ◆ Quality not rate is what's important. We should be selective about the type of commercial growth we allow. More of some kinds is fine. More of others is not.
- ◆ Rezone to housing and then let the market figure it out
- ◆ See above.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ Simply make good decisions about growth. Don't change the character of semi-rural areas by approving development -- whether by private developers or by the city/county -- on open fields that add considerably to the joy of living in this area.
- ◆ SLOW growth
- ◆ Some 'commercial' used are less impactful than others, especially with regard to congestion and walkability
- ◆ stabilize jobs/housing balance
- ◆ The city needs a system to monitor growth, and limit/slow as needed
- ◆ The city needs to implement an affordable rent system for local, small businesses .
- ◆ the city should have a role in this process and a plan. market conditions alone will not lead to the best outcomes and will change the character of boulder
- ◆ The city should monitor commercial growth in case of imbalance
- ◆ The city should stop commercial/jobs growth; it IS the city's responsibility because of our community's goals for clean air and water and against global warming.
- ◆ The city should transform some areas slated for commercial development into residential development or make them parks.
- ◆ The city should encourage new businesses and startups. Large commercial growth should not occur in city centers, rather be encouraged in the industrial complexes that seem to have a lot of vacancies. Mixed use of these areas could be explored.
- ◆ The public needs a better understanding of linkage fees and how commercial development can integrate with present and future housing goals. We also need better urban planning and design, as too many commercial developments play out to the same maximized interpretation of code and regulation which misses the 'innovation' goal attributed in the Comp Plan.
- ◆ They operative key phrase 'so long as any new commercial development meets zoning and regulations. These need to be taken more seriously and monitored more carefully.
- ◆ Too much density will limit our quality of life
- ◆ We don't need to explicitly limit job commercial growth, but carefully consider what kind of growth we want. We might consider changing zoning and land-use regulations to favor new housing, but otherwise let market forces work.
- ◆ We have more than enough commercial growth!!!
- ◆ We must reach an equilibrium. We cannot grow indefinitely.
- ◆ Why does the city have plans for potential growth in commercial and employment since it does not manage commercial growth? Limit commercial growth , whatever is driving the recent cheap and ugly development needs to be managed.

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
- c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
- d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
- g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
- h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
- i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ A community that supports and encourages cultural and income diversity.
- ♦ all are good
- ♦ All super, in theory....
- ♦ I can't read that list
- ♦ I strongly disagree with the idea that Boulder should be striving for new urbanism values and thus feel the word compact should not be the first word in the values.
- ♦ See above
- ♦ Too much housing density will eliminate our quality of life.
- ♦ a 'Compact' should not mean intense urbanization, but rather avoidance of sprawl
- ♦ a "Compact" can become "over density" which destroys "quality of life"
- ♦ a A compact city.....communities perhaps...adding urban design as a value....
- ♦ a A compact community need not raise height limits
- ♦ a A compact community with preserved open space on its western edge
- ♦ a a compact, dense and urban community surrounded by preserved open space.
- ♦ a add 'agriculture' for cultivating food as a primary aspect of open space
- ♦ a City leaders seem to think that "compact" can mean the new urbanism with too many exemptions with height restrictions and too many buy-outs of affordable housing for building projects
- ♦ a Clarify 'compact' and 'surrounded by' in relationship to the existing City bounds. Implies that we should 'limit' growth of the city to preserve County 'open space'.
- ♦ a Clarify compact-
- ♦ a Compact community Gunbarrel does not want a 'compact' community. What type of value a community where there is high density in a small area with not enough resources for so many people?
- ♦ a compact means growing within a confined space. i do not appreciate luring more jobs to boulder. or luring out of towers to jobs in town. we need to use local residents for as many jobs as possible.
- ♦ a Continue to ban drones on open space and encourage the U.S. Forest Service to ban them, too.
- ♦ a define 'compact community'
- ♦ a Define 'compact'. Is that high density!?
- ♦ a Development of open space to low income housing.
- ♦ a don't develop Twin Lakes
- ♦ a How dense is 'compact'? Was the vote against 300 an endorsement of severe increase in density? I don't believe so, it was based more on the flaws of 300.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
- c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
- d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
- g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
- h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
- i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ a How much more compact can Boulder get before it crosses the line of diminished quality of life? I would say, after living here for 27 years, we are toeing that line right now.
- ♦ a I disagree with this. You cannot abandon the non-city parts of the community. Your transportation policies are a joke.
- ♦ a I do not understand the use of the word 'compact' - that suggests exclusion and insular.
- ♦ a I do not want to live in a "compact" community and I do not want diverse housing. We have other communities outside of the Boulder city limits to provide "diverse" pricing.
- ♦ a I don't want a dense, compact community
- ♦ a I don't want to see a 'compact community' if that means large dense buildings that go higher than the zoning and also aren't set back from the streets.
- ♦ a In light of the fact that Boulder county Housing Authority is considering taking land that has been Open Space(i.e. Twin Lakes Rd) and converting it to medium to high density housing, I feel that this need clarification.
- ♦ a include the need to keep intact the vertical open space by limiting to 35 ANY construction.
- ♦ a It also feels like we are not doing as much as we could with open space, with the new Twin Lakes development trying to re-zone from single family units to high-density.
- ♦ a It feels like we are deviating from 'a compact community' with all the new construction, some of which is multi-level.
- ♦ a It is time to define 'compact' - we might not all agree on that definition and we should have a strict growth rate that we follow. Yes, open space is sacred.
- ♦ a Making low density housing in Boulder frozen in time.
- ♦ a My concern about the 'density' goal is that it brings with it a lot of vehicles. I know the response is 'well, we will push for more public transportation.' The problem with that is there are limits to public transportation. A family that needs to get to the grocery store or kids to sports after school, likely needs to drive to do it.
- ♦ a Need to address wildlife corridors and connections to Open Space better. A ring of open space without adequate connections can do more harm than good.
- ♦ a Not just 'preserved open space' but open space available for active uses like biking, running, horseback riding, and open to dogs and their gaurdians
- ♦ a Open space must include the vertical dimension. We might even consider, as a city, purchasing development rights above certain building heights, if necessary to preserve our viewsheds.
- ♦ a Open space should emphasize bother recreation and conservation values.
- ♦ a Open space, yes; compact community, no. Too many people in Boulder.

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
- c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
- d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
- g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
- h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
- i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ a Preserved should be better defined, perhaps replaced with protected. More public access is needed to reduce vehicle trips to other open areas
- ♦ a Sounds like the plan is for Boulder to build out like Austin.
- ♦ a That sounds like a closed community, where's room for growth in housing, especially affordable housing?
- ♦ a The affordable housing plan for Twin Lakes Road totally goes against this core value.
- ♦ a the community is landlocked, thus compact, that does not correlate to high density
- ♦ a The compact community goal needs to have limits - not losing the sense of place with high buildings and walls of tightly packed buildings; not crowding so many people into the compact community that quality of life is drastically impacted for the current residents.
- ♦ a The concept of 'preserved' open space needs to recognize that the open space is the only home for flora and fauna, and that any recreational access needs to protect flora and fauna.
- ♦ a the statement ought to include something about connectivity - both for human use(recreation) and wildlife - open space does not have to an 'other' to community or a buffer; it should function as PART of the community
- ♦ a There is plenty of open space surrounding the City of Boulder. Boulder County does not need to continue purchasing additional open space. We are surrounded.
- ♦ a This has already been accomplished beyond the level that was needed.
- ♦ a this has already been achieved and is basically non-reversible
- ♦ a This is not what I want for Boulder. I read this has high-density, over-crowded living with most of the people driving in from other cities to work or go to school.
- ♦ a Use of the word 'preserved' implies to me that it is not to be used by humans. I think human use of our open is vital to our community and I would clarify this value accordingly.
- ♦ a What do we mean by compact? How are we engaged with our Open Space? Could some Open Space serve other needs?
- ♦ a What do we really mean by compact? Isolated, or dense? The city doesn't seem particularly 'compact; to me as it is, with large suburban areas, and few walkable centers & corridors.
- ♦ a What does a compact community mean? More density?
- ♦ a What is 'compact?' Does this term refer to density? There is a big difference between dense and small.
- ♦ a What is a compact community mean? Few people or density with more people?

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. *A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action*
- c. *A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces***
- d. **A welcoming and inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. **A healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. *A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths*
- g. *A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges*
- h. *An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone*
- i. **Strong city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ a When is 'compact' too compact? How far reaching should the 'compact-ness' be? (Downtown Boulder, 29th street area?) 'Compactness' should not be forced on out-lying areas, such as Gunbarrel.
- ♦ a Why, with the Twin Lakes area which is already a compact community with an existing open space area for both wild life (owls (a mating pair for 27 years) and the red tailed Hawks) and the people that use that space be considered for more density and lose of that space?
- ♦ a , g 'Compact' has become stifling. Open the reserve area N of Jay.
- ♦ a-i The County's needs should NOT be dominated by the City.
- ♦ a, d, g, h These have become Trojan Horses for interests with an agenda to increase population and density, e.g., out of state developers and speculators, and those who want to make our home into something it is not in order to achieve their ideal demographics and public transportation system. The plan should serve EXISTING residents and businesses, NOT outsiders!
- ♦ a,g I do not want to live in a 'compact' community and I do not want diverse housing. We have other communities outside of the Boulder city limits to provide 'diverse' pricing.
- ♦ b 'Climate action' sounds like a very vague term begging to be abused by the powers that be in government
- ♦ b A community that practices sustainable development, environmental stewardship and climate action.
- ♦ b A ridiculous priority.
- ♦ b additional business and expanding population limits and diminishes environmental stewardship and climate action effectiveness
- ♦ b Another waste of time and money for our city and county.
- ♦ b Any action by a city this small does not impact global climate
- ♦ b b. should add after climate action- to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.
- ♦ b climate action is not needed or viable on a local level
- ♦ b environmental stewardship means improving not forcing a waste of funds to the antiquated municipal model for electricity.
- ♦ b Get rid of municipalization and spend the millions on rooftop solar
- ♦ b Goal to broad and open to interpretation
- ♦ b In cooperation with existing networks (i.e.Excel)
- ♦ b Needs clarification - what does practicing climate action look like?
- ♦ b not a local issue

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
- c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
- d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
- g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
- h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
- i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ b sounds like political BS in my opinion
- ♦ b This is counter to the over development of the last few years. How to combat climate change when you have built a city based on car commuting.
- ♦ b We need to clarify that environmental stewardship means that we cannot continue to become obese (not even compactly obese) as a city. When we raze a one story building and build a four story building we are throwing away the embodied energy in the original building, disrupting the community with construction activity for years sometimes, increasing the in migration pressure, and forcing up property values. All of these contradict a goal of environmental stewardship.
- ♦ b yes, we need to more accurately account for our greenhouse emissions starting immediately, and including consumption used in construction
- ♦ b,c, As compact becomes dense in providing low cost housing and big buildings (see old Daily Camera spot), there is a loss of a unique identity, and neighborhoods and public spaces lose uniqueness and value.
- ♦ i,c, d, f, All of those 'core values' are great if you are a trustfunder with nothing better to do. You folks don't get out to see the rest of the real world, do you?
- ♦ b , g propose green requirements for new home construction will increase construction costs to an unreasonable level
- ♦ c "unique" should also be in bold to emphasize that characteristic
- ♦ c A place with a unique urban identity and sense of place, with great neighborhoods, excellent employment opportunities and both urban and rural public spaces
- ♦ c Add recognition that identity and a unique sense of place includes preservation of our built environment
- ♦ c Boulder is becoming gentrified and is very homogenized
- ♦ c Boulder's unqiues idenity is being replaced with sameness, bland housing, box stores and franchises.
- ♦ c C needs clarification and/or modification. I live in a great neighborhood with a unique identity and sense of place in Gunbarrel, Red a fox Hills. This will be destroyed if the County proceeds with inserting high-density housing in the center of our rural neighborhood. It will also violate core value 'B', as well as 'C'.
- ♦ c define 'great' neighborhoods. I believe my suggested (j) does so.
- ♦ c great existing neighborhoods whose residents need to be consulted and respected when making decisions about public spaces, density of planned neighborhoods, etc.

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. *A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action*
- c. *A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces***
- d. **A welcoming and inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. **A healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. *A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths*
- g. *A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges*
- h. *An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone*
- i. **Strong city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ c Great neighborhoods is very vague. One plan for the whole city means no neighborhood gets to gain / build character.
- ♦ c how are 'great neighborhoods' defined?
- ♦ c I think our community needs to have more vision/dialogue on what sense of place means to all.
- ♦ c Instead of 'great' neighborhoods, it should be 'diverse set of neighborhoods.'
- ♦ c Let's start affordable housing for artists programs like Loveland does.
- ♦ c No one will go to the public spaces because they are overrun with transients
- ♦ c Public spaces must mean more than open space if we're going to become a city that has neighborhoods.
- ♦ c support neighborhoods in controlling their own future
- ♦ c The counsel seems to be forgetting that change is not always good and is not always in the best interest of established communities. Our open spaces need to be protected and are an integral part of the neighborhoods.
- ♦ c This needs more clarification about what is sense of place. Need to embrace urbanity and the defining role of good architecture.
- ♦ c Truly great city's and neighborhoods have parks as a part of their DNA. Think Central Park in NYC. Think Wash Park (or many others) in Denver. You need large spaces for such a park. The Flatirons are great, but they are not a park. You don't see mixed uses in the Flatirons. Valmont bike park is an excellent step in the right direction - but taking something like North Boulder Park (or another, even larger property park - maybe Viele Lake - and turning it into something truly special would take Boulder up a notch.
- ♦ c varied neighborhoods that don't have to cater to everyone (eg the hill doesn't have to be family friendly, everywhere else is already family friendly)
- ♦ c We must clarify that being welcoming and inclusive does not imply that we must 'obesify' the city.
- ♦ c We need to articulate what is the unique identity and sense of place. That appears to not be universally agreed upon.
- ♦ c Who defines 'great neighborhoods'? Respect for existing neighborhoods including open areas within to maintain quality of life.
- ♦ c Why are neighborhoods not being protected if it is a core value.
- ♦ c,d,e What does these mean?
- ♦ d A welcoming and inclusive community, with a culture of creativity and innovation, who support the arts and entrepreneurship
- ♦ d A welcoming, diverse, and inclusive community with a culture of creativity and innovation.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
- c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
- d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
- g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
- h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
- i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ◆ d Add at the end, ', and with a strong commitment to diversity'
- ◆ d additional business and expanding population limits and diminishes creativity and innovation
- ◆ d be more specific about inclusive ... socioeconomically, ethnically, age, family forms, etc.
- ◆ d Boulder is chasing innovation and creativity to nearby towns.
- ◆ d culture should include racial and ethnic peoples' contributions
- ◆ d I have heard that some already here prefer older folks to move elsewhere
- ◆ d I think that d. should be divided into two values - 1) A welcoming and inclusive community, 2) A culture of Creativity and Innovation. They are different things.
- ◆ d i would like to see something specific stating attention to addressing the vast levels of income disparity in our 'inclusiveness', which tends to read 'well off' in large part
- ◆ d Inclusive? Seems to be getting more exclusive by the day relative to income.
- ◆ d Innovation is the most important part of this core value and it gets lost at the end.
- ◆ d innovation. How about opening the 'Reserve' area (200 acres?) off the diagonal between Jay and Lookout?
- ◆ d It seems that Boulder is very welcoming to apartment developers. What about converting all those apartment complexes into ownable houses and condos instead so we really can be an inclusive community.
- ◆ d needs to address the needs of minorities in Boulder
- ◆ d Our definition of creativity and innovation need to welcome art, music, and a diversity of business.
- ◆ d See above comments
- ◆ d The community conversations about affordable housing leave me wondering if we do truly desire to be welcoming and inclusive.
- ◆ d There is too much catering to immigrant, people of color. Affordable housing, realing programs, other social services stongly cater to non-native citizens and new citizens. What about us.? American citizens from centuries and no services. Shitty deal.
- ◆ d these are meaningless words
- ◆ d this is really two different statements
- ◆ d Welcoming and inclusive is too important to lump in with creativity
- ◆ d Welcoming and inclusive to whom? And in what fora? We seem reluctant to embrace renters, younger people, lower income people, in our civic processes.
- ◆ d Your welcome if your part of the eco-group think.
- ◆ d G. We have lost our middle and low income housing stock
- ◆ e A healthy community where ALL people's well-being is supported

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. *A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action*
- c. *A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces***
- d. **A welcoming and inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. **A healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. *A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths*
- g. *A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges*
- h. *An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone*
- i. **Strong city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ e a healthy community where people's well-being is supported. In the example above of the planned Twin Lakes concentration of vulnerable people left to fend for themselves in an isolated rural residential neighborhood does not show concern for their well-being nor the well-being of the surround residential neighborhood to deal with possible drugs and crime deposited on them without their input!! This is an unhealthy environment for everyone and is really unconsiderate and terrible planning!!
- ♦ e A healthy community where people's well-being and ACTIVITY ARE supported
- ♦ e A healthy, urban community where peoples well-being is supported
- ♦ e clarify: mental, physical, and social well-being
- ♦ e Diversity of housing! If neighborhoods are to infilled with bulk housing let's spread the joy and comendem some blocks on 6th st or North Boulder Park to build affordable housing. Intermixing is good?
- ♦ e Does this include clean air and water as well as affordable health care?
- ♦ e Don't know what e means.
- ♦ e how a person's well-being is to be supported needs clarification.
- ♦ e How is this defined?
- ♦ e I would suggest adding the terms 'physical and mental' in front of well-being so that it is clear that the mental aspects of health are just as important as a healthy body, otherwise this community value could be misconstrued to mean support of our hikers, bikers, climbers, athletes, etc. only.
- ♦ e infill is not the best solution maintaining well-being .
- ♦ e Leaves room for too many interpretations. 'people's well-being' is way too broad and to one may imply 'space' and to another may imply 'close amenities'. Easy to get people behind 'improving the human race', after all, who would be against it, but it is a meaningless goal that is not quantifiable.
- ♦ e No idea what this means. Vague. Should be clarified.
- ♦ e Note:,The "people's"; well-being, ie individual quality of life. NOT the "peoples' ". Mass rental units do not serve the Quality of life!
- ♦ e Specific inclusion of children and youth
- ♦ e This is so ambiguous
- ♦ f 'Vibrant economy' needs to be clarified. Misinterpretations of what this really should mean this have become a source of conflict.
- ♦ f A 'vibrant' economy. Is that more and more and more buisnesses?
- ♦ f A vibrant community where many must live outside Boulder and commute in?
- ♦ f A vibrant economy based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
- c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
- d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
- g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
- h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
- i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ f A vibrant economy that is welcoming and focused on employment growth and empowerment for all workers.
- ♦ f A what point does a 'vibrant economy' deteriorate from Boulder being a balanced community. 65K in-commuters, 70K in-commuters?
- ♦ f attractive to business owners
- ♦ f Boulder's economy is doing great - I don't think it needs special attention in the plan
- ♦ f growth is not a goal.
- ♦ f I think having too many jobs in Boulder is a problem. We are not a compact community with so many in commuters.
- ♦ f jobs creation is diminishing the quality of life
- ♦ f Needs clarification
- ♦ f The focus on a vibrant economy has caused an imbalance in the ability of the City to maintain other aspects of the community values.
- ♦ f there is too much economic development which had made Bldr Valley crowded, ugly and unlivable
- ♦ f There must be some forethought here. Economic growth has resulted in "infill" to the point of destroying communities. Such density is NOT what Boulder should be about.
- ♦ f This should emphasize economic opportunity for all, not just for those who are already wealthy
- ♦ f vibrant economy should include all income levels
- ♦ f Way too much 'economy' being brought into Boulder like Google. We are not NYC or Silicon Valley.
- ♦ f we have too many in commuters for work. Jobs need to locate in our surrounding boulder county communities like longmont and louisville instead of Boulder. You cannot house 'all the workers' in Boulder for a number of reasons. We should end our economic development programs.
- ♦ f We need to clarify that a 'vibrant' economy does not imply a 'growing' economy. The principle needs to be 'renewal and innovation' not expansion.
- ♦ f What constitutes a vibrant economy? who does it benefit and how?
- ♦ f Your policies are putting this at risk.
- ♦ g A diversity of affordable, accessible housing for all members of our community, not just the most wealthy, entitled individuals.
- ♦ g A diversity of housing types and price ranges
- ♦ g Add at the end, 'and price ranges that allow all people of all socio-economic levels to call Boulder home'

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
- c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
- d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
- g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
- h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
- i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ g Almost all the new buildings being built to provide housing are rental apartments. This does not help the folks who want to live here long term and are going to feel a part of the community. They have to buy somewhere else and commute in on the Diagonal and 36. This creates gridlock, pollution, road rage, and does not help with the tax base.
- ♦ g Also more diversity in housing density
- ♦ g Bad idea. Let the economy drive this.
- ♦ g Balance rental and ownership, now too much rental vs.ownership (including permanently affordable); add after 'price ranges,' permanently affordable to those who work here
- ♦ g Boulder is no longer affordable for the middle class
- ♦ g committment to thoughtful infill and realization that there are limits to the number of people who can live here
- ♦ g different price ranges okay but not if it means very high density right in the middle of established neighborhoods.
- ♦ g Diversity belongs in the urban areas, not in the rural and suburban, single family neighborhoods.
- ♦ g diversity created in new neighborhoods not imposed upon existing residential neighborhoods
- ♦ g Diversity of housing, yes, but a respect for what neighbors in and around the area have to say about
- ♦ g Drop the county proposal to build so-called affordable housing near the Twin Lakes Open Space.
- ♦ g Feel like we need to recognize that diversity of housing we can add is limited by growth boundary -- additional diversity must come as infill & redevelopment.
- ♦ g High density housing does not match with the feel and look of the community that Gunbarrel residents are accustomed to.
- ♦ g Housing is still a pressing issue for young people who cannot, and may never, be able to afford a single family home in Boulder.
- ♦ g Housing stock is not accessible to anyone below middle class
- ♦ g How can the city create more diversity of housing types & prices when the cost of land is so expensive. This goal should be deleted as it is not possible without ruining the existing city & neighborhoods.
- ♦ g How exactly would this be ensured?

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
- c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
- d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
- g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
- h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
- i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ g i am horrified by the glut of butt ugly 4 story buildings that have sprung up like mushrooms over the last year. i cannot imagine that such physically unimpressive styles were approved by counsel. i think of boulder as cutting edge, but this is not so architecturally. grey and brown boxes! i see such innovative designs in other cities and it pains me to see the lack of creativity exhibited. where are the beautiful new designs? and who decided to make pearl street a canyon? do we really have to monetize every square inch of real estate?!
- ♦ g I'm concerned that this item is taking priority over other identified values. In reality, there are limited options for improving the diversity of housing types and price ranges, in large part this is determined by the market - Boulder is a desirable place so it gets bid up. I think the permanently affordable housing program does a good job of providing middle class options, and to an extent trailer parks are a good solution for working class neighborhoods. On the other hand, large monolithic apartment buildings (or low-end condos) don't belong here and while they might provide more lower priced options, I don't think they are in keeping with the larger goals identified by the plan. For that matter, I am also concerned with increased development, at this point I think development of empty land outside of incorporated boulder county should be very limited and even edgewise properties within the city should be very limited. If development holds sway in these decisions the unique character of the city of Boulder will be definitively endangered, threatening the desirability, sustainability and economics of the city on multiple fronts. My wife and I have heavily invested in both Boulder over the past 20 years but are seriously considering leaving if these issues continue to threaten the quality of life we came here for. I think this item in particular could use revision/clarification.
- ♦ g I'm not convinced this value is as widely shared as its inclusion here might indicate. More focus on the detail implied by it would be helpful.
- ♦ g Important, but I'm not sure the BVCP is the appropriate place for this one
- ♦ g including attractive higher valued residential properties
- ♦ g It's not just about a diversity of housing types but also a significant increase in affordable and middle income housing.
- ♦ g just leave the market alone and stop messing with it and making it worse with permanently affordable housing that no one wants and quite sensibly (for their finances) not buy
- ♦ g keep rural low density areas whole. Cluster high density housing near transit centers and jobs
- ♦ g let the market decide what is needed
- ♦ g More focus on affordable housing.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
- c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
- d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
- g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
- h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
- i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ g My suggestion above could replace this; or this one could be rewritten for much more emphasis on affordability (rather than simply diversity)
- ♦ g Need more emphasis on this value. FAMILY housing is important for long term community vibrancy.
- ♦ g Neighborhoods seem to rule other peoples property desires.
- ♦ g Not everyone needs to live in Boulder - you have succeeded in making Gunbarrel a slum and crime has gone through the roof
- ♦ g Our best way to preserve the most affordable housing here is not to allow scrapes, to preserve the smaller houses that we have, and to keep occupancy limits enforced and ban short term rentals. We need more home owners here. We should not become a city of renters-only.
- ♦ g Should this be 'market' driven or government subsidized. If you look at Boulder as a whole, this mix exists today. Can we get this mix interwoven with our communities without building dense 'affordable housing' complexes.
- ♦ g sufficient housing exists
- ♦ g The diversity of housing prices is a very laudable goal. But if goal A -- ample open space -- is also a goal, it's inevitable that Goal A makes Goal G harder to achieve (owing to limits on housing supply). Just mentioning this as the goals do work against each other, and we should acknowledge that.
- ♦ g The government should not subsidize housing or engage in rent control.
- ♦ g The middle class gets squeezed out because only low income gets subsidies from the rich people.
- ♦ g this goal is conflated by other issues, which create the lack of diverse housing
- ♦ g This needs clarification since we are seeing many new apartment houses without seeming to take into account any services in the area or the fact that the area is being overbuilt.
- ♦ g This needs more explicit description, as it's clear from the public discussion that people don't think their own neighborhoods should support housing diversity.
- ♦ g We are not doing enough to ensure diversity in price ranges for housing. A Boulder that only the very rich can afford will not be the same Boulder that so many of us, including the very rich, love today.
- ♦ g We don't need affordable housing for immigrants. And no affordable housing wrecking neighbords
- ♦ g We need to build affordable houses that families want to live in with some kind of yard even if small.
- ♦ g We need to focus on this with an intensity...before the opportunity to enact this no longer exists.

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. *A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action*
- c. *A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces***
- d. **A welcoming and inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. **A healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. *A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths*
- g. *A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges*
- h. *An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone*
- i. **Strong city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ h All-mode transportation is not the same as, "all bicycles, all the time." So many bikes riding around (or parked) on top of SUVs. There are better ways to improve transportation energy efficiency & achieve our environmental goals. Let the bikers use & enjoy their trails under the category of "Healthy community.."
- ♦ h Am wary of 'all-mode' when cars now have such an advantage that they don't even recognize their privilege.
- ♦ h An all mode transportation system focused on reducing traffic and improving service by linking every neighborhood efficiently.
- ♦ h Aside from busses and more bike paths etc, Boulder needs to work with large employers IBM, CU, Ball UCAR, NOAA, etc and get them to have a 7 day work week. Provide incentives for employees to have flex options - where some staff leave at 2 after a 6 hour work day twice a week and then work 4 hours on the weekend. There has to be a way to track traffic flows and figure out that from 10-11 the Diagonal is less congested than at 7-9. So get employers to allow a certain % of employees to work from home 2x a week and have flex time 2x a week.....
- ♦ h Biking has become Boulder's baby. Right- sizing's a joke. The mount of money spent on bikes is excessive considering our winter clime. Your aging population and others would be better served by public transit.
- ♦ h Biking is one mode of transportation only. The seniors need walkable and drivable spaces.
- ♦ h Boulder and Boulder County need private or govt. operated 'Jitney' bus services. These are vans that carry 5 to 7 passengers along busy streets, to shopping centers, to industrial areas. This lets get more people on bikes is BS. Wont' work in winter and many of us never will ride bikes.
- ♦ h Boulder needs to be truly progressive in it's efforts to move the city in a less automobile-centric direction.
- ♦ h can we drop out of RTD? other cities have frequent, reliable bus transportation - eg Breckenridge
- ♦ h God damnit....fight for our light rail!!!!
- ♦ h heavy traffic and tight parking impact everyone. Including multi-modal transportation helps, but not nearly enough.
- ♦ h How could the Folsom experiment have even taken place? It was clearly anti car and not in keeping with this statement. There is broad support for making things better for alternate modes but virtually no support for making it worse for cars.
- ♦ h i have a lot of trouble with the frequent changes of plans with public transportation. first light rail, then not. next transportation center by 31st and pearl, then the hyatt instead. communication and information for residents is woefully lacking.

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. *A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action*
- c. *A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces***
- d. **A welcoming and inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. **A healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. *A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths*
- g. *A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges*
- h. *An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone*
- i. **Strong city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ h I hope that an 'all-mode transportation system' includes bicycle paths that are separate from motorized vehicle pathways.
- ♦ h I would suggest modifying h. to 'An all-mode transportation system to make getting around (with or without a car) SAFE, easy, and accessible to everyone.
- ♦ h Just leave us alone and stop trying to get us to ride bicycles. Riding on these streets is dangerous and foolish, encouraging people (particularly those who are not young) is reckless. Leave us to find our own ways to travel efficiently.
- ♦ h Lots of empty busses!!! High density appropriate in city. Buses of little use to elderly who can't walk around town.
- ♦ h Mise well scratch this one. No long term vision for public transportation to connect Boulder / Denver / Longmont. Only a small percentage of in-commuters can realistically commute via bicycles. This goal is meaningless without addressing the major transportation corridors to/from Boulder.
- ♦ h More of your lunacy for non-urban residents. Get a clue.
- ♦ h multi-model concept creates for more friction than cooperation. Bikes should be managed as a separate transportation model with their own corridors.
- ♦ h Needs clarification since the only mode of transportation. In the area is by car or bike.
- ♦ h Needs stronger language to protect alternative transportation options
- ♦ h Please consider refining the value related to transportation to reflect maximizing access and mobility for all users.
- ♦ h roads and main routes or travel and commuting need to be addressed also maintenance such as Snow Plowing!
- ♦ h stop the nonsense 'Living Labs' and 'Right Sizing' programs and fill our potholes, overlay failing streets, repair curb & gutter and sidewalks, build additional bike paths, water, mow, trim and weed islands and berms
- ♦ h The bus system needs to be figured out. There are too many empty buses driving around town. Trying to force people out of their cars is not going to get them to ride a bike or ride the bus
- ♦ h The effects of new development on traffic are being ignored, witness the gridlock often on 28th and 30th. Traffic congestion affects everybody: worse air quality, etc. Boulder has too many jobs for the population, thus all the in-commuting.
- ♦ h the link between b and h needs to be made more clear
- ♦ h There seems to be no transportation plan. We buy cars and pay taxes so we can drive. DRIVING is what most of us like to do! We need expanded roads and maintenance on those roads!

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. **A community that practices environmental stewardship and climate action**
- c. **A place with a unique identity and sense of place, with great neighborhoods and public spaces**
- d. **A welcoming and inclusive community, with a culture of creativity and innovation**
- e. **A healthy community where people's well-being is supported**
- f. **A vibrant economy based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths**
- g. **A diversity of housing types and price ranges**
- h. **An all-mode transportation system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone**
- i. **Strong city and county cooperation to carry out the Plan**

Value Comment

- ♦ h Transportation planning is not livable friendly for families and the aging. As a parent, I needed to drive a car to drop off and pick up kids at school, take to activities and run consolidated errands, get to Drs appointments. How would I carry groceries, what do I do if there is an emergency? A bus for such an average day would add hours to a packed day. How do I manage in rain and snow? As someone in their 60's, getting to work disheveled, dirty is not how I will present myself. Even if I rode my bike sometimes to work, the need to have and using a car will continue. Busses are another issue, most buses I see are empty or nearly so. They are road and generally not safe or economic, yet they proliferate. It is very disappointing that Boulder does not have a rail system for getting between cities.
- ♦ h trying to incorporate an all-mode transportation system over complicates most other goals
- ♦ h vague and it clearly isn't working
- ♦ h WAY too much emphasis and money spent on bikes and trails, not nearly enough on roads.
- ♦ h We have no transportation hub. If you want to relieve congestion, move the bus station east and make it a true hub by building spokes. All it is now is a terminal.
- ♦ h We need to be willing and unafraid to try revolutionary transportation systems that might be able to really make a difference in the city. For example, studies of 'personal rapid transit' have indicated that a PRT installation might attract a modal share of 30%. That could hugely improve mobility for drivers and non-drivers alike. But such an installation would require more willingness to innovate than most cities are able to muster.
- ♦ h what does all-mode mean? does it include making light rail a priority?
- ♦ h yes, a public transportation/bus system tailored to Boulder (and independent of RTD if necessary)
- ♦ h A. Should be made clear that the open space is usable not just for passive activities. it should be clarified that this does not mean deliberately punishing vehicular options by deliberately increasing traffic congestion.
- ♦ i A strong city, county and citizen cooperation to carry out the Plan.
- ♦ i add 'community' to fulfil value of 'welcoming and inclusive'.
- ♦ i add city, county, business and residential communities' cooperation to carry out the plan
- ♦ i An absolute disaster. The County is ruled by Boulder.
- ♦ i As the city becomes more growth-oriented, imperative for the County to maintain open-space views and preserve habitats.
- ♦ i Boulder city should be separate from the county. City council should
- ♦ i City and Boulder County should cooperate with local neighborhoods!!!

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. *A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action*
- c. *A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces***
- d. **A welcoming and inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. **A healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. *A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths*
- g. *A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges*
- h. *An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone*
- i. **Strong city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ i cooperation is good, but four party review should be eliminated because the county controls decisions that should be left to the city
- ♦ i cooperation or collusion?
- ♦ i cooperation should include element of community wide input re: core value identified above
- ♦ i could be rephrased. 'strong city and county cooperation.'
- ♦ i CU drives a good deal of the 'obesification' of the city. We must work with them to cap the student population. As the city cannot grow indefinitely, neither can the Boulder campus of CU.
- ♦ i f this were true, 550 apartments in Gunbarrel would not have been built without affordable housing. The county has claimed on several occasions that they had no input into this decision. Now we are facing a land use designation change and an annexation request that is out of character with the Twin Lakes neighborhood.
- ♦ i How about strong resident support and cooperation with the plan? We seem to be left out of the process as it is now.
- ♦ i I often don't feel the City Council actually understand or considers long term residents.
- ♦ i Much more City and County communication and cooperation needs to happen.
- ♦ i Strong city and county cooperation? All we see is more housing and the same roads creating heavy traffic on Lookout. Services have not been upgraded either to support the growth population.
- ♦ i The word 'strong' should be removed. Independent opinions need to be heard, county officials should advocate for unincorporated areas, city officials for city residents. The overlapping authority of the Housing Authorities is an example where independent and transparent decisions do not occur.
- ♦ i There should be a healthy distance maintained between city and county. Their interests and constituencies differ.
- ♦ i Would like the Plan to also look regionally, not just within the county. We should be a leader and create a model for the region on sustainable, safe, high quality planning.
- ♦ other statements are 'coined' and trite. How about cohesive neighborhoods, respect for existing neighborhoods, and county borders.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 First Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ -- Preservation of existing open space, whether officially designated as open space or not, particularly in areas that have a semi-rural feeling.
- ◆ 'great walkable neighborhoods'
- ◆ 2. A community that practices environmental stewardship
- ◆ A baseline of access to our public lands that is sustainable, fun, and will serve the generations that will come.
- ◆ A community that practices environmental stewardship and climate action.
- ◆ A community that supports racial and cultural diversity
- ◆ A community that values its elderly
- ◆ A community where neighborhoods are respected and have an important role in planning their future.
- ◆ A community where the landscape is prioritized. This would mean trees, parks, gardens and setbacks which embrace public space and beautiful surroundings.
- ◆ A community where there is respect for the neighborhood, and excessive noise and vandalism are not tolerated.
- ◆ A diversity of housing types and price ranges.
- ◆ A mix of housing options
- ◆ a quaint city not overbuilt with dense development
- ◆ A welcoming community, with a culture of creativity and innovation.
- ◆ A welcoming community but not for transients. The homeless are in need of our empathy and support. Transients are making some feel intimidated.
- ◆ above feature did not seem to work
- ◆ Access to open space for range of interests
- ◆ Achieving better balance
- ◆ add this... End this notion of building up to the sidewalks and 55' buildings everywhere. We should value our mountain town origins and try to maintain that character for our tourists.
- ◆ Addressing the ever-increasing homeless population.
- ◆ Affordable housing
- ◆ Affordable Housing
- ◆ Affordable Housing
- ◆ affordable housing for low income -folks that wash dishes etc. need to be able to live in town.
- ◆ aging in place
- ◆ Allow middle class and lower to survive here
- ◆ Allowing neighborhoods to retain their character
- ◆ Area-appropriate development - denser, taller buildings away from the historic core and neighborhoods, for example, shifting height to industrial zones
- ◆ Balance in Residential/Commercial Development
- ◆ Better thought out plan for where to place affordable housing
- ◆ Better transit, separate from RTD
- ◆ Buy more open space
- ◆ carefully calibrated and controlled growth limits on new business and on its attendant expansion of population
- ◆ citizen self determination
- ◆ City/County actually LISTENING to Neighborhoods concerns !!!
- ◆ community involvement

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 First Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ Connected community, relations between city government and citizens
- ◆ Consensus building.
- ◆ Consider the needs of the existing residents, not just those that are incoming down the road. There's only so much room at the inn. Growth is the top issue.
- ◆ Continued effort to reduced poverty and to decrease wage disparity.
- ◆ control development of overbuilding Boulder and raising the height limits
- ◆ couldn't get above to work
- ◆ Create more open space whenever possible
- ◆ creating housing stock for homeless community members
- ◆ Decisions made with common sense rather than ideologically.
- ◆ Density
- ◆ Determining a population size beyond which we will not grow and implementing policies that will keep us vibrant in that new environment.
- ◆ Development of more housing
- ◆ diversity
- ◆ Diversity!
- ◆ Don't shove high-density badly planned housing developments down local neighbors throats and expect them to like it!
- ◆ Elect city Council by district to better represent all of the town- it's too much wealthy people on Council
- ◆ Elevate the civic discourse
- ◆ embracing and encouraging diverse citizenry
- ◆ Enforcement of over occupancy turning family neighborhoods into rental ghettos
- ◆ Ensuring new development is placed according to available transportation and services
- ◆ respect for PEOPLE vs THE PEOPLE\'s republic
- ◆ Existing communities have priority voice on development
- ◆ Figure out how to move CAR traffic around Boulder more efficiently. People are still going to drive cars. This is a necessary step if we are going to continue bringing businesses here and adding mulit-unit housing. It has become extremely congested in the last 15 years and only gets worse.
- ◆ FIX the ROADS ALREADY!
- ◆ Greater density of development to create a more sustainable and inclusive community
- ◆ GROWTH CONTROL!
- ◆ Growth limit in pace of additional development
- ◆ Growth rate
- ◆ growth restriction
- ◆ Housing is so expensive!
- ◆ Housing. Rent control.
- ◆ Improve city services & infrastructure
- ◆ Improving traffic flow.
- ◆ Inclusive (diverse) community
- ◆ Increased services for the dramatic increase in senior citizens over the next 25 years
- ◆ infill instead of annexation
- ◆ Infrastructure needs to be addressed before new development & high density housing are considered!Boulder
- ◆ Integration of housing and transportation policies.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 First Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ involving citizens in decisions
- ◆ Jobs to Housing Balance
- ◆ Just leave us be. I don't want Boulder trying to affect values.
- ◆ keeping open space
- ◆ Less crowding / density.
- ◆ Less density
- ◆ Less Regulation
- ◆ Libraries within walking or biking distance of all neighborhoods in the county.
- ◆ Limit growth and commercialization to current level.
- ◆ Limit vertical growth
- ◆ Listen to the will of the people - just because you were voted into office, that doesn't give you a mandate
- ◆ Local carrying capacity
- ◆ lower density
- ◆ Lower income reduced fee services - such as trash, water,
- ◆ Maintain our open spaces
- ◆ Maintaining low density housing.
- ◆ Maintenance of existing resources such as parks and trails
- ◆ Make a deal with Xcel so that we can achieve a smaller carbon foot print with intense, realistic use of wind and solar power.
- ◆ middle class
- ◆ mobile home owners
- ◆ More parking options
- ◆ Need mid-priced housing for families
- ◆ need more parking downtown
- ◆ Neighborhood citizen's opinions, suggestions and values must be included in new proposals that impact their quality of life.
- ◆ Neighborhood cooperation
- ◆ Nimbus should not overrule needs of the community.
- ◆ noise pollution: preserve the quiet places
- ◆ Not mindlessly increasing density to fill the pockets of greedy out-of-town developers and corrupt City Council members
- ◆ Open Space
- ◆ Park/small open spaces in the new high-density area of town
- ◆ parking and traffic
- ◆ partnerships
- ◆ people first
- ◆ Permanent height restrictions to keep from blocking views of the mountains.
- ◆ preservation of neighborhood character
- ◆ Preservation of Unique Neighborhood Character
- ◆ Preservation or rural landscapes and neighborhoods
- ◆ preserved open space
- ◆ Preserving the qualities of Boulder that have made it a great community to live in for many previous generations.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 First Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ Proactive and visionary - we should be talking about how we are going to evolve instead of talking about what we are not going to do or are afraid of
- ◆ Protect the character of existing neighborhoods.
- ◆ Protection of existing neighborhoods
- ◆ protection of flora & fauna on open space, and acquisition of additional open space for this purpose
- ◆ Public Access to Public Land
- ◆ quiet
- ◆ Recreation
- ◆ Reduce space, speed and subsidies allocated to cars, and reduce distances to destinations
- ◆ rent control for low income housing/mobil home parks
- ◆ Repair Infrastructure - streets, medians, etc.
- ◆ Respect for an stewardship of wildlife.
- ◆ Respect for the civil rights and liberties of all people
- ◆ Respect of Citizen
- ◆ Road repair.
- ◆ Safety and Protection
- ◆ See notes on inclusivity
- ◆ separate transportation models for bikes, separate from cars and pedestrians
- ◆ slow down the pace of development, limit growth
- ◆ social equity
- ◆ social justice
- ◆ socio-economic diversity
- ◆ Stewardship of infrastructure like roads.
- ◆ Stop building!
- ◆ Stop growth
- ◆ stop overbuilding
- ◆ Stop the growth
- ◆ Stop the growth and sprawl
- ◆ Stopping new development, retroactively in the case of Google and other abominations.
- ◆ Strong educational system from elementary to college and beyond.
- ◆ strong support for arts
- ◆ Support for the arts. This drives a lot of value.
- ◆ Support for the poor, homeless, and disabled, and respect for their rights.
- ◆ The city needs to leave Gunbarrel alone
- ◆ TRAFFIC --it has become a freaking nightmare!! it is unacceptable!!
- ◆ transportation to include new development allotting at least 2 parking spaces off the street per unit to ensure safe streets
- ◆ valuing people and community over business profits and expansion
- ◆ vibrant economy
- ◆ We are letting large scale developers put in buildings that are not leading edge efficient and non net zero solar.
- ◆ Welcoming and inclusive community with a culture of creativity and innovation
- ◆ wildlidge protection
- ◆ Work with Xcel to make all of Boulder\'s electricity carbon free today (renewable plus nuclear)

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 First Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ♦ Zero growth after permit comitment.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 Second Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ -- Proper long-term maintenance and periodic repaving of roads -- including those not designated as main arterials.
- ◆ 1. A vibrant economy
- ◆ A community that supports affordable housing at all income ranges
- ◆ A community where citizens have a say in how much and how fast Boulder gets developed, and the quality of that development.
- ◆ A compact community that embraces renewal but shuns '\obesification,\'' in the form of endless '\development\''.
- ◆ A diverse population. I am concerned only the wealthy can live here.
- ◆ A Government that listens to citizen
- ◆ A healthy community where people's well being is supported -It's been found that the healthiest communities strongly support the arts
- ◆ A healthy community where people's well-being is supported
- ◆ A place with a unique identity and sense of place, with great neighborhoods and public spaces
- ◆ A set growth limit which we adhere to. (1/2 percent per year)
- ◆ Actually listen to people in neighborhoods who will be impacted by planned growth
- ◆ affordability
- ◆ affordable housing = RENT CONTROL
- ◆ An all-mode transportation system. . .
- ◆ Better maintenance of existing public spaces
- ◆ better roads
- ◆ better transportation options so there are fewer cars on the road
- ◆ Boulder had a unique identity and sense of place. Get it back!
- ◆ Building Height and size restriction. Attention to the character and quality of all building. No more monster buildings!
- ◆ City/County actually doing soil, hydrology, environmental studies BEFORE deciding to build developments.
- ◆ clean energy supply
- ◆ Connectivity (trails) to open space and recreational activity outside the city
- ◆ Continuing to employ our residents in lieu of lower wage/cheaper immigrant workers.
- ◆ coordination
- ◆ Develop / allow nightlife options instead of expecting college kids to act like adults when they're not given options.
- ◆ ditto
- ◆ diverse housing types and prices
- ◆ Diversity
- ◆ do not over build the area
- ◆ Domestic violence
- ◆ Ecological balance of trade
- ◆ Economic diversity
- ◆ economic fairness
- ◆ Economic growth
- ◆ Economy
- ◆ Education, especially of youth, of the importance of protecting habitat for flora and fauna.
- ◆ Effective transportation options for commuters into the city
- ◆ environmental stewardship

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 Second Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ equity
- ◆ Facilitating opportunities for 'in commuters' (a label I find derogatory and non-inclusive) to live here. And until they can, let's call them 'day timers'.
- ◆ Fewer rules, regs, mandates.
- ◆ fewer transient renters that destroy the sense of community
- ◆ Good, cooperative relations with the University of Colorado and its students.
- ◆ great neighborhoods, public spaces, open space
- ◆ greater focus in cultural diversity of population and equal access to city resources
- ◆ Greater voice to the residents of the neighborhood in planning.
- ◆ Growing in respectful, logical, and intentional ways
- ◆ Gunbarrel area open space and open lands are preserved
- ◆ having an open government
- ◆ Higher density, upzone RL-1 & RL-2
- ◆ Homeless people loitering, particularly near Municipal Building
- ◆ Honesty and transparency from council and city bureaucracy. Totally absent now!
- ◆ Housing
- ◆ Housing the homeless
- ◆ How can we talk about a denser city without enacting flood protection such as the s boulder creek berm?
- ◆ Improve the infrastructure to match the population
- ◆ In-Commuters
- ◆ Limit densification
- ◆ Limit development that increases traffic.
- ◆ Limit growth and density to preserve quality of life
- ◆ LMI housing and policies that support LMI families
- ◆ Look at the true motivations for these badly planned projects--just exporting the City's problem out to rural residential neighborhoods!
- ◆ low income housing
- ◆ Maintain tranquil, undeveloped public spaces like the lawns in Central Park and the Creek Path
- ◆ maintenance of open space and open areas
- ◆ Max size of Boulder
- ◆ More access to open space
- ◆ More attention to needs of seniors in the community
- ◆ MORE OPEN SPACE!
- ◆ no more height variances - the views of the mountains are being ruined
- ◆ No more housing in Gunbarrel
- ◆ Open Space preservation
- ◆ Parks within walking or biking distance of all neighborhoods in the county.
- ◆ Preservation of open space
- ◆ Preserve Open Space.
- ◆ Preserve the existing character of the area.
- ◆ Preserving the beauty of the mountain backdrop and city architecture.
- ◆ protecting rural neighborhoods
- ◆ protection of private property
- ◆ Protection of wildlife both in the urban area and beyond
- ◆ Provide more 'open space/parks' within the city to break up all the building

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 Second Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ Provide much more housing that is compact, walkable and mixed use
- ◆ quality over quantity
- ◆ Recreation
- ◆ Respect and conservation of wildlife.
- ◆ Representative government, not the at-large elections that silent the minority.
- ◆ Respect for NON-city needs
- ◆ role in the region
- ◆ see above
- ◆ Slow the pace of development, make profits more transparent
- ◆ Socio-economic Diversity
- ◆ Stop building! it is a fallacy that the world depends on growth! shoot for sustainability without growth. remember we have a finite piece of turf here.
- ◆ Stop spending money on consultants for projects that are not feasible, I.e. Municipalization, Fastracks.
- ◆ stop wasting money on climate change
- ◆ strict adherence to the blue line and height limits preserving access to views of the foothills for everyone from every vantage in Boulder Valley
- ◆ support for science and innovation
- ◆ Support well being through new development to provide access to resources to promote health i.e. grocery stores, health care, day care, and easy access to public transportation
- ◆ Supporting the tech economy
- ◆ transit oriented development
- ◆ valueing and supporting single family housing affordable to the middle class
- ◆ Work proactively with RTD and the surrounding communities to develop a plan to start working on rail from Longmont to Denver today, not 2040

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 Third Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ 3. A place with a unique identity
- ◆ A community that practices environmental stewardship and climate action
- ◆ A community that support the arts and artists of all type
- ◆ A community where citizens have a say in the balance of jobs and housing
- ◆ A community where individuals, not businesses and not money, control political discourse and decision-making.
- ◆ A diversity of housing types and price ranges.
- ◆ A healthy community where people\'s well-being is supported
- ◆ A place with a unique identity and sense of place, with great neighborhoods and public spaces.
- ◆ A place with unique identity and send of place, with great neighborhoods and public spaces
- ◆ action to ameliorate climate change
- ◆ AGE & SEX DISCRIMINATION IN COUNTY HIRING!
- ◆ Allow housing infill citywide
- ◆ Allow raw industrial space for artists to be built.
- ◆ arts for all rather than elite
- ◆ Balancing the needs of college student-year round residents
- ◆ Ban pesticides and herbicides
- ◆ Bicycle commuting routes
- ◆ Boulder City should not bully the county residents into accepting rezoning to suit their (the city\'s)agenda of high density affordable housing.
- ◆ compact and denser community
- ◆ Convertnew apartment building into ownable properties.
- ◆ creativity
- ◆ Defensible, measureable progress on prior goals
- ◆ Density
- ◆ ditto
- ◆ Drop the push for a public utility!
- ◆ End developer control of planning board.
- ◆ environmental stewardship
- ◆ Flood mitigation
- ◆ for any development, that it not eliminate entrepreneurs and small local businesses
- ◆ Gridlock on roads
- ◆ healthy community where well being is supported
- ◆ If you own a truck, you must also register a scooter.
- ◆ improving infra-structure (roads, etc.)
- ◆ In order to be heard by BCHA--Gunbarrel neighborhoods have to 'Lawyer Up'
- ◆ Increasing pay for low wage jobs.
- ◆ Infrastructure keeps pace with growth
- ◆ Keep better architectural integrity so we don\'t have so many ugly buildings
- ◆ keep housing density at a resonable amount
- ◆ Keep Marijuana business out of our family oriented neighborhood
- ◆ Leave No Trace principals for open space
- ◆ Less voice to the developers and investors that just want to make money off of Boulder residents.
- ◆ LIMIT GROWTH

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 Third Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ Limit in-communting
- ◆ Limit the number of banks and investment firms downtown. These big dominating window tinted cold buildings are draining the life out of town center!
- ◆ Look at infill not annexation
- ◆ Look hard at the municipal electricity concept; spend our money on renewable enery generation, not money on endless legal tussles
- ◆ More economic development.
- ◆ more open space
- ◆ more than sustinable, a regenerative community
- ◆ More urban housing opportunities throughout our community
- ◆ not bowing to developers ideas
- ◆ ontrol growth or open NEW areas for housing.
- ◆ Pick up the litter, maintain the city owned vegetation, and fill the potholes. Complete bike paths where they are now lacking instead of experimenting with projects like right-sizing.
- ◆ Poverty / Homelessness
- ◆ recreation
- ◆ restriction on development density
- ◆ RTD pass for everyone
- ◆ Safety
- ◆ see above
- ◆ Start spending OUR monies on state mandated projects.
- ◆ Stop making money Boulder's main priority.
- ◆ stop overbuilding commercial space
- ◆ strict adherence to the blue line and height limits preserving access to views of the foothills for everyone from every vantage in Boulder Valley
- ◆ transportation
- ◆ Transportation
- ◆ urban beuty
- ◆ walkable neighborhoods
- ◆ Work creatively to solve user conflicts because of overcrowded and/or outmoded infrastructure

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? (OTHER)

- ◆ Developers and City/County policies favoring them i.e. to upzone Boulder neighborhoods and annex up and develop the rest of Gunbarrel is going to RUIN our whole community!!! It really makes me sick because I feel its already too late to stop the investor greed taking over.
- ◆ don't develop Twin Lakes
- ◆ I am disgusted with the agenda of density and growth as the objective of Will Toor and of our City Council. I no longer trust or believe in these people.
- ◆ I worry about too much new development of higher priced housing
- ◆ It's very confusing as the stated goals don't match the planned implementation of growth!
- ◆ Less development!
- ◆ Stop trying to impose values.
- ◆ The community is heading in the wrong direction. We have lost our mt. views
- ◆ The community needs to embrace the notion of renewal, not unending growth.
- ◆ The county making housing development decisions in neighborhoods without community involvement. Cramming high density developments on riparian corridors without environmental impact studies. Not even notifying impacted neighborhoods until after the developments already in the works. I was involved in the NoBo 'planning process ' over 23 years ago. The same thing is still happening. As citizens, we are asked to get involved. However, we are not heard. The city and county have paid employees and the citizens are volunteers. The the city and county can keepi going until the citizens are worn down. The city and county will proceed as planned while paying lip service to the citizens.
- ◆ This community is definitely headed in the right direction.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Right direction	1. Please stop the insanity of converting automobile lanes into double-wide bike lanes 2. Stop RTD's plan to increase the minimum required people from 2 to 3 for the HOV lane on 36. The purpose of the HOV lane is to reduce congestion, not create revenue for a private company.
♦ Right direction	Although I think we're generally headed in the right direction, I think some things have been poorly introduced to and/or vetted by community members. For example, while I strongly support the efforts at street reconfiguration in the City of Boulder, I found the presentation of those ideas ham-handed and the actual implementation of the trials amateurish, not to mention visually quite ugly.
♦ Right direction	Broad community concerns must out-weigh a few grumpy neighbors. The welfare of the many people who could live and work in more dense mixed-use infill developments is far more important than the aesthetic personal preferences of people who don't like 'big buildings'. The need for housing and employment is far more fundamental than a few individual's desire to enforce their personal preference for suburban style surroundings everywhere in Boulder.
♦ Right direction	But in many ways it is beginning to resemble a resort town, like Aspen and Telluride, where old white people go to lounge.
♦ Right direction	Change is positive and keeps our community vital and strong.
♦ Right direction	Change needs to be embraced. Becoming locked in a certain time will slowly weaken and destroy the community; it will become a rich person's retirement, gated community. A NIMBYville and innovation and creativity will slowly deflate. We need to have confidence in our ability to re-generate and reinvent reflecting general core values - but they need to change or they will die.
♦ Right direction	Constrained from outward (Open Space) or upward (55 foot height limit) growth, the community should maximize the potential of redevelopment sites. I strongly support both constraints just mentioned. However, I feel that redevelopment should generally be three or four stories provided that the design is very good--and provided that the design is better than most of the buildings recently built (last 15 years).
♦ Right direction	Denser housing and multi-use are the right direction. The city should have sections of town that can allow for even denser housing than is now allowed - by lifting the ceiling on building height.
♦ Right direction	Focusing on Climate Change resiliency will not become popular in a survey like this until it is too late. It is the government's responsibility to develop a relationship with Nederland now, in order to protect the watershed. We should be doing what is smart, not what is popular. Preparing the infrastructure for multi-modal transportation is also smart but not popular.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
◆ Right direction	I am hopeful that with thoughtful redevelopment that the urban centers in Boulder County (Boulder, Longmont) can become great small cities.
◆ Right direction	I believe the community needs to continue evolving. Stagnation equals failure on many of the community's sustainability goals. Increased density means we are using less and can preserve more. The large swaths of suburban land use and building form in and around the county are outdated and unsustainable. We need to develop more housing to accommodate the growing population. The growth in home pricing is unsustainable and hurts the community.
◆ Right direction	I don't like many of the bulky, boxy brick buildings coming up around town and would like to see more innovative design, more green space, etc. but I do realize that to keep the open space open we need to increase density as the city grows. I just hope it can be done with a little more aesthetic flair in the future.
◆ Right direction	I don't know where to fit this in, but above all, preserve open space.
◆ Right direction	I don't want to stop our City from evolving. What has happened in the past five years has not been perfect, but generally speaking, we are on the right path. We should continue to focus on integrating land use, transportation, and housing policies to create great places for the future.
◆ Right direction	I know that we need to grow but you must be sensitive to impact of growth on neighborhoods. Current residents should be able to count on keeping their quality of life.
◆ Right direction	I love all the new mixed-use development. As somebody who was born and raised in Boulder, I have never thought that our single family character is what makes us great. What makes us great is our amazing location, downtown Boulder and urban places like Pearl Street, our wonderful open space, as well as the CU campus. We need to get denser.
◆ Right direction	I strongly favor the higher density, mixed use, transit oriented development, and would like to see more mini-commercial districts surrounded by diminishing densities.
◆ Right direction	I think it is heading in the right direction particularly in the Boulder Junction area. I also believe that it could be even more dense. In order for a robust transportation system to work there needs to be enough people to support the use. More housing would help and not just apartments.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Right direction	I think there are legitimate concerns about the economic development and increased courting of tech industries, as this has significant potential to alter the affordability and character of Boulder. Even though there has long been tech industries in the region, it does feel that too much of this could alter (negatively) the character and balance of other creative economies that would attract vibrant people, culture, and foster sense of place. Affordable housing for middle income is a priority but is lacking and this is implicated in the growth. I am not opposed to the growth happening, but I can see why people are concerned about the character of the community. It's not entirely clear (with all these things happening at the same time), who the city is really prioritizing? Tech industries or low-mid income families that already work but might not live within the city.
♦ Right direction	Long-held viewpoints about the population size of Boulder is being challenged. A generation who believe that the Danish plan/growth limits was sacrosanct are not factoring in who lives here now and who will be the stewards in the future. The community is in transition - but still needs to look at balance based on environment and carrying capacity that protect and enhance what is special about 'our smallish city.' The dialogue needs to be about how to preserve what is special and still provide for more quality development/re-development, community investments that add vibrancy that the new creative class of professionals and young families want in our city and processes to build in and protect housing stock and neighborhood character that ensure affordability and access for a middle class.
♦ Right direction	Many of the values listed above are in conflict with one another in practice. It is very difficult to find the balance point between affordable housing, free market development, transportation congestion and environmental impacts of each of the aforementioned items. For instance, forcing a higher # of affordable units in a project pushes up property values of free market units. Reducing the # of units/density that can be built adds to the # of cars in-commuting. So, each decision must be looked at and how it effects EACH value, not just the one that it improves or is being targeted during that decision.
♦ Right direction	Need more apartments that are affordable. Heights restrictions should be relaxed.
♦ Right direction	Need to increase our sustainability by housing more employees, greater housing diversity to recognize changing demographics, providing more density and mixed use areas where people can walk to basic needs, remove the subsidies for driving and parking autos. The data clearly supports the need for this kind of urban sustainability

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Right direction	Since 'right direction' is not defined, this question has no meaning. Some people are under the impression growth is totally out of control, which is statistically incorrect, but they would therefor say 'wrong direction' - which direction are we talking about?
♦ Right direction	The community dialogue has been increasingly divisive. We need to foster an increased sense of community: one where people felt that they are heard, and can affect change, but can also understand different perspectives.
♦ Right direction	The council and staff don't listen and went way too far on Folsom St. Public Involvement is not taken seriously. City promotes position to groups that support their positions and make it difficult for others to voice their positions. Staff is argumentative with anyone who has a different opinion.
♦ Right direction	The quality of the public realm and diversity of architectural design is low
♦ Right direction	This is hard to answer. We are headed in the right direction by having Google develop a campus, by redeveloping the daily camera building, by developing Boulder Junction. But the sentiment against these things is bad and that anti growth sentiment is headed in the wrong direction.
♦ Right direction	Very large need for more geographic diversity on city council. The council is not listening (or apparently not in touch) to the at large community i.e. Folsom bicycle lanes, East Arapahoe (need 4 lanes not 2).
♦ Right direction	voters' defeat of 300/301 = positive signal
♦ Right direction	We need more development and more density.
♦ Right direction	We need to allow the city to evolve, culling the less good and replacing it with the excellent.
♦ Wrong direction	Affordable housing has seemingly become the new buzz word in Boulder. We constantly hear that Boulder is not affordable, that we must build affordable housing. Yet, article after article on the daily camera point out the obvious issues with our existing strategy. Developers constantly 'buy out' of affordable housing to preserve their developments, the City is considering selling Pollard motors site to profit from the land, and the fact that the units that are set aside as affordable are leased to CU students or families that clearly benefited from the system yet won't move out when their economic situation improves. We need to be smart about integrating our 'affordable' housing with existing communities and not build 'projects' (a single building complex with all affordable housing in one location).
♦ Wrong direction	Amateurish, crude design guidelines; Byzantine permit and approval process; inability to synthesize conflicting values; failure to recognize intangibles the community values, i.e., the character of the historic Pearl Street Mall, including the view.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	As usual, old people control much of what is done in Boulder. Their old ideas are no longer relevant...we need new blood, new thinking, a modern approach to solving issues of economic disparity of citizens, lack of diversity, and lack of affordable housing.
♦ Wrong direction	Banks, investment firms, business expansion, big commercial businesses are taking over Boulder. Cheap ugly looking buildings dominate all the new construction. Who would want to live in a building with sheet metal siding, no awnings, bare windows and looks like a huge boxes shoved together ten feet from a street with constant traffic. That's what Boulder is becoming. That's not about people's well-being--That's about developers making quick profits and leaving a disaster behind that we have to live with and that is disturbing and distasteful.
♦ Wrong direction	Both the City Council and the County Commissioners have veered toward autocracy, governing according to their own wishes, and avoiding or ignoring the voices of the citizens.
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder county has NO say as to the development being thrust upon It by the city of Boulder. We have NO vote on impact to our area.
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder is headed in the wrong direction! Moved here & retired 8 years ago. A town that was unique and desirable is headed toward becoming unlivable!
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder is not getting better and better. It is getting worse. More people, more buildings, more density do not make a better quality of life. Too many rats in a cage is not a way to live. And lots of tall buildings do not make people happy. The best place on the planet is getting ruined.
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder politicians and city staff appear to both personally desire and want to appeal to public sentiment for environmental piety. On a per capita basis Boulderites are far more consumptive than the average American and Americans are far beyond our fair share globally. Aside from the ethical implications of this, our community is highly dependent of an overstretched regional/national economy. It is in our best interest to hedge against that.
♦ Wrong direction	Build the high density housing and businesses in the business district, and in similar housing districts. Do not mix high density housing with low density housing.
♦ Wrong direction	Building has accelerated at a pace that is tearing apart the community. Too many Exemptions given for new buildings. Too many new Supersized, Square, UGLY building going up in the core of Boulder. To much new traffic and congestion. No new public facilities.
♦ Wrong direction	Building on Twin Lakes Road is the wrong direction. Besides impacting wildlife, it will greatly degrade quality of life in the Gunbarrel area. We don't have the stores, transportation, jobs here, etc., to support it.
♦ Wrong direction	Citizen concerns are given lip service while the bureaucracy forges ahead doing what it wants.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	Citizens are being pushed around by the county. I don't want a multiuse trail taking up street parking outside of my home. How F'n intrusive!!! We don't want hundreds of new apartments on our two lane street!!! Do we have a choice. You are creating resentment. Sorry new neighbors who are encroaching on my home are not welcome.
♦ Wrong direction	city and county are not getting or using community input.
♦ Wrong direction	City leaders should show leadership & explain what advantages there are for current citizens to embrace the following: 1. Spend millions to make a family-friendly park out of the park downtown when the biggest obstacle (the homeless) remains with no apparent plan to change their status quo. 2. Affordable housing. It's good for us because it makes us better people? It's good for us because residents of affordable housing don't drive & thus we have better air? The AH residents are the much storied firemen and teachers? What is the goal? What is the reality? 3. On the plus side, I've enjoyed not hearing so much about prairie dogs & their housing.
♦ Wrong direction	City needs to STOP allowing developers from buying out of building affordable housing and establish RENT CONTROLS.
♦ Wrong direction	City staff is working in vacuum. Council change/election does not help because city is run essentially by staff. City manager is weak and lacking vision.
♦ Wrong direction	Compact community? No thanks Diversity of housing- No thanks- ruin the character of Boulder- do this in another town
♦ Wrong direction	density is being aggressively misrepresented as a solution to the lack of affordable housing
♦ Wrong direction	Developers are eager to make profits and the trend toward developing every inch of real estate, only benefits their pockets. Living in a neighborhood that is high density, Wonderland Hill, I appreciate the need for high density but we still need to maintain parks and open spaces. Low height of buildings allows for views of mountains and sky.
♦ Wrong direction	do not try to bring more jobs. we have plenty of jobs. do not encourage people to move here. they will come as needed. don't court corporations like google! that was a big mistake. which of you were paid to make this happen? they should be out in broomfield. why don't you freaking ASK US before you do something so radical? unacceptable.
♦ Wrong direction	Don't develop Gunbarrel any more, it is beyond capacity
♦ Wrong direction	Every one who wants to live here can't for various reasons. More businesses here, more employees, less housing available increasing costs, more drive-ins each day, too much emphasis on rentals.
♦ Wrong direction	Excessive development in Gunbarrel has decreased the quality of life drastrically

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	Excessive growth and commercialization is ruining the character of Boulder and the outlying areas.
♦ Wrong direction	Growth and development are putting a strain on infrastructure - especially on housing, on libraries, parks and open space and of course on roads.
♦ Wrong direction	Growth feels entirely out of control. Traffic is getting worse by the year. The new building going up on the west end of Pearl is a monstrosity that obstructs the view of the Flatirons. Hight additions to a building on the south side of Pearl at 17th also obstructed views of the Flatirons. The unique character of Boulder is being lost.
♦ Wrong direction	Growth is being shoved-down current, long-time resident's throats. Boulder has lost it's quirky, eclectic feel and is being replaced by big-box condo housing. If we continue down this path, Boulder will become a big city. Affordability will not decrease, instead density will increase and along with that will come big-city problems of congestion and crime. Boulder, you cannot have it all job growth, making the city affordable and limiting growth are incongruous goals. One thing that makes Boulder great is their commitment to limiting growth through their commitment to bordering the city with open space. But this commitment then means Boulder must limit growth too - population and job growth. Since Boulder has not limiting these types of growth, we are now seeing housing become un-affordable. If Boulder wants to continue their commitment to limiting growth by not expanding the city boundaries ... then they must also limit business growth.
♦ Wrong direction	Gunbarrel is becoming more crowded and dense with the addition of several apartment developments. That would still be OK if we also had acquired some public amenities, such as a library and rec center. It would also help if there were better transportation options. RTD is not serving this area well. We feel like the Gunbarrel step-children of Boulder out here...all the density, none of the amenities.
♦ Wrong direction	High density housing but no interesting businesses introduced that would give the area character. No parks or green areas just high density housing development in the last few years. Instead of the city locating affordable housing on Lookout Road or 63rd street which has RTD service, they are now planning to introduce very high density affordable housing on the last bit of green open space between two interior neighborhoods. These spaces should become designated open space to support wildlife or part open space/park space where children can play.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	I am a Boulder native, i was born in Boulder 37 years ago and continue to live in Boulder. I always admired Boulder's approach to limiting growth, i fully understand that limiting growth means less available housing, which results in increased prices. However, i have been appalled at the rapid growth and rezoning of Boulder that continues take commercial spaces and transform them in to very dense residential. "Smart-growth" is a great concept, but i feel that reality is different. In reality, even if you build a new "smart-growth" community designed so that everyone can walk everywhere -- the reality is that the vast majority of the residents DO have cars and WILL continue to drive... I have found that Boulder has become increasingly congested and has lost so much of the identity that i grew up with and loved. One argument for growth is that is creates more housing which in-turn creates more affordable housing and keeps housing prices down. But at what cost? Boulder will always be a desirable place to live and will always be expensive, that's just the reality. But we don't need to turn it into a dense city -- that will kill its identity. People say that its inevitable and we need to account for growth so let's continue to redevelop and pack more people in to accommodate them -- if you are against this rapid growth then apparently you are an elitist that doesn't want to let people in. I'm not, I'm just a realist. There is a limited amount of space, making it more dense fixes the problem of people but diminishes the quality of life in return. If accommodating everyone was the primary focus then why not get rid of some open-space? That would allow for more housing to be built, it could be smart-growth neighborhoods, there would be more supply and thus prices would be lower... But, that would change the face of Boulder wouldn't it? I would never ever give up open-space. That's my point, defending limits on growth and defending open-space i are the same argument. Yes, it means that there is less space available, and demand will continue to outweigh supply and thus housing prices will climb, but that's just simply the reality. You know who benefit from limiting growth in the City of Boulder? Boulder County would benefit -- as an example: Longmont and surrounding areas would flourish.
♦ Wrong direction	I am concerned about all the development going on. I'm concerned about all the new apartment developments in Gunbarrel. I am concerned about the Housing Authority's plans to erect mega-apartment buildings smack in the middle of a rural-residential community of long-standing. I am concerned that Google is going to take up such a large area, but is bringing in workers from out-of-state.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	I am very concerned about the agenda of the current counsel. They appear to be motoring ahead with their ideas, not paying any attention to the input that is in conflict with their ideas. I live in a neighborhood with a significant open space and wildlife presence. They wish to change the designation of the land that is open in order to push their 'housing goals' irregardless of the documented adverse affect this change would have on the ecosystem, wildlife and quality of life already established in my neighborhood. In addition, I can see no value for these decisions as the neighborhood is not situated to support the goals of less traffic, public transportation, nearness to amenities etc. It is very disheartening to see the possibilty of neighborhood destruction so close to home. If the counsel lived in my neighborhood I can promise you this would never be an issue as they would not allow the proposed destruction. How sad to live in a place that is so irreverant to the needs of an established community.
♦ Wrong direction	I believe almost all of the projects in development target the wealthy and out-of-towners coming here (i.e.: google, software companies). My ex-husband (daughters father) is a native of Colorado (Denver), is African-American, and has just been forced to leave his rental because of a 1/3 raise in rent by the property owner. He cannot afford to live in our neighborhood anymore. The developments being proposed would not help him, a single, blue-collar, working family guy. We are losing this lower/middle class.
♦ Wrong direction	I believe that NYMBYism is taking over Boulder. There are only so many opportunities that this community will have to build better, higher density housing while still preserving the connection to nature that we all love. To think that demand to live in a town this wonderful will ever decrease is laughable, so we should act to make things better now! House the homeless. Get them off the streets. Create housing for 'light blue' collar workers (teachers, cops, etc) so that we keep those folks living here. Recognize that connection to these beautiful places means working to build better access. Finally, I think it's imperative to consider a truly progressive mindset. Don't let Boulder become the land of the rich, latte liberals.
♦ Wrong direction	I feel like there's a great disconnect between our elected leaders and city staff. I believe city staff have too much power over big decisions and council has done a poor job of reining that in. The people we elect should be running this town.
♦ Wrong direction	I feel that Boulder is being over-developed putting a strain on current services and creating congestion. Rural neighborhoods such as Gunbarrel (specifically Twin Lakes Road) should be preserved and not developed with high density housing.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	I feel that growth is out of hand and that developers have a stronger voice in influencing and directing Boulder's growth and design than the citizens of Boulder and its surrounding communities.
♦ Wrong direction	I feel zoning is being changed willy-nilly and community voices are being ignored. In Gunbarrel, we are trying to protect important open space near the Twin Lakes, by keeping it zoned rural residential, but the commissioners are determined to change it to high-density. They won't even consider other options, such as buying other already built housing and converting it to affordable housing. What good is zoning if the commissioners can just change it whenever they want? What's more, their plan conflicts with Boulder's goals to protect ecosystems. Please reject this zoning change at Twin Lakes.
♦ Wrong direction	I live in Gunbarrel where three huge developments were put in with a potential fourth in the works. Aside from the increased traffic issues that were not addressed, there are many problems that were not considered that have changed our small community into a crowded problem strewn city. I pay HOA dues for a private park that has now become by default a public park. My dues had to be increased to cover the cost of additional garbage collection, erection of doggie bags, repair of playground equip, grass being ripped up etc. In addition, there is a lot more vandalism, loose dogs, loud music, and littering. There is nothing for kids to do out here - no rec center, no gym, no library. It's really a shame.
♦ Wrong direction	I say headed in wrong direction, but I mean the community as a whole, not necessarily the City and County. More specifically, I think that increasing home prices and resistance to trying to mitigate the trend, makes Boulder less inclusive. Fortunately we've got a long way to go until it's unbearable, but we're headed in that direction ... don't 'Aspenize' Boulder
♦ Wrong direction	I see the trend, and that is greed. I have experience in many communities that have allowed developers and short-term town management to ruin the essence of the town. In many ways, it's already happened in Boulder. We allowed in-fill development of the worst kind, with strip mall after strip mall. I do like that we are planning more mixed-use development on 30th and on Valmont, but I worry greatly when developers start 'planning for Google.' One of the reasons I moved here, and not San Francisco, was to get away from that thinking.

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	I think there is too much money influence in decision making in the county and the city. I fear we are headed toward a Silicon Valley type area with housing costs sky rocketing due to many high paying tech jobs moving in causing a huge demand for housing that we cannot fill. I fear Boulder will be a city of the rich and the subsidized lower income and the middle class will be non-existent. I fear the middle class will not only be priced out of housing but will also leave due to policies set by the county and city government. I think there is too much emphasis on a new urban density and not enough on preservation of existing neighborhoods' character. I fear that out-of-state developers and realtors and financial companies will move in and make as much money as they can in the name of compact urban design and sustainability and in the process destroy all that made Boulder unique and a great place to live. After they have made all the money they can they will move on to the next town/city to exploit and we will be left with the consequences of all the growth that they made their money off of.
♦ Wrong direction	I used to think I wanted to live out my life in Boulder but not if it is headed in this direction. Unbridled development with seemingly no plan. Already my neighborhood has changed from a quiet area to cars parked practically blocking my driveway 5 days a week, increased traffic and speeding cars. Double the density. I have a feeling the powers that be are living in large lots surrounded by old buildings with no changes to have to deal with while the rest of us are finding high-density or massive buildings with inadequate parking in our neighborhoods and more and more cars driving into and across town and traffic and near collisions. And yet the infrastructure and amenities are the same. The post office is a good example of something that is set up for 1/2 the population that we have now in Boulder. Try to maintain and upkeep what we have now before adding more to the mess.
♦ Wrong direction	Infill is NOT the answer. If Boulder's going to grow it must STOP abusing neighboring lands and provide for it's own growth. Open the 'reserve'. Stop letting builders opt-out of affordable housing to 'buy' it somewhere else.
♦ Wrong direction	It's getting too homogenous-too many rich white people, out of pace with the rest of America in terms of demographics-wealth, race, class. Not welcoming or affordable for young people. Needs to allow more dense housing to match the job opportunities here.
♦ Wrong direction	Land use decision process is a mess. With the heightened attention on affordable housing, why are developers allowed to 'buy-out' when a new project is approved? The community then has to go through a second round of divisive discussions when a site for large affordable-housing is proposed. Affordable housing needs to be mixed in with the community, not 'ghetto-ized' in single massive projects (i.e. Josephine Commons)

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	Laws made by our sitting bodies are directly contradictory to the direction they state the communities should be going. Case in point - allowing developers to 'opt out' of affordable housing in prime locations WITHIN the city. Or wanting lower cost housing, yet requiring net-zero housing which adds \$100k-200k to the cost of development - driving housing prices up.
♦ Wrong direction	More big industry coming to Boulder and pushing out smaller companies and middle class people. This is only going to get worse.
♦ Wrong direction	Much land on the 287 corridor is being to quickly developed.
♦ Wrong direction	Much new development is unattractive and doesn't honor the visual beauty of our community. For instance the new building on Pearl St between 11th & 10th Streets....totally blocks the iconic view of the flatirons. New apartments on 28th Street near Valmont are unattractive and without setbacks one would normally see. Roads and streets are a disaster and in need of major repair.
♦ Wrong direction	No more housing in Gunbarrel. No Marijuana businesses in our family neighborhoods: Niwot, Gunbarrel. Expand our open spaces
♦ Wrong direction	North Boulder is becoming a traffic nightmare. Too many new homes, with no improvement to roads.
♦ Wrong direction	Not so much the community, it is the City & County heading in the wrong direction.
♦ Wrong direction	Out of control bureaucratic regulatory zeal borders on the ridiculous. This place has gone from wonderful to awful in the 45 years I've lived here. Thank you PLAN-Boulder control freaks.
♦ Wrong direction	Out of control development and the resulting congestion have really degraded the City. Outlying areas are already at risk of becoming expedient dumping grounds for development and other problems that should remain within Boulder. Developers should not be allowed to buy their way out of including affordable housing in their projects; that the City repeatedly allows this to happen increases the pressure on low density neighborhoods in outlying areas. 'Ideological myopia' (the Camera's very apt phrase) by Council, Commission, and their staffs has done real damage. The only active agenda should be doing what citizens want.
♦ Wrong direction	Over the past few years I have observed an increase in homeless begging and loitering. There is an increase in garbage along Boulder Creek due to this and it is feeling less safe along the path. The rapidly rising cost of living and housing will inevitably lead to an increase in crime and homelessness. With this growth, it is important to employ our local residents and not default to hiring lower wage immigrant labor, as this tends to result in an increase of graffiti, garbage, and crime.

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	Rampant growth, diminished quality of life, heavy traffic, and the failure on the part of the City and County to reign it in. Continued growth cannot work without plowing over all undeveloped space, wrecking neighborhoods, and destroying the quality of life many residents currently have - the very thing that attracts new people to Boulder is quickly disappearing.
♦ Wrong direction	Since emerging from the 'Great Recession', it seems to be a near free-for-all for development. A perfect example is the unconscionable blockage of the view of the Flatirons from the west end of the pedestrian Pearl Street Mall by the structure that replaced the old Daily Camera building. Apparently, there are no decisions made by city and county government that should be consider 'no-brainers'.
♦ Wrong direction	Skyrocketing cost-of-living is making the city into a milquetoast town of rich white people. All others not fitting that definition have already moved out of the city or are living illegally (?!) overoccupied. This is not sustainable, for the people of this county nor for the environment.
♦ Wrong direction	Some of the proposed build-out is paradoxically in some of the quietest and darkest areas around the city (Twin Lakes). Once lost, those values will NEVER be regained.
♦ Wrong direction	Space for development is limited. This is true today, and was true when I moved here in 1979. While with two incomes, we could afford to rent, the first house we bought was in Lafayette. Evenutally were were able to move up to a house in Boulder. Many people that live in Boulder do not work in Boulder. Should they move? (The RTD Express to Denver is quite busy) Another thought is to free up housing space by encouraging CU to provide housing for their students. Single family homes and neighborhoods are not designed for multi student housing. Another idea is to reduce the enticement for investment landlords, again, free the homes for single family living!
♦ Wrong direction	The communities are being overbuilt with no support systems in place. The housing density is too high in the newer area and the public, rural areas are being destroyed for increased population. We moved to this area for the Open Spaces which are now in danger of being removed.
♦ Wrong direction	The culture of the city is taking a highly negative destructive tone pitting generations against each other. Monied interest have taken a large toll on apparent public opinion in recent elections think municipalization, growth, and access to Open Space. The disregard of the principals that have made Boulder attractive for decades appears to be overtaking the city. For the first time in decades, I'm considering its time to move out of what used to be a special town that bucked the conventional wisdom in favor of respect for heartfealt concern for each other. The town is losing its values. So sad.
♦ Wrong direction	the development is too big, urban and ugly

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	The need to increase open spaces and need to limit the densification of Boulder
♦ Wrong direction	The new construction around Boulder Junction is ugly and boring -- it looks like future tenements. In fact a lot of the new construction, all over town, is monotonously similar and uninspired. Boulder seems to be going the way of Santa Fe, which has gradually lost its soul to new development. Also, none of the 'affordable' housing in Boulder, new or old, is actually affordable to middle and low income people. Right now the only truly affordable housing in Boulder is mobile homes -- the City of Boulder should be actively supporting mobile home parks, which are currently housing many of Boulder's essential service workers, school teachers, Naropa professors, artists, retirees, and other Boulder citizens who have chosen careers that do not generate piles of money.
♦ Wrong direction	The tall buildings and all the buildings that have gone up, in general are too big. There are very little mom and pop stores left. Boulder is the new California. It is only a matter of time before we loose our views, affordable living and quality of life. Our roads can't handle all this volume.
♦ Wrong direction	The uniqueness that was once present is being lost with over development over crowding and a high cost of living. The artistic and creative types that helped make Boulder interesting can either no longer afford to live there or no longer want to.
♦ Wrong direction	There are too many people trying to freeze Boulder in its past or current state. We need to embrace and plan a more urban, inclusive and sustainable community through additional high density development all over our city. It needs to be done in a thoughtful, considered way, but it has to be done or we will continue to be one of the most elitist, insular, and monocultural communities in the country. Increase the hight limit downtown and other commercial nodes, increase residential densities throughout the city, and plan a state of the art transportation system that will accommodate our increasing mobility needs.
♦ Wrong direction	There is a 'gold' rush going on in Boulder with infill construction. This new construction is anywhere corporate america, often treeless, not coated in solar panels. Every new rushed permitted project today is a lost opportunity for future planning, leading edge efficiency building. I cant believe large out of town commercial landlords are being allowed to build flat roofed buildings without covering them with solar!
♦ Wrong direction	There is this big push for density. When did the citizens of Boulder say they desired more density? Density without transportation/traffic improvements is a disaster!

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	There is too much development happening without honoring the BVCP's own principals, such as the 2.01 unique community identity being respected , 2.03 compact development pattern (while trying to build dense apartments in rural residential neighborhoods), 2.06 preservation of rural areas, 2.10 'seek appropriate building scale and compatible character'...I could go on and on about the commitments not being honored. Example is at 11th and Pearl st- building a giant 4 story high building that completely blocks the mountain view from Pearl st and just looks plain menacing. In my opinion, this city is in bed with all the developers making obscene profits at the cost of the people who live here and who they are pledged to serve. As always in human history, the ego and its power hungry desire for control have taken over our government and believes that if we keep building more and more, we are bettering our community in the name of 'progress.' Are we trying to build a Manhattan in Colorado, trying to stuff as many people in this valley as we can? Extremely frustrated by these supposed 'leaders' who don't seem to actually care at all about nature or the happiness of the citizens of Boulder.
♦ Wrong direction	There is way, way too much development taking place in my opinion. My sense is that developers have way too much control over the planning board.
♦ Wrong direction	To much growth in housing and the lack of infer structure to support such growth. The lack of listening to the existing home owners regarding their wants and needs.
♦ Wrong direction	Too much ugly development. City government which caters to developers vs. citizens. Losing the friendly, small town atmosphere very fast. Overcrowding in all aspects of daily life within the City.
♦ Wrong direction	too many dense and ugly developments (like Boulder junction) too many exceptions to height limits
♦ Wrong direction	Too much emphasis on commercial development and dense housing. Losing our values about open space within neighborhoods and protecting our amazing views
♦ Wrong direction	too much growth
♦ Wrong direction	too much growth without considering transportation needs
♦ Wrong direction	Too much housing density will eliminate our quality of life.
♦ Wrong direction	Too much large scale development and too many exemptions for Height above zoning, setbacks, etc. Ugly new buildings many blocking the view of the Flatirons.
♦ Wrong direction	Too much new development. Espeically office space. We don't need more jobs.
♦ Wrong direction	Too much new multi-unit housing going in. There is not enough room for an endless amount of new residents. Traffic is already bad, and bikes are not going to solve the problem.
♦ Wrong direction	Traffic congestion; jobs/housing imbalance being exacerbated (Google).

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	Traffic is a big problem and only getting worse.
♦ Wrong direction	Traffic is terrible, resulting in pollution when cars stop/start on streets or circle/wait looking for parking. New restaurants but not enough parking for them. Views of Flatirons disrupted. High-rise development buildings which do not fit into the neighborhood. Not enough parking for those big buildings. Not enough green space required when doing new developments. New housing is NOT keeping prices down. Affordable housing is not always PERMANENT. Boulder does not need to solve the world's problem of not enough housing. More housing is used for out-commuters as well as people who work in Boulder. Poor bus service.
♦ Wrong direction	Ugly high rise buildings don't make a community. City council only listens to the bike and low income housing groups. You've made terrible decisions
♦ Wrong direction	Want people to stop using cars? 1) Clear the streets after a snow, not just sidewalks. Can't walk if it's unsafe to cross the street. 2) Repair the sidewalks 3) Cut back the overgrown bushes. Want to put a halt to traffic overload? Stop approving the Googles of the world to locate here. Want to keep the cost of homes from skyrocketing still more? 1) Stop approving the Googles of the world to locate here. 2) Stop building more dense housing (do you really think all those people won't have cars? that all of them will work in Boulder rather than commute to somewhere else? 3) Don't permit more unrelated people to live in a rental house. I read 55% of homes are rentals? When landlords can get \$1000 a renter or more, homeowners can't afford to buy, so more homes will become rentals. When Boulder is 65% 70% 75%, you pick the percent, it will not be a unique place with a sense of place.
♦ Wrong direction	We aren't setting our standards high enough when approving new building projects. It appears we (powers that be) want to grow rapidly more than we (powers that be) want to grow wisely. We need to add small houses and town homes so that people can buy houses here in which they can raise families. No more apartments and rentals. They do nothing for us. Let's get back to a majority of home ownership residents here, from today's 55% renters. Affordable housing needs to be in Gunbarrel, Louisville, Longmont and all over, not just in Boulder.
♦ Wrong direction	We failed on the 29th St development; 25 year mistake. We failed to get light rail; 10-20 year mistake. We have a toll road; 50 year mistake. City council is against airbnb, etc due to unfounded fears which would mean another step against affordability.
♦ Wrong direction	We have made the growth/no growth debate binary. There is not enough discussion about intelligent, measured and inclusive growth.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	We have our house on the market to leave Boulder after 35 years. From 1980 until about 2005, Boulder supported entrepreneurial development of new technology products - but these firms understood that they would move to the bedroom communities during their growth phase. This was a highly effective and sustainable model. Our council has acted out its own distorted view of Boulder over the past ten years. So, we believe that Boulder has left us.
♦ Wrong direction	We must focus on sustainable growth to insure we have an inclusive and walkable community.
♦ Wrong direction	We need more affordable housing units to be a priority and with limits on growth, there needs to be some sort of landlord requirements to accept Section 8 Housing vouchers and to not discriminate.
♦ Wrong direction	We need to find a middle path, where we create some more walkable neighborhoods that are moderately priced, and co-housing communities and co-ops. We need to stop the kinds of new development that Boulder is seeing now - huge buildings with height exemptions blocking flatiron views, new apartment buildings that are huge and have high rents (what is up with that when we need rentals that are moderately priced?)., developers buying up apartment buildings and small houses all over town and scraping them off and building massive homes and apartments for the rich (not the right approach!). We are allowing developers to prey on our city. Somebody needs to control that! Also, not everyone needs to live in Boulder. That is not my definition of inclusivity.
♦ Wrong direction	We should not be granting exemptions for anything. Nor for height, or set back or density. The tall (ugly) buildings are destroying our 'unique identity' (see priority #1 above). If developers don't like that, they should change the law - let all the people in the city vote, not just the CC. The CC only listens to environmentalists and developers. It is really scary. Where are all the Google people going to live? We do not need tall buildings - please stop. We moved here because there were rules in place. If you don't like the rules, don't come here.
♦ Wrong direction	Without dramatically better mass transit system on and around Boulder, higher occupancy, and the extremely dense units, will seriously degrade the existing quality of life -- traffic will get HUGELY WORSE.
♦ Wrong direction	You all have done a pretty good job of messing Boulder up irreparably. Just waiting for prices to go a little higher so we can sell and leave before it gets any worse. Good job alienating your existing, long-term residents by overbuilding the city, then coating it all in a light glaze of greenwashing that anyone with half a brain can see right through.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	You have brought us to this state by exercising poor governance. Take care of your state required mandates and leave us alone. Your constant nanny state visions are infringing on our rights. If I want to build a 12,000 square foot house on my 35 acres, it's none of your business what size it is.
♦ Wrong direction	Your abandonment of critical infrastructure like neighborhood streets is a disaster. You're eco-focus is ridiculous. You need to lead us to holistic sustainability.
♦ Mixed reaction	Adding to many new big UGLY Buildings. Boulder Junction is going to be a lasting mistake. Out of scope, lost of new traffic. No Train, Light-Rail or BRT coming to the area. So most trips will be by car. PearlWest is also an example of something that should never have been approved. Towers over historic buildings. 300 more cars clogging already gridlocked roads.
♦ Mixed reaction	Affordability is a huge issue. Let's find a way to create more affordable housing options AND preserve open space/quality of life. I think density, and multifamily housing types should be the priority.
♦ Mixed reaction	After the election last night I have much higher hopes for the city.
♦ Mixed reaction	As a resident of Gunbarrel, just barely outside city limits, it appears to me that the city is exporting it high-density housing to the edges of the county...or even planning on annexing some more county land (in the midst of existing unincorporated neighborhoods) to fill needs. I don't see how this sprawl fits the 'compact community' goals. New housing in Gunbarrel still means that you have to drive to Boulder proper for most services beyond a sandwich or a single grocery store.
♦ Mixed reaction	Becoming too wealthy of a community, too expensive to live here; growing disparity between high income and low income groups; too homogeneous of a community; still a beautiful place to live
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder is a great place to live, but there is little to no diversity. A lot of this is driven by the housing market, and Boulder is seen as a haven for upper class white people.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder is becoming increasingly elitist and unwelcoming. We need a more welcoming and collaborative approach to community discussions-- even where we disagree, there needs to be a level of respect and empathy that sadly is missing today.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder is becoming more of a city -- and that's fine. The problem is that it has increased job growth, but housing is not keeping up, which means more people forced to commute in and more people unable to afford the increasing cost of living. At the same time, there's increased community discrimination against the poor and the homeless. City leaders fight against services for the homeless, while implementing policies to criminalize their presence in downtown areas, scattering them and making them less safe. Additionally, anti-growth activists are doubling down on their desire to make Boulder more like it is when they moved here in the 1970s. They increasingly fight for policies that discriminate against renters (e.g., stricter enforcement of unfair and unreasonable occupancy limits, opposition to new housing developments) and the poor and homeless in general (e.g., their attempt to grab power through ballot items 300 and 301, the non-smoking ordinances that are applied only to people who look 'homeless'). I'm concerned that Boulder will become, within a few years, basically another Aspen, and I'm dismayed to see powerful, influential members of the community actively fighting to make that happen.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder is becoming very expensive and elitist. 300 and 301 were attempts by the elite to lock in their way of life and keep others out. While pretending to care about people of lower income, the actions of the city's elite is really about making themselves feel good about things like saving the environment, but really have the opposite effect.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder is losing its heart to the greed of developers. And it seems like city council just doesn't care.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder Junction is an example of what is going well. The Folsom 'right sizing' is clearly the wrong direction. Toll/BRT/HOV lanes are being added to bring more vehicular traffic into Boulder on US 36. Staff and council originally proposed removing vehicular lanes from Iris, Folsom, 55th and 63rd. Then scaled back to just Folsom. They refused to provide data on the increased pollution caused by the artificially induced congestion and delay. Common sense tells you you can't bring more traffic into town and then take away arterial traffic lanes and expect anything else.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder needs to be more open to affordable housing, density and height in the right places, protected bike lanes, better transit. It also needs to figure out how to create better design that doesn't make people afraid of all those things. Boulder needs to look at environmental impacts regionally and globally, not just locally (currently the city creates huge emissions and sprawls problems by not building enough housing). Open space protection and job creation is fine, but not at the expense of everything else.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder strives to be inclusive, however, without affordable housing, that is increasingly going to lead to less diversity and less inclusion. High density housing or group housing with a focus on transit connections is SO important for land use, climate change (less need to drive) and ability of younger people to actually live in Boulder, but there is a lot of push back from people with a different vision of Boulder. Mostly things are good and growth is going to happen, so let's make positive choices. Also, the amount of tech companies coming in and developing area/moving in large amounts of out-of-state employees is a little alarming- housing is only going to get more expensive so let's try and create some viable alternatives so Boulder is not just for the affluent to enjoy.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder's municipal utility is not well thought out and creates huge risk for future energy costs. There is no realistic (public) evaluation of the costs of the utility and no long-term plan which mitigates the price risk of wholesale power costs, even if they are 'renewable' and 'sustainable'. Too many new residences is creating very difficult traffic and parking problems that will only grow. People living in the county must drive to Boulder and can't reasonably drive through town with all the traffic.
♦ Mixed reaction	By and large, I think Boulder is changing for the better. however, i think we are far too timid in addressing the housing affordability crisis. We need to do much more to bring more housing to our community. I also think that we should be doing more to grow without adding automobiles, both by adding much less parking and by making more use of new technology that enables people to be carefree, but still have access to a car when they need it.
♦ Mixed reaction	City promotes antagonism between user groups based on poor planning and favoritism.
♦ Mixed reaction	City puts too many restrictions on building heights and allowed density/intensity. Too much emphasis is placed on maintaining or promoting 'free-flowing traffic.' That leads to many counterproductive measures: max densities are too low, street intersections are too large, streets have too many lanes, and too many signal lights are synchronized for car speeds.
♦ Mixed reaction	Climate action is imperative, but we are hypocritical. While our goals are laudable our actions are moving us in the opposite direction. See TRENDS on recycling, emissions and water usage.
♦ Mixed reaction	Commercial growth is overwhelming Boulder's identity and charm.
♦ Mixed reaction	Concerned about the housing growth on Gunbarrel without any of the infrastructure improvements needed to accommodate such growth

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Development and change are necessary, but the pace of development is a real cause of discomfort, unease, too fast. People can only digest a certain of change, 'bite off a chewable amount' - neighborhood sub community processes are messy but vital.
♦ Mixed reaction	Development is happening at too fast a pace. Too much residential development along the railroad tracks. It does not seem healthy to live with that kind of noise at all hours of the day.
♦ Mixed reaction	Development of derelict areas is a good idea to rejuvenate the city. However, adding massive amounts of public housing in one location in a quiet neighborhood just because the land was cheap is extremely detrimental to all those involved. Please take a closer look at the BCHA and BHP plan to develop housing in Gunbarrel!
♦ Mixed reaction	Don't let Boulder become Google's new gentrified headquarters. I'm a bike advocate, so the Folsom street bike lanes are, of course, getting a mixed reaction from me.
♦ Mixed reaction	Economic development (new businesses) will only add to Boulder's serious traffic problems and carbon impacts. But dialing back on ED could harm Boulder in economic down turns.
♦ Mixed reaction	Environmental stewardship and climate action are being subverted by too much of the wrong kind of growth and development.
♦ Mixed reaction	expansion is good, but there seems to be little focus on affordable housing.
♦ Mixed reaction	Fundamentally, I don't think Boulder should aspire to grow much beyond 100,000.
♦ Mixed reaction	Goals are good but implementation often poor, ie right sizing lack of input/data, carbon reduction can be achieved without expense and risk of forming utility, etc
♦ Mixed reaction	Great concern about the google campus being built. Worry about how google coming in will affect housing and infrastructure. Don't like the 'look' of much of Boulder Junction. Think buildings downtown are too tall and should not be obscuring the view of Flatirons that is uniquely Boulder. Luxury townhouses atop downtown buildings benefit only the tiny percentage of rich people who can afford them. Think too much emphasis placed on turning Boulder into an 'arts destination' when in fact arts orgs in Boulder serve a very small percentage of the population (& often are poorly managed, e.g., The Dairy).
♦ Mixed reaction	Greater communication to public. Use of internet to broadcast planning sessions and documented council responses to input.
♦ Mixed reaction	Growth, design and redevelopment are very important for communities to thrive and not become stagnant, but the City Planning process, such as their arbitrary moratoriums on height, is becoming more stifling, in my opinion, as a reaction to a minority public outcry.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Have been a resident since 1948. Former city employee. Municipalization would be a costly mistake. Continue to work with Xcel to achieve 'clean' goals.
♦ Mixed reaction	High density housing should not be a part of the plan - it is in direct opposition to many of the stated priorities and goals.
♦ Mixed reaction	Housing cost in Boulder is a mess, and is the number one factor preventing me/my family from feeling whole and at home in this community
♦ Mixed reaction	Housing diversity needs to accommodate people in all stages of their life. From college kids, single/couple professionals, young families, executive families, seniors. While I appreciate mixed-use, TOD and other more compact/high density development within Boulder, more needs to be done to preserve the neighborhoods where families live and to develop the type of housing that families could afford and want to live. Families do not necessarily want to live in a condo above retail/commercial in a high density TOD, but they may successfully be attracted to attached dwelling neighborhoods that are part of TOD/Mixed-Use developments, especially with adequate community open space. AND PARKING! The reality of having a family means that even the most eco-friendly families will need to use their cars more than a single, working professional. And it is not convenient to not have adequate parking or assume that a working mother with a young child in school and a baby going to daycare could accomplish transporting those two kids where they need to be and work a full day by biking them all to their destinations every day or taking the bus.
♦ Mixed reaction	Housing is very out of whack. Some people want small and sustainable houses and not mansions on postage stamp lots. Traffic is a real problem and we can't just beg people to get out of their cars.
♦ Mixed reaction	Housing prices are ridiculous in that a lower income or even a middle class family can't afford to live in Boulder, and new development doesn't seem to be addressing that situation.
♦ Mixed reaction	Housing:I think the City needs to increase from 10% the affordable housing goal, and subsidize the purchase of apartment complexes that will be deed restricted for affordable/workforce. The City should donate land to developers for affordable/workforce housing. Employee/Resident Ratio: The city should consider rezoning commercial land to residential to help increase the residents and reduce future employment growth. Transportation: Highway 36 was expanded but there is no change to the circulation once you enter Boulder. There needs to be more focus on the 'last mile' so that people can move more easily within Boulder. We should consider solutions that do not include RTD. Perhaps a free shuttle between Boulder Junction, 29th Street, and the Pearl St Mall.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I agree on the focus on climate (though I'd rather have seen more negotiation with Xcel than the costs we have spent on municipalization.) I'm also for re-building some areas, which will allow a focus on making things more energy efficient (and offering rebates so homeowners can do the same.) However, it seems lately our infrastructure isn't supporting our growth and community. Especially over the past couple of years, traffic seems to have significantly worsened. Both on major roads (diagonal, 157, etc) as well as near new construction areas such as at Lookout and 63rd. A good plan for quality of life should include making sure we don't overpopulate an area; whether that is traffic on roads, or open spaces. People need nature, and some prefer some solitude there.
♦ Mixed reaction	I am concerned that our community's ability to evolve is limited by vocal voices in local government. I'm also concerned that the equity issues in Boulder (achievement and opportunity gap, health disparities) are invisible and not getting attention.
♦ Mixed reaction	I am worried about all the concrete being poured in the city, the growing height and density of buildings, the loss of open views, the increased traffic and noise, inconsistent enforcement on quality-of-life issues (noise, smoking, parking, litter, graffiti/vandalism).
♦ Mixed reaction	I appreciate the city's efforts around climate change and sustainability. I also appreciate the city's commitment to permanently affordable housing. I think the city council's action to remove the Folsom Street bikeway was short-sighted and showed their unwillingness to commit to changes that are essential to reaching the city's broader goals. I think the city's approval of development that ignores existing limitations (like the height restrictions that were not followed for the Daily Camera development) are confusing and frustrating.
♦ Mixed reaction	I believe intent is good but the execution is not well managed. The right sizing of the streets to accommodate bikes is an example. I don't trust the research and analysis before the plan. Affordable housing is a need but it needs to be in the more urban parts of town with easier access to services and public transportation. Not in the county where it is neither walkable to has necessary services.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I believe that Boulder does need to consider some higher density residential options, BUT they should be done with very careful consideration to the location, neighborhoods impacted, etc. For example, the plan for Boulder to change the zoning from rural-residential to higher density classification is ignoring the character of the neighborhood, the desires of the current residents, the results of an independant hydrology study and impacts to a very sensitive wildlife area. Not to mention the fact that it is a terrible place for affordable housing given the lack of transportation options and services nearby.
♦ Mixed reaction	I believe that new business should pay their way. I do not want an overpopulated town that don't have the resource to keep up with development. Boulder is becoming very crowed with too much traffic downtown.
♦ Mixed reaction	I don't know what direction we're headed. It seems like it will hinge on the outcome of this election (300/301). I don't think the city can stay the way it is or has been. Have to choose between Aspenization & (hopefully thoughtful, sustainable) urbanization.
♦ Mixed reaction	I feel like Boulder is doing great on attracting innovative businesses and young educated rich people....but it is really losing it's sense of being a progressive, environmentally sensitive community that welcomes all socio-economic levels. It is feeling more exclusive and white-bred here, every year. And I say this as a graduate level educated middle-high socio-economic level person myself. I don't have the answers, but it's something that is starting to keep me up at night. I want to raise my family here, but not if there is only ONE type of person who lives here.
♦ Mixed reaction	I feel like there is support of lower income housing and that developers pay into this but I dont' see where forward movement is being made. We now have Junction village and I thought the idea was that people would be able to work and live close to where they work, but those places are so small (which is okay) but so expensive. It is so hard to live in Boulder. Also I hear our town say it wants to be more climate friendly but then we take down the bike lanes because a lot of people driving cars with only themselves in it want the convenience of getting wherever they are going as fast as they can. I feel like what we want and what we can expect to get our conflicting.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I feel our 'great neighborhoods' are under threat from developers seeking to profit from increased housing density and building heights. I feel developers should pay for the costs associated with their developments. I feel insufficient planning and funds are focused on the silver tsunami's coming effects on Boulder's future. We will need more appropriate fitness maintenance facilities and activities, increased affordable senior housing and new transportation means for seniors. These improvements will pay off in a healthier and more active senior population, a boon for all inhabitants.
♦ Mixed reaction	I feel strongly that the entrenched interests in the debate are already 'secure' in their place in the Boulder community. More representation of voices/opinions 18-35 are needed. Furthermore, I sense a disconnect in that the housing market is being shaped by interests outside of Boulder that recognize the speculative payoff in investing (REIT) in this area.
♦ Mixed reaction	I find the Planning Board's and the City Council's trend toward favoring dense development alarming. In particular I have the impression that all a developer has to do to get a questionable plan passed is to attach a couple of 'affordable' or 'senior' units. Suddenly the siren call of a few cheap units makes a lousy plan attractive in spite of its overall poor quality or its impact on the existing neighborhood around it.
♦ Mixed reaction	I firmly believe that greater density is the only real solution to housing problems in the city. However, I hear very strong, emotionally laden responses from other members of my neighborhood when this suggestion is made (my neighborhood is somewhat scarred by its interactions with what are generally assumed to be student renters, even if the renters in question are no longer students!). We will benefit from increased density only in the case that current residents of the neighborhoods that face the first wave of this increase do not suffer the consequences they most anticipate (and fear): problems with excessive noise, trash (which should be understood to include poor upkeep of the property), and parking/traffic. It's clear to me that if these problems were addressed plainly and simply, there would be less successful fear-mongering on the part of those who fear increased density. I've noted a second issue with many of the people who complain about the newer residential structures at Boulder Junction: unbroken facades create a sense of blockage and oppression on the part of the viewer (where tall trees do not). I would suggest that many of the public responses to large buildings would be mitigated if building facades were between 30 and 80% vegetation. This would include ivy-covered walls, but would be best implemented as step-backs by floor with large planters filled with trees and shrubs. This would also vastly increase the value to the residents of living in such a space.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I firmly believe that the two most critical issues that Boulder faces right now are zoning and transportation. On zoning, I see two issues that need remedied. First, the City boundaries are very odd and do not represent the people that wish to make Boulder their home. I live in unincorporated Boulder County in the Palo Park neighborhood with my spouse and dogs. I work downtown Boulder, and my wife works near Valmont. Boulder is our home, yet we cannot vote for Boulder City Council, or Boulder ballot issues. We are counted as in-commuters for under the City's metrics. We, along with the entire Palo neighborhood, do not live here to somehow escape Boulder - we live here because it is Boulder. Meanwhile half of Gunbarrel is part of the City, while the other half has no say. This creates misrepresentation and causes a host of issues, such as with the Muni. It makes no sense to have many such pockets spread throughout Boulder and on the periphery of Boulder when we have clear open space defining our borders. I would like to propose annexation to the City as a way to unify all of us that have made Boulder our home. Secondly, the mix of residential and commercial/industrial zoning is reprehensible. I see zero compatibility with Boulder's stated goals (climate action, sustainability, etc) and the creation of a regional jobs hub that requires 60,000 in-commuters, and is zoned for an additional 60,000 while providing only 5,000 additional homes. This is a simple, moral issue - we need to stop importing our labor and driving up housing prices even higher. The growth needs to be organic, medium density and provide a range of housing opportunities. Lastly, on transportation we have simply failed. We do not have a multi-modal transportation system. We have an automobile-first transportation system, with everyone else scraping by. We spend millions on roads every year (which will never be enough) and we have wasted half of the City on surface parking. Driving and parking costs are not borne by the users of those services - they are spread among everyone, without any economic incentive to drive less present. We can do a lot better. Issues like 300/301, the muni, height exemptions, and transportation and parking are all inextricably linked to zoning. This is the point of the BVCP, and this is why we absolutely need to get this right. This is our chance to get at the root of the problem, and not just treat the symptoms.
♦ Mixed reaction	I have been a resident of Boulder since 1948 and am a former City employee. The city should remain with Xcel Energy. Municipalization would be a costly mistake.
♦ Mixed reaction	I know new buildings are necessary to keep our community vibrant, but I don't like how towering the new Daily Camera building appears as well as much of the new construction along West and East Pearl, which cuts off the open vistas towards the mountains from downtown.
♦ Mixed reaction	I live in Gunbarrel and feel concern that the City is trying to annex land in my neighborhood, and further, rezone it and put in high-density housing. With one street leading in, the increase of up to 600 cars daily, more people, loss of open space, loss of quality of life and community feel, increased environmental degradation, noise pollution, potential for crime, etc., has me deeply concerned. Moreover, I do not feel that the administrators of this plan are sincerely and honestly listening and seeking a middle ground that meets both development needs and the needs of existing community members. That is disappointing, as overall, I deeply appreciate the values and vision of our Boulder community at large.

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I live in Twin Lakes. I think it's irresponsible for the Boulder government to try to slam in so much high density living in the few open parcels left in the subdivision. It will completely change the character of the neighborhood, and the land isn't even suitable for that sort of development (water levels, etc). I have no problem with that land being used, but it would be much better put to use as a park, sports field, or some sort of residential installment that blends in with the surroundings. It should not be high density, low-income housing. It would be better as condos or townhomes that the middle class folks of Boulder can afford?
♦ Mixed reaction	I really think a top priority needs to be affordable living! otherwise, all of the rich yuppies are going to come in and take over and Boulder will lose its unique culture. That is already happening. I know many folks who have been here for a long time and have been pushed out because it is too expensive. And I also know a lot of people who are able to move to Boulder just because they are especially wealthy and can afford it.
♦ Mixed reaction	I strongly believe that there is too much growth!!!! Adding more density is creating many problems. I am very concerned that we are not protecting open spaces. I would much rather see more open space than apartments etc.!
♦ Mixed reaction	I support residential density on transit corridors but want better looking buildings to be built and to contribute better visual value to the public realm. I support multi modes of transit and I want a compact walkable, rideable city.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think Boulder has been managed very well. We have a wonderful community. But I have been concerned that in pursuit of increased density, we might abandon building height codes. I also find the new buildings in the Boulder Junction area to be unattractive. I think we can do better than that.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think Boulder is allowing developments that are too large for the area. They block mountain views (such as former Daily Camera site) and create more traffic. I don't think we should be encouraging large developments without first dealing with how it will impact an area...such as added traffic. Too many developments seem to get the okay for height variations and give little back to the community.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think that when the annexation of an area is in question, the residents of that area should be asked before the process takes place.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think the city staff/council needs to do a better job of listening and responding to comments. People are asked to respond to lots of 'partial plans' without seeing the impact on adjacent areas --this is not good.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think the County is ok. The City is becoming a disaster of horrible housing that attracts people who don't value preservation of key habitats, scenic views, or small-town living.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I think the developments at Boulder Junction--so far--have been tasteful and well proportioned. At the same time, I am not yet happy about the Camera rebuild and the one at 13th and Walnut. Perhaps when they are finished, they will look better. Transportation is another important issue for me which I don't think is being addressed. I take the bus as often as possible, but find many areas of town difficult to access. Could we employ smaller buses on certain routes where the regular buses run nearly empty? Could we have non-polluting buses?
♦ Mixed reaction	I think the people who say 'Boulder isn't what it used to be' need to get over it. Things have changed. People are interested in living in apartment complexes and with roommates in 15 minute neighborhoods where they can walk, bike and bus to where they need to get to. Old things like ordinances prohibiting streetlights that are actually effective need to go away.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think there is too much emphasis on open space at the expense of road paving
♦ Mixed reaction	I think we have entrenched interests who don't want Boulder to change AT ALL and enjoy their high value houses (I might too if I had a house to call my own), but being inflexible on any growth or other housing options is untenable. We have a great area / community that needs some more options, which I hope will not change Boulder too much if we can find solutions. Sometimes it feels like a Catch-22. But I feel that large houses with one family in them are completely irresponsible to the earth and to letting people live in / enjoy Boulder. Ramble over.
♦ Mixed reaction	I very much believe that the city can run a power utility that can help achieve our goals & I'm for many other environmental efficiencies. On the other hand, cutting out parking spaces, lanes of traffic & other deliberate punitive measures toward motorists without reasonable, safe options for our entire population, not just those in tights, is ill-conceived & arrogant. It was incredible how quickly they could fund that "experiment" when so many other repairs & projects have been waiting & waiting. Bicyclists are motorists too - you can tell that by the ubiquitous bikes in/on their SUVs. Repaired roads & accessible parking uses less energy at present. Provide alternatives & we can move in that direction. (Electric city shuttles & parking at the edge of town?)

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I'm concerned that Boulder has become cost-prohibitive for small, independent businesses that bring that unique character to Boulder. I would like to see more support for these businesses. I would like to see Boulder find some innovative ways/incentives to encourage transportation other than cars, etc. The bike lanes and bike paths are wonderful, but the bus transportation, while awesome in terms of cleanliness, etc, is not robust or convenient enough to rely upon. Also, everyone should have access to an Eco-Pass at a reasonable rate. I really want to encourage continued support for improvements on The Hill. It could be a vibrant business district with the right planning and support - I would like to see it as a funkier, more progressive alternative to Pearl Street.
♦ Mixed reaction	I'm in favor of increasing density to support a compact and walkable community. However, housing prices are largely out of step with what people can afford. The solution to the strong demand for housing in Boulder, in my mind, is to not restrict supply of housing, but rather to design places that are intentional and friendly to the working poor, etc.
♦ Mixed reaction	In general I support in-fill density, but projects have been built very close to the street and I do not see an accompanying increase in public transportation services.
♦ Mixed reaction	It seems that a lot of attention is being placed on affordable / low income homes for younger people but many families and seniors who would like to move to a larger/smaller place are shut out. We make too much money for affordable housing but not enough to afford a house in Boulder. Not only that but building low income housing in our neighborhoods lowers our property values and decrease our chance to sell our homes and move
♦ Mixed reaction	It seems to me many agencies that deal with the intricacies of this plan are, dare I say it, in bed together. They are not necessarily listening to the voices in various communities and are putting city problems in our unincorporated areas.
♦ Mixed reaction	It's great to see municipalization efforts continued; let's make streets more bike friendly; let's do a better job of protecting habitat in our open space, especially from off-leash dogs and encroaching high-impact recreational interests.
♦ Mixed reaction	It's rather weird to answer this question prior to the 300/301 vote. I'm not necessarily happy with every aspect of all of the new development, but I understand how it happened and its purpose. If 300/301 pass, I would answer this question with the 'wrong direction'. If they fail, then my answer stands. I still think we need better transportation planning, housing planning (more luxury condos doesn't really help anything), etc, but the infill stuff is good as a theoretical matter.

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Jamming 60 units of affordable housing into a neighborhood (Twin Lakes) that can't possibly support it, along with the fact the the proposed site is hydrologically unstable, is one great example of things definitely heading in the wrong direction.
♦ Mixed reaction	Leaders need to gather more public input and ideas before starting projects
♦ Mixed reaction	living in the county, i feel we are 2nd class and our opinion does not matter. i do not live in boulder by choice - i resent having land around me appropriated for 'affordable housing'... obviously an oxymoron if it is outside the famous green donut of protection
♦ Mixed reaction	Lots of growth, which can be good, but it feels as if the poverty gap keeps getting wider. It also feels as if commuting is rapidly increasing because people that work in Boulder can't afford to live here and have no viable travel options other than driving.
♦ Mixed reaction	Make sure the high density areas and packed low income housing have some open spaces and trees so it is not like a life quality sacrifice zone
♦ Mixed reaction	Many times, it's not clear what direction we're heading. We say we're going to do one thing, then don't. Or we start on something, then stop halfway.
♦ Mixed reaction	Middle class in the city of Boulder is history. The no-growth agenda is ridiculous. Interconnecting Boulder Valley communities with real rapid transit (BRaT) is vital. RTD is a joke- do it yourself. Open space rocks. The county is gorgeous. Boulder County does a great job supporting our farmers. We can do more. Innovation is our driver, support it with intention, not accidentally.
♦ Mixed reaction	Neighborhoods need to be allowed to have more input regarding building affordable housing. Developers should not be allowed to buy their way out of including affordable housing in their projects. Such as the current project in Gunbarrel, for instance.
♦ Mixed reaction	Not a fan of new 4 story buildings
♦ Mixed reaction	Not enough parking!!!! Need more downtown parking!!! I can not take the bus, ride a bike, or walk everywhere.
♦ Mixed reaction	Nothing is being done about housing middle income people. We are being squeezed out. Need to get city or countywide ecopass. The neighborhood system is nonexistent in most places. RTD trains need to be a priority.
♦ Mixed reaction	Open space is fine, so long as people don't have to live on the streets. People should come first. Buying up open space on the edge of nearly 250,000 acres permanently protected open parkland seems kind of self defeating in a city that has little developable land near services and businesses. It's time to be real.
♦ Mixed reaction	Overall heading in the right direction except it's no longer affordable for many people to live in the city limits.

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Overall, Boulder is incredibly well-managed. However, the city micromanages individual owner-occupied property owners who aren't hurting anyone, just making normal use of private property, with burdensome regulation (which can pit neighbor against neighbor and empower local crackpots) while rental properties and CU itself are largely given a pass - many rental properties remain appalling, overoccupied eyesores and nuisances which lower surrounding property values, and CU is not held to account for lacking an effective disciplinary policy on public drunk and disorderly behavior which degrades property values as well.
♦ Mixed reaction	Re: housing and general affordability in Boulder: 1. In the realm of dreams....I'd love to prohibit big new multi-million dollar mansions in and around the city! (Or at least assess a HUGE impact fee annually on super expensive housing). 2. In the real world, our city's problems and challenges are symptoms of the much larger phenomenon of ever-growing income and power concentration in society. Dealing successfully with this bigger trend is like trying to stop the tide coming in. But we're trying, and we're sometimes succeeding. THANK YOU for your efforts!
♦ Mixed reaction	Real estate is going to continue to skyrocket if you are going to limit housing and keep preserving open space. It is not feasible. We are simply going to have sprawl outside of Boulder, in Superior, Louisville, Longmont, Niwot, etc, where housing is more affordable. Open space will only become a small area of preserved land. We might as well expand Boulder proper and allow more (affordable) housing here.
♦ Mixed reaction	Right sizing was a fiasco. Forcing density onto communities is another. The Cash in Lieu program must go away
♦ Mixed reaction	Road projects are always started at the absolute worst time of year: back to school. Plowing leaves a lot to be desired. The new building on Pearl Street, where the Daily Camera was, is a disgraceful eyesore that should not have gotten approval. It is too tall and feels completely out of place. If people want an urban feel, seriously, move to Denver.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Since I haven't been paying attention to what is actually being done, these comments may not be relevant, but a couple quick thoughts: 1) Traffic in Boulder seems to be getting worse. Would love to see more bus options w/ increased frequency and additional routes. With increased development in North Boulder, would be in support of a bus run that goes from way north (Broadway and 36) down to Table Mesa and back. e.g. let's say you want to go from the Holiday Neighborhood to Target. It's about a 10-min drive. It's about a 30-min bus trip if you are lucky with the connection times. There is so much commerce and housing along/near 28th St that it would be nice to make that connection. 2) I support the permanently affordable housing program, but I don't like how it effectively keeps out a middle chunk of income earners. You can be 'Boulder poor' or relatively well off (or rich, of course) to buy a house in Boulder, but there are a lot of people in between who have no options. 3) While I like the affordable housing program, I also know from personal experience that it gets abused. One friend rented from a landlord who had bought a PAH condo and then moved out of town and rented it out at market rates. And a woman I worked with was planning to buy a PAH 2-BR unit quickly before she started grad school and then rent out the 2nd bedroom at market rates. (I don't know if this actually happened, but I've heard others talk about this type of thing and I have no doubt it happens). This makes me mad. We have made the decision to try and support lower-income people being able to live in the community they work in, but I'm pretty sure we weren't wanting to subsidize people trying to scam the system. On the other hand, a man I work with was just able to buy himself a 1BR PAH place in Boulder and I'm thrilled for him. He doesn't make enough to otherwise buy a place here, but he works in Boulder, has family in Boulder, etc. He's a great candidate. He is now taking the bus or riding a bike to work every day instead of driving from Denver, is making improvements to the condo, etc. I think the program is a good idea but needs some additional oversight (e.g. make sure people are living at the places they buy; sell only 1BR places to single people or require that if they are renting it is for people who need rent assistance and would not be able to pay market rates; etc). 4) Love all the importance placed on Open Space!
♦ Mixed reaction	So sad to see the response regarding the Folsom Green Streets - that everyone was fighting to drive their cars. And the cars won. Disappointed in Boulder.
♦ Mixed reaction	Some new buildings are not unique, classy, or esthetically pleasing in my opinion. I understand promoting different modes of transportation other than the car, BUT let's remember and understand that not everyone is in a position to use alternative transportation.
♦ Mixed reaction	Terrible new buildings which destroy the unique feel of boulder: 9th & pearl, daily camera building, etc
♦ Mixed reaction	The amount of rentals on the hill needs to have a limit. If there is an increase in CU students living on the hill there will be a decrease in families.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	The architecture downtown is getting so boring - it all looks the same. And the development along 28th - also looking the same. we need some more architectural creativity as we are becoming a very mundane looking place.
♦ Mixed reaction	The barrack-like housing is a big mistake. The huge old Camera location building replacement is a big mistake. The historical designations and their application were a big mistake.
♦ Mixed reaction	The big buildings downtown blocking views and taking away the Boulder feel is just heart breaking.
♦ Mixed reaction	The bulk of the opposition to new development or increased density in (some) neighborhoods seems focused on three issues: noise, trash (which should be understood to include sub-standard property upkeep), and parking/traffic (I'm floored by my neighbors' apparent need to be able to have fifty cars park on the street at a moment's notice-- I base this on the standard several of them have expressed regarding the 'availability' of street parking whilst complaining about there being too many cars parked on the street!). I believe that if greater enforcement of these concerns were coupled with an increase in things like ADUs, a more reasonable occupancy standard (one adult per conforming bedroom would seem a far more appropriate standard than the current 'family' based one), we could find our way to a better Boulder-- one with a more reasonable employment to population ratio, and where it's reasonable to live on a lower-middle class wage.
♦ Mixed reaction	The camera building should not have happened. Terrible. The code needs to more closely link with the Comp. Plan. We need to rezone - maybe use form based codes. The Housing Strategy has been a disaster. It is weak and disappointing. Just do something already.
♦ Mixed reaction	The City and County will have to work very hard and plan very consciously how to address the issues caused by decreased opportunities for affordable housing. There are numerous people in Boulder County experiencing homelessness, many of whom have children and many of whom are from the County and/or close to. Helping support these individuals in gaining access to shelter, food, appropriate clothing, transportation, jobs and school for their children should be a top priority. But instead, it seems that the solution to 'dealing' with these people is to put them in jail or leave them to fend on their own. Furthermore, the vast majority of the housing being built right now is very high-end, expensive units. I do not believe that we need more of these communities, but more for the true middle class, for students, for the working poor (often Latino or Hispanic), the elderly and for those right now who are experiencing homelessness.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	The city is too focused on alternative mode transportation and helping the homeless while making it nearly impossible to build financially viable housing stock for rent. Home ownership is not a right.
♦ Mixed reaction	The community conversation in Boulder around growth and change has been very rancorous. There is strong advocacy at this point to 'do nothing' or to stop change, which of course doesn't mean things won't change, but instead means that wealth will grow for the ones lucky to buy in at the right time and it will become a more exclusive community. Some are okay with this outcome, but I believe this will make Boulder less dynamic, less interesting, less welcoming, and more homogeneous.
♦ Mixed reaction	The current City Council and staff are in 'group think' mode all the time. It is insulting. The attitude of council and staff is that they think they are entitled to their own goals with disregard for other perspectives.
♦ Mixed reaction	The current system allows contractors to buy out of providing affordable housing when building new developments, town homes, condominiums, etc. This is resulting in inappropriate use of land; high density building in low density/rural settings, high density/affordable housing being located too far from services, etc. The county needs to get back on track with land use and not just build where it can get cheap land. The hidden costs nullify the upfront 'cheap' cost of the land.
♦ Mixed reaction	The emphasis on business expansion is inappropriate for the limits of Boulder's available space because of the housing and transportation issues generated by additional population. More pressure could be applied by the City to the University of Colorado taking up housing issues for students. Innovation and creativity and vitality and ecological health of the city and its individuals can thrive within the blue line and height limits established and should be the focus of the City and County. Updates of existing housing and commercial areas need not entail violations of these limits to be vibrant or exciting. Maintenance and care for what Boulder already is and has should be a greater concern than new business. Investors in the rail line development have too much influence on the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan which is detrimental to these concerns.
♦ Mixed reaction	the emphasis on low income housing is not coherent with the goal of a compact community surround by open space
♦ Mixed reaction	The general vision/values of a diverse community and affordable housing to support such a community are evident. However, the lack of regulatory structure to manage and mitigate impacts that negatively effect the City's ability to successfully create those values needs to be addressed immediately.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	The growth in north Boulder over the last 10 years has been mostly ugly, too big and poorly planned. We are lacking infrastructure to support it like post offices, libraries, and walkable community areas.
♦ Mixed reaction	The housing situation is becoming intolerable. Additional affordable housing isn't going to alleviate the squeeze on median income families, if anything it could make it worse (as non-affordable housing prices will rise through loss of supply). We must increase supply through reasonable increases in density and decrease demand by raising taxes on second homes and unreasonably sized mansions.
♦ Mixed reaction	The increase in real estate costs has made the area difficult to live in for middle class and low-income families. The City of Boulder seems focused on providing affordable housing options to meet previously agreed upon quotas, however they seem to find it acceptable to use undeveloped county land (specifically, two parcels in the Twin Lakes neighborhood of Gunbarrel) instead of finding appropriate spaces within the city itself and they are charging ahead with little regard for the natural features and harmony with the existing community of neighbors. While forcing unacceptable levels of housing density on a community with services unprepared to support such an influx, they are allowing commercial developers in city limits to opt out of affordable housing responsibilities by paying a fee.
♦ Mixed reaction	the middle class cannot afford to live in boulder and they are moving out of town thus we are losing money in our local economy.
♦ Mixed reaction	The overall goals are good but the means sometimes miss the mark.
♦ Mixed reaction	The proliferation of starter castles and prairie mansions, and the destruction of modest homes is a very bad trend.
♦ Mixed reaction	The reaction to infill redevelopment and adding more affordable housing in Boulder is dismaying. If the nay-sayers have their way, we may lose the idea of an inclusive, diverse, economically robust community with more walkable neighborhoods and districts than we have today, and many more transit options to driving.
♦ Mixed reaction	The socioeconomic diversity of the community in past years no longer exists in a community way.
♦ Mixed reaction	The whole unrest everyone has over 300 and 301 underscore a disconnect in the community over how things are being generally handled.
♦ Mixed reaction	there are lots of ordinances and provisions in law, however these seem to be just suggestions and developers can always buy their way out of any of these well thought out requirements.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	There are several good development projects and others that have been failures. I think most of the 'fill-in' projects downtown have been successful. These projects are successful because they are done with an existing context. The holiday redevelopment was also highly successful, because the guiding principles behind it were in line with the BVCP. Other projects like the redevelopment of the 29th St mall are total failures from a quality of life and community character perspective. I fear the transit center development (30th & Pearl) is much more akin to 29th St than Holiday. I really don't understand how the city is approving such appallingly poor development plans - it's as if they want Boulder to be like every other city - which is what developers want, because they understand the economics of these types of plans and how they can maximize profits, but the city should be refusing these ugly, car-centric, anti-community developments on the face of them and require more green space, more bike lanes, more pedestrian access points and protection, more mixed-use development with communal spaces, less surface parking, fewer roads - aim for something that doesn't exist, be inspired and inspiring!
♦ Mixed reaction	There are too many large, unattractive, lifeless buildings going up downtown. It feels like Boulder is losing it's character and starting to feel VERY wealthy.
♦ Mixed reaction	There are tradeoffs- open space + development controls (low supply/high demand) means housing prices are out of control. The city needs to very actively make affordable housing exist so that the school teachers and firefighters in the community don't have to live an hour away.
♦ Mixed reaction	There has been too much emphasis on taking on expensive projects for far flung environmental goals while blocking opportunities to expand quality employment in Boulder. People who are working hard in the private sector to live and stay in this area are ignored or worse persecuted.
♦ Mixed reaction	There is a limit to the amount of growth an area can absorb over a short period and still maintain a sense of neighborhood. Gunbarrel has been inundated with new multi-unit housing complexes that have changed, and will continue to change, the feel of the area. Road congestion is already an issue and will only get worse as the population increases without an increase in infrastructure. Making this area a less pleasant place for those of us who call Gunbarrel home.
♦ Mixed reaction	There is a major need for more housing Go up not out. Raise the building limit to 7 or 8 stories is gross grove , folsun to 33rd our along arapahoe. Baseline

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	There is almost no place to live that is affordable unless you rent/buy with roommates. It is incredibly hard to feel connected when I live in Gunbarrel due to my budget restrictions - I had almost no connection with Boulder unless I drive. However, I like the healthy, environmental focus of the community.
♦ Mixed reaction	There seems to be more apartment development for rentals rather than condos for home ownership. Does affordable housing really work effectively? http://reason.org/news/show/do-affordable-housing-mandates
♦ Mixed reaction	There's such a push to build affordable housing that the community is not taking into consideration the needs of the people already living here.
♦ Mixed reaction	Think it is important to be more welcoming to large companies that might want to relocate here like Google and Twitter. It's becoming too difficult to develop or redevelop real estate here.
♦ Mixed reaction	To often the city has approved variances to the many growth restrictions. The Google campus is a case in point. The Google campus will be a collection of tall buildings in the middle of a busy area that does not contribute to the vitality of the neighborhood, other than paying taxes. Google employees don't tend to leave their building so they won't participate in the area. It will be a large dead spot.
♦ Mixed reaction	Too many BIG building, no set back.
♦ Mixed reaction	Too much development of late in the rural Gunbarrel area. There are plans to build where the owls nest and live. The land is being changed from low density to high. This is very out of character for Boulder, and makes me think that making money takes precedence over keeping outlying Boulder rural areas rural.
♦ Mixed reaction	Too much high density growth with an infrastructure that cannot support nor sustain the massive increases in housing and what is starting to become 'strip-like plazas'.
♦ Mixed reaction	Too much parking is being removed in the downtown area. There are a lot of people that NEED their cars!
♦ Mixed reaction	Too much regulation and cost in building codes. Not enough creativity in zoning. What about tiny homes, ADU's and other medium density solutions? City seems detached from reality. Need to work closer with all Boulder Co cities for transportation solutions.
♦ Mixed reaction	Too much urbanization, too fast.
♦ Mixed reaction	Trying to have less parking at new construction housing areas - you do know that most families have up to 3-4 cars especially with teens living in the home. Some areas do not support the family vehicle experience and create parking headaches for all

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Very concerned about too much emphasis on housing density. It's a good tool when used properly, but it should not be overused or placed at the top of all priorities at the expense of others. We got this year's ballot measure 300 at least partially in response to pushes for liberalization (my opinion over-liberalization) of things like building height, occupancy limits, variances on setbacks and parking, etc.
♦ Mixed reaction	Very surprised to hear about the choice to expand the highway to increase car travel as opposed to including train travel to increase diversity of travel options.
♦ Mixed reaction	Very worried about losing sunshine and mountain views with the frequency of tall new buildings and the attendant traffic jams from too many residents and commuters. We need to resolve the RTD promise of fast-track transportation from Boulder to Denver so more commuters can use mass transit.
♦ Mixed reaction	We could do a lot more to encourage a diversity of housing price ranges and housing types.
♦ Mixed reaction	We don't need to get bigger.
♦ Mixed reaction	We need more affordable housing for those who are single and want to live in this community
♦ Mixed reaction	We need to be more supportive of business owners who provide the economic engine We need to be smarter about road development and maintenance - e.g. East Arapahoe was a waste of money
♦ Mixed reaction	WE NEED TO CELEBRATE AND PRACTICE URBAN DESIGN HERE! WE NEED TO INNOVATE WITH OUR AVAILABLE RESOURCES TO CREATE MORE MIXED USE VIBRANT PLACES THAT REFLECT CULTURE AND RESOURCES IN A WAY THAT IS SHAPED TO OUR EXISTING AND FUTURE INFRASTRUCTURE. WE NEED TO GO BEYOND POLICIES AND WORDS AND USE DESIGN TOOLS TO DEEPEN THE CONVERSATION AND HELP LEADERS TO LEAD, WE CAN DO THIS WITHOUT BEING STRANGLERED BY COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IF WE ARE CLEAR ABOUT WHAT WE WANT TO DO!!! Thank You!!!

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	We need to completely reevaluate certain impactful laws in this City - For example, occupancy limits. Does it make sense that 10 'family members' can live in one house that has an occupancy limit of 3 but 4 close friends cannot? Does that make sense when there are 4 bedrooms in the house? No, it does not. This is a shameful way to discriminate against a different path in life. People are getting married later in life. People are having kids later in life. Where are people supposed to live during this time of transition if they still want a community-type living space and also don't want to spend their entire income on housing? I know this is a 'controversial' idea, but guess what? If the options are between building new apartment buildings or increasing the occupancy limit, I think most people would have less of a hard time accepting an increase in occupancy limits. Or perhaps there could be a pilot where adults can apply to a program through the City to be approved for their home to have temporary relief of the occupancy limit? Let's think outside the box and not be constricted by our own rules.
♦ Mixed reaction	We need to continue to honor height restrictions....we are creating urban canyons with limited views. The density is getting too pronounced.
♦ Mixed reaction	We should not permit ANY MORE height variances for buildings. Period. We are just about as dense as we can be, without creating unhappiness. Perhaps new neighborhood and city center designs can be more efficient and convenient (without a car), thus permitting a little more density. Boulder offers great access to the out-of-doors, and we can do better still... more trails, please, so that we don't have to drive to trailheads (those of us who cycle; also good, secure bike racks/locks at trailheads are great)
♦ Mixed reaction	Which people are you referring to? I am pro-development and economic vitality. I see a lot of it in my neighborhood (Holiday), which I appreciate. I do not appreciate the Boulder establishment that wants to prohibit growth, jobs, and innovation. I do value retail, art, restaurants, etc. that I can walk to; and I also appreciate a diverse population. These are reasons I chose Holiday in particular.
♦ Mixed reaction	While there are exceptions within public and nonprofit outreach programs, more and more Boulder's social, retail, entertainment options feel geared toward the wealthy.
♦ Mixed reaction	Why all of a sudden have the people who own homes here become pariahs? We live and work here too - and we should be able to have a say in our community.
♦ Mixed reaction	would like to see a final report and steps that will be taken to accomplish the community's priorities

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	wrong is continued gentrification as seen in housing prices, retail options, selfish/NIMBY approach to affordable housing right is commitment to environment (although people need to accept the need to consume less) and social services
♦ Mixed reaction	Yes, I approve of creating and maintaining good employment but think we need more middle class housing and more controls on student usurping family housing near the University.
♦ Mixed reaction	Your development and urban planning puts the cart before the horse and your transportation grid can be innovated. The BVCP ought to develop strategies that incentivize developers to move in the direction of cohousing. It is a missed opportunity no to do so. Feel free to contact me, my first project is www.bfcc.me - Peter Spaulding
♦ Other	City Council members voted in this November are pro growth. What happened to paying attention to the citizens opinions on growth? Our now diminished quality of life due to massive development and traffic standstills is not being properly addressed. We are now co-oped by Council and developers ideology of a 'Open' Boulder. I was disgusted at what I saw the city do during recent elections in an effort to defeat 300/301. This was a bought election. I am no longer proud of this city 'leadership'.
♦ Other	don't develop twin lakes keep it open space
♦ Other	I can't access squares unfortunately. However, I do feel city planners have sold out to commercial interests and we are losing our mountain views and what makes Boulder downtown unique. Why are we expanding east and draining our Boulder downtown vitality?
♦ Other	Let's keep Boulder green - no more new developments!
♦ Other	Since the recession (notably) development and their backers have razed long existing buildings, and expended huge amounts of energy building much, much bigger structures. These structures, such as the one at the former Daily Camera site, have radically changed the community, bringing a sense of overwhelming size and a sense that the community has lost control of development. Developers are clearly in the ascendance in political power and that too, brings a powerful sense of loss. Pictures of Will Toor gloating over the defeat of props 300 and 301 evokes a sense that powerful interests will be able to quash citizen interests as they see fit in the future. This all brings a sense of sadness that the community we have loved is selling out to the highest bidder. It is hard to believe that we will be able to preserve our open space and our views when the pressure for growth is pushing so hard toward expansion.

**2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Other	These discussions have become so ridiculous that when developers bend over backwards to meet these absurd criteria, and even the council says they have done an exceptional job, projects don't get approved - ii.e. when a piece of undesirable land is to be turned into a mixed use development with affordable housing and they reject it because the people getting this subsidized housing would find themselves between two busy roads.
♦ Other	You All are not listening--you are enabling the take over of our once vibrant healthy community!!! The Boulder inclusionary housing ordinance in the last 15 years has set us on a course that is truly unsustainable. It is not providing workforce housing or reducing in-commuting. Look at the outrageous market rate costs of units and the sky high unaffordable rents, Developers are raking in big money hand over fist under the ordinance. What in the hell is the City getting out it!! Poor ballot 300 supporters--they are called Nimbys. Look at who the real Nimbys are--Developers get to buy out of building affordable housing. They actually get a 25% off deal to NOT build affordable housing on site. They only pay 75% of the costs to build off-site and taxpayer money pays most of the difference. They are Nimbys because they want all their units to be market rate--less affordable then they can raise rents sky high--there's no rent control--and they don't want any riff-raff hanging round their hot tubs and fire pits to turn off the crowd they are rent gouging and they get this 25% off deal to boot. Look at all the Commerical buildings take of buildable areas. LOOK AT ALL THE BANKS AND INVESTMENT FIRMS THE DOMINATE OUR DOWNTOWN AREA!!
♦	I guess I don't know what you mean by 'the community.' There is currently a fracture between the direction of the city council and the citizens (what I see as 'the community.')
♦	If we create new places with incredible design, I think people are more likely to feel reassured about the future of the city and be more comfortable with density. Citizens probably need better education on WHY decisions are made. For example, if there is a narrow, curvy street with cars parked on either side, explain that this actually slows traffic and makes accidents less likely even though it seems counterintuitive.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.8a: Which of the following statements best represents your preference regarding the future growth of jobs in the Boulder Valley? (OTHER)

- ◆ Boulder should limit the number of additional government employees.
- ◆ Boulder should find a potential that keeps employment levels low within the county
- ◆ Boulder should increase both.
- ◆ Boulder should not be addition jobs if there are no housing in place for them. Just creates more traffic. However, the same goes for a large housing development...fix the traffic issues first.
- ◆ don't try to manipulate, always seems to be unintended consequences
- ◆ Either increase or maintain. I'm concerned with rigid limits, understand the potential impacts of a jobs/housing imbalance, but know there is nuance to this discussion and that over time economic conditions the world over shift and we can't be too fixed in our approach.
- ◆ Give hiring preference to current citizens. Stop age and sex discrimination!
- ◆ Growth is not always good. Think cancer. If Boulder grows at 5% per year it will double every 12-15 years. That means by 2040, Boulder will have about 8 times the population it currently has.
- ◆ how big is Boulder Valley
- ◆ I'm fine either way as long as more parking is available
- ◆ If jobs are increased, training those without skills needs to be a priority
- ◆ It depends on how much housing is being built and in which locations.
- ◆ It depends on whether the city can manage the transportation needs of these workers into the city -- is there parking? Transit? Housing that meets workers' desires?
- ◆ It's a dual edged sword, we need good job opportunities but we then need the infrastructure to support those workers
- ◆ Leave it alone. It is so jacked up now, just stop trying to mess with the economy, culture, transportation, and demographics.
- ◆ maintain or increase if the amount of available and affordable housing increases.
- ◆ more jobs that pay for housing too, less incoming traffic
- ◆ no more additional employees. Boulder is full!
- ◆ No potential for future jobs need be created at all. The city has no business manipulating jobs but has a duty monitor the organic emergence of employment centers within the city to maintain the balance of housing to employment which should be the focus and goal. New business only by attrition of old business will stabilize the community.
- ◆ Reduce - Can't access squares
- ◆ Should reduce the potential unless there is adequate transportation into the city.
- ◆ Unless infrastructure is changed, Boulder can't handle additional job growth. Traffic in Boulder is already impossible during rush hours, adding additional jobs/employees will just make it worse.
- ◆ Until there is a viable plan in place regarding housing, jobs should stay as is.
- ◆ While I'm tending to lean towards reducing the potential, I'd need to know more about what space is currently available. I'd prefer to incent use of the buildings/space we already have; hopefully that is still promoting growth.
- ◆ Won't the answer to this question depend upon supply and demand? I think we need to prioritize jobs that pay a living wage.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.8b: Which of the following statements best represents your preference regarding the future growth of housing in the Boulder Valley? (OTHER)

- ◆ A stabilized business/commercial sector with additional housing for students provided by CU would be reflected in a reduced demand for housing which cannot be predicted or anticipated as a potential for additional housing.
- ◆ affordable housing should be increased and sensitive infill such as ADU's should be allowed
- ◆ AFFORDABLE housing, not just 'more' or 'less'. Too many fucking huge houses for the rich.
- ◆ as above new jobs should help with local housing \$
- ◆ Boulder needs to limit apartment housing growth and increase condos and lower prices houses
- ◆ Boulder should expand into new areas for housing. Infill is creating an urban density NOT part of the Boulder experience here-to-fore. It is ruining Boulder!
- ◆ Boulder should focus on better regional transportation rather than more housing in Boulder proper
- ◆ Boulder should improve transportation infrastructure (roads, mass transit) to support commuting
- ◆ Boulder should increase availability of affordable housing and encourage co-operative housing.
- ◆ boulder should purchase the mobile home parks to preserve superior affordable housing for the workers that keep the whole system humming.
- ◆ Boulder should require that at least half the new housing units are affordable and at high density near transit hubs
- ◆ boulder should slow down until it can find places for it's existing workforce.
- ◆ Boulder should transition back to more home-ownership here. Housing should be distributed among the region's towns, Boulder is not singularly required to house all the workers.
- ◆ Build Housing where it will not interfere or disrupt Open Space, established neighbors or create traffic congestion.
- ◆ Developers are controlling what is being built---THEY ARE NOT BUILDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING!!!
- ◆ Don't care, I'm leaving - hate it here.
- ◆ focus should be on housing for middle class people
- ◆ high density housing belongs with high density housing
- ◆ I prefer to incent upgrades, and re-construction of existing structures to be more advanced/efficient; rather than re-zoning to higher densities.
- ◆ I'm all for increasing housing --- but I want it focused on LMI housing options
- ◆ I'm fine either way as long as more parking is available
- ◆ In-fill. Rezoning of land not currently zoned for housing.
- ◆ Increase affordable housing
- ◆ Increase housing by increasing density and supporting that with effective multi-modal transportation system
- ◆ Increase the potential but not at the expense of open space. Put more housing in Martin Acres. Many many tiny homes can be replaced with larger multi-family options
- ◆ It's not as simple as increase or decrease. it's the KIND of housing that needs to change.
- ◆ New housing should be reduced but any should be targeted to affordable and to senior housing. Any additional Student housing should be created at the University..
- ◆ offer affordable
- ◆ REDUCE
- ◆ Responsible housing that adheres to the values of energy conservation, wildlife preservation, community resources without high density
- ◆ same as above
- ◆ Same as above - unless main roads (Broadway, 28th, 30th, Foothills, are widened to accommodate growth, it should just be maintained not grown.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.8b: Which of the following statements best represents your preference regarding the future growth of housing in the Boulder Valley? (OTHER)

- ◆ Same problem as above. Boulder needs to look at current high density areas and perhaps develop them further rather than pushing density out to the surrounding areas where many of us have settled intentionally to avoid living in a high density area.
- ◆ See answer above.
- ◆ Should increase housing for low-middle income and stop allowing McMansions on open space fringe and other scenic areas.. This kind of opulence is not a sustainable practice in so many ways..
- ◆ should not be adding housing by changing character of neighborhoods to massively infill/increase density or by re-zoning in areas such to vastly increase density/change character of neighborhoods, increase traffic in quiet neighborhoods
- ◆ stop multiunit compact soviet style housing and more single family livable housing
- ◆ these options don't seem to reflect the lack of affordable housing without an increase, which I believe is possible.
- ◆ This question is very poorly worded. I am opposed to within neighborhood infill. I am in favor of adding units on large streets. I am opposed to reducing industrial space in favor of housing,
- ◆ What sort of housing units?

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.9: Which of the following best reflects your views regarding the rate of housing unit growth? (OTHER)

- ◆ 1% per yr. including mixed use and affordable housing. I think this survey could be very misleading to those who are not somewhat informed about the current rate of development of mixed use and affordable housing . Also 'current potential' for growth. The planning department has its own language that obscures its plans to the public.
- ◆ A temporary housing growth rate slightly higher than 1% (say 1.2% for 5 years)
- ◆ Add rental caps for single parent/low income/1 person residents.
- ◆ AFFORDABLE housing, not just 'more' or 'less'. Too many fucking huge houses for the rich.
- ◆ Again, responsible housing would solve the current controversies in this area
- ◆ ALL housing growth should be subject to limits.
- ◆ Allow for densification: alley houses and other housing that meets the needs of a diverse market (young, old, transient/here part of the year, families
- ◆ Allow increased housing as part of densifying already developed areas
- ◆ Allow of slightly more than 1% housing growth.
- ◆ Boulder needs to make housing affordable for all income ranges
- ◆ Boulder needs to reduce the apartment housing growth and maintain the growth in lower priced ownable properties.
- ◆ Boulder should use land for additional housing that does not abut or disrupt County or City OpenSpace; and should add housing to areas such as the 119/157 closed gas station property. Do not add housing where in high water table areas or where new building can cause flooding to existing housing/structures.
- ◆ City should raise the limit above 1%
- ◆ City should slow down growth until it catches up. Needs to open new areas vs obnoxious infill.
- ◆ Do whatever is necessary to make both working & living in Boulder affordable.
- ◆ Encourage more 'affordable' housing, discourage more expensive housing
- ◆ Goal should be zero growth.
- ◆ Housing and employment need to be brought into line. Making Boulder a job center was a mistake.
- ◆ I am generally for market fluctuations but with restrictions that would support livability...in terms of growth ordinance and rent control. This is done in other places.
- ◆ I believe there is a density issue at play here and that the housing being developed favors a select set of the population.
- ◆ I'm fine either way as long as more parking is available
- ◆ if there is any government manipulation of housing, it should be to make more available for middle class people
- ◆ If there were better, more efficient public transportation in to the city, the traffic wouldn't be such a mess. More housing will bring more traffic mess.
- ◆ Kind of an academic point, since city is built out and surrounded by open space.
- ◆ less than .1 percent should be the city's rate of growth
- ◆ Limit housing growth to less than 1% EXCEPT for affordable housing
- ◆ local business should help staff find local housing
- ◆ Maintain/increase strict laws on new buildings but if met allow affordable housing to be built
- ◆ More than 1% but not completely up to the market.
- ◆ need more housing
- ◆ no exemption for mixed use projects
- ◆ only allow affordable housing development
- ◆ permits for improvements, rebuilds, etc should be more available; new construction should be limited as there is a finite amount of space. Part of a good quality of life is not waiting in heavy traffic, having the ability to have time alone in the wilderness, etc.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.9: Which of the following best reflects your views regarding the rate of housing unit growth? (OTHER)

- ◆ Rate doesn't matter. Type, quality, and affordability matter.
- ◆ REDUCE
- ◆ Reduce housing growth and focus on infrastructure/traffic. Once that happens then go back to 1%
- ◆ Rent Control to make housing more affordable
- ◆ Should be reduced to 0.5%/year
- ◆ stabilize jobs/housing balance
- ◆ stay on 1% per year but do so through multi family core infill
- ◆ The city should actively promote growth in housing as a way to increase supply and decrease price. Build up and promote density. The 29th Street mall was a huge missed opportunity to put housing on top of all the building there.
- ◆ The city should allow more housing growth. Particularly apartments.
- ◆ The city should continue to limit growth. Further, the city should stop allowing developers to 'buy out' of providing affordable housing.
- ◆ The City should determine the desired balance of Jobs to Housing before making a determination regarding rate of residential growth. Also, focus should be towards affordable/subsidized housing.
- ◆ The city should encourage middle income affordable dense housing - condos etc. the city should also pressure the university to build more student housing. VRBOs should be limited to owner occupied properties and should be enforced.
- ◆ The city should find a growth rate that supports the fm goals of Boulder County, not too big not too little
- ◆ The city should limit housing growth, but aim for more like 5%. Or allow it to grow unlimited with an opportunity to review in a few years.
- ◆ The city should limit housing permits to an average growth rate of 1% per year, but should not exclude permanently affordable housing and in mixed use projects from this 1% growth rate. Growth is growth, whether it is market housing or other types of housing. All affects the quality of life and strains the infrastructure.
- ◆ The city should limit this rate, but could perhaps increase it to do a better job at meeting demand - especially for affordable housing.
- ◆ The city should maintain its system but end the mixed-use exemption.
- ◆ The city should maintain its system of limiting the rate of housing growth (no more than 1% per year on average) but with no exemptions (meaning permanently affordable housing and mixed use projects are included in the 1%)
- ◆ The city should not limit the growth and should be working to create truly affordable housing to the working poor, the elderly, and income-qualifying students.
- ◆ The city should NOT limited the rate of housing growth and should rezone some commercial land for housing and/or mixed use.
- ◆ The city should reduce the rate of potential housing growth and refuse any exemptions to height limits . It should reinstate set back codes.
- ◆ The city should spread the new housing units throughout the city and not dramatically increase housing units in any one neighborhood.
- ◆ The current Inclusionary housing system is not working and is resulting in higher housing prices and there is NO RENT CONTROL. Rent controls would make housing affordable!!!
- ◆ The growth should be limited to affordable and workforce deed restricted housing to foster more economic diversity
- ◆ Too much density will change our quality of life.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.9: Which of the following best reflects your views regarding the rate of housing unit growth? (OTHER)

- ◆ We must get to an equilibrium point sooner or later. If we continue to grow housing and jobs for the near term, we will just have to deal with increasing pressures later. If we do build 6,300 housing units for 2040, what will we do after that? In short, there is no option other than reaching an equilibrium point, either sooner or later.
- ◆ Why in the world would mixed use be excluded from the count?

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.10: Which of the following best reflects your view about the rate of new commercial growth? (OTHER)

- ◆ 1% a year is adequate. However, I am opposed to office space and banks on the first floor or buildings in high pedestrian areas downtown on the Hill, etc.
- ◆ Again, commercial growth that is required to abide by community values of sustainable building and maintaining the character of neighborhoods. Look at the Ft. Collins model! They've reduced urban sprawl while increasing the economic and cultural vibrancy and rigor of the community.
- ◆ Again, smart growth matters. We need business mixed with housing. No strip malls, no remote business parks. Build places to work within walking distance of places to live.
- ◆ All commercial growth should provide some form public benefits, if it doesn't, it should be limited. Upper stories below market rate rentals, convenience centers, etc.
- ◆ allow different commercial growth. our hotel / meeting space sucks and we don't need another office condo with a coffee shop. we need a theater down town, a meeting space and a second center
- ◆ Allow managed growth
- ◆ attract solid commercial jobs that have housing benefits as noted above
- ◆ Because we have had recessions, we should be aware of the potential for overbuilding. I wouldn't call it limiting growth so much as I would be concerned about empty buildings if the economy goes south.
- ◆ city needs to stop commercial growth
- ◆ Commercial Growth should be inextricably tied to residential growth and remain within the character of the type of City that is identified by the goals of the BVCP
- ◆ Development for regular people. Big new Google expansions are not for regular people.
- ◆ empty store fronts and boarded windows are beautiful
- ◆ Encourage moderate growth of businesses
- ◆ I think mostly the top option, but I do have concerns about so much tech growth.
- ◆ I want to say not managing it, but I want to limit the number of people daily driving to Boulder to work
- ◆ I'm fine either way as long as more parking is available
- ◆ If housing availability can't keep up with jobs, maybe there should be some limit on commercial development.
- ◆ Increase commercial growth by allowing new commercial retail, industrial and hospitality, structures to replace old, 1-story structures with new structure max 3 stories.
- ◆ It is difficult to regulate housing stock but not commercial, creating a larger pressure on in-commuting during growth periods, such as we currently have. However, strict regulations on commercial growth have other negative unintended consequences.
- ◆ Let the market handle this.
- ◆ Like Aspen, the city should encourage/require new commercial entities to hire locally whenever
- ◆ Limit commercial growth and also exert more control over the style of commercial development
- ◆ Limit commercial growth based on environmental restrictions (e.g. require solar panels)
- ◆ limit only through land use
- ◆ Limits to commercial growth are unnecessary and send a bizarre message to potential new businesses. Land use is better tool to manage growth rather than a growth management system.
- ◆ Manage a way for middle class Income full time working residents to affordable live and thrive in BC
- ◆ Quality not rate is what's important. We should be selective about the type of commercial growth we allow. More of some kinds is fine. More of others is not.
- ◆ Rezone to housing and then let the market figure it out
- ◆ See above.
- ◆ Simply make good decisions about growth. Don't change the character of semi-rural areas by approving development -- whether by private developers or by the city/county -- on open fields that add considerably to the joy of living in this area.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.10: Which of the following best reflects your view about the rate of new commercial growth? (OTHER)

- ◆ SLOW growth
- ◆ Some 'commercial' used are less impactful than others, especially with regard to congestion and walkability
- ◆ stabilize jobs/housing balance
- ◆ The city needs a system to monitor growth, and limit/slow as needed
- ◆ The city needs to implement an affordable rent system for local, small businesses .
- ◆ the city should have a role in this process and a plan. market conditions alone will not lead to the best outcomes and will change the character of boulder
- ◆ The city should monitor commercial growth in case of imbalance
- ◆ The city should stop commercial/jobs growth; it IS the city's responsibility because of our community's goals for clean air and water and against global warming.
- ◆ The city should transform some areas slated for commercial development into residential development or make them parks.
- ◆ The city should encourage new businesses and startups. Large commercial growth should not occur in city centers, rather be encouraged in the industrial complexes that seem to have a lot of vacancies. Mixed use of these areas could be explored.
- ◆ The public needs a better understanding of linkage fees and how commercial development can integrate with present and future housing goals. We also need better urban planning and design, as too many commercial developments play out to the same maximized interpretation of code and regulation which misses the 'innovation' goal attributed in the Comp Plan.
- ◆ They operative key phrase 'so long as any new commercial development meets zoning and regulations. These need to be taken more seriously and monitored more carefully.
- ◆ Too much density will limit our quality of life
- ◆ We don't need to explicitly limit job commercial growth, but carefully consider what kind of growth we want. We might consider changing zoning and land-use regulations to favor new housing, but otherwise let market forces work.
- ◆ We have more than enough commercial growth!!!
- ◆ We must reach an equilibrium. We cannot grow indefinitely.
- ◆ Why does the city have plans for potential growth in commercial and employment since it does not manage commercial growth? Limit commercial growth , whatever is driving the recent cheap and ugly development needs to be managed.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? (OTHER)

- ◆ City is 100% on the wrong track. Downtown is ugly, unwelcoming, suited only for the rich with their penthouses and Porsches.
- ◆ Generally support it but be sure these are not spaces with no open areas or aesthetics so they are not like rat cages
- ◆ I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use (with compatible densities to the surrounding area) should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of the City of Boulder (not in unincorporated Boulder County)
- ◆ I don't see a need for mixed use. Boulder already has medium and high density housing within walking distance to several commercial types of businesses.
- ◆ I like 15-minute neighborhoods, NOT mixed use development.
- ◆ I oppose the city's definition of 'appropriate' places.s
- ◆ I strongly support mixed use everywhere!
- ◆ I support mixed use, but want to maintain the height limits.
- ◆ I'm fine either way as long as more parking is available
- ◆ If it meets zoning restrictions then approve and move on.
- ◆ Increase housing but build what all the commuters want. They are not just looking for apartments and or condos. Most want some form of yard and sense of place for their families. We are not providing that right now.
- ◆ Let the market decide and stop trying to micromanage development.
- ◆ Let's have more transportation options: small buses that hold 5 to 9 passengers
- ◆ medium to high density housing should be located near transit centers or near the malls where the jobs actually are
- ◆ Mixed use is a catch phrase that may or may not result in community health and vibrancy
- ◆ Mixed use is appropriate and welcomed in some areas but not as successful in suburban areas.
- ◆ mixed use with average not higher densities
- ◆ OPPOSE - it is a way for the city to get around height limits - bad idea
- ◆ Sufficient roads and parking are necessary to support mixed use
- ◆ The concept of mixed use is fine. The idea that because it is mixed density it must densify the area is shortsighted and harmful to our efforts toward becoming a sustainable city.
- ◆ there are positives and negatives but in most locations mixed us only works if it does not lead to increased height and mass
- ◆ There is no single, simple answer. Appropriate development is closer to the answer. Mix when it makes sense, don't mix for the sake of mixing.
- ◆ When mixed currently appears to be stacked apartments, not enough parking and traffic problems. Many are not aesthetically pleasing or don't fit the neighborhood wear the are jammed.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
- ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
- ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
- ◆ *Other*
- ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*

- ◆ Support 1. If we fill in the green belt, Boulder's housing could grow at a rate greater than 1% 2. Projects like Googles new offices at 30th and Pearl will continue to keep Boulder's economy vibrant
- ◆ Support A return to a urban mixed use form is a key indicator of a progressive community in the 21st-century. I fully support more high density mixed-use.
- ◆ Support Affordable housing needs to be top priority in my opinion.
- ◆ Support All of these responses assume that the Planning regs are adhered to and we do not go crazy with exemptions that then make exemptions the norm.
- ◆ Support Allow more coop living. And inlaw units. Allow residential living buildings to go up 7 or 8 stories
- ◆ Support Although mixed use is fine. Shoving people into tiny apartment by the rail road tracks is silly.
- ◆ Support Boulder already has a ton of restrictions on growth. We definitely don't need more. Please focus on providing affordable housing.
- ◆ Support Boulder's problem is not too many jobs (especially the highly skilled, well-paying jobs we attract) but a lack of options for transportation and housing choices.
- ◆ Support Coming from an East Coast city with public rail transportation, I wholeheartedly feel that Boulder will only solve the issues related to affordable housing (throughout the county) and taking cars off the road - with light rail from Longmont to Denver and streetcars running throughout the city/county. Major public investment would be a boon to Boulder over the next century.
- ◆ Support Community character should never be more important than environmental sustainability, new jobs, or affordable housing. Character = entitlement
- ◆ Support Compact mixed-use infill developments provide a very important housing choice. The sky high demand shows that many, many people are eager to live and work in them. Government needs to balance the needs and desires of the thousands of people who want to live and work in mixed-use with the complaints of (mostly older) residents who want to mandate a suburban land use pattern throughout Boulder. But the needs for housing and employment are fundamental human needs and must rank higher than mere personal aesthetic preference, especially when that preference is expressed by people who do not own the property in question. Let property owners, tenants, and buyers choose their preferred building form, rather than allowing people who live in a completely different area to mandate their preferences everywhere in Boulder.
- ◆ Support Create more areas for mixed use.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Support dense is not bad, we should encourage/require smaller attached homes in well-amenitized developments/neighborhoods, single family detached neighborhoods would be enhanced with some duplex, triplex, fourplex allowed and neighborhood-serving retail, shared office space will be possible
 - ◆ Support Emphasis on maintaining 'free-flowing traffic' is counterproductively creating obstacles to desirable compact development efforts, and efforts to increase rates of walking, bicycling, and transit.
 - ◆ Support High-density development + cars = disaster. Therefore we need strong alternative transportation options city/county wide.
 - ◆ Support I like the mixed use development around Broadway & Yarmouth best, but the recent construction in other areas, especially Boulder Junction, looks ugly and uninspired.
 - ◆ Support I actually STRONGLY support mixed use developments. This creates great community character and gets people out of their cars because the can actually walk to local business and public transportation.
 - ◆ Support I encourage mixed use in appropriate city locations. I do not encourage mixed-use style housing or infrastructure in less urban environments, unless of course the mixed us is 4 homes and a farm (as a hypothetical example of something that is in line with the current community layout).
 - ◆ Support I like living in my area that has mixed use development nearby so that I can walk to restaurants, fitness facilities and coffee shops.
 - ◆ Support I live in a mixed use area and would like to see more and varied incarnations of it throughout Boulder, including alley housing and 'mother-in-law' units. I would also like to see the city support moderately priced retail such as groceries, drugstores, and general stores, strategically-located, to make more neighborhoods walkable.
 - ◆ Support I loved mixed use developments--they are great for all ages.
 - ◆ Support I strongly support mixed use developments, especially within the context of providing basic services within a walking or biking distance. However, I think there are ways this could be done better. As practiced in some of Boulder, parking and cars are often so integrated into mixed use developments that it actually inhibits pleasant pedestrian experiences. Not enough green is put into these developments. Some of them feel as though we are walking through a parking lot. There are better models out there than what is being employed in Boulder currently.
 - ◆ Support I STRONGLY support mixed use. Mixed use is the 'desired community character' for me.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Support I support (relatively) high density mixed-use areas when coupled with sensible transit planning to reduce automobile congestion. I would also support greater 'mixed use' within residential neighborhoods, as in allowing some small businesses to be located in areas that are now only housing.
 - ◆ Support I support growth in the historic Downtown where it belongs!
 - ◆ Support I think that mixed use development, coupled with proximity to transportation hubs, has the potential to provide significant environmental benefits.
 - ◆ Support I think the mixed use is more beneficial than detrimental. Living amongst (or on top of) commercial buildings would not be desirable to most folks, therefore it would provide the needed naturally lower cost housing without as much urban sprawl. Also I think the mixed use idea will help keep certain areas from becoming 'slums' so to speak. Hopefully each side (commercial vs residential) would encourage to other to keep the area attractive and clean. It is also a good way for folks in different economic ranges to interact more personally assuming the commercial part is not filled with just commodities and services intended for the lower income class.
 - ◆ Support I would like to see more farms, and more opportunities for people to participate in growing their own food.
 - ◆ Support If people are really concerned about sprawl, traffic, commuting, affordable housing (which should most definitely be included in mixed-use plans) etc. then mixed-use development is a smart alternative to pursue that allows multiple uses to come in without more land use, taking away open space etc.
 - ◆ Support If we could tear down this town and start all over, I hope we'd start with the idea of mixed-use. Go to any big city (chicago, new york), and their quaint neighborhoods are based on the idea of mixed use. And it works.
 - ◆ Support If you want to argue mixed use limitation, then I also want to argue the merits of save-one wall 'remodels' that redefine neighborhoods with multi-million dollar homes. I'd like to better understand how we accommodate situations where an \$800k is spent on a lot where they tear down the existing neighborhood equivalent home and put in a 5000 sq ft architectural digest 'home' in its place. If you want 'trophy wall' neighborhoods of homes and the density limited to select 'mix use' neighborhoods where it is convenient while policing occupancy limits, then Boulder really starts to suck.
 - ◆ Support It's a moral issue for me that we increase housing and decrease jobs to try and salvage some semblance of sustainability. Mixed-use development and car-free zones are a fantastic path forward.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Support Mixed use development helps reduce dependency on cars. It promotes alternative modes of transportation like walking to services from your residence. Strict single use land use promotes individual use of cars as different uses are generally farther apart. We should move towards more mixed use.
- ◆ Support Mixed use development is critical to the success of our community and establishing diverse, vibrant, navigable neighborhoods. We need to prioritize development, jobs, density, and transportation.
- ◆ Support Mixed use development returns a community to 1000s of years of successful cohabitation of place. Cities in the US and around the world support flourishing mixed use development. Mixed use development has the potential to reduce SOV mode share, and the need to dedicate space to house cars.
- ◆ Support Mixed use development should be done in conjunction with modernizing the transit system - less reliance on thinly scheduled, huge, lumbering, largely empty busses, and more on vans that are dispatched flexibly in response to online (smartphone app) requests
- ◆ Support Mixed use developments in the areas stated makes sense. Setting up mixed use development or mid to high density housing in areas that are NOT along major roads or near commercial hubs and other amenities doesn't make sense and creates a strain.
- ◆ Support Mixed use is smart and is a viable way to keep Boulder's vitality.
- ◆ Support Mixed use seems like a great idea as long as it retains the limitations of growth in particular the HEIGHT restrictions. I've read recently about a development near the Steelyards, where the owners want to increase the height limits and target the luxury, high end Google employees. Limiting views around the city like that would severely decrease the quality of life here.
- ◆ Support Mixed use should be allowed in residential areas. I like my 'hood because I can walk to a small market (not Whole Foods, etc). Make neighborhoods human scale and stop thinking that development can only happen along arterials.
- ◆ Support My answers to the above questions are shaped by the sense that we are currently making changes too fast. Boulder will not become less desirable or less popular, and we should take more time to get it right. The 'right-sizing' of Folsom is a good example of moving too fast, letting vision obscure practicalities and annoying many. I'd like to see more deliberation, and better communication with the public, before large changes are implemented.
- ◆ Support New mixed use needs to have significant architectural improvements. We don't need any more beige buildings with faux brick facades.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Support Please more mixed use. Focus on making businesses in the areas with housing, so rezoning may be important. Living up in the Holiday Neighborhood, I think the greatest failings of this method to-date are twofold: First, you need anchors - larger businesses right in the middle of these developments to bring in the community (brew pubs, theaters, corner groceries). Second, you need to think about larger business space in close proximity. Stop thinking about what will go on one particular block and think about the two adjacent blocks as well. Can you build one block with mixed use (homes over coffee shops, restaurants, single-office workplaces and have a larger business on an adjacent block? In Holiday our perennial problem is that small single-office entrepreneurial businesses both fail regularly and contribute little to the culture. Put in anchors (like an Oskar Blues in the Armory site) so that folks want to visit/spend time.
- ◆ Support Population growth in unavoidable. The question is how to manage it. Making Boulder a de facto gated community through high housing prices is elitist and wrong. It all increases traffic so long as jobs stay in town. I don't think new housing necessarily will increase housing diversity, but it could if done well. Basically, I think the only housing that should be build is low and middle income housing. There is plenty of high end housing already
- ◆ Support read Jane Jacobs
- ◆ Support Require housing to be built on EVERY new development.
- ◆ Support See previous responses for more detail. I think mixed use is generally good but only to a point. For example, I live in Twin Lakes. We already have a grocery store and variety of commercial services within a 5 minute bike ride. We don't need to build more in the subdivision (it's not planned but the point is, commercial centers are not a bad thing and we already have enough to support the area). More importantly, I'm against the plan to slam high density living in the open parcel on twin lakes road. The land is not suitable for that sort of development and it's totally out of character with the surrounding neighborhoods. I'm realistic that it's going to be developed at some point. I just don't think it should be subsidized, high density, low income housing. It should either be something like middle class housing (houses, townhomes or condos) or it should be built out as parks, recreation, etc for the neighborhoods that surround it. If money is the concern for turning it into public space, I'm sure the city could sell it to the local area residents.
- ◆ Support small neighborhood business centers reduce car miles. period. i'm all for the practice.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Support Some areas in Boulder have been hijacked by moneyed investors who have driven the middle class out of south boulder (Table Mesa) -old decrepit houses are being bought at inflated rates and sold after remodeling. Capitalism flourishes there yet the city of Boulder is insisting on rezoning and building very high density affordable housing in Gunbarrel-where is the justice and sense of fair play in this? Mixed use developments are encouraged in areas where the very rich or the investors don't live. The city should locate these developments next to multimillion dollar homes too.
- ◆ Support Some mix allows less commuting. For example, allowing local pubs and restaurants in a neighborhood allows nearby residents to walk to these.
- ◆ Support Stats on in and out commuting that look only at gross numbers ignore types of jobs commuted for in and out. Are more people commuting out for high paying jobs and commuting in for low paying service jobs? Or are the rates equal. There are very few jobs in my field, and my company is moving out of Boulder, driven out by the high commercial rents. To afford to live here I must out commute, because when I look for jobs within Boulder they are all too low paid to cover my costs as a Boulder homeowner. Yet, the rhetoric in this city is very anti-commuter. I'm sorry I can't bike commute to Golden and the public transport options are laughable. Yet, people in Boulder talk like wanting to develop a well paying, rewarding career is a crime. This is extremely distressing. The fees for new companies bringing jobs for so called affordable housing for new employees is not going to help me as I will never be low income enough. The city should be welcoming and encouraging companies bringing high-paying jobs because those are the jobs it takes to afford this city. The city profits in tax revenue from being a desirable high cost real-estate area, and no city policies can turn back that fact. The city restricting new housing so severely at under 1% only adds to the pressures that make Boulder housing so un-affordable. Pressuring developers and businesses to pay for affordable housing increases this distortion, as those costs are passed on to the full market rate housing and overall commercial rents and prices. The 'market rate' units in a development delivering the affordable quota increase in cost by the amount of those units. People with lower incomes can queue to buy the affordable units. People with high incomes can buy the full rate units. The middle is entirely squeezed out. The city should stop trying to micromange the market and encourage more creative solutions, more in-fill, accessory dwellings, and well planned development - even if it pushes past the artificial three story limit. At the same time the city should encourage employers bringing real, well paying jobs - whether office work or firms in the 'industrial' areas - rather than seek to add more retail development and poor paying retail jobs to a city that already has too much retail vacancy.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Support Stop NIMBYs and the old, elitist class in Boulder from holding us back from building the most exciting dense, urban community, surrounded by vast tracks of open space, in the world.
 - ◆ Support The 'character' of the neighborhoods where this is happening were run-down and largely unused. I don't understand why anyone would think that parking lots, used car dealerships, warehouses, and self-storage trailers make for a neighborhood character worth preserving. If I want to look at the Flatirons, I might go to Norlin Quad or Scott Carpenter Park -- or, you know, to Chautauqua. Having the Flatiron views from neighborhood yards is also nice. But a nice backdrop on an otherwise ugly street -- i.e., Broadway, Pearl, and 30th in the areas of this new development -- does little to make Boulder a nicer place to live.
 - ◆ Support The city should focus less on the numbers (# of units, square footage, etc.) and more on the quality and place making aspects of the developments. Auto related impacts are generally what people perceive and complain about so should focus on these.
 - ◆ Support The degree/kind of mixed use growth is important to define. A waste treatment plant is not the same as a coffee shop, is not the same as a manufacturing facility is not the same as a coworking space in terms of the quality of life they afford and the type of jobs that are created around each sector.
 - ◆ Support The idea of suburban, single-family, residentially zoned neighborhoods designed around the use of automobiles will need to change. Boulder needs to proactively study this before it is too late to adapt, and these neighborhoods are no longer viable.
 - ◆ Support The infrastructure in the Boulder Valley is already showing many signs of stress and incapacity to handle the existing residents and workers in the area. Any future growth of housing or commercial development must be accompanied by thoughtful increases in infrastructure capacity, done in a way so that the Boulder Valley does not become an area dominated by major roadways.
 - ◆ Support The most livable cities in the world with great public transit and high bike use are all mixed use, high density cities. Another huge difference is that separate bikes and pedestrians from cars and trucks. Look at Amsterdam and Kyoto, copy those models.
 - ◆ Support The overall discussion of rates/amounts -- how many jobs, what our population should be, how fast we should change -- kind of drives me nuts. If we're building good, lovable neighborhoods and replacing auto-intensive infrastructure and places with pedestrian/transit/bike friendly places, and helping balance out the housing/jobs mix, then by all means do it quickly! If we're making things worse, then we shouldn't do it at all, not just do it slowly. I firmly believe there **is** such a thing as great infill & redevelopment, and it's what we should be doing.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Support The Planning Board and Council seem to think there should be a coffee shop on every block. The idea should be to encourage mixed use to create viable neighborhood hubs. There really isn't the demand to have as much as is currently being pushed.
- ◆ Support There are obviously various types of housing growth; which type is critical to the answer. I support more co-ops, more people per unit, easier ADU's, but no more cars = infill without much more construction or impacts.
- ◆ Support There is a lack of available land in and around Boulder, if we don't support mixed-use developments, where are people going to live?
- ◆ Support We have lots of out-of-date strip malls in the area along 28th St. There is a lot of opportunity to advance community goals in this area. Why would anyone chose to keep this area as is?
- ◆ Support We should focus on mixing land uses in appropriate locations to create neighborhoods where more of your daily needs are within a close distance.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Always keep in mind that water usage and availability will be nature's way to limit sustainable growth.
- ◆ Tradeoffs boulder junction is horrendous. steelyards a much better example. There are appropriate places and appropriate scale. The scale of Boulder Junction is inappropriate for Boulder.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Boulder's track record is mixed. The concept of mixed use at Baseline and 36 was horrible; Boulder Junction not so great. Steelyards works well. There are tradeoffs. Neighborhoods will be degraded without strong, and strongly enforced design rules (how does building an ugly 'block' building right up to sidewalk ever do anything for a neighborhood?) . I think a big problem is all the 'exceptions' made to existing guidelines and standards. When a new development is proposed, saying it meets a core value should not have a higher priority than keeping an existing neighborhood desirable and unique and valued. And, I think Boulder should see if Boulder Junction 'meets expectations' before other mixed use developments are implemented. (Remember the bike lane fiasco?)
- ◆ Tradeoffs Buy-in from residents in affected neighborhoods is critical (whether or not Amendment 300 passes). If the buy-in is not there, the project should not proceed.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Tradeoffs Density advocates eye east Boulder's traditional homes and yards with greed. However, most of the residents, including tenants, choose these neighborhoods to escape levels of density in neighborhoods such as Martin Acres or the Hill. We should respect that choice and the corresponding large personal investment. These neighborhoods should be respected with zero infill inside them. Multi family infill should occur on large streets or more commercial areas. Additionally, it is more important to me that these buildings go in net zero, max solar than that they contribute to what is increasingly a get lucky lottery low income affordable housing program.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Has the city evaluated any of the existing mixed use areas to see, in fact, that the goals are met?
- ◆ Tradeoffs High density mixed use should not be inserted into existing residential neighborhoods such that the character of the neighborhood changes.
- ◆ Tradeoffs how many people really want to live above their business/work offices? For example the google building, will employees really want to never have to leave the building for their home/work?
- ◆ Tradeoffs I believe mixed use has definite advantages for senior housing. Walking for groceries, library services, medical services, recreation services, other neighborhood services, would be of great benefit to seniors in maintaining independence and ceasing driving, or in riding electric-assisted tricycles. Well designed and comfortable, affordable apartments/condos for seniors, placed in walkable areas and served by transit, offer us the best way to increase density without increasing traffic. Also, single family homes thus freed up for the next generation of families will maintain the 'healthy neighborhoods' without sacrificing views and open spaces. I feel mixed use should be carefully planned to minimize traffic and other density problems.
- ◆ Tradeoffs I believe the city/county be very careful in the development of housing as to not negatively impact rural residential areas. I think the mixed use done in most of the places in or near Boulder (with walkability, transport, services) are ok but when you move it out into more rural areas it goes against the values of maintaining the look and feel of the area and the carbon footprint of those placed in those areas without resources needed.
- ◆ Tradeoffs I support the plan for Boulder Junction.
- ◆ Tradeoffs I think Boulder is missing a huge opportunity to have new developments be either net Zero or near net Zero. Also new buildings should be designed and optimized for solar panels.
- ◆ Tradeoffs I think boulder needs to grow at a careful pace - creating more jobs and houses will only worsen traffic

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Tradeoffs I think mixed use is a good solution for many places, especially when transit and daily needs are located nearby. The areas identified above are good examples. Zoning for mixed use and transportation planning should go hand in hand
- ◆ Tradeoffs I think that Boulder needs to rethink how commercial properties gain permits. We are not getting what really supports Boulder. They need to be rewritten. For example, Google met the rules and requirements and was issued a permit. We will live to regret that. I think that city council and planning department should never have allowed what is going up at Pearl and 11th. Not in character with Boulder. There needs to be careful consideration of what we allow in Boulder, given that we want to maintain our quality of life. How can that careful consideration be built into the system?
- ◆ Tradeoffs I would support, in fact require that all redevelopment of current commercial districts be substantially or completely mixed use in nature, though in some very limited circumstances I could see exceptions being granted. On the other hand, current residential zones should rarely be given over to mixed-use development.
- ◆ Tradeoffs In general status qua is acceptable. There are many factors that can affect the 'perceived' growth projections for the city (2040) that you base the premise of these questions on. The perception that we are doomed if we don't drastically alter our course is in my opinion exactly that... a perception. Boulder has existed for many years with a 1% growth rate. I don't believe this is the first time the 'doomsday' scenario card has been played. Build the transportation infrastructure to make commuting to Boulder a possibility.
- ◆ Tradeoffs In my area of town traffic has increased and businesses are more crowded. I also feel the level of service is many businesses has gone down due to being so crowded.
- ◆ Tradeoffs It feels to us and many friends that commercial developers have gained too much power and tilted the city to growth on steroids.
- ◆ Tradeoffs It's important that the whole city not become mixed use. We need a variety of residential and mixed use.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Keep the height limits
- ◆ Tradeoffs Make sure the mixed use development adheres to the 55 foot height restriction. No exceptions!
- ◆ Tradeoffs many of us moved to the suburbs of Boulder for many reasons, including quiet environments and accessibility to Open Space. Please leave high density in town
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use - there must be enough parking and streets must be developed so traffic moves smoothly.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use and high density developments make sense in the City of Boulder but not in rural areas such as Gunbarrel. Affordable Housing should be a requirement of all new development. Developers should not be able to buy their way out of providing affordable housing.
- ◆ Tradeoffs mixed use development in Boulder city proper may make sense. Out in Gunbarrel near rural residential areas it makes NO sense
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use development is appropriate, especially in any location where the amount of land devoted to parking can be reduced by this form of redevelopment.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use developments are only appropriate in commercial or high density areas. They are not appropriate in residential, rural residential or rural areas.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use doesn't have to come with baggage of increased height and mass. The steelyards and west pearl are great examples (before the new monolith where the old DC building and parking lot were). Our talented architects and developers should be challenged to make compact, attractive mixed-use developments.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use doesnt mean destroying natural habitats
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use has its limits. You cannot continually add retail space if the population is not there to support it. Just how many coffee shops can a town of 100K support? Can a town thrive on coffee and restaurants alone?
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use has mixed results. Building height exemptions have negative impacts. The mixed use has been the source of conflict particularly in the North Boulder Broadway area. The Steelyards appears to be done in a more sustainable manner. The disregard of historical buildings and landmarks e.g. the planned scraping of all structures in the Sanitas area shows a lack of concern and respect for Boulder's heritage.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use is good but there should be more community input into the final result or aesthetic of the community.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use is not a panacea, and we shouldn't force it into areas where it isn't needed or where it will damage neighborhood character.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use works in areas where the existing infrastructure can support it
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use works in the city center, not so well in the surrounding rural areas.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use/high density makes sense near campus and downtown. Elsewhere it is unnecessarily changing the character of neighborhoods, with big impacts on traffic and views. We bought in these areas to take advantage of the lower density lifestyle and don't see the benefit of high-density housing in areas with few jobs. Just more people who have no choice other than to get in a car to get to work. More traffic and air pollution.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed-use developments should be planned very judiciously. They are appropriate in certain areas of town, such as down-town boulder and off of major streets such as 29th street. But they are not appropriate in areas such as Gunbarrel - where it is out of characteristic of existing neighborhoods and where the transportation (roads, traffic lights, and mass transit options) and infrastructure (shopping options, schools, police and fire fighters) cannot handle the additional density. By focusing on building multi-use developments, Boulder will have a huge affordability problem in the future. What will happen with all of the young 20-somethings who work in well-paying high-tech jobs, that eventually will get married and have kids? What happens when they no longer want to rent a condo and want to live in a single family home. That type of house is what is in demand, and compared with the increasing population will be come more limited ... and thus even more expensive in the future. Boulder ... don't become the city that only caters to the young and the affluent!
 - ◆ Tradeoffs most of the mixed use areas feel like enclaves and do not seem integrated with the rest of their neighborhoods. Planning needs to do a better job of locating these areas so there is an unnoticeable flow into those areas. They have not done a good job. Now there is talk about broadway and hawthorne, The old BCH, On Jay....more dense mixed use enclaves. There has to be a better way to integrate development....More smaller infill instead of such huge developments, less stringent building codes (pops and scrapes controls). It makes smaller development almost impossible here.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs New developments have been unattractive and diminish Boulder's appeal.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs Our solar access ordinance preserves some of the sunshine on residences. We need to preserve solar access to the streets, especially east-west streets, which lose sunshine for people, plants. Density in mixed uses should be cascaded downward toward single family houses, with openings for sunshine to come through.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs Places like the Twin Lakes, which is zoned rural residential, should remain that way.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs Please discourage increased height plus increased mass. Density should increase only with great sensitivity to/respect for surrounding neighborhood and uses.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs There should be attempts to make more areas in the city 'walkable' to amenities.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs We already have 60,000+ commuters that come to work in Boulder everyday. I don't think creating a whole bunch of jobs is going to help with overcrowding. I feel that we are in a place of where we need o work with what we've got. Or Boulder will just look like the rest of the country if commercialism takes over.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs We live in a mixed use building downtown. While it is a convenient lifestyle for us, I understand why it would not be comfortable for many others.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ♦ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ♦ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ♦ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ♦ *Other*
 - ♦ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ♦ Oppose .8% is a lie! Actual rate of growth for housing has been 1.7% for the last 4 years. Jobs has been 1.9%. Traffic has increased along with the increase of jobs and people driving in.
 - ♦ Oppose Artificial communities are artificial. Too much density in these mixed use areas.
 - ♦ Oppose Continue to give citizens of Boulder the opportunity to voice our opinions. Please listen to our opinions.
 - ♦ Oppose Development is expanding much too quickly. There needs to be a pause and reassessment of what is happening in the city. The roads cannot handle the traffic. Life has become quite stressful here in terms of getting around the City. Too many businesses, hotels, students and lack of adequate roads to accommodate the influx of people.
 - ♦ Oppose Everything the City has been doing recently is causing greater density.....which in and of itself is harmful. We have neither a decent transit system nor good traffic flow to support greater density.
 - ♦ Oppose Government should be 'controlling' or 'limiting' or 'encouraging' business, housing or any other aspect of our community.
 - ♦ Oppose Gunbarrel is a pit due to mixed use building. Now we have lots of sandwich shops and breweries that are terrible. We need another grocery store and some good restaurants. Stop building crap!
 - ♦ Oppose I hope you seriously pay attention to how half the Boulder citizens feel about the present growth. I see this as the tuning point of Boulder. Right now growth is a runaway train and it is sad to witness.
 - ♦ Oppose I live in mixed use development in Gunbarrel and I feel my hearing is constantly at risk with traffic, planes, UPS delivery, etc. Literally, I have to keep my windows closed in this outdoor community and really need to wear hearing protection outdoors. A very bad idea in actual use. I am looking to relocate.
 - ♦ Oppose If the mixed use could be done with a lower density to fit our existing character, it would be more preferable. One of the reasons many people move to Boulder is the small mountain town charm. They don't want to live in a city; staying away from high density and high congestion.
 - ♦ Oppose Last 5 years the rate of growth has been 1.7% for residents. Jobs growth is somewhere around 1.9%. Need to go back to 1% of growth from 2000 population. We tried to limit cars in Downtown, but they ended up building more parking garages. Don't believe the Will Toor fairy tales.
 - ♦ Oppose Mixed use development discourages families from finding the area acceptable - rather, they preselect a urban demographic, young professionals, for instance.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Oppose Mixed use development sound desirable, but end up with too much concrete, too many paved parking areas, and not enough green spaces. They feel cold and sterile, are architecturally boring, and block more and more of our open views.
 - ◆ Oppose Mixed use development, although appealing, just adds to the lack of affordable housing. It seems most of these residential units are affordable only by the wealthy.
 - ◆ Oppose Mixed-use buildings are unsightly and horrible, and the businesses that seem to locate there are not the sorts of things one might find useful. E.g., do we need more coffee shops, foodie restaurants, hipster clothing stores, etc.? No, not really. Who cares if I'm in eco-sustainable walking distance of a store if it doesn't sell basic, day-to-day commodities/ People need little corner markets, post offices, hardware stores, barber shops, etc. Not just Californicated junk...
 - ◆ Oppose My concern is based on traffic issues, for example the proposed 94 unit mixed use development at Iris and Broadway. There is no accommodation for all of the additional traffic it will generate.
 - ◆ Oppose Open spaces need to be maintained, especially where there are animals that clearly use the areas. In particular the Twin Lakes area, where birds, owls, etc are known to live and produce in this open environment. More housing is not ideal, for the above reason and adding more people to the area will increase traffic, etc. I purchased in this community because of its tranquility and open spaces.. Please leave as is. Thank you
 - ◆ Oppose Opposed to any height increase.
 - ◆ Oppose So far the 'mixed use' development I see like Boulder Junction, is so ugly with huge buildings. The idea of mixed development sounded like it could be a good idea. It's not! Boulder isn't meant to be a big, ugly, crowded city.
 - ◆ Oppose the current mixed use developments have not been done well. in addition to being ugly. they lack parking - people still have the cars they just get pushed out onto the street - this happens even before developments are fully lease they are generally rentals and we need to provide for home ownership opportunities so that folks can own today build equity and buy up they are not adding green space and parks - they are generally concrete jungles they remind me of the ugly parts of brooklyn or the new denver mega development behind union station they also are not conducive to family housing
 - ◆ Oppose Those new buildings/apartments around King Soopers are super ugly. More of these to take away the blue sky while walking will never do.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Oppose Yes. The statement, 'Some people think the current system artificially limits housing potential and results in higher housing prices. ' is partially true, but the bigger picture is that the green belt around the city causes limited housing potential, thereby artificially raising housing values. If Boulder wants to continue to grow, it's time to loosen up its belt, as it were. There's nothing about compact, multi-use development that contains 'character' or 'a special sense of place'. Boulder is becoming just another overcrowded city that could be almost anywhere.
- ◆ Other I feel the city is not protecting our most precious resources and is determined to build to increase tax coffers. The ballot asks us whether we should tax short term rentals but does not make clear that would allow the current regs on short term rentals to be moot. This is not being transparent and I do not trust City Council any longer.
- ◆ Other I have no objection to shop owners living in condos over their stores. However, much of our mixed use development is used as an excuse to build very high end housing, such as that along Canyon Blvd. Mixed use must also not be used to justify obesification and it must be introduced only in places where residents feel it will improve their neighborhoods.
- ◆ Other I like the idea of mixed use. But I don't want tall buildings in Boulder which block the sun and the views. I also want mixed use to be done with some sense of design. Some of the buildings in Boulder Junction are unattractive. Was that necessary?
- ◆ Other I think mixed-use developments can work in certain areas of the city. However, there should not be waivers on height restrictions and zoning in order to obtain greater density. Also, this type of development should be restricted to the city limits (and don't annex county land in order to develop mixed use). There should be careful analysis and consideration of surrounding businesses and neighborhoods to make sure this is a good fit for the area. Do not let desire to maximize investment returns trump what is good for the citizens and the city.
- ◆ Other I'm not for anymore mixed use development until the city and county sincerely involve the impacted neighborhoods. For example, the mixed use at 30th and pearl has no commercial outlets in with the apartments(all apartments, no mixed housing-extremely expensive apartments, mostly out of state college students) Residents are expected to cross an extremely congested intersection to get to the most expensive grocery store in Boulder. The development encourages residents to drive to escape the dangers of walking or biking in the area.
- ◆ Other Mixed use developments are just an excuse for ugly density, loss of our views, up to the sidewalk brick & mortar, 55' buildings, and all the things some of us abhor.
- ◆ Other Mixed use does NOT belong in neighborhoods of single family housing.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Other Mixed use restrained to a few areas leaves vast tracts of land as low-density dead-zones - we need to rethink the suburban designs of 1960s era and have something more forward-thinking.
 - ◆ Other Planning and plopping mixed-use development into areas that don't want it and that are not zoned for it is not appropriate and not in-line with preserving the character of neighborhoods. For those citizens that want to live in mixed-use areas, great, they can move to those areas. Forcing it on existing neighborhoods, which is becoming more common, is not appropriate.
 - ◆ Other The city should require more housing from CU and slow down it's infill in surrounding communities.
 - ◆ Other The lovey view of the Flatirons inspire us all but some of the mixed use areas are getting way too packed and the quality of life is going down, and even dogs have nowhere to pee as an indicator of over-sealed (asphalt etc.)surface area extent.
 - ◆ Other The reality is people will commute by car. Roads and parking must be sufficient to support the reality.
 - ◆ Other There are a lot of people that NEED their cars, so stop reducing parking!
 - ◆ Other This is a constraining question. Mixed use in concept is positive. Implementation at Boulder Junction is atrocious!
 - ◆ Other This town is increasingly built for the rich and those earning six figures, leaving most of us without affordable housing and with decreasing prospects for decent jobs that pay a living wage. The council is bought and paid for, clearly, so none of this is going to change. Been here for 25 years and am FED THE FUCK UP.
 - ◆ We have enough retail on bottom high priced condos on top in downtown area. How about north 28rh for affordable housing?

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.12: Which locations should the city emphasize for planning for redevelopment and future mixed use concentrated activity? (OTHER)

- ◆ All of them could be amazing nodes of higher density with a network of transit linking them
- ◆ all!
- ◆ Along most of 28th Street
- ◆ Any locations may or may not fit with the plan values. Language around mixed use needs more specifics to ensure the sustainability and vibrancy of a community
- ◆ area 2 and south boulder road east of manhattan
- ◆ Areas near CU for more student housing
- ◆ BCH campus on Broadway
- ◆ be careful!!!
- ◆ Boulder Community Health Broadway Campus
- ◆ Broadway to 9th, between North and Alpine
- ◆ Commercial areas with vacant buildings
- ◆ Did I say The Hill? Yeah, I did. Do that first.
- ◆ Do not include Gunbarrel; RedFox hills, Twin Lakes and residential areas in 'Area 2'. Downtown Boulder, east of Broadway
- ◆ East of Foothills between Pearl Parkway and Valmont Road
- ◆ East Valmont Rd
- ◆ Entire Broadway & Arapahoe corridors.
- ◆ Flagstaff; Shanahan
- ◆ Gunbarrel only if transit is also improved
- ◆ Gunbarrel town center only if rail is created from Gunbarrel to Boulder Junction
- ◆ Gunbarrel Town Center was sold to the community as a town center. It is no such thing. It is high density apartments behind the unattractive back of King Soopers. There is no town square or feeling of community in the development. There isn't any view of the surrounding area. Once again the county didn't deliver what was sold. Just apartments. There is not own home, townhouse, condo. No privately owned housing in GB Town Center. There's not even a defined center.
- ◆ I think that as broad a base as possible should be considered for mixed use.
- ◆ I think Valmont East of Foothills in an area that could withstand both commercial and mixed use development as long as bus service is increased and bicycle and pedestrian paths are built and maintained.
- ◆ If any, East Arapahoe could go from commercial spaces to single-family housing like town homes that are 25' tall in 15 minute neighborhoods. We've got enough growth in recent years to last us a long while. Now, let's maintain and take care of what we have and work as a region to address problems.
- ◆ If Gunbarrel Town Center is used as an example, then why no affordable housing there? Why a push to annex beautiful land around the twin lakes in a far less desirable area? Was that success?
- ◆ Louisville, Lafayette, Erie
- ◆ Maybe an area or two where the residents are for it, the redevelopment makes sense, and provides significant value.
- ◆ Mixed use infill in neighborhoods, like Denver is doing would be great!
- ◆ Much of central Boulder is now unacceptably congested. Without destroying neighborhoods I'm not sure where.
- ◆ No more building in Gunbarrel. It's becoming too crowded as it is.
- ◆ None of the above
- ◆ Old BCH site
- ◆ Places that are already high density
- ◆ Planning reserve

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.12: Which locations should the city emphasize for planning for redevelopment and future mixed use concentrated activity? (OTHER)

- ◆ Quince Avenue- Wonderland Lake area
- ◆ Residents near affected areas should be polled. I don't want to presume I know what they would want. I know I like my area of single family residences, and would be opposed to redevelopment to more concentrated activity and mixed use.
- ◆ Stay out of Table Mesa!!!!!!!!!!
- ◆ Stop already you are degrading the quality of life, increasing pollution congestion and crime
- ◆ Table Mesa PnR
- ◆ The city should not be meddling in this and should stop vetoing the plans of people willing to invest in this community.
- ◆ the table mesa area where all the rich people live
- ◆ the two major areas on the west side that don't have bubbles
- ◆ There has been very poor planning in Gunbarrel town center---NOT ONE AFFORDABLE UNIT!!!!
- ◆ Too much development already. Just stop.
- ◆ Variations on 'mixed use' could be used in any of these places, but focus first on doing it well in a few selected spots.
- ◆ What are we afraid of?
- ◆ Where ever city planners decide, they know more than I do when it comes to decisions like this
- ◆ Wherever there is room.
- ◆ Whenever done, should be done SENSITIVELY!
- ◆ Why do we have to redevelop everything!!? Boulder has already become too concentrated. It would be nice if the Hill were a bit nicer, but it seems like it will be turned into another overcrowded dense area with huge buildings. Be nice to make it quaint, since Pearl Street is being ruined.
- ◆ Yarrow and Broadway

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.13 First Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ 1limit height
- ◆ actually needed, as requested by community
- ◆ Affordable housing
- ◆ Allow housing infill in suburban (single-family house) neighborhoods
- ◆ Courtyards are listed above, but they need emphasis. There are few places in Boulder that are insulated from cars.
- ◆ Create great places
- ◆ Design. Fit into instead of stick out.
- ◆ Develop through replacing of worn existing stock rather than growing..
- ◆ Development should not change density
- ◆ diversity of businesses and services supported in the mixed-use redevelopment
- ◆ do not know how to drag them
- ◆ Encourage CU to create more rental units for students on their properties
- ◆ f
- ◆ feedback from surrounding community
- ◆ fits in with local residential look and feel
- ◆ Good architecture
- ◆ greater setbacks on all sides particularly from the street
- ◆ high quality design too!!!!!!
- ◆ House the homeless
- ◆ I also support affordable housing.
- ◆ In my book, the best way to 'improve the quality of life of residents' is to 'do no harm'. In other words, don't develop open fields/open space that make the area what it is -- particularly the semi-rural area outside the city limits
- ◆ Increase height and density
- ◆ Infrastructure needs to include fire protection, water, schools and other city services
- ◆ Keep Boulder's height limits in whole city
- ◆ leave wild spaces full of dependent animals alone
- ◆ Let the market decide
- ◆ Limit height and /or protect views
- ◆ limit height and protect views
- ◆ Limit height and protect views
- ◆ limit height, protect views (sorry; couldn't drag)
- ◆ Limit new development, a lot!
- ◆ limit noise pollution
- ◆ Listen to surrounding neighborhoods
- ◆ Look good!!
- ◆ Maintain quality of neighborhood
- ◆ Make life better, not the city bigger.
- ◆ Market Rate housing that are more affordable by nature due to a smaller size and higher density
- ◆ Meet (not exceed) energy standards.
- ◆ Meet market demands as they exist without regulatory strings.
- ◆ Minimize drastic density changes to existing neighborhoods

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.13 First Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:

- ♦ minimum square footage required for affordable housing units - ie, middle class and working residents should not be required to live in shoeboxes if that is all that is 'affordable'
- ♦ mobile homes
- ♦ More green space - mini parks!
- ♦ more greenspace and parks
- ♦ More roads and less bikes
- ♦ No more housing development in Gunbarrel: Inadaquate bus services; only one gas station; only one grocery store; roads are all to small, two lanes; NO DON'T remove street parking for bike paths/multiuse trails
- ♦ Pay their own way
- ♦ Permanently affordable housing/underlying land
- ♦ prevent the over urbanization of boulder
- ♦ Promote density and get rid of the height restriction in certain areas. This is critical to increasing supply, decreasing housing costs and reducing our carbon footprint.
- ♦ Protect open spaces and wildlife nearby
- ♦ Provide a successful mix of housing, retail, employment and recreation
- ♦ provide a wellness center with a warm therapy pool for rehab and seniors
- ♦ provide accessible, useable green space
- ♦ Provide adequate parking
- ♦ Provide affordable housing for apartments, condos, residences that are not price controlled
- ♦ Provide affordable housing, not necessarily permanent
- ♦ Provide high paying jobs
- ♦ Provide housing for middle income
- ♦ provide jobs
- ♦ Provide permanently affordable housing
- ♦ Public housing should be built near services for clients--not 5 miles away in rural residential neighborhoods were there are NO SERVICES!!!
- ♦ quality of design and how it interfaces with adjacent sites
- ♦ really pay their own way
- ♦ Reduce number of people driving into the city from other places.
- ♦ Revamping dead areas
- ♦ Safe drinking water.
- ♦ seamlessly integrate with the existing neighborhood
- ♦ Senior living
- ♦ Should not increase density. We are dense enough.
- ♦ stewardship of the commons
- ♦ Subject architectural plans for public review to avoid ugly designs out of character like have been recently built.
- ♦ sufficient parking
- ♦ Support for schools, hospitals, infrastructure.
- ♦ Support for the arts
- ♦ The development should contain single family homes
- ♦ There should be a signifigant setback with landscaping and greenspace. Aesthetic is very important.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13 First Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ They shouldn't suck as hard as all the new stuff going in does at present. I mean, have you looked at these ugly, boxy, view-blighting buildings? UGH...
- ◆ voice of existing communities should be priority
- ◆ We shouldn't reduce parking!

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13 Second Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ 2good materials
- ◆ affordable housing
- ◆ affordable housing, carbon footprint , etc would be desirable but the history of how this works out here does not really work Huge Public housing complexes are not desirable for anyone, let alone vulnerable populations, Affordable housing lower case might imply regular housing that is affordable, there is usually a downside to subsidized housing, according to those who have lived there. Also, the planning is sometimes for only 15 yrs.- that is not permanent. If Boulder had a better track record in these matters I would say this was a priority, I don't have a solution. Get more input from those who have used public and subsidized housing.
- ◆ Allow more unrelated people to live together in new developments
- ◆ Build with exceptionally high quality and design
- ◆ Development should account for open space and areas
- ◆ Don't make it so modern with steel. Keep it quaint
- ◆ don't build on a swamp
- ◆ electric bikes or scooters
- ◆ Ensure that proper services exist nearby for the amount of density
- ◆ f
- ◆ For edge-of-city development, include county voices
- ◆ Get rid of height limits
- ◆ Good roads.
- ◆ Greater emphasis on design, less on minimum open space and parking requirements
- ◆ Human Scale.
- ◆ If mixed use, the living units need to be affordable for middle class - no more luxury apartments in Boulder for the rich!!!!!!
- ◆ Increase housing diversity
- ◆ leave the existing traffic lanes on all major streets and provide other alternatives for bikes
- ◆ Less density, so everyone isn't on top of each other
- ◆ Living Building Challenge
- ◆ make ownership opportunities for middle class
- ◆ Market and build town community living
- ◆ minimize auto use, etc.
- ◆ Minimize car use
- ◆ more grass, trees, plantings
- ◆ more parking
- ◆ Not just plazas and courtyards but small gardens with trees for health and happiness
- ◆ Offer low income qualified families and seniors reduced fees for public services
- ◆ open space and open areas are critical
- ◆ Pay for necessary related new infrastructure. . .
- ◆ Provide accessible and useable public spaces - plazas, courtyards, seating ,art, etc
- ◆ provide for adequate and free parking.
- ◆ provide housing that is attractive to families
- ◆ see above
- ◆ Smaller units
- ◆ Solve the over occupancy issues in existing family neighborhoods.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.13 Second Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ Support for emergency/disaster mitigation and services.
- ◆ Take into account lifestyle of current residents
- ◆ There are too many neighborhoods that have no walkable amenities.
- ◆ undefined space

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13 Third Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ built for humans, not cars
- ◆ Community housing
- ◆ conservation
- ◆ Create buildings with architectural character like The Academy
- ◆ Do something with Area III - it is an eye sore
- ◆ Don't cram it in to every empty space
- ◆ Expand or develop new transit systems to improve connectivity
- ◆ f
- ◆ Find solutions to meet growth needs that honor existing neighborhoods/environment/quality of life
- ◆ Free EcoPass
- ◆ Good fire protection.
- ◆ Increase density of development
- ◆ keep housing density much lower than at 30th street junction.
- ◆ larger units attractive to families not young hipsters and retirees
- ◆ Limit slumlord cash cow rentals in existing family neighborhoods.
- ◆ Market forces should drive new development, with height limits.
- ◆ middle class housing
- ◆ middle income housing
- ◆ Minimize automobile use
- ◆ More density
- ◆ More supply for high demand drives cost of housing down.
- ◆ pay for necessary infrastructure, etc.
- ◆ Provide permanently affordable housing
- ◆ Provide only quality housing, affordable or not.
- ◆ Provide permanently affordable housing
- ◆ provide services in areas that are lacking in these services
- ◆ see above
- ◆ Unique economic opportunity
- ◆ view and wildlife corridors are critical
- ◆ Weigh carefully whether this business will negatively impact Boulder's quality of life (like Google!!!) Don't allow any more of this to be built in Boulder.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of "community benefit" not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ 'Community benefit' means affordable housing and related issues, not building some new monstrous piece of ugly profiteering crap. Seriously: new development in Boulder is UGLY, TOO LARGE, TOO HIGH, BUILT TO SERVE THE WRONG PEOPLE, and doesn't serve regular folks. Rich developers running amok ruining the town I love.
- ◆ A range of identities. Each pocket of Boulder currently has an identity of some sort, or purpose... these should be varied and unique across town, even multi-cultural.
- ◆ A wellness center with a warm water wellness pool.
- ◆ Aesthetics - new construction normally stays with us for many years, and residents and visitors alike gain impressions about a community based on visuals. While it might cost a bit more to make something look decent, we ought to consider it within reasonable cost constraints.
- ◆ Affordable commercial, affordable live/work spaces
- ◆ All of these seem important, though. Tough to choose just 3.
- ◆ allowing people who work in the city to live in the city.
- ◆ An aesthetically pleasing environment
- ◆ Blend new any building to maintain the integrity of the area. Don't destroy rural feel of rural areas by building more.
- ◆ Boulder County needs a leading edge vision not on density but on transportation. RTD screwed us. Time to cut our losses. Job development in Boulder should pay for a bold monorail system up the diagonal to service Longmont in order to partner with Longmont to provide a 21st century commute. Such a system would expand affordable housing options for jobs in Boulder, housing in Longmont within the golden half hour commute that provides a high quality of life.
- ◆ Build parks or convert unused fields to open space!! We need trees and birds.
- ◆ Building only in appropriate places
- ◆ Can't believe you included Gunbarrel 'Town Center' into this mix. This has been nothing but a fiasco. If you lived in Gunbarrel, you'd be embarrassed to have included this development as any type of benefit to the residents.
- ◆ Clustered development to leave room for park-like natural space, trees, etc., as respite from the high - density urban surroundings. Medium density should be n the table.
- ◆ Community anchors - restaurants where people love to come and gather. In south Boulder, Southern Sun is a great example. In these new developments, you need to have places where people can come in out of the rain, eat, drink, and feel like they are in their own neighborhood with friends. These are larger establishments than small coffee shops.
- ◆ community benefit should be determined in accordance with the wishes of the people who will be most directly affected by new development - through proximity, increased traffic, etc
- ◆ Community benefit: leave us space without development!!
- ◆ create great places
- ◆ Density, urban character and sustainable development patterns that recognize the communities dramatic need to evolve.
- ◆ Developers should pay 100 percent of the costs of additional infrastructure, such as bike paths and schools, that are required by their projects.
- ◆ Discontinue the current pace of housing growth in the Gunbarrel / Twin Lakes area. There are no parks here, no libraries, only one market and parking there is already a hassle. Enough, already.
- ◆ Do not add to the density.
- ◆ efficient transportation infrastructure
- ◆ Establish a sustainable funding source and with the private sector implement a city wide public art program so people see, feel, hear and sense public art throughout the city - day and night and throughout the year.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of “community benefit” not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ Find ways to create attractive designs that do not require the most expensive materials.
- ◆ Generate revenue to purchase more open space.
- ◆ green building and affordable housing
- ◆ Having flexible zoning laws is critical for providing mixed use. If you want a more bikeable and walkable environment then you have to build it. I think the height limit in zones 4,6,8,9 (along the perimeter) maybe 75' height limit.
- ◆ Housing opportunities to allow 'aging in place.'
- ◆ Housing where people work! All Transportation Plans are doomed unless there is housing near where people work. (The Gunbarrel developments now are excellent).
- ◆ I don't like the notion of 'permanently affordable' because I feel it is too limiting. I don't want a community of affluent and poor, and no middle class because they make too much for the affordable housing program but can't afford market rate. There needs to be an expansion of the deed-restricted program to accommodate middle income folks.
- ◆ I don't see any community benefit to this. You are essentially creating more pollution with more people. Your current views are completely distorted and wrong
- ◆ I haven't seen anything built in Boulder Junction with a 'Community Benefit'. Lots of cement and soon to be lots of traffic. Ex. the new GooglePlex is going to be a closed off office building. 50% or more will be driving in and out everyday. More Gridlock.
- ◆ I think Gunbarrel needs a library branch, or at minimum, a library drop-off box. That would cut down on traffic.
- ◆ I think it's a dumb idea to try to minimize car traffic. It's not going to happen. Instead, why can't we find a way to allow for more efficient car traffic while still increasing the number of trails, and improving ability for bikes. You aren't going to eliminate automobile traffic because you enhance bike lanes.
- ◆ I think that we might have to give up the height restrictions in some places, especially non-residential areas (i.e. remove from BVCP)
- ◆ I think the above list about covers it.
- ◆ I think the community really needs a conversation about what 'community benefit' means. This conversation has been lost in the absence of community planning and neighborhood involvement. The 1960 to 1980's 'strip mall' development in each of the city sectors (many listed above) were not high quality in original construction - but are now transforming into community centers with good local business, restaurants and walkable shopping. Adding some amount of mixed use/housing to these centers - with good design - will make them more vibrant and provides the opportunity to create community spaces where people congregate and interact.
- ◆ I think you've covered it.
- ◆ I wanted to add that in my second choice above it should also include additional school enrollment, road maintenance, city infrastructure, police, and any other city service or infrastructure that would need to be increased. Also in my third choice - could help pay for new libraries and rec centers etc. Maintain historical architectural design - build buildings that blend into the present architecture of the surrounding area as best as possible. For example in the historic areas of town don't put up some modern block building. Don't put up multi-story block buildings with flat roofs in single family neighborhoods with pitched roofs. Another requirement would be that the project approved is beneficial to the city/county and the average citizens approve of the design and project and this trumps the financial gain of the developers. In other words, make decision on what is best for the citizens and not just those that stand to gain financially.
- ◆ I work in the healthcare industry and the lack of mental health parity is astonishing. More investment in mental health resources and cutting-edge addictions programs.
- ◆ Improve roads, public transportation before adding to the congestion

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of “community benefit” not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ In Gunbarrel, the developments put in doggie parks - these 'parks' are solid rock, and fit 2-3 dogs and are smaller than a bedroom. Thus, everyone walks their dogs in the neighboring HOA owned parks. Guess who pays for the additional erection of doggie bags, receptacles, grass repair and garbage collection - yes, the HOA.
- ◆ In our rush to redevelop we must not forget that many of the current derided 'strip mall' and industrial spaces are the main commercial spaces in this town for small-medium, local and non-chain businesses. We shouldn't push these businesses out by 'redeveloping' these spaces with more 29th street malls that only national chain businesses can afford.
- ◆ Include areas for municipal services. Growth will require (and should include) space for new schools and libraries - real library branches not kiosks like NoBo Library.
- ◆ It is a community benefit to have lots more housing units that are not permanently affordable. Permanently affordable housing is effectively ghettoizing the people that own those properties, because their property can't appreciate at normal market rates. Thus they are cut off from the wealth accumulation.
- ◆ It is likely couched in the statement around 'affordable housing' but a diversity of residents. That includes economic and age diversity, not just color and gender.
- ◆ It would be great to have some architectural diversity. Recent construction along Canyon looks too similar. They all look like One Boulder Plaza. It would be great to see some modern buildings that weren't brick.
- ◆ Keep our neighborhoods uniqueness. Ensure that car/truck/bus flow does supports livability. Having to cross a multi lane road with a center bus lane would be a deterrant to walking to dining. How far can (will) a pedestrian walk and carry bags of groceries? Can I get there with my two year old granddaughter? (I would never put her in a bike carrier or bike seat). As an aside, I will never use a flashy midstreet crosswalk with children, either. They are terrible, low visibility hazards.
- ◆ Keep out of existing low density communities.
- ◆ Keeping Boulder green.
- ◆ Let the market determine 'community benefit'
- ◆ Let us only build beautiful buildings. If building space is limited here, then each building must be beautiful and add value to our community.
- ◆ Let's not perpetuate the status quo of the automobile as the primary means of transportation. 29th st mall is relatively new and is virtually indistinguishable from any other strip mall in the region. There is a quarter mile of pavement just to get to REI on the other side of the street.
- ◆ Limit the use of metal in new building designs.
- ◆ Look at each development and see if community benefit is for the future generations, versus a 'windfall' to the first buyer/occupant.
- ◆ Made to be resilient for predicted impacts of climate change (i.e. more variable and intense storms/weather).
- ◆ Maintain and enhance existing neighborhoods
- ◆ Mixed use
- ◆ more housing for middle class
- ◆ More middle income housing.
- ◆ Move forward where there is wide consensus. Harmony over politics and profit as usual.
- ◆ Multi-family buildings are inherently energy efficient, due to shared walls losing no heat to the outdoors. Multi-family is also inherently walkable, because more destinations are with walking distance for more people. Having diverse housing choices will allow a more diverse population (and conversely limiting housing choices to a suburban single family monoculture will make Boulder's population even less diverse than the current severe lack of ethnic and economic diversity).

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of “community benefit” not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ My reading of the objections to the developments recently finished at Boulder Junction is that they're perceived as 'too big'. I think much of this objection would be diminished if the facades of the buildings there were less bulky. If a standard were established that at least 50% of a building's finished facade must appear as vegetation to the street-level observer, there would be far fewer objections. After all, you don't here (many) complaints that our views are blocked by trees, yet in most neighborhoods that are not new, that is the case. This would have the significant benefit of improving the experience of living in such dwellings, too.
- ◆ Need more parking!! You talk about growth, more housing, more business, but you keep reducing parking and it's ridiculous! It is not an option for everyone to take the bus, walk, or bike everywhere. Cars are a part of life.
- ◆ New development must increase or at least not decrease the amount of open, public parklands. New development must not decrease the amount of land available for plants, water absorption, nature, children, old people, people on lunch break, walkers, bikers. These 'benefits' might seem absurd but they are in the same ilk as 'limit height and/or protect views,' because the only way that new development can do that is the replace a taller building with a shorter one or remove a building completely. Otherwise, the plan seems to be saying that merely limiting the damage that a new development does constitutes a 'benefit.' Public space provided by new development needs to be natural space, not hardscaping. It is not a benefit to continually transform natural ground to concrete pads. Until we have a truly individualized, universal, time saving form of alternative transportation, new development must not make it harder to use the transportation we have now: cars, buses.
- ◆ New development should have to include affordable housing and not be allowed to buy their way out of it. This allowance forces affordable housing to go where it should not be, like in rural residential neighborhoods!
- ◆ New development should not change the nature of surrounding neighborhoods nor impose impacts that will change the personality of the neighborhood.
- ◆ No high density. Windows should not be looking into neighbors windows directly. Rooms should have windows on two sides.
- ◆ Not a benefit, but I can't believe you call out Gunbarrel Town Center as a 'benefit'. It's nothing but a nightmare for the residents. You've clogged our streets, overwhelmed our ONE store, crime in the area has increased.
- ◆ Not every project has to have community benefits. As far as affordable housing, if you can't afford to live here, you can't live here. As far as building, if it meets the IBC, then I don't care what materials you use, if you have solar panels or if your house is 'net zero.' That is a personal choice based on how much money one wants to spend, not the decision of a meddling government.
- ◆ On my comment on the height limit, I think that 55 feet is OK on key transit corridors or in more eastern parts of the city, but not west of Folsom. Views should be protected for everyone.
- ◆ One of the worst building proposals has been Baseline Zero. That is a disaster and should never be approved in the future.
- ◆ Open spaces for animals and birds. We've taken so much from them already.
- ◆ Parking cash-out, mixed use, unbundling the price of parking, reducing size of building setbacks
- ◆ Parks and community gardens!
- ◆ pay for infrastructure like libraries, rec centers, fire stations pay for parking spaces for added people, since they will not all use bikes pay for upgrades, widening, better traffic light control throughout the whole city
- ◆ Pay for necessary infrastructure such as schools and roads.
- ◆ Please limit the height of new buildings.
- ◆ Preservation of historic resources.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of “community benefit” not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ Preserve rural residential neighborhoods, maintain and increase open space
- ◆ Preserve wildlife habitat. Plan for impacts of climate change.
- ◆ Programmed public facilities, libraries, activity centers, etc
- ◆ Provide a community wellness center with a warm-water therapy pool.
- ◆ Provide housing and/or transportation choices
- ◆ Provide middle-income housing
- ◆ Provide more housing for people who currently work in Boulder but do not live in Boulder.
- ◆ Provide more modest market rate housing options -- small houses on small lots, or row-homes, efficiency apartments, equity cooperatives, etc. Especially that are attractive to families.
- ◆ Provide to only permanently affordable for low income but for middle income individuals and families
- ◆ provide unique economic opportunity
- ◆ Providing a service or use that had a demonstrated high demand within the neighborhood (quiet crossing or a railroad, daycare services, etc)
- ◆ Providing housing for middle income. Provide housing that are attractive for families Provide services that are lacking in that area
- ◆ Quality of life: promoting quiet (including traffic noise and mechanical noise from home gadgets like leaf blowers), promoting civic pride (flowers, gardens, native landscaping).
- ◆ Some people NEED their cars, so don't reduce parking!!
- ◆ strengthen connection to University and city
- ◆ Sufficient parking easily accessible (ie more than one in/out) so as not to cause customers/residents to park along streets or other folks property or too crowded and becoming a hazard for bikes and pedestrians
- ◆ Supporting local charities and nonprofits
- ◆ Taking walks in the nature of your neighborhood. Wildlife have rights, not just us. They put up with us enough as it is. Give them some peace. We have pushed them into a corner already. They have nowhere else to go.
- ◆ That the aesthetic look and feel is integrated with the surrounding area. Don't put high density in rural residential. Stop allowing large developments (Gunbarrel apts near King Soopers) to pay the city in lieu of offering affordable units. That is outrageous given the number of units near transportation and shopping.
- ◆ The benefit to the climate of allowing and promoting density which acknowledges that our open space system has created a huge carbon footprint by causing bedroom communities to be created around Boulder with 60,000 commuting in and out a day. We need to take responsibility for this as a community that cares about the environment.
- ◆ The intangibles that make a community feel like home. I'm not sure that the city/county can or should address these issues but putting lots of high density units in a suburban area certainly does not accomplish this. It often feels as if the city wants to push the development it doesn't what out to the county.
- ◆ the people who live in Gunbarrel have had NO community benefit from Gunbarrel Green - what we have is more crime and traffic congestion so I think a community benefit should be LEAVE the community as is i.e. if it is more rural, suburban area, leave it that way
- ◆ There are no community benefits to overpopulated areas.
- ◆ There should be something between very low income 'affordable' housing and the regular housing market. Many of us make just a bit too much to get into affordable housing, but are pinching pennies to live in regular housing.
- ◆ Think about the aging as well as disabilities groups. They need easy car and VIA access.
- ◆ To maintain current open areas in existing neighborhoods - even if these open spaces are not 'official Open Space' on the edge of the city.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of “community benefit” not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ Unique neighborhood nodes and activity centers that could frame new urban changes to infrastructure and to strengthen suburban living. Go east first!
- ◆ We need to consider the impact a high-density development will have on adjacent open space and the wildlife that lives there.
- ◆ We really need that Light Rail to cut down on cars coming into the city each day
- ◆ We should prioritize building dense, urban environments -- surrounded by beautiful open spaces. This will ensure the maximum number of people can live in and enjoy all that Boulder has to offer.
- ◆ what are we doing to protect single family homes?
- ◆ Your phrasing of benefit D -- 'Limit height and/or protect views' -- seems poorly chosen. While I believe that part of the original thinking behind the 55-foot height limitation was to protect views of the Flatirons, it has in fact had the opposite effect. In downtown Boulder, for example, because buildings cannot be tall, they are built wide, effectively blocking almost all views of the mountain backdrop. Thinking about the preservation of sight lines rather than just limiting height would have left us with a much friendlier and attractive down town area.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? (OTHER)

- ◆ 8-10 floors
- ◆ Again - what are we afraid of?
- ◆ Building heights should be balanced with the views they may obstruct and the environmental footprint they may be able to reduce (or not).
- ◆ Building taller than 55 feet might be ok in the eastern industrial zones, where they can be built with sensitivity to landscaping and view corridors, and where the building design and spacing is brilliantly done! Varied heights better than all same height.
- ◆ Building up to hundred of feet should be allowed in certain areas.
- ◆ Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder
- ◆ Buildings above 50 feet should be prohibited
- ◆ Buildings should be at least 55 feet and should be even taller in many mixed-use and commercial nodes all around the city.
- ◆ Buildings taller than 40 ft, should be EXTREMELY rare if ever allowed--no matter how exemplary.
- ◆ Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if they have a logical reason to function at 55 feet. Example: you want to be the tallest so your brand is visible, not really a function. You need your building to be 55 feet because the equipment in it that makes your product is 45 feet, ok that's functional.
- ◆ I'm fine either way as long as more parking is available
- ◆ New buildings above 40 feet should be prohibited by the city of Boulder.
- ◆ No building should be taller than the maximum height of a tree capable of thriving in our climate.
- ◆ put all higher buildings in the middle of town and on University only
- ◆ see below
- ◆ Stop meddling with the real estate market.
- ◆ Unrestricted height buildings have their place in some parts of Boulder
- ◆ Would go with option 3-4 but do not agree about putting this in downtown

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

-
- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-

- 1 Allowing an increase in density can benefit the city because people may have an opportunity to NOT have to use autos to get around and neighborhoods would have an ability to thrive with increased population which does not require 'in commuting.' The questions are not complete, because it's not asked if heights taller than 55 feet might be APPROPRIATE THROUGHOUT parts of the city.
- 1 Boulder's height limit makes some sense in the area between the historic core and the mountains. The height limit in East Boulder should be relaxed a lot. The idea that the new hospital is limited to 55 feet while there are no neighbors whose views could be blocked is ridiculous. Given the limit is in the charter, I think that demographic change will be required before the height limit is relaxed, but I think more efficient building forms are inevitable eventually.
- 1 Building height restrictions are not trivial both in terms of overall negative economic impacts & sprawl.
- 1 CU has taller buildings which generally don't bother anyone. We need to seize the opportunity to create more density in infill locations near transit. In addition, by adding more tall buildings in select locations, we can provide opportunities for design diversity. It is difficult to design and construct visually interesting and diverse buildings within the max of 55 feet. This generally results in squatty buildings and we also get the 'canyon' effect like K Street in Washington, DC. While Boulder does not need or want to become a high rise city, this could add some visual diversity and more complexity in mixed use.
- 1 East of 28th
- 1 Focus less on absolute numbers and more on incentivizing attractive and functional architecture.
- 1 Higher buildings might make sense in the denser, more urban parts of Boulder. The farther out, the less sense it makes and the more impact it would make to views.
- 1 In the area between 30th and Foothills Parkway between Arapahoe and Pearl taller buildings would be fine. The few examples of taller buildings we have around town offer a different idea of 'view corridors' where there is more open space at ground level and views between buildings. A monolithic 55 foot series of buildings totally blocks views for pedestrians.
- 1 See my answer to the previous question...
- 1 Sight lines should be considered rather than the absolute height of buildings

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 1 The 55' regulation should be modified in terms of how it is measured to reflect the actual perceived impact on the street in terms of view, shade etc. Going above 55' should be considered in select areas for exceptional community benefit such as 50% affordable housing. There was significant citizen support for going above 55' in the Transit Village Area which was not supported by Planning staff which was a huge missed opportunity.
 - 1 The city of Boulder is an island in terms of development. Going up makes efficient use of space which opens more real estate for middle and low-income residents. Views can be preserved by diminishing building width as it goes higher and placing tall buildings in key spots.
 - 1 The height limit is outdated and increases costs. It should be removed for non-single family zoned areas, especially all the corridors where retail or commercial uses currently predominate, so that mixed-use commercial, residential and retail development can be pursued in these areas.
 - 1 We can accommodate more people and businesses in strategic locations that respect view sheds.
 - 1 We need to change the measurement system. Measuring from the low point 25 feet away from a building is totally absurd.
 - 1 We should tailor height limitations to the views they preserve. In a commercial or industrial area in East Boulder, it might be reasonable to have allow somewhat higher buildings. On University Hill, or near the Pearl Street Mall, it might be reasonable to keep limits to 35 or 40 feet.
 - 2 As we saw during discussion of form-based code, it's all about the design of the building which makes the height tolerable. That, and making sure important views aren't obstructed for the general public, as with the new Daily Camera site building. I think a lot of people are up in arms about that because it removes a quintessential view from a public area.
 - 2 Over 55 feet, buildings lose human scale. Taller buildings also tend to require too much car parking. Boulder's height limits are far too restrictive for creating compact, walkable development
 - 2 Site Review for tall buildings should be thorough and open.
 - 2 Stop with the profit-driven zoning exceptions and changes.
 - 2 Taller buildings should be set back from the street with green spaces in between them and the road. This gives a feeling of light and openness.
 - 3 Actually I'm not sure I think the 55' height limit is crucial, but there needs to be very very careful consideration of the value of any project seeking exceptions -- the looks, who it will serve, whose views it might be blocking, how much traffic it will generate, etc.
 - 3 Am curious what is meant by 'a few selected areas of Boulder' -- which areas, exactly?
 - 3 I support buildings at 55 feet for residential uses east of Folsom
 - 3 I think that it's our only solution to not filling up our open space with houses. Let's grow up!

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-

- 3 I think there may a few reasons to allow more height (rarely occasionally 55'+) for specific reasons, e.g., CU would offer more housing to students, on campus. In general, 55' works in many commercial areas, but only one building that tall, other buildings should cascade down to a lower height. Need a vote for anything higher than 55'.
- 3 I think too many buildings are getting exemptions to build to 55 feet without enough community benefit.
- 3 The 4th choice in this list is a bit vague. Is it perhaps missing some words? '....if the quality an design of the buildings and public (?) is exemplary..... Public what?
- 3 The 55 ft limit should be as sacrosanct s the Blue Line.
- 3 There should be very strict standards if buildings are to go above 35 feet and measures should be in place to make sure shaded ares from buildings is ice free in the winter.
- 3 This exemption to 55 feet has been way over-used.
- 4 Also, only if they do not completely obstruct people's view who live nearby.
- 4 Buildings over 35 feet should be required to provide community benefit - like affordable housing or small live work space or retail spaces for local businesses that serve minority communities
- 4 Height up to 55 feet if they do not obstruct view of the mountains.
- 4 I don't even understand why this rule is being debated. Set the rule, no exceptions and move on. Debating it just leaves you open to criticism from all sides.
- 4 I have seen comments from people saying they don't understand why people care about mountain/foothills views. Please help them understand. This is Colorado, and many people who live here naturally want to maintain the views they've enjoyed for most or all of their lives.
- 4 I think height restriction in existing neighborhoods should be even less/lower if a neighbor can prove damage by the building 'up'. For example, an existing house has been across the street from me forever. The owners have passed away and I'm concerned a new family will buy it, scrape it, and rebuild, blocking my 'peak' view. I have no power to prevent this which is incredibly disappointing and unfair.
- 4 I think limiting building height is very important to building a livable city. Large buildings must be evaluated based on their immediate environmental impact as well. For instance if there is a long row of 55' buildings that will significantly degrade winter light conditions for neighbors and users of outdoor space. Development should continue to include top-story setbacks to prevent 'canyoning' and the city should considet the shape of the the enitre block of buildings, aiming for a 'mountain-tops' shape rather than a straight line skyline where everything is the same height.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 4 Need good architecture, not just good quality! We also need to do Six Sigma in taking cost out of our city processes so costs can go down.
 - 4 NOTHING in Boulder Junction has been built with 'exemplary' design. All is MAXed out to maximize developer profits. Stop approving these Supersized projects. Only a small portion of any building should be above the 35/38 ft height limit. Height Exemptions should be the EXCEPTION not the norm. Maybe 1 in 10 should get it for only part of their building site.
 - 4 Our current spate of 55 ft buildings are of mediocre design. The first built seems to set the (low) bar for the adjacent properties. The new large building blocks are not creating vibrant places. Earlier the 'developer' wall along the South side of Canyon diminished the Canyon and Walnut areas. I think, too often, the staff is convinced by glossy development PR rather than looking at a bigger picture. Boulder has a potential to be too bland in the future. Boom town blandness.
 - 4 Our views are precious to us. Don't block mountain views with buildings. Don't block sunshine from the ground or the neighbors. Developers will figure it out.
 - 4 Tall buildings are generally an eyesore, especially in a city this size. Boulder is not a metropolis such as Denver, nor should we aspire to be. Growth is only positive to a certain degree and we are approaching our limit, where the charm of this eclectic and progressive city will be altered.
 - 4 The two major issues with the exceptions that have been given recently both have to do with maintaining Boulder's unique characteristics. They are: (1) Many of the new tall building exemptions block the classic view of the Flatirons and the mountains that give Boulder much of its charm, and (2) The design of many of these buildings looks like 1950s Soviet architecture, a fad that will look very dated in 20 years. The design needs to have stone and brick facades that keep with the unique, traditional architectural style of Boulder and the University that forms its core.
 - 4 These height allowances should be determined by the planning board during site plan reviews. If negative impacts on adjacent properties are noted, then they design should not be approved. Varying heights are not necessarily bad until they impinge on the views of other property owners.
 - 4 Views are important. It is NOT appropriate to allow a height variance just because it makes the project affordable for the developer. Find another way to make it affordable.
 - 4 We have too many 55' buildings being added currently. It has become expected. Boulder has NO REASON to ever build higher than 55'. Other cities like SantaFe and SantaBarbara are built low and they don't even have our Flatiron views which we should value above all else. Why can we not uphold a strong building-restraint value system here? This question shouldn't even be on the comp plan questionnaire as it shows that someone is chomping at the bit to build higher.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 4 We should focus on improving people's relationship to these buildings, and the first way to do that is by changing their facades, and the second way is to not get so tall the building can be seen from far away. Next, we should insist that all new buildings are built with solar panels on their roofs, and that their facades be largely obscured by vegetation.
 - 5 Again, Boulder let go of areas of green belt space in order grow responsibly.
 - 5 Boulder is a desirable place to live because it hasn't had the landscape change that denver and surrounding areas have seen.
 - 5 Boulder is sacrificing all it's lovelyness.
 - 5 Building set back provisions should be adopted to prevent the Boulder Building Canyons that have been pervasive in recent developments.
 - 5 Do we really want to look like Peoria? the current city planners seem to think so.
 - 5 Having a strict height limit tends to create box-like buildings that are all exactly the maximum allowable height. I would like to see some flexibility in the height limit. For instance, if there was an average height limit of 45 feet, then a building could be built with a cupula at the cost of lowering the rest of the roof by a few inches. Or perhaps the height limit could be written as a function of distance from the sidewalk. So a building right next to the sidewalk would have, say, a 30 for limit, but if they put in a10 for green buffer they could build to 40 feet.
 - 5 Height limits must be measured to the top of any mechanical units such as HVAC or elevator housing. Mechanicals such as these must be incorporated into the structure, not merely sitting on the roof or, for that matter, on the lawn. Height exceptions should be rare and voted on by the population as a whole, as we vote from time to time on exceptions to the Blue line restriction. It doesn't matter what the 'level of quality' is if the view is destroyed or if the structure casts a pall of cold darkness in mid-winter. Level of quality should not constitute grounds for an exemption. I favor lowering the 55 foot maximum to the point where at least one less floor can be built than can be built under the current limit. Being consistent with the 'surrounding development context' is problematic where buildings already exist that are inconsistent with current development requirements. My case in point is the hugely oversized slant-faced building near 11th and Pearl. The existence of that monstrosity should, in no way, be available as justification to build additional oversized structures.
 - 5 Housing could be expanded by allowing homes to rent out a room in the house.
 - 5 I don't trust city council to determine the selected areas that would permit 55 feet.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 5 I miss Boulder. They turned it into a megames for megamesed up people. Now they are bringing their megameses our way. Lordy.
 - 5 I think the height limit is good for the city to protect views and the small town feel (versus big city feel) of Boulder. I think if you allow building taller than 55 feet in certain areas that the exemption could be abused and then who decides where that will be. I can see certain instances where it may be helpful to go higher but I am fearful that this will be abused and we will end up with a lot of tall buildings blocking views.
 - 5 It is becoming harder to find an unobstructed view of the mountains and sky from within the city.
 - 5 It's a conundrum - density and growth - but 55' buildings block sunlight and the iconic views that make Boulder Boulder. NO to any more height exemptions.
 - 5 Maintain the qualities that have made Boulder a great place to live.
 - 5 Mountain views are for all the people.
 - 5 Our streets aren't wide enough for tall buildings except in a few spots along 28th
 - 5 Recent approvals for higher buildings benefit the developer but not Boulder citizens, or just a few citizens. The track record suggests it would be better to NOT allow higher buildings since it is too easy for decision makers to be swayed. My experience suggests that better quality will apply to the parts that are NOT affordable housing and that cheaper quality will be used there. It is too hard to enforce better quality. Inhabitants will still have cars and when there is not enough parking, cars will spill into nearby neighborhoods.
 - 5 STOP with the 'height modifications'. We had height restrictions respected and in place for years in Boulder, that recently is waived constantly. Why continue to let developers degrade our quality of life?
 - 5 The mountains are our most beautiful asset. We should be able to see them from all angles
 - 5 The new, tall building on the old Daily Camera site ruins the spectacular view of the Flatirons that was formerly available. Why was this allowed?
 - 5 this needs to be well managed and fit into the urban part of the city, not in quiet neighborhoods.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 5 This whole affordability thing is like trying to bail out a battleship with a bucket. We should be focused on providing bold transportation (not buses) options so surrounding communities can offer alternatively priced housing options. Look at Boulder Junction: 2 bedroom apartment for \$2500/month! What a joke! We allowed that ugly piece of crap to be built for that 'affordability'? Tall buildings will fundamentally change Boulder's look and feel. I'm 100% opposed. I'm sure some will get built but the variances shouldn't be for reasons like the Armory project (11' ceilings, architecturally 'interesting' roof - make it flat with solar!)
- 5 Two many tall building have already negatively impcted the wonderfulness of views from all over.
- 5 We are losing the beautiful view we moved here for day by day with the tall development being allowed to build
- 5 We currently have more than enough tall buildings in Boulder.
- 5 We live here because of the unique landscape and access, otherwise why deal with the prices and politics? Preserve the views.
- 5 We live here for the views and proximity to the mountains. Please stop ruining that. I might as well move to Topeka at that rate.
- 5 Well it's apparent that you are all taking bribes based on the ugliness of all new building that's occurred inGunbarrel and Boulder
- 5 With a moat of open space around the city, eventually the only place to go will be up. To keep the unique feel of the city, that must be headed off now.
- 5 You can't even see the Faltirons from most of downtown anymore. Is that a Boulder anyone wants? Ridiculous that it's even gotten this far, and testament to how thoroughly bought and paid for the council and board are.
- 5 You've already ruined the views. Heck, put 55 footers on the Pearl St. Mall.
- 6 Buildings up to 55 feet should be allowed in Downtown Boulder only - as this is the only place within very convenient public transportation services (downtown boulder station). Other than that isolated location, only buildings 35 feet and below should be allowed in the City of Boulder
- 6 Downtown has received a lot of development, and while some of that is appropriate, it's unclear what development there will serve the public at the expense of further reducing mountain views. The views are an important part of the downtown experience and this is being diminished with development. I think higher building heights should be reserved for areas toward the east that do not block views.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)	
1	<i>Buildings <u>taller than</u> 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.</i>
2	<i>Buildings <u>up to</u> 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.</i>
3	<i>Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.</i>
4	<i>Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.</i>
5	<i>Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.</i>
6	<i>Other</i>
7	<i>Don't know/no opinion</i>

6	The 'canyonization' downtown and near 29th Street have wrecked these already areas. It should not be allowed elsewhere.
6	We need to revisit the 55 foot height restriction as it is a major cause of housing prices rising and a big carbon foot print. I definitely don't want really tall building on Pearl but anywhere east of 28th I could care less. There should be huge towers out there.
7	People who have views should not be forced to lose them.
7	Whatever the city thinks is best... depends on the angle, the location and benefits altogether.
1,2	If we can't go out, we should go up. All of the best cities in the world allow buildings over 55 ft and so should Boulder. I think 5 stories is completely reasonable in a lot of locations (i.e. 28th st, 30 th, Arapahoe, Broadway, Folsom, Canyon). Our communities slavish dedication to preserving views we experience in our cars is incredibly short sighted. I don't need to see the 3rd Flatiron from my car.
1,2	Increase height limits above 55 feet in eastern town areas. For example, east of Foothills between Baseline and Valmont.
1,2	Seriously, you need to edit the content down. It's taken me 2 days to complete this survey.
1,2	Taller buildings should be allowed in east boulder
1,2	The 55 foot height limit was intended to protect vistas of Boulder from afar. They are being misinterpreted by some as protecting be used from within the city. This is not true, and there is nothing wrong with a 55 foot building.
1,2	We are going to grow ... either up, out or even more expensive. I prefer the latter most, IF it facilitates other goals like affordable housing and minimizing car use
1,2	We need to focus on what we want as a community and not let height drive the conversation. We have already created the issue with the city surrounding by open space and need to focus on the development inside the city - focus on people and quality of life - that's what it is about not the issue of development.
1,2,3,4	55 feet is an artificial limit and should be reconsidered. By limiting the entire city to 55 feet, we are going to get a city full of big square buildings, built right up to the height limit, because of the high value of the ground. By allowing buildings to be taller, but requiring other set backs at certain heights, we can preserve views and create more architectural interest.
1,2,3,4	Buildings size should be primarily assessed by the context of the surrounding buildings and then should also be required to provide some sort of benefit (not an exhaustive list of benefits) and should be required to have exemplary design and materials.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)	
1	<i>Buildings <u>taller than</u> 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.</i>
2	<i>Buildings <u>up to</u> 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.</i>
3	<i>Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.</i>
4	<i>Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.</i>
5	<i>Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.</i>
6	<i>Other</i>
7	<i>Don't know/no opinion</i>

1,2,6	We should be building a lot of density and very tall (100ft+) buildings east of 28th street. These buildings should be in dense, mixed-use clusters. Downtown buildings should be guided by a downtown neighborhood plan.
1,3	While tall/dense building can be more efficient than many smaller ones, they can also lead to a canyon effect if too close to the street.
1,6	Allowing for taller, iconic buildings in specific areas would make for a beautiful skyline and increased variety of roof forms. The current regulation equates to flat roofed buildings in 99% of cases due to costs. Making exception for unoccupied roof forms would provide an opportunity for needed variety.
1,6	Buildings should be at least 55 feet and should be even taller in many mixed-use and commercial nodes all around the city.
1,6	Current policy spikes Boulder housing prices by severely limiting supply of housing, so existing homeowners are vastly rewarded while young, poor, renters, etc. are punished. The City Charter limiting height is economically disastrous for Boulder, and prevents many people from being able to live or stay here, which is a shame.
2,4	Building height is not a magical cure-all for Flatirons views. We need to discuss things like setbacks and other site issues that affect views. Architecturally pleasing is top priority.
3,4	A community benefit is not enough to favor a height-limit exception if it destroys another irreplaceable benefit - sunlight on a major pedestrian corridor, views from an area of unique history, civic pride, tourist destination (thinking mainly about Pearl Street here)
3,4	Building height should not compete with the foothills and views are important. Design has been sorely lacking. Worst case is the large, out-of-place building on the old Camera site.
3,4	It is a false statement that land values are necessarily high. Land values are a function of what is left over after consideration of what the market will bear and what is entitled, i.e. valuation is residual.
3,4	Views of the flatirons are getting squeezed out. We need to protect this valuable asset.
3,4,5	I prefer lower buildings, so if no buildings above 35-40 feet were built, I would be very happy. However, I have seen some taller buildings (like the new CU buildings on the East Campus, which don't block the view and which look nice), so I MIGHT be open to a few taller buildings done the right way and only in limited areas.
3,4,6	Unless you are implementing something of a Haussmann plan for some new neighborhood/mixed use zones - I would vary the heights and design and assure we do not create canyons and lots of edge 'walls' to infill and new development

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-

- 3,5 this question really makes me nervous because of the slippery slope syndrome. it might be better to keep the height at 35-40 feet. otherwise, the monied will get exemption after exemption from the complain city counsel who value some sort of feather in the cap. i suspect that members take pride in high finance projects more than the general population.
- 5,6 Looks like you're trying to wall up downtown - Such a shame!
Limit density! Too much growth changes our quality of life.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ 5775 Jay Rd.
- ◆ 9th and Portland, not sure of the neighborhood name
- ◆ Alpine Dewey
- ◆ Baseline subdivision
- ◆ Boulder Country Club
- ◆ Boulder Country Club
- ◆ Boulder Heights
- ◆ Boulder Meadows
- ◆ Boulders
- ◆ Brandon Creek
- ◆ Brookfield
- ◆ central boulder
- ◆ Central Boulder (we call our area as Old North Boulder
- ◆ Chatauqua
- ◆ Chatauqua neighborhood north of Baseline.
- ◆ Chatauqua/University Hill
- ◆ Cherryvale / Hoover Hills
- ◆ Country Club Estates
- ◆ Country Club Park
- ◆ Crossroads/Central
- ◆ Dakota Ridge
- ◆ Dakota Ridge
- ◆ Dakota Ridge
- ◆ devils thumb
- ◆ Do not have a name; near Southern Hills and Fairview - Viele Lake Park
- ◆ Dover neighborhood
- ◆ Downtown
- ◆ Downtown
- ◆ Downtown (13th and Canyon)
- ◆ East arapahoe
- ◆ East Aurora
- ◆ East Aurora
- ◆ Edge of Newlands and Mapleton Hill
- ◆ Edgewood
- ◆ Edgewood
- ◆ Eisenhower Elementary
- ◆ Eisenhower school neighborhood
- ◆ Flatirons
- ◆ Flatirons
- ◆ Forest glen
- ◆ Fountain Greens
- ◆ Frasier Meadows
- ◆ Frasier Meadows
- ◆ Frasier Meadows
- ◆ Geneva Park
- ◆ Good heavens! I wouldn't want to divide Boulder up in that way. The opponents of Props 300 and

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ Goose Creek Neighborhoods
- ◆ Goss Grove
- ◆ Goss Grove
- ◆ Goss-Grove
- ◆ Goss-Grove
- ◆ Goss-Grove
- ◆ Goss-Grove
- ◆ Goss/Grove
- ◆ Greenbelt Meadows
- ◆ Gunbarrel
- ◆ Gunbarrel
- ◆ Gunbarrel
- ◆ Gunbarrel
- ◆ Gunbarrel
- ◆ Gunbarrel
- ◆ Gunbarrel commons
- ◆ Gunbarrel Estates
- ◆ Gunbarrel Green
- ◆ Gunbarrel Green
- ◆ Gunbarrel-much of Gunbarrel, marked blue is outside city limits, this map is inaccurate
- ◆ Hartford-Yale
- ◆ Heatherwood
- ◆ Heatherwood
- ◆ Heatherwood
- ◆ Heatherwood
- ◆ Heatherwood
- ◆ Heatherwood
- ◆ Heatherwood
- ◆ Heatherwood
- ◆ Heatherwood
- ◆ Heatherwood
- ◆ Heatherwood
- ◆ Highland
- ◆ Highland Park
- ◆ hill
- ◆ Hill
- ◆ Hill
- ◆ Hillcrest
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday Neighborhood.
- ◆ Homestead
- ◆ Hyview
- ◆ Iris Hollow
- ◆ Iris Hollow
- ◆ Keewaydin
- ◆ Keewaydin Meadows
- ◆ Kings Ridge
- ◆ Kings Ridge or Apple Green
- ◆ Lower Chautauqua
- ◆ Manhattan
- ◆ Mapleton
- ◆ Mapleton Hill
- ◆ Mapleton Hill
- ◆ Mapleton Hill
- ◆ Mapleton Hill
- ◆ Mapleton Hill
- ◆ Mapleton Hill
- ◆ Mapleton/newlands
- ◆ Martin acres
- ◆ Martin acres
- ◆ Martin Acres
- ◆ Martin Acres
- ◆ Martin Acres
- ◆ Martin Acres
- ◆ Martin Acres
- ◆ Martin Acres
- ◆ Martin Acres
- ◆ Martin Acres
- ◆ Martin Acres / Majestic Heights (South of Table Mesa)
- ◆ Martin Acres.
- ◆ Martin Park
- ◆ Meadow Glen
- ◆ Meadow Glen
- ◆ Meadow Glen
- ◆ Meadow Glen/Country Meadows
- ◆ MeadowGlen
- ◆ melody
- ◆ Melody
- ◆ Melody Catalpa
- ◆ Melody Catalpa
- ◆ Melody Catalpa

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ Melody heights
- ◆ Melody Heights
- ◆ Melody Heights
- ◆ Melody Heights
- ◆ Melody-Catalpa
- ◆ Melody-Catalpa
- ◆ Melody-Catalpa
- ◆ Melody-Catalpa
- ◆ Melody/Catalpa
- ◆ middle Chautauqua
- ◆ Moores
- ◆ Near Smith Park
- ◆ newlands
- ◆ newlands
- ◆ Newlands
- ◆ Newlands
- ◆ Newlands
- ◆ Newlands
- ◆ Newlands
- ◆ Newlands
- ◆ Newlands
- ◆ No name - between Palo and the creek.
- ◆ NoBo
- ◆ Norris subdivision on Norwood
- ◆ North 26th St
- ◆ north boulder
- ◆ North boulder
- ◆ North Boulder
- ◆ north wonderland
- ◆ Northfield Commons
- ◆ orchard grove
- ◆ Old North Boulder
- ◆ Olde Stage Road
- ◆ orchard area
- ◆ Orchard Grove
- ◆ Orchard Grove
- ◆ Orchard Grove
- ◆ Orchard Grove Mobile Home Park
- ◆ Orchard Grove Mobile Home Park WE WANT TO OWN OUR PARK!
- ◆ Park East
- ◆ Park East
- ◆ Park East
- ◆ Park East
- ◆ Park East (Near East Campus)
- ◆ Park East or CU Research Park
- ◆ Parkside

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ Paul Nor
- ◆ Peloton
- ◆ Pine brook Hills
- ◆ Pine Brook Hills
- ◆ Pine needle notch
- ◆ Poplar/Quince/Norwood
- ◆ Powderhorn
- ◆ Red Fox Hills
- ◆ red fox hills
- ◆ Red fox hills
- ◆ Red fox Hills
- ◆ Red Fox Hills
- ◆ Red Fox Hills
- ◆ Red Fox Hills
- ◆ Red Fox Hills
- ◆ Red Fox Hills
- ◆ Red Fox Hills
- ◆ Red Fox Hills
- ◆ Red Fox Hills
- ◆ Red Fox Hills
- ◆ Red Fox Hills
- ◆ Red Fox Hills
- ◆ red fox hills/ twin lakes
- ◆ Remington Post
- ◆ Rose Hill (Chautauqua)
- ◆ Shanahan Ridge
- ◆ Shanahan Ridge
- ◆ Shanahan Ridge
- ◆ Shanahan Ridge
- ◆ shannonhan ridge
- ◆ Silver Maple
- ◆ Silver Maple
- ◆ Southeast Boulder
- ◆ Southeast Boulder
- ◆ Sumac Estates
- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa
- ◆ Tantra
- ◆ The hill
- ◆ The Reserve
- ◆ The subdivision is The Meadows
- ◆ twin laakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Twin Lakes - Brandon Creek
- ◆ twin lakes area
- ◆ Twin Lakes area
- ◆ Uni Hill
- ◆ Uni Hill
- ◆ Uni Hill
- ◆ Uni-Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill/Lower Chautauqua
- ◆ wagoner estates

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ Wellington Gardens
- ◆ West Arapahoe
- ◆ West Keewaydin (east of Frasier Meadows)
- ◆ West Pearl
- ◆ West Pearl
- ◆ West Pearl/Lower Kollwood area
- ◆ whittier
- ◆ Whittier
- ◆ Whittier
- ◆ Whittier
- ◆ Whittier
- ◆ Whittier
- ◆ Whittier
- ◆ Whittier
- ◆ Whittier
- ◆ Wimbledon Condos -- 30th and Colorado Ave
- ◆ Winding Trail Village
- ◆ Wonderland Hill
- ◆ Wonderland Hill
- ◆ Wonderland Hill
- ◆ Wonderland lake
- ◆ Wonderland Lake/ Norwood

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.18: What do you like MOST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that should be preserved or protected? (OTHER)

- ◆ Access to transit is OK, could be better
- ◆ All except rentals -
- ◆ all of above except affordability, which does not exist
- ◆ Buildings are all of similar heights and make it possible, at least with judicious positioning, to see the mountains.
- ◆ Close to CU, close to downtown
- ◆ cohousing
- ◆ dark skies, safety, wildlife, rural residential
- ◆ Density and urban feel
- ◆ diverse wildlife
- ◆ Diversity of the people AND the homes/units
- ◆ Ethnic and socioeconomic mix
- ◆ Feels safe
- ◆ gardens
- ◆ grocery shopping is a short bike ride away, as is a library
- ◆ Historic houses
- ◆ hopefully preserved mobile home park
- ◆ I actually know my neighbors and it feels like home here.
- ◆ I selfishly like living in a mostly owner-owned neighborhood now, but I also liked living in a mixed rent-own area and feel that's better for the environment.
- ◆ if you own your own home, then the lot rent is way below a 1 bedroom affordable housing - it is cheapest place to live.
- ◆ It is safe, low crime, Twin Lakes is a safe place to walk alone, for anyone in any physical condition
- ◆ Kid friendly, sense of community among neighbors
- ◆ Less pretentious than No. Boulder
- ◆ lots of great businesses / restaurants around me
- ◆ Most places are within a 15 minute bike ride
- ◆ mobile homes
- ◆ most of these qualities have already been lost
- ◆ Mt. views, decreasing with development
- ◆ My area is going from good to not very good to awful
- ◆ Neighborhood organization
- ◆ Neighbors who are engaged with the neighborhood
- ◆ No business, neither profit nor non-profit
- ◆ no tall buildings
- ◆ Not having to deal with Boulder traffic, city taxes, Boulder pretentiousness, Boulder city council, overall rudeness of people shopping in Boulder.
- ◆ open spaces
- ◆ Open-space preservation
- ◆ Preserve Long's Iris land!
- ◆ Racial diversity
- ◆ Seems protected from development
- ◆ Separation from and resistance to imposition of Boulder's values
- ◆ spruce pool
- ◆ The almost rural feel.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.18: What do you like MOST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that should be preserved or protected? (OTHER)

- ◆ the beauty of the mountains
- ◆ There is one island of affordable housing (the Ostara co-op, where I live)
- ◆ Twin Lakes Open Space
- ◆ Twin Lakes Open Space
- ◆ Underground power lines, cable, and telephone (Yes, I still love my landlines.). Also city water and sewer.
- ◆ Urban wildlife
- ◆ Very kid friendly
- ◆ Views and nature
- ◆ views, generally already affordable vs Boulder
- ◆ walk/bike access to retail, schools
- ◆ we purchased early so it was affordable. Now we cannot move. I would prefer a more urban neighborhood but cannot afford it.
- ◆ wonderful neighbors!

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.19: What do you like LEAST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that you would most like to improve? (OTHER)

- ◆ Area has changed greatly due to major development
- ◆ at severe risk of annexation and ill-conceived affordable housing apts
- ◆ barking dogs and yelling kids for hours. Short bursts are fine but shut up already.
- ◆ BNSF, the train whistle is far too loud, and often.
- ◆ Boulder rental conditions are atrocious and getting worse.
- ◆ Bus transit is available but doesn't go where I need it to go.
- ◆ Bus transit not frequent enough
- ◆ Commuters parking on the street
- ◆ Concerned it will be ruined.
- ◆ Consideration of change in density in the Twin Lakes area.
- ◆ County does not maintain roads
- ◆ County road maintenance is very slow, residents on dirt roads get almost no maintenance.
- ◆ Crappy streets, Muni-risk
- ◆ Crime is up
- ◆ dealing with Boulder County transportation
- ◆ Deep concern about infill on 55th or on Pennsylvania destroying the neighborhood.
- ◆ Density of condos next to SFHs
- ◆ deterioration of roads
- ◆ development happening faster than infrastructure to support it
- ◆ does not feel safe at night. More lights on the streets would be good
- ◆ Dog guardians not keeping their dogs under voice & sight control on the trails; also, dog owners letting their dogs chase wildlife and not picking up after their dogs
- ◆ Drainage around roads
- ◆ ex moved 1/2 mile from me & I have a restraining order
- ◆ explosion of development in gunbarrel
- ◆ FIX THE ROADS!!
- ◆ Flood risk.
- ◆ Getting priced out
- ◆ Ground water issues
- ◆ Gunbarrel thought the Town Center development was going to be a community gathering place. Now we have tons of apartments and no town center. Plus the county wants to jam high density in a riparian corridor south of Twin Lakes.
- ◆ Hard to walk, can bike most places
- ◆ Heatherwood could benefit from stronger cell tower signal strength.
- ◆ heavy affordable housing burden as well as heavy homeless services
- ◆ heavy traffic to/from Boulder during peak hours
- ◆ houses are crammed too close together
- ◆ Housing is old and needs updating
- ◆ I recently moved from Central Boulder and miss the variety of neighborhoods and services there.
- ◆ I'm concerned about change -- coming from the county and city -- that apparently is a fait accompli. Specifically, turning a large open field -- enjoyed by many in the community -- into 'affordable housing' units that are not needed. Gunbarrel is already, de-facto, one big 'affordable housing' community. We don't need the government's involvement in this case.
- ◆ Idiot county refuses to do its job and fix my street, even though I specifically pay into a fund for it to do so.
- ◆ Infrequent bus transit

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.19: What do you like LEAST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that you would most like to improve? (OTHER)

- ◆ Insufficient density for demand
- ◆ It feels like only super rich white people live in our neighborhood. It doesn't feel vibrant
- ◆ It's getting too expensive - wealthier/more elite people are moving in
- ◆ Lack of affordability...families cannot afford to buy a house in Boulder
- ◆ lack of code enforcement
- ◆ Lack of density, particularly the inability to build an ADU or even another house on my 7,000 sf lot.
- ◆ Lack of future security...being at the mercy/whim of the landowners considering the cost or impossibility of moving my home.
- ◆ Lack of street maintenance
- ◆ Lacks off-leash dog park
- ◆ landlords suck
- ◆ Large Ugly Apt. Buildings
- ◆ like to see ADU's
- ◆ long bus ride, rail would be quick. No designated bike path directly from Gunbarrel to Boulder.
- ◆ Long drive to library.
- ◆ Loud student rental two doors down but all other rentals and owner occupied places are respectful and realize we have small lots and need to be careful. Students tend to be the renters of issue.
- ◆ Need a bus that goes from north boulder near Lee Hill down 28th st.
- ◆ Need for more frequent bus service.
- ◆ Needs Ball Fields and Public grassy parks
- ◆ Needs more local commerce
- ◆ Needs retail within the neighborhood--coffee shop!
- ◆ Neighborhood Housing Association prejudices against renters
- ◆ No anchor - local pub, grocery, large restaurants, theater
- ◆ No community amenities such as library or community and rec center.
- ◆ no HOA
- ◆ no retail- only residential
- ◆ Noisy train whistles
- ◆ non full-time resident properties that are dark
- ◆ Not enough dense housing close to campus
- ◆ Not kid friendly
- ◆ Not Safe or Pleasant riding Folsom or walking across Folsom
- ◆ Over occupied un-maintained rentals.increasing every year.
- ◆ owner keeps raising lot rent and adding additional fees not in our lease
- ◆ Park is a campground, would like more offerings on the Hill (shopping restaurants)
- ◆ Parking is a problem because the NPP is not enforced regularly
- ◆ Planned development next door
- ◆ Potential loss of existing open space in Twin Lakes area.
- ◆ Preserve Long's Iris land and community gardens
- ◆ Problems with overflow parking for Chautauqua park, event and trail users that consume street parking limiting our own use of the street parking in front of our residences on 9th street.
- ◆ Proposed multiuse trail that would remove greatly needed parking from Twin lakes Road and Williams Fork Trail; this will create parking wars!!! Also, proposed housing on 6655 TLR and Across the street will reduce safety, create auto/people congestion, disrupt open space. County commissioners are turning me into a nervous wreck with your neighborhood wrecking affordable housing and trail proposals

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.19: What do you like LEAST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that you would most like to improve? (OTHER)

- ◆ rental next door - city does not enforce rules
- ◆ rental units not being good neighbors
- ◆ Rentals are ridiculous in pricing for the square footage.
- ◆ Roads must be paved immediately. The current state of the roads here is a disgrace.
- ◆ roads need help
- ◆ rude students walk by yelling in the middle of the night- I really dislike them!!!!
- ◆ Rude, oblivious bikers zooming down the on Broadway w/o looking. Transportation Dept modifications placing islands in Broadway resulting in motorists from west of Broadway doing dangerous U turns at Chambers and Ludlow. Student renters.
- ◆ see below
- ◆ Some rental properties not well maintained - students are not effectively disciplined for drunk and disorderly behavior
- ◆ speeding cars
- ◆ Street in bad shape
- ◆ Streets don't get plowed in the winter.
- ◆ Student noise on weekends in neighborhood streets
- ◆ students loud, messy, inconsiderate
- ◆ Terrible parking for the neighborhood, burden of homeless situation
- ◆ the homeless shelter houses a lot of registered sex offenders and they make a morning walk downtown - I am concerned about this as they are walking past neighborhoods with kids
- ◆ The open space is being threatened by zoning changes
- ◆ The other rental units in my neighborhood are very expensive
- ◆ the parks that are undesirable though they do exist
- ◆ the proposed bulk housing/mixed-use at 6655 twin lakes rd. AND approx 600 new rental units at lookout rd.
- ◆ There've been several robberies lately.
- ◆ too many rentals
- ◆ too many similar looking and large houses being built
- ◆ too quiet, lacks urban fabric; no lighting
- ◆ too uniform in development--only single family homes
- ◆ Traffic generated by CU (new development)
- ◆ Traffic on 20th is fast and loud
- ◆ Ugly
- ◆ We will get a large new development in the coming years, which will change character dramatically. I hope it's neutral or for the better, not convinced though.
- ◆ Wish there were bike trails inside of Holiday linking with other bike trails. There are so many cars parked on the street it is difficult to bike safely with my small children
- ◆ With the addition of more than 100 affordable units in the next several years coupled with already poor accessibility and parking, poor road maintenance and no plans for improvement in the future!!

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Improved	3 houses have been scraped and rebuild increasing property values and more great restaurants have come in around West Pearl which I love and walk to often.
♦ Improved	A number of housing units have turned over to younger families and children. Others would if there were age appropriate housing that older singles and couple could afford in town.
♦ Improved	Active HOA has enforced property upkeep and improved public areas.
♦ Improved	All parts of boulder have improved, but there has been a big increase in high priced housing, forcing many seniors, families, and average income workers to move out of the city. The increased density of housing downtown and at 30th street junction is giving Boulder the feel and look of a big city, not the relaxed feeling of a small town of 100,000. Allowing higher building heights, buildings packed close together are not only unattractive but an unhealthy living environment for the tenants. 30th junction looks like public housing in major cities like Chicago or Detroit which has proven to have unhealthy affects on the residents, many of these public housing have been taken down or repurposed. People need grass, trees, open park spaces right outside their windows, low density and small short buildings. Many public housing studies have been conducted which provided these results. Contact the Environmental Design Dept at University of Colorado for details on these studies.
♦ Improved	Appreciate knowing people and local places and amazing opportunities within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive or a bike ride along the amazing trails. Love that City bought hospital site and that this upcoming process can be a great learning and living opportunity for all and that City offices are close by and I can volunteer for the planning department (sic)
♦ Improved	As home prices increase, people are tending to take care of their properties more
♦ Improved	better retail close by, updating of old uninspired housing
♦ Improved	CU has been adding buildings along Colorado Avenue between 30th and Foothills. I like them. I like the fact that my condo is now essentially on the CU campus. (I live at 30th and Colorado.)
♦ Improved	Distance to schools - completely missed I think in the stock responses
♦ Improved	Elmers Two mile construction.
♦ Improved	HOA management has been great. Diagonal plaza has made major improvements.
♦ Improved	Honestly, it's largely the fact that there are fewer rentals in my neighborhood, and that the rentals that remain are better managed. But the management of the rentals is *far* more important than the fact that they're rented, and my neighbors have gotten better at confronting the poor managers and insisting that they 'read the riot act' to their tenants, emphasizing that this is a neighborhood, with people who work, etc.
♦ Improved	Housing values are up

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Improved	I live and work in Downtown Boulder. I wish there were MORE density downtown -- which would enable more people to live and work here. I love that I can walk to work and wish my coworkers could do the same. I hate that we limit development in the proximate neighborhoods which prevent more people from enjoying the wonderful community I call home. Adding more development will reduce traffic (because more folks will live here), will increase economic vitality, and will improve the diversity and cultural landscape of the community.
♦ Improved	I live in south Boulder. There are enough stores/restaurants to meet our needs, so we do not have to go into downtown Boulder now. With all the traffic around Pearl Street, all the new businesses on 28th street, the soon to be Google & Boulder Junction traffic - we will rarely go north of here. It is easier for us to go to Superior/Louisville than to go 'into Boulder'. We're making a mess of our city.
♦ Improved	I'm seeing more people who enjoy a neighborhood environment
♦ Improved	Improvements to our neighborhood park, a new library, and recent sidewalk art have all improved the area. There continue to be few walkable or affordable options, however, with very little retail available.
♦ Improved	Infill of empty lots, better quality of commercial offerings, access to trails, public transportation connectivity
♦ Improved	Love the nearby businesses that we can walk to. Also, houses are getting renovated and not torn down and the fact that there are three neighborhood schools
♦ Improved	More community activities, food trucks etc. Lots of home and garden upgrades.
♦ Improved	More development is helping Gunbarrel overall
♦ Improved	more home owners and families taking care of properties. less rentals.
♦ Improved	More interesting stores and restaurants in the area.
♦ Improved	More places to eat at the Table Mesa shopping center, re-do of King Soopers, added park on Table Mesa.
♦ Improved	Nearby renters are more graduate students with less nuisance problems. Redevelopment is mainly attractive and improvement.
♦ Improved	Neighborhood has matured but in a good way, grocery store has updated look and offers many healthy choices. Animals, birds enjoy the mature landscape of the lakes and open spaces.
♦ Improved	Neighbors are renovating their homes. And the neighbors are being more cohesive with parades, parties, internet communications.
♦ Improved	New developments along the south side of Palo Parkway (east of 30th) add a new vibrancy to the area.
♦ Improved	Open space has done a great job with the Twin Lakes Open Space area. The older part of Twin Lakes is also seeing more revitalization. I fear that massive public housing planned on the open Twin Lakes area will become a nightmare with the swampy hydrology of the area, increased traffic, and parked cars if BCHA goes through with their ill conceived plan. This will truly ruin the peaceful character of this entire area.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Improved	Our neighborhood group email list (we're using google groups now) is such a great resource for everything from advice on local contractors and service providers to notifications of wildlife sightings to yard sale announcements.
♦ Improved	Our neighborhood has more and more children each year, which is a wonderful for us. I do deeply wish we had a coffee shop in the neighborhood, not just for coffee but to serve as a gathering spot. I also was hoping for the Boulder-style mini-market nearby at the Armory, and I'm disappointed that is no longer planned. I want to be able to walk to services, and that would have helped. We also are having issues with safety in our neighborhood and at the borders. I really wish the Bus Stop and Nader's businesses would go away and be more sanitized.
♦ Improved	Our neighborhood organization is great.
♦ Improved	people are investing in their homes
♦ Improved	pride in maintaining a pleasant home, yard, garden.
♦ Improved	public art, neighborhood organizations/events, north boulder corner library fantastic, upgraded crosswalk, properties painted, little library landscaping, public engagement in armory planning
♦ Improved	Remodel of old apt buildings... still so expensive!
♦ Improved	Remodeling; new landscaping; turn over to younger occupants
♦ Improved	Remodels and homeowners taking better care of their property.
♦ Improved	Renovation of nearby hotel, repaving/sidewalk improvements
♦ Improved	Restaurant situation in S. Boulder has improved (at Table Mesa Shopping Center) and with the likelihood of Lucky's moving in the shopping has improved. This helps limit the amount of driving we might do.
♦ Improved	tasteful remodels, more families with young children
♦ Improved	The development in North Boulder has been a positive move - better restaurants and shops, new condos, recreational space.
♦ Improved	The houses continue to be improved, and therefore the landscaping, etc.
♦ Improved	The neighborhood has been changing from empty nesters to families moving back in.
♦ Improved	The neighborhood is quiet and safe and well maintained.
♦ Improved	The no-name trailer park with the discarded hypodermics and abandoned trailers became Violet Crossing. Lots of nice people moved in.
♦ Improved	The NPP program, which made parking problems bearable The change in zoning from RH-2 to RMX-1, which gave us the confidence that our neighborhood wouldn't be destroyed by further cheap development Noise ordinances 5-6-1 and 5-3-8, which gave us real tools to control over our quality of life A neighborhood reputation that's changed from 'party' to 'quiet residential'
♦ Improved	Trees have matured, a boulevard was improved by the city, the neighbors take good care of their homes and property.
♦ Improved	Upgraded shopping area at Gunbarrel King Soopers People taking better care of their townhomes.
♦ Improved	We fought to be correctly zoned. We fought Landmarks board so we could have a parcel re-developed to keep a young family in the neighborhood. Better enforcement of noise violations.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Improved	While there has been more local residences constructed, the homes seem to be of high quality and do not detract from the quality of our neighborhood experience.
♦ Improved	Younger people moving in and sprucing up properties that were neglected.
♦ Gotten worse	3 large rental complexes in Gunbarrel center.... no units designated 'affordable'. Counties plan to destroy the last vacant land surrounding the Twin lakes with dense 'affordable' housing. The oxymoron approach to all of this. Our neighborhood road maintenance issues with the County.
♦ Gotten worse	600 new 3-story rentals crammed in along the sidewalks. I left Chicago and NY in 1969. I actually think it's getting worse here.
♦ Gotten worse	All of the affordable houses that go on the market are bought and turned into rentals.
♦ Gotten worse	An incredibly dense development has gone up behind the King Soopers in Gunbarrel. This is not affordable housing, rather, it is expensive rental housing. Shame on whomever approved this ugly monstrosity and whomever developed it.
♦ Gotten worse	As a frequent user of open space I feel the trails have gotten much more crowded and worn.
♦ Gotten worse	Boulder County Housing Authority wants to build up to 140 low-income public housing units on the property near my home which will increase traffic, noise and be much more unsafe. I will worry about drug users and gang activity in the housing project adjacent to my property. It will ruin the quiet and peaceful rural area that I live in and destroy the wildlife habitat. The BCHA seems determined to build this project even though the neighborhood of more than 150 people strongly oppose it. The neighborhood is anxious and has hired legal counsel to represent their concerns and take legal action to prevent BCHA from destroying the peaceful rural environment that we all love.
♦ Gotten worse	Broadway is a nice street until you reach Norwood. The sidewalks from Norwood to Violet are terrible! They slope and pool water from rain and snow, forcing you to walk in the street. Fences are constantly covered with graffiti. Trees need to be trimmed so I can safely see oncoming traffic. Also, the cross walk announcer is ridiculously loud. I can hear it in my house about 50 times per day.
♦ Gotten worse	Bus service to west Pearl has been scaled down since we've moved there.
♦ Gotten worse	County Commissioners: Obey the judge and fix our #&* streets with the tax money you have collected from us. Fix the sewer system so that the flooding we experienced (resulting from inadequacy of sewers, not Mother Nature) does not reoccur. Fix the flood damage in Walden Ponds.
♦ Gotten worse	deterioration of roads overbuilding around Gunbarrel King Soopers
♦ Gotten worse	Development in Meadow Glen subdivision e.g. massive unsightly platform tennis building.
♦ Gotten worse	Development of Gunbarrel Town Center has increased crime in the area. We now have concerns walking at night, number of smash and grab break-ins of cars is on the rise. The development has overwhelmed ALL services in Gunbarrel, making the ONE store almost impossible to visit. I have started driving to Superior for all my shopping needs.
♦ Gotten worse	Even more traffic on Canyon plus many more homeless/campers.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Gotten worse	Excessive development and new development that have greater density than surrounding neighborhoods and bring greater car traffic and increase already crowded streets for parking spots. Increased air traffic and train traffic adding to the noise levels day and night. Deterioration of roads within and surrounding the neighborhood. Even relatively 'new' roads within my neighborhood and adjacent neighborhoods are poorly constructed - Developers need to do better.
♦ Gotten worse	Flood destruction, multiple derelict homes, intention of the county to widen Fourmile Canyon Drive, dust and speeding because of tree loss, and 2 more years of road construction expected
♦ Gotten worse	Gunbarrel has gotten denser and denser. It frustrates me that recent developers were allowed to opt out of affordable housing, and now the county wants to appropriate open fields to build high-density rentals.
♦ Gotten worse	Has gotten more expensive, and there's been more rowdy student incursions. Also, the mix of housing has been pretty static. There's clearly lots of demand here... and honestly, I'd think it would be fine to include more multi-family or at least duplex/triplex/4-plex or ADUs... especially if they weren't aimed at students. Maybe some permanently affordable family/moderate income multi-unit housing?
♦ Gotten worse	Hundreds of rental units, hundreds of new cars. We have inadequate bus service here so the traffic impact is significant. There aren't many nearby job opportunities so everyone is driving. And even scoring a job nearby is no guarantee you will have that job in six months. I've lived here 19 years and for the past 11/2 years I have commuted to Denver.
♦ Gotten worse	I live in an area that was quiet and peaceful and I work only minutes from my office. In the past few years, development has tripled, housing additions have tripled and the congestion is horrible. Now there is talk of making greenbelt land, which is very, very close to the lakes that support extensive wildlife and a wonderful trail system, and making it into high density housing. The horror of imaging the negative impact on the quality of life, the ecosystem and the environment makes me incredibly angry. This is just unimaginable and I question the reasons why this is even on the agenda. There are no easy transportation answers, amenities are too far away to walk to and the protected wildlife is in significant danger with the proposed designated use changes. This is very, very irresponsible and completely out of character with the already established neighborhoods.
♦ Gotten worse	I'm surrounded by only millionaires. We need more diversity within neighborhoods.
♦ Gotten worse	Increase in rent, decrease in rental agencies care for property (no response to leaky ceilings, dangerous wasp nests, etc)
♦ Gotten worse	Increased vandalism, more noise, lack of police and code enforcement - slum landlords who let their rental homes (some of which should get Historic designation) go to the dogs.
♦ Gotten worse	Increasing crime. Overcrowding. Traffic congestion. Poor internet service providers - please consider a City run internet service. Taxation without representation at the county level.
♦ Gotten worse	Influx of transients, family homes becoming student rentals

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Gotten worse	It is becoming too built up, more crowded, often can't even find a parking space at Kingsoopers, our only grocery store.
◆ Gotten worse	It is the same or better in most ways - but the one way it has gotten worse is the huge escalation in housing prices, which is reducing diversity in our neighborhood.
◆ Gotten worse	It's a complex situation - the neighborhood is very hostile to new development and especially new liquor licenses, so there is general decline in the UHill commercial area and there are fewer venues that students can go to party, resulting in drunk and disorderly behavior in the neighborhood itself.
◆ Gotten worse	It's getting too crowded here. The Avery Brewing looming over West TWin Lake; hundreds maybe thousands of new housing units built or being built by Lookout road and none of these are affordable. BoCo/city policies allow builders to opt-out of creating 20% permanently affordable housing units and with your pitiful cash BoCo has purchased land for affordable housing that will disrupt or ruin existing neighborhoods by Twin Lake Road. No I don't want my home flooded because of less ground to soak up precipitation. This is a high ground water area! Actually there should be no homes here at all.
◆ Gotten worse	loss of owner-occupied houses, overcrowding, increased noise and traffic, loss of community, too many rentals
◆ Gotten worse	Loss of single-family homes catering to permanent residents. Too many rentals. Trash and noise issues.
◆ Gotten worse	Lots of new construction that doesn't fit the neighborhood. More noise, parking difficulty. It is harder to feel like we live in a neighborhood since so many poor planning decisions have impacted us.
◆ Gotten worse	Lots of office space built ten yrs ago, Covdien traffic, noise, light, blocking views,; recent condo development very dense and ugly, seems to have increased rental prices. Recent plans to develop affordable housing, evidently huge undispersed public housing complexes for most vulnerable populations, without any opportunity for current residents to vote since 2/3 of residents live in county areas and this will be an intrusion of city development into county area 1/2 mi or more from other city development land. 'Leapfrogging' It will about the only very small Open Space-Twin Lakes I and many other residents can walk to, probably degrading it considerably. This completely different land use and zoning contradicts the Comprehensive Planstated goal of annexing land in its current use
◆ Gotten worse	More and more overflow parking for Chautauqua park, events and trail users taking up the street parking in front of our homes on 9th street.
◆ Gotten worse	More crowded with apartments bringing density, transportation still awful, no public amenities.
◆ Gotten worse	More homeless, rentals
◆ Gotten worse	More rentals in my neighborhood.
◆ Gotten worse	more rentals. People in rentals fill garage with stuff and park in guest parking. Then others park in the street (which is NOT designed for parking) since guest parking is full. Train whistles crossing 47th st seem to be lots louder and obnoxious.
◆ Gotten worse	More rentals. Rental properties are obvious because they are not taken care of

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Gotten worse	More renters
◆ Gotten worse	more traffic building of giant million dollar homes on small lots dangerous traffic circles
◆ Gotten worse	Mostly traffic
◆ Gotten worse	My area was downzoned and is now becoming a location for the super-rich to build.
◆ Gotten worse	my rent went up 25% this year.
◆ Gotten worse	Neighborhood is transitioning to rental, Airbnb, from formerly owner-occupied. Tenants are not engaged in neighborhood.
◆ Gotten worse	new developments in gunbarrel
◆ Gotten worse	New developments in our neighborhood.
◆ Gotten worse	Noise, traffic
◆ Gotten worse	Noise, traffic, abusive development (looming and past), lack of speed bumps, lack of traffic enforcement, bad light timing, shitty grocery options, impossible traffic on Baseline & Broadway, homeless hippies in the bushes, endless sirens on Broadway, traffic noise from air brakes and traffic on 36, CU-related impacts, etc...
◆ Gotten worse	North Broadway trash, unkempt lots, vacant buildings, homeless gatherings with public alcohol, sex, abuse.
◆ Gotten worse	Older people leave and houses are slowly turning into rentals. Too many eyesores. Why would a young family move in next to a house that has weeds in the yard and 4-5 cars parked on the street, driveway and yard. Now they have made the cutoff for increased fines to be Table Mesa. Immediately across Table Mesa is as bad or worse. These homes have basements and are tempting to rent to students who can pack em in.
◆ Gotten worse	Our roads have deteriorated quite a bit. Crime may be increasing We have had more flooding Traffic in the area has increased
◆ Gotten worse	Over development, particularly of high density housing.
◆ Gotten worse	recent crime in our neighborhood
◆ Gotten worse	Rent is going up at an exponentially untenable rate
◆ Gotten worse	Rental units around us seem to have no interest in the neighborhood where they live - don't say hi or even acknowledge their neighbors when they are out. Don't take care of their yards - leave trash out after parties. Are not considerate in the times of day or volume that they play their music or have their conversations. Families are moving away from University Hill and the homes they leave are being purchased as investment properties to rent to students.
◆ Gotten worse	rental units in the area not well maintained
◆ Gotten worse	Rents are going up. More students from up on the hill are moving down into our neighborhood.
◆ Gotten worse	Road condition, number of times Cherryvale has been closed
◆ Gotten worse	Road maintenance is a concern. High density urban density in our neighborhoods is affecting quality of life (light pollution, traffic)
◆ Gotten worse	Shanahan Ridge has basically not changed, except it has gotten more expensive.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Gotten worse	Short term rentals. There are a 5 rentals on my block and the Marpa House. Two of these rentals are large homes that used to be owner occupied. Two of the homes are used extensively for short term rentals - and I hope that the vote next week continues to make such rentals illegal. It is a real burden.
♦ Gotten worse	Some students moved in on our block. Students tend not to care about their space because they figure someone else will clean up for them and they will be gone within a year, so some disrespect property.
♦ Gotten worse	The city allowed over 600 new units without any community input. This has resulted in an overflow of people in the neighborhood resources such as King Soopers, and many units have not yet been filled. The development looks like very high density urban areas, not at all the character of Gunbarrel. There are no parks to speak of in the entire development, just a few corridors of grass. It is an outrage that the developer was allowed to 'opt out' by buying out of their responsibility toward the community for affordable housing. Now BHP is hoping to build 280 units over a mile away instead of having worked with the developer to offer affordable housing close to resources. This situation has made a mockery of the stated values of the comprehensive plan and has created unprecedented community turmoil as well as polarizing many elected officials against working with the community. Very sad situation out here.
♦ Gotten worse	The construction of almost 500 rental units within a block of Spine and Lookout. This kind of density outside the downtown area is ridiculous.
♦ Gotten worse	The county commissioners have diverted monies from the Road and Bridge fund to their pet projects and have abandon the maintenance of our roads.
♦ Gotten worse	The Hogan Pancost Project threatens my property by planning to put a dense housing project into a currently undeveloped space next to my neighborhood. Development would destroy the parcel's current function as a containment area for flood waters (as amply demonstrated in the 2013 flood). Worse, raising the overall level of this large parcel would create a dam, causing any future flood waters to back up into my neighborhood instead. I don't understand why the city continues to entertain development plans for this property when the result may be to flood all the neighborhoods around it.
♦ Gotten worse	The influx of part-time residents is diminishing neighborhood cohesion.
♦ Gotten worse	The large/tall homes relative to lot size that are being built where more modest homes once stood. No consideration for building style... many exact replica houses being constructed. The influx of large truck traffic the construction brings. Having to constantly keep an eye/ear out for detrimental building proposals near our homes/schools (i.e.: the People's Clinic Redevelopment proposal right now that could bring high density single user tiny dwellings right next to our neighborhood school).

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Gotten worse	The rapidly increasing costs of living in Orchard Grove is the biggest negative. The increase of the raccoon community and the increased destruction they cause is something that has just occurred over the last 2 years and I have been here for 28 years. Also, I imagine due to the higher cost of living in Boulder many of the units are occupied by multiple families making the park a much higher density than it ever has been in the past.
◆ Gotten worse	The roads and general support for infrastructure have gotten significantly worse.
◆ Gotten worse	The tenants in surrounding rentals have improved but the congestion and traffic have gone from a once quiet neighborhood with lots of on-street parking to virtually no on-street parking and major thoroughfare due to the amount of commuters that refuse to pay for parking at the University and the building of the CU bio-tech building. The amount of litter has noticeably gone up.
◆ Gotten worse	The traffic coming into Boulder is unbearable. Pollution (cars, dust, noise, etc) has increased dramatically.
◆ Gotten worse	There are a lot more apartments and higher density housing all around Gunbarrel, which creates more traffic, road-wear, etc. I like the fact that it is a little more rural and would prefer it stay that way.
◆ Gotten worse	There are more rentals; I prefer ownership. At least one of the rentals is occupied by members of a non-profit which is inappropriate if not illegal under zoning regulations. Traffic has increased; parking is more congested.
◆ Gotten worse	There has been more cut through traffic in the neighborhood due to the increased traffic on Iris and long waits for the lights.
◆ Gotten worse	There has been so much building in Gunbarrel, resulting in more traffic, more noise, more pollution..... it has lost its rural feeling which is starting to make me very 'squirmy'. I can't afford to move anywhere, so the result is looks like I will have to stay home inside isolated more. This is not happy. Also I am distressed about the high cost of utilities. Where I live in Gunbarrel, I have heard we will not be included in the Boulder Utility municipalization project. I wish we could be. I am also getting creamed by the increases in basic telephone and utility costs.
◆ Gotten worse	There is a growing homeless population using needles in local area parks with kid play areas. More people loitering on the Hill in front of vacant business space.
◆ Gotten worse	There's a bunch of drug addicts here now. Crime is skyrocketing, it's way to crowded. People beg for money while you walk your dog now. The new apartments are ugly and the people that live in them are disgusting.
◆ Gotten worse	They build huge apartments behind us where we now have tons of light pollution, lights flooding our bedroom windows at night, a dog park which has made the quite neighborhood unpleasant and noisy. Hardly any of the people have moved it yet and the traffic is horrible already and the noise has increased from the dogs. I hate to see what happens when all the new apartments are filled.
◆ Gotten worse	This mobile home park and housing laws are allowing over 15 people to live in a 2 bedroom mobile home - there are 5-6 cars per site with these 15 people homes. The park management stated that they can do nothing to enforce the covenants as listed when I moved in 20 years ago.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Gotten worse	Too many rules regarding walking my dog in open space.
♦ Gotten worse	Too much city regulation that creates a lack of diversity and entrepreneurialship.
♦ Gotten worse	too much traffic and getting worse
♦ Gotten worse	traffic and related noise is increasing
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic congestion; pedestrian crossings on arterial streets (and I'm a bike-rider, not a driver generally). Also, issues limited to ownership of our mobile home park which are not affected by the Comp Plan.
♦ Gotten worse	Turnover of single family occupied homes to investors for undergrad housing that is not maintained and often over-occupied, and rather lawless a lot of the time.
♦ Gotten worse	University Hill lack of businesses and restaurants and overall dirtiness on the Hill
♦ Gotten worse	Unsafe road conditions due to heavy recreational bicycle traffic. Bicycles do not go single file in curves and block traffic by riding two or more abreast uphill. I moved here to bicycle, but no longer ride in my neighborhood because I do not feel safe when riding. Both cyclists and motorists contribute to the unsafe conditions. A bike lane is desperately needed and single file riding should be enforced in canyons.
♦ Gotten worse	vehicle traffic noise is becoming terrible less safe due to some zoning changes that have occurred more garbage and litter, trash especially on my nearby frequently used Bear Creek bike trail
♦ Gotten worse	We have issues with speeding through the neighborhood and the city refuses to take step to alleviate the issue. In addition crime is up due to the fact that people are continually in our neighborhood who do not reside there.
♦ Gotten worse	We were sold to a corporation this year so rents are higher and extra water costs are above City standards. Boulder really ought to look at Mobile Home park laws in California and Oregon to create a kinder and less feudal oppression for the residents. Also every vacant spot in the neighborhood is targeted for high density housing with no green spaces.
♦ Gotten worse	Wealthy buying homes, scraping or expanding considerably. Student renters. Number of commercial dope growers, hash oil cookers in houses.
♦ Gotten worse	What a coincidence. I've live here for 8 years. Never a problem. Now those butt ugly apartments go up and here come the pumpkin smashers from hell.
♦ Gotten worse	You insane policy of abandoning streets is making our neighborhood less competitive with similar homes in other counties. Yes, we competitive with other counties.
♦ Mixed	Affordability of houses has gotten worse.
♦ Mixed	Development in Gunbarrel area near King Soopers. Increase in traffic.
♦ Mixed	Dog owners are often irresponsible. The open space trails are an inherent part of our neighborhood. Dog owners often (1) use trails after dark and pre-dawn, (2) don't control/pick up after dogs, (3) let dogs harass wildlife, and (4) let dogs roam far off trail.
♦ Mixed	Gunbarrel Town Center is not a town center. It's just an apartment complex name. And the high density development planned south out the owl nesting spot was not even discussed with the neighborhood prior to its purchase and planning.
♦ Mixed	Housing prices have soared pushing out families and leaving this an enclave for relatively well off old, white people. There is very little diversity.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Mixed	I'm noticing over occupancy issues more now (the house next to us has 5 renters, the house across the street has at least 4 renters, but more than 4 cars, the house next to that has at least 4 cars) and there is a lot of parking contention (we only have 2 cars).
♦ Mixed	Improved - more restaurants and brewpubs now; Worse - Meadows shopping center not fully leased; traffic has increased, esp at Arapahoe & 48th w the new hospital
♦ Mixed	Insane amount of apartment units went into Gunbarrel Center and NOT A SINGLE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNIT!!!! WHAT A JOKE!!!! Because of that fact, they are trying to build on two beautiful fields that provide hunting grounds for wildlife, wildlife corridors, beauty and space for the neighborhood. This will literally destroy the surrounding neighborhood!!
♦ Mixed	Many very nice houses have been torn down (or vastly remodeled and enlarged), and replaced by much bigger and more costly houses.
♦ Mixed	More people- more traffic
♦ Mixed	movement of 'boulder' housing into gunbarrel - also the inability of gunbarrel residents to have rights in the discussion, most seems planned by boulder, county says ok and residents aren't given option of input
♦ Mixed	New developments in the immediate neighborhood (Baseline & 30th to Colorado & 28th) have brought in new businesses and new residents. It continues to involve a lot of construction, which has sometimes resulted (eventually) in welcome improvements to roads and bike paths, and sometimes resulted in large/ugly new buildings. It often seems like there's not enough parking to accommodate all the new residents, because cars are often parked on the street in illegal zones that block access to paths and sidewalks.
♦ Mixed	new ordinances and enforcement has helped protect quality of life in most cases however people keep moving out due to noise and landlord irresponsibility that cant be resolved. Noise continues to increase. Occupancy not well enforced, rental licensing not well enforced.
♦ Mixed	Newlands is a highly walkable neighborhood. When you take into account Broadway, BHP housing nearby, and multi-family/condo clustered near Ideal Market and 9th/North, we have decent diversity in housing stock. Downside: It's become very expensive since we bought in 1993 as a young family. Today's young families are closed out unless they are wealthy. Newlands could benefit from more ADUs, perhaps some townhouse development on single-family lots, and the redevelopment of BCH to include lots of affordable housing. In addition, we provide some affordable housing by renting a spare bedroom in our empty-nester home to a grad student for \$700/month. Could the city have a formal program to encourage this?
♦ Mixed	Nothing has improved! Livability is going down the tubes!
♦ Mixed	On the minus side: our mobile home lot rents have steadily increased over the last 7 years. On the plus side: our community has become united in response to challenges presented by park owners, it has been empowering.
♦ Mixed	Our street was affordable, now unaffordable because many have 'popped up' their modest houses into million-macmansions.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Mixed	People are tearing down cute little bungalows to build 6000-8000 square foot mansions. They are tasteful and driving up our home value, but it leads to a leaving of exclusivity that I don't like at all. The hippies are moving out, and young rich couples from the Bay area and NY are moving in. It doesn't feel like environmental stewardship is possible with such large homes...
♦ Mixed	Population of my neighborhood has gone up (great), but amenities have not followed (bad). Bike paths to downtown do not exist (bad). Our parks are increasingly dirty. Homelessness is a problem. I believe in giving housing to the homeless 24 hours a day to help them and reduce burden on neighborhoods. The number of empty storefronts (for single office storefronts under apartments/condos) has remained troublingly high even after the economy has recovered.
♦ Mixed	potential impact of fracking; traffic; roads not maintained
♦ Mixed	Roads have deteriorated. Prairie dogs have seemingly been gone unchecked and have decimated the vegetation near Heatherwood school; and they can regularly be seen crossing streets and going into residential yards. Would love to see more bus options and more bike routes connecting to Boulder. Gigabit broadband (like Longmont's NextLight) would be great.
♦ Mixed	Safety. Lots of break in lately. A lot more traffic and cars! It is a lot less safe to commute home on Broadway by bike now.
♦ Mixed	Some of the growth in Gunbarrel has been good, but I feel it's now getting out of control and too much development is being done without consideration for adequate transportation and other services. It seems that the developers are in it to make money and then leave the residents to deal with resulting problems of greatly increased density without appropriate infrastructure/services.
♦ Mixed	Student area cleaner; fewer sofas on fire in street. Less late noise, drunken students, vandalism, and trash nearby. Less graffiti. Much appreciated. Traffic on Baseline, Broadway and 9th Street gotten much worse particularly at commute times. No more leaf and yard removal services. More of area now rentals for students.
♦ Mixed	The growth/development in the Gunbarrel center has some great benefits and was needed overall. Yet (as is so often the case) parking and general traffic in the area is increasing. Some days there aren't any parking spaces at our King Soopers and that will just get worse. Traffic at certain intersections is also becoming a problem. Without some good planning, it will really be an issue within the next few years (much like these issues are presenting themselves in Boulder now).
♦ Mixed	The houses are well maintained and there is a strong sense of neighborhood unity; the issue is that there are very few affordable housing opportunities for new families. In a sense, this neighborhood operates like a "gated community" because of the economic barriers to living here. Not unusual if you look at Boulder County on the whole. The median range for a home does not match the median salary for a person working in the county. For example: a BVSD teacher's salary would not allow one to live here (own a home) without prior savings/investment/inheritance from another family member.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Mixed	the increasing densification and potential for densification
♦ Mixed	The King Sooper upgrade was a big plus. The fact that the roads in our neighborhood are rapidly deteriorating with no plan in sight to repair them (and I'm not talking about simply tossing asphalt into a pot hole) is absolutely disgusting.
♦ Mixed	The new 1000+ units of compact housing recently built around Gunbarrel Center are verging on destroying the quality of life here. When, finished, they'll add an enormous amount of traffic and congestion to a rural infrastructure.
♦ Mixed	The roads within the neighborhoods have not been repaved in years.
♦ Mixed	The traffic around Gunbarrel gets increasingly worse. We need our neighborhoods paved!!!!
♦ Mixed	The value of homes in my neighborhood has gotten ridiculous. And I am seeing the encroaching creep of the 'trophy homes' heading our way from the Newlands area. Drive along Elder and witness it for yourself.
♦ Mixed	There are more cars parked on the street. Everyone has a car, even if they take the bus to work. It makes biking difficult since the roads in Holiday are so narrow. Two cars can barely pass each other.... If you add a bike to the mix, one day, someone is going to get hurt. There was no planning for multi-use paths linking with the current Boulder path system when Holiday/NOBO was developed. It's very disappointing
♦ Mixed	too much traffic noise on diagonal carries into the park area. too much traffic for our roads.
♦ Mixed	traffic has gotten worse as well as density, too many people for too little services (.i.e. grocery store
♦ Mixed	Traffic has increased greatly along 30th Street, along with all the accompanying noise and pollution. Rental houses don't show much in the way of civic pride (nice landscaping, native plants, low noise, low litter, respectful parking, etc.)
♦ Mixed	Traffic, number of people.
♦ Mixed	Traffic/noise on Foothills
♦ Mixed	With addition of the high density apartments near King Soopers, congestion has been a factor, however, I reserve my opinion until everything (retail, restaurants, etc.) has been completed. It may be a plus, or a minus depending upon the added noise, traffic, and general congestion.
♦ Stayed the same	But, from the sound of things, that will soon change.
♦ Stayed the same	Comparing many other 'Central' neighborhoods I have lived in - many large cities around the world. Central Boulder as a housing area is almost the worst I have ever lived in (NYC-Rome-Athens-Vienna-Oslo-Tokyo. Bolder seems VERY haphazard and really not clean.... but this is probably a reflection of the AGE of the renters and the ATTITUDES of the rental landlords. Most of the other cities have a very different notion of renting (as a long-term lifestyle) and maintaining properties.
♦ Stayed the same	Consistency, comfortable with surroundings, changes moderate.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Stayed the same	Each time development has happened on the properties east of our neighborhood ground water problems have started or increased in homes in our neighborhood. Having to install and operated sump pumps that were not required in the previous 30 years is an increased externalized cost to the residents, and several homes in the neighborhood have had the costs of flood damage when their sump pumps failed (or in our case the first time it flooded so we had to install perimeter drains and a sump).
◆ Stayed the same	Excellent community feeling, connected by email because of ecopass. Fabulous community.
◆ Stayed the same	Except that more home owners are renting to more than 3 unrelated people.
◆ Stayed the same	friendliness amongst neighbors, stagnant bike paths and centers
◆ Stayed the same	great neighbors, location, amount of traffic
◆ Stayed the same	Have only lived in this area for 6 months
◆ Stayed the same	Homeless people hanging out in the park.
◆ Stayed the same	Houses were built in the 60's. They're ugly and energy inefficient. It's really hard to get a building permit to upgrade, even though the City wants energy efficiency!
◆ Stayed the same	I have only been in this area for 2.5 years, but seems to have stayed the same. Nothing jarringly different.
◆ Stayed the same	I like to be able to walk places like restaurants and coffee shops. I enjoy biking and running so easy access to trails and bike routes is a plus.
◆ Stayed the same	I love this neighborhood. I know my neighbors and I trust them.
◆ Stayed the same	It is hard for me to say that scraped small houses rebuilt with huge houses is an improvement to my neighborhood. But the level of wealth in my neighborhood has certainly risen
◆ Stayed the same	it is what it is.
◆ Stayed the same	It's very static
◆ Stayed the same	It's stayed the same for now. You all are about to ruin it by developing the fields along Twin Lakes Road. The vast majority of people living in the surrounding neighborhoods feel this way. Why are the voices and desires of existing residents being muted, in the name of 'progress'? Does Boulder care about its existing homeowners?
◆ Stayed the same	I've been here 26 years. The neighborhood has improved in that there are more kids in the area. Otherwise pretty much the same except the house prices have gone up immensely and therefore the property taxes have too.
◆ Stayed the same	mostly the same - but there is not enough parking in North boulder and I am concerned about the over concentration of affordable housing - research shows it is best when dispersed and integrated
◆ Stayed the same	My neighborhood is in a HOA with strict covenants. Love the nearby parks and trails and use them daily. Shopping and dining are too far a walk and carrying bags. Riding a bike would require riding on Baseline or Arapahoe which makes me uncomfortable, plus again, could not do in bad weather or at night.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Stayed the same	My neighborhood has gotten very expensive, because of Boulder's housing supply restrictions and high demand. While price appreciation has benefited us financially, our new neighbors who can afford the \$1 million + prices tend to be entitled rich people. So much of the community, where people shared and worked together in the neighborhood is eroding. New very wealthy residents hire everything from house cleaning to yard work to child care, etc., so they are very isolated from the community by their wealth. While there are a few duplexes, triplexes, and apartment building in our neighborhood, the vast majority is single family. More housing diversity would allow more resident diversity, reducing the conversion to an elitest enclave.
◆ Stayed the same	No big developments. Schools are still good. Table mesa shopping center is better with a good coffee house and Brew Pub. Not sure if it's a great idea to put another grocery store (Lucky's) next to King Soopers. At least that is what we hear. Could have been something more useful. It has unfortunately become less affordable. Even though we own a home, I don't like seeing prices so ridiculously high.
◆ Stayed the same	No rental infill! Concerned about through traffic in the neighborhood. Concerned about carrying capacity of 55th but am opposed to widening.
◆ Stayed the same	Not a lot has changed for me.
◆ Stayed the same	Nothing changes The neighborhood is built out. The city has made impossible to modify the housing. There are no retail outlets, offices, cafes, restaurants, limited RTD transit, no 15 minute neighborhood and no change in sight. FUCK PLAN-Boulder and their stranglehold on the city.
◆ Stayed the same	Our otherwise lovely neighborhood is at severe risk of annexation and development of affordable housing completely incompatible w/ the rural residential character that is why we live there. And if the project moves forward, it will likely decrease local home values. THIS IS NOT RIGHT!
◆ Stayed the same	Park improvements (ok). Road maintenance (bad). Skyrocketing prices (mixed). Neighbors and community (good).
◆ Stayed the same	Price, traffic safety, bike facilities
◆ Stayed the same	Property values, safety, cleanliness. But, it should be noted that I live in a covenant controlled community, which can be oppressive, but supports stated areas of satisfaction.
◆ Stayed the same	quiet, access to parks and open space, no new houses, accessible by car to most of places that we need to go to
◆ Stayed the same	Sense of community. Visual stability.
◆ Stayed the same	Table Mesa hasn't changed in decades, the Table Mesa Shopping center and every property along Broadway should be upzoned to much higher intensity to encourage redevelopment. Almost every road in Table Mesa is much too wide, the sidewalks are too narrow, and cars drive too fast on the through streets.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Stayed the same	The amount of activity from the homeless shelter is increasing and the transients on the street, in the bike underpasses and now wandering through our neighborhoods. Our kids cannot go across Broadway to friends houses, Amante or the new library without an adult. Biking to and from school down Broadway can be a hassle weaving through the shelter parade. I think in the long run this will be a detriment to our neighborhood and businesses up here.
◆ Stayed the same	The biggest issues in Goss/Grove relate to the number of transients who come through the neighborhood (largely attracted by liquormart) & the poor actions/decision making of the high-school kids. I live at 16th & Grove, and I realize that these are highly localized issues. Though, Boulder attracts and tolerates far too many transients (I would define this as the population of homeless people that have no interest in being a part of the society that we define as part of our culture). I don't see any type of programs helping these people until they decide they want to participate, they have already decided that they don't belong and don't want to join in with the 'normals' - I would suggest that Boulder and the U.S. in general have a much greater responsibility than generally recognized to support those who are homeless and want to participate in society. But I don't want Boulder supporting or allowing societal drop-outs to take over areas of downtown, public spaces or my neighborhood whenever the mood strikes them. I walk with my family (wife and 2 year old) all over the downtown area and we often come upon large and small groups of transients drinking, smoking, using drugs, discussing violent acts they have perpetrated or witnessed, and often bothering us by directly insulting us, trying to get something from us (usually money), or trying to interact with us while they are clearly out of control because of drug or alcohol consumption. I have a lot of sympathy for people who have hit hard times, but I have little tolerance for people who are intentionally rude and abusive while taking advantage of resources they have zero personal investment in.
◆ Stayed the same	The homeless shelter may be attracting more mentally ill people to the neighborhood and deserve our support, but there has an increase in numbers with the economic downturn. I am from NYC so I am used to living with them. I am not sure how to address this, but appreciate that the shelter helps such a diverse array of people.
◆ Stayed the same	The neighborhood is gentrifying and houses are so expensive, young families with average income can't afford to live here. My own children (well-employed and in their 20s) couldn't afford to live here. That makes me very sad. The families moving in are wealthier. 30 years ago the neighborhood was filled with children playing in the street and families socializing. Now you rarely see kids just playing outdoors, making up games. These wealthier families keep life more structured and are less neighborly.
◆ Stayed the same	The only thing that has slightly gotten worse is parking traffic from hikers going to Chautauqua
◆ Stayed the same	The train noise is unbelievable! Why do trains blare their horns so loudly at all times of day? And the highway noise from 119 is almost nonstop.
◆ Stayed the same	There have been ups and downs, but having lived there for so long, things seem to level out over time.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Stayed the same	Things change in neighborhoods. This question implies a binary response, but change is a spectrum. This is not a neutral question.
◆ Stayed the same	This is a stable 'subcommunity' and development here consists of remodeling individual homes, not tearing out homes to densify the neighborhood. The neighborhood is constrained on 3 sides by open space, thus population growth is flat and auto traffic is not worsening.
◆ Stayed the same	Too few people walking, which is partly due to restrictions on density and mixed use.
◆ Stayed the same	Tough answering this one. Things are pretty much the same over the past 6 years...but in the past 1 year, over 1000 new units have gone in...and the results of that are not yet clear. Getting out of my neighborhood at rush hour is certainly worse now...and I expect that to deteriorate as those units finish and are populated. I also see more development on the horizon. And despite what the developers say, I really doubt that all these new places will house folks who ONLY work in the gunbarrel area. That's just wishful thinking. I hope and pray that there will be a study on that before additional high-density units are added on the hairy edge of the city.
◆ Stayed the same	Very little turnover in the past 10 years.
◆ Stayed the same	Very outdated building stock and no real buy in on improving BBS
◆ Stayed the same	We always worry that the number of student rentals in our immediate area will increase, and the neighborhood will decline, but right now it seems to be fairly stable. The rental houses are eye-sores, poorly maintained, with lots of trash around. I wish the university would build more apartments for students so these houses could return to single family homes.
◆ Stayed the same	We are zoned properly for the area with single family homes in a rural area.
◆ Stayed the same	We have a great neighborhood that is being threatened by the proposed high-density development of the parcel of land at 6655 Twin Lakes Road. If this development moves forward then the quality of life in our neighborhood will be far worse.
◆ Stayed the same	We have lots of interaction between neighbors, which is fantastic. But the cost of single-family housing means we're also very economically homogeneous, which is a downside. Mixing in some lower-cost housing would help, and slightly higher density would be a reasonable trade-off.
◆ Stayed the same	We have seen a recent uptick in some non-violent crime, which is obviously concerning. But I believe that if the Armory site is developed, that would drive down some crime. I love the walkability of my neighborhood and I value our diverse population.
◆ Stayed the same	We would like to move into a more urban environment with more amenities within walking or biking distance, but we can't afford to do it. So, we are stuck in Gunbarrel until we leave or until other affordable, more urban options are available in Boulder. That's not likely given the current domination of our planning process by the elitist, NIMBY community.
◆ Stayed the same	Worse: Noise after 11 pm, vandalism, crime, bus transport, Same or better: Relationships with neighbors including renters, people are friendly and look out for each other,
◆ Do not know / no opinion	I have only lived here for 3 years.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Do not know / no opinion	I moved in one year ago to this neighborhood.
♦ Do not know / no opinion	Just moved here in June.
♦ Do not know / no opinion	Only lived there for 1.5 years.
♦ Do not know / no opinion	Only lived there for 6 months
♦	I love my neighborhood. I love the quiet, safety, and abundant wildlife. Bcha would like to destroy it and I am extremely against their methods, objectives, and complete lack of transparency and disregard for our beloved community.
♦	Improved - Bus transit (eco passes)
♦	Rent has increased in our neighborhood the past few years and that has made things difficult
♦	Up until last year I would have said that our neighborhood has improved as an excellent place to live. With the addition of 500 high-end rental units around Lookout and Spine, traffic and crime has increased significantly - and they aren't finished and fully leased yet! These dense, multi-use apartments are out-of character for Gunbarrel and are not what existing residents want. We moved to Gunbarrel because it wasn't the city - we do not want it to become Boulder-City-North.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.21: The city is revitalizing its neighborhood outreach and programs with the new role of a neighborhood liaison. What neighborhood programs, improvements, or outreach services would you like to see emphasized by the city? (OTHER)

- ◆ A neighborhood library
- ◆ Again, better enforcement
- ◆ All of the above
- ◆ Allowing input on Land Use Planning is huge - especially for things that directly affect us - such as the Twin Lakes plan, and the new construction near 63rd and Lookout.
- ◆ Another example of a waste of taxpayer money. Needed only because of the limited makeup of city council
- ◆ Assure that communities just outside the city limits are included in scope
- ◆ Attention to the traffic problems caused by development our neighborhood opposed but the city approved without regard to our concerns
- ◆ be one of us, not one of you.
- ◆ Change City Council / County Commissioners to represent wards / geographical regions
- ◆ Come to HOA meeting and be our liaison to city staff
- ◆ community gardens
- ◆ creating viable parking restrictions that benefit the homeowners in the 700 block of 9th street and Lincoln.
- ◆ Eliminate the neighborhood liaison and put in place voting by district or ward.
- ◆ enforce loitering/camping laws
- ◆ Enforce occupancy limits
- ◆ enforcement of housing standards and policing
- ◆ enforcement of occupancy limits, noise limits, traffic violations parking restrictions that we pay to have enforced
- ◆ Facilitate increasing urban density and the evolution of our community from a suburban to an urban character
- ◆ financial support to rent the school or etown for neighborhood meetings
- ◆ Flood mitigation!! How can we talk about density without removing existing homes from the floodplain!
- ◆ Generally speaking, unless such a liaison helps in preventing government from making poor decisions about land use, it's probably not needed.
- ◆ go for it!
- ◆ Has to be real. No one believes that staff listens to any thing that they disagree with or 'takes it up the line' to people who don't want to hear anything outside the echo chamber.
- ◆ Have each City staff member go out to lunch with a citizen and listen
- ◆ I am so disgusted with the city, all I have to say is leave us alone.
- ◆ I have no idea how the city and county can or will work together in Gunbarrel. Many G residents do not want the urban style, top-down, dense,
- ◆ I really want an underground subway system but I realize that is ridiculous for the size of Boulder.
- ◆ I reviewed the city block grant program for projects in my neighborhood and found the process and requirements very time consuming for a small project.
- ◆ I think this position is a waste of money - another example of Boulder overdoing things.
- ◆ Improve the laws on how many people related to each other can live in a 2 bedroom apartment or mobile home
- ◆ Include us in all new construction proposals prior to action.
- ◆ Less traffic, less noise
- ◆ Let it be.
- ◆ Listen, respect and act on to existing residents views, what works in central Boulder is dramatically different than what is wanted and what works in outlying areas.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.21: The city is revitalizing its neighborhood outreach and programs with the new role of a neighborhood liaison. What neighborhood programs, improvements, or outreach services would you like to see emphasized by the city? (OTHER)

- ◆ Maximize open space
- ◆ More aggressive (particularly proactive) enforcement of noise and trash problems.
- ◆ more code enforcement and police presence
- ◆ More effective patrolling in the UHill neighborhood to identify disruptive students and more effective CU disciplinary penalties for repeat offenders - but combined with allowing many new liquor licenses in the UHill commercial district so that students have a place to party that does not disrupt the neighborhood
- ◆ more Sub community plans
- ◆ More support for neighborhood or city wide EcoPass
- ◆ need more cohousing
- ◆ Need to go to a award system to engage responsiveness.
- ◆ Needs city/county flood mitigation to actually happen. More coordination between city/county is needed to effect this.
- ◆ Neighbors should be notified if the city or county is in negotiations before purchasing land/development planning. Not after the fact when the neighbors have no say.
- ◆ no growth or development
- ◆ not really alot
- ◆ Open and support existing online channels of communications (eg. Twitter and email) as a means of gathering community input.
- ◆ Our water main broke last week & we were without water for 8 hours. I would rather City spends that money on infrastructure repair than a 'neighborhood liaison'. If we can't figure out how to have a neighborhood potluck on our own, there's nothing a highly paid city employee should do. Your priorities are backwards.
- ◆ Parking and trash overflow enforcement for wildlife versus people safety
- ◆ parking patrolling
- ◆ Protect us from cracking.
- ◆ Rec Center improvements
- ◆ Reducing rentals and college housing in the neighborhood
- ◆ Stop endlessly hiring employees and increasing taxes.
- ◆ STOP GROWING AND DENSIFYING!
- ◆ Stop trying to inflict city problems on our county neighborhoods
- ◆ Support 'Bee Safe' neighborhoods
- ◆ Support for Code enforcement
- ◆ support for development of neighborhood organizations
- ◆ Support neighborhoods in their effort to address disagreement about how the neighborhood should move forward - basically mediate between different stakeholders
- ◆ support systems in place prior to placing homeless veterans in their cages to warehouse them.
- ◆ Support to enforce zoning law, parking regs, etc.
- ◆ Support to improve community-based policing and foster personal relationships between law enforcement and residents
- ◆ Training for eco-pass coordinators
- ◆ wards or districts
- ◆ We need rent control a lot more than we need 'liaisons.'
- ◆ Where is the flood mitigation project planned for 2015 at Goose Creek?

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ 'Boulder is not 'built out'. Barcelona's Gràcia neighborhood is less than 7 stories tall & houses 120,000 people in 7% of Boulder's area.' - @ZaneSelvans
- ◆ A city and/or county operated internet service would allow more people to work from their residence and avoid exacerbating the increasing traffic congestion in the Boulder area.
- ◆ Address 'affordability' of housing in a logical manor. Creating high density 'affordable' housing as opposed to integrating it with the fabric and character of the neighborhoods is a mistake. Involve the communities in the discussion from the begining (prior to purchasing land) to get their input and involvement.
- ◆ affordable housing. artist's retreats. job opportunities,, and a living wage.
- ◆ Am quite sure that these comments will be disregarded or willfully misinterpreted, tossed in the round file and ignored. The city is led by development-friendly rich people, for development-friendly rich people, same as it ever was. Thanks for ruining my beloved city, people.
- ◆ Apparent commercial development on the 287 corridor appears to be destroying much potential open space that could be preserved.
- ◆ Be original. But please be aware of who we want to come to Boulder to help this town thrive in years to come, those who cannot speak for themselves, and not just build a plan that protects who lives here now and what brought them here. Stagnation is not our future. Smarter growth should be.
- ◆ Boulder city / county government needs to address the failure to implement an effective transit plan for routine travel between the City and Denver.
- ◆ Boulder is a wonderful place and we are grateful to the public officials who help make it so. Our problems are those of success, not failure. Some of the issues raised--affordable housing or transportation are the critical ones--are very tough, but that can and should be addressed. Preserving this city in its current stasis will not achieve this. Thank you for leadership and vision in pointing us all toward the future.
- ◆ Boulder is at a critical point. How we manage this rapid growth is of the utmost importance. Boulder runs the risk of losing it's character and quality of life that makes this community so unique and special. With rapid growth comes an increase in traffic, crime, and cost of living. This is a not a recipe for a thriving, safe, and healthy community.
- ◆ Boulder's housing issue is a supply and demand issue. Demand is outstripping supply. Increase supply to provide enough housing for the people who want to be here. The limited supply is creating the traffic and commuting issues people hate. Boulder should allow some more creative freedom, it is too tightly controlled by the vocal minority.
- ◆ City council needs to be more open to community input (ex. Folsom Street Corridor, short-term rentals ordinance). New members of Council should revisit those issues and truly ask the opinion of the community before taking action.
- ◆ Clean up the City by getting rid of the destructive transient population AND figure out a way to increase parking

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Climate Change is the overwhelming challenge of our century. We must make rapid progress to decrease CO2 generation and eliminate more carbon from our atmosphere. One of the most hopeful ways to combat climate change is soil sequestration of carbon, which uses specific agricultural, range management and forestry practices to sequester more carbon in the soil than they produce. In addition to locking up carbon, these practices can also lead to greater soil fertility, better water retention, lower fertilizer/fuel costs, and increased crop yields. Boulder County is blessed with large swaths of agricultural and forest lands which, if managed appropriately, have the potential to sequester a large percentage (perhaps up to 1/3rd or more) of the CO2 produced by County residents. Soil sequestration of carbon is a new science and Best Management Practices for our local climate and soils are still being developed. Very small capital outlays now to support local studies will pay huge future dividends, and Boulder has the opportunity to be a leader, in partnership with CSU. City of Boulder and Boulder County agricultural lands, as well as private farms which are already using many soil sequestration methods, provide opportunities for Pilot Projects to test various strategies on the Front Range. Currently, most people do not understand the vocabulary or concepts of Soil Sequestration of Carbon. Knowledge about healthy soils is lacking, and most people do not realize that carbon can be sequestered in lawns, mulched flower beds, vegetable gardens, farm fields, rangelands and forest lands. With education, landowners can take simple steps to sequester more carbon themselves. I ask that you make the following additions to Sections 4 and 9 of the Boulder Valley Comp Plan: Section 4.09 Soil Sequestration of Carbon: The City and County will identify and implement innovative and cost-effective actions to sequester carbon on their agricultural, range and forest lands. The City will develop strategies to educate landowners about how to sequester carbon on their own properties. Partnerships with public and private entities can amplify the effectiveness of these actions. Section 9.09 Soil Sequestration of Carbon: Although many agricultural practices generate carbon, other agricultural practices can sequester large amounts of carbon in soils, enrich agricultural lands, and increase water retention and soil fertility. The City and County will encourage and support the development of Best Management Practices for soil sequestration of carbon along the Front Range. They will identify suitable sites to run Pilot Projects for Soil Sequestration of Carbon, implement soil protection actions for their own properties, and explore opportunities to incentivize "Carbon Farming".
- ◆ Comments have been limited to City of Boulder. They apply to other cities as well. Erie's urban sprawl is unsightly and is a major impact on the agriculture heritage. Open space between cities has diminished significantly in the past 30 years. While bike and pedestrian trails are wonderful often they are built at the expense of treasured riparian areas. All Open Space does not and should not be accessed by humans. Wildlife are treasured neighbors. More needs to be done to emphasize and enforce the responsibilities that accompany the right to enjoy open spaces. A coordinated effort between all Boulder County governments is a high priority.
- ◆ Community Involvement! True involvement, not smoke and mirrors. In addition, don't misname developments just to market them to the neighborhood. A town center should have a center. Not apartments wedged on wetlands with no community appeal. There is no place walk or talk or sit or do anything behind the unsightly back of King Soopers and Neighboring stores back parking lots.
- ◆ Consider allowing more MH zoning and mobile home parks in appropriate areas. It's the most affordable and dense form of single family housing, which is important in the mix. Encourage resident ownership of mobile home parks and/or mobile home lots.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Consider the broad community, not just a few loud and selfish voices opposing all change. The 65,000 daily in-commuters to Boulder cannot vote in elections, but their needs and concerns should be part of the discussion. We all breath the air pollution from the thousands of auto in-commuters, and experience the congestion from their vehicles. Providing some of those in-commuters with housing choices inside Boulder is an ethical and logistical imperative.
- ◆ Continue to improve because Boulder is just as beautiful now as it was when I first moved here in 1992!
- ◆ Do not build affordable housing at 6655 Twin Lakes Road, and that should include the lot directly across the street as well. This is a perfect opportunity for Boulder to maintain much needed open space in this community. A neighborhood park would be a much better use for this location.
- ◆ do not develop ini Twin Lakes (Gunbarrel). Thank you!
- ◆ Do not upzone our Twin Lakes neighborhood to build a 100% PUBLIC HOUSING high density housing development!!!! It will ruin our neighborhood and end up ghettoizing it because the kind of development is NOT SUITABLE FOR THE AREA--THERE ARE NO SERVICES FOR SUCH VULNERABLE PEOPLE WITH MENTAL AND PHYSICAL DISABILITIES--ALL Human Services providers agree that their clients should be housed close-in in Boulder rather than 5 miles outside Boulder in a rural residential neighborhood. This is a disaster in the making if it is pushed through over common sense for some kind of political reason. I can't imagine that this has been thought through for the well-being and safety of all of the people involved. PLEASE DO NOT BUILD THIS OVER THE OVERWHELMING OPPOSITION OF THE TWIN LAKES NEIGHBORHOOD!!!
- ◆ Do some user testing of this survey. Sit down with a few groups and have them take it, find out if it's understandable to them. My hypothesis is that you're weeding out everyone but those that are wonky as fuck about Boulder planning.
- ◆ Don't buy into the no-growth agenda. That will only create a community that is even more exclusive. Boulder is vibrant community, not a museum.
- ◆ Don't forget the importance of single family homes.
- ◆ Don't let a few vocal people, generally the elitist minority in this city, stop Boulder from becoming the most vibrant, unique, urban community in the world.
- ◆ Emphasize graphics and plain English in the Plan.
- ◆ Explain what and why regularly and frequently. Affordable housing is important to Boulderites because... And the extra money that it costs citizens is important because... And having affordable housing improves our carbon footprint because... And it really cuts down the number on those 60K commuters every workday and we can prove it with ... And yes it's okay for this building and that building to be 55 feet tall (you know like the BDC bldg) because...
- ◆ Focus on the changing demographics of the city and county. There is an expected large increase in the percentage of senior population. Include the specific needs of this group in the comprehensive plan, ie. do not restrict auto transportation on existing major streets since the seniors form of transportation is more dependent on autos and much less on walking, biking, or public transportation. Add additional wellness facilities including a warm water therapy pool. Recognize that many seniors live in homes they have owned for a long time and would prefer to continue to live in their homes vs going into an organized senior housing. Put their requirements for independence, continued wellness via wellness facilities in the comprehensive plan
- ◆ Generally the plan often reinforces fiefdoms and political correctness.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ♦ I am appalled at the bubble attitude I see from Boulder. We should be formulating a BOCO RTD variant so housing and affordability options can be created and planned across the county in the context of a leading edge non-bus transit solution. I am appalled that the city will create more density in the south boulder creek drainage without undertaking flood mitigation to remove SE Boulder from the floodplain. We feel the newly arrived tech/startup/VC community is exerting too much influence in the direction of their illusionary new urbanism while ignoring that fact that many of us chose Boulder because we have lived in San Francisco etc and hated it.
- ♦ I am appalled that you show the Boulder neighborhood map with Gunbarrel all within the city limits. Perhaps the city and county staff are misinformed, which is truly appalling. The 2/3 of Gunbarrel residents who live in unincorporated County land within the boundaries you show as in the city, on more than half of the land area have little or no democratic input on their neighborhood development by the city of Boulder. Overruling everything I have said on this extensive form, city and county employees need more education and training on this community. This ignorance is truly appalling.
- ♦ I appreciate the work that the leaders of our community have done to make Boulder a liveable place. I just find I disagree with the pace of change. I hope to have a better composition of the city council with the election so there isn't too much group-think and more problem-solving with outreach to the community.
- ♦ I believe in a progressive vision for Boulder. I love the character and natural beauty, but I have no desire to live in an elite, NYMBY town filled with only Colorado's most wealthy. Boulder became famous for being a town where people could go out and enjoy nature in a progressive community. I encourage this plan to recapture both of these things. Access to open space has not kept pace with both our understanding of how we can manage human impacts to our system, nor the demand of our increasing population. In addition, I see densifying housing and businesses and necessary, both for social justice reasons and to keep our city thriving and vital.
- ♦ I believe several more projects are better than a few big ones.
- ♦ I do not see how Boulder can continue to grow more dense and add more rental units without becoming an even more unaffordable city, with rents so high homeowners cannot afford to buy so more homes become rentals held by a small number of real estate LLC's. Increased population and business encouraging community to the city (Google) will continue to increase traffic congestion and a reduction in city and county services and a decline in the concept of neighborhoods. Right now the Central part of the City, the 'Hill', is really two distinct zones: the student zone, where there are blocks of city rentals and, of course, tremendous turnover, and areas farther away which have homeowners living in them, where more people know each other and work to maintain neighborhood schools and some neighborhood integrity. I do not know how things can improve unless these two zones are addressed separately.
- ♦ I don't know if this falls into this plan, but it would be nice to see more snow removal on the side streets (not salt, just some plowing).
- ♦ I found out about this survey from a blog run by a neighborhood I lived in previously. Otherwise, I may not have found out about it. How does the city generally broadcast such information? I get the Daily Camera on Sundays (and may be stopping it, not much news in it), and occasionally look at the city's web site, but feel that I miss out on much that is underway. So communication enhancements?
- ♦ I grew up here and my greatest concern is that my kids, and others of modest means, will be excluded from Boulder. I would much rather be a small, dense, high-performing city than an enclave of suburban rich.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ I have lived in Colorado for over 28 years, most of them in Boulder. I'm very disappointed in the lack of dialogue among city and county leadership with community residents. The sessions of community outreach by the city and county are not truly geared to listening and dialogue. They are more like 'hearing' sessions. Lots of nodding and 'we'll get back to you'. No real effort to dialogue and 'feed-forward'.
- ◆ I hope this survey will actually be paid attention to - most surveys and chance for public input are usually just a formality and the small group of people who decide what happens with Plans like this already have their mind made up and our input has no bearing on what happens
- ◆ I saw a link to this survey on a Twitter site I follow, otherwise I would not have known to take the survey. I'd like the city to do a better job reaching out publicly to neighborhoods to let us know about things and to get our feedback.
- ◆ I support reasoned growth and development within the adopted urban limits. I think density of homes, commercial area and employment centers is a sound way to continue to preserve open space outside of our urban growth areas that make this area an really great place to live, work, and play!
- ◆ I support some growth in the City of Boulder, and we do need some additional housing, but we don't need to discard the values we've lived under for decades in the process. This to me means incremental change as opposed to a sea change.
- ◆ I think our most important assets are our open spaces and parks. We cannot let development ruin these or add such high numbers of people that these spaces become congested. There are already lines up mountain trails in some parks on the weekends. If the population gets too large, and open spaces become too crowded, they will lose their appeal and function. Boulder will lose its identity as a peaceful place connected to natural habitats and beauty. It will be just another city.
- ◆ I think this is a difficult time in Boulder for trying to make sustainable choices and keep people happy on both sides of the fence. I'm not for taller buildings or more people but I'd like there to be more choice and affordability so that I can stay in Boulder and own a place. I can see the challenges from both sides of the fence. But I do hope a solution happens and helps out!
- ◆ I travel extensively for work (I am submitting this from Yokohama, Japan), and when I come home, I come home to one of the quietest areas around Boulder (Red Fox Hills). The area is scheduled for destruction--oops, development. Increasing the traffic and noise, brightening the dark night sky -- I could live in the urban East if I valued those qualities. There is value in seeing the Flatirons, there is value in seeing the stars at night, there is value in quiet that allows me to hear the bees working through the flowers. Once gone, these things will not return. I believe that these and similar qualities are lost in the allure of developer dollar that could fund pet projects. I believe that staff discounts the rights and needs of current residents over potential residents and is selling us down the river in exchange for some future unrealized utopia -- of their own definition.
- ◆ I will be moving to a new house in the city limits late next year.
- ◆ I wish more people knew about surveys like this. I don't think the local government gets the word out on what is happening and uses the feedback. My biggest concern is density, both from an environmental perspective as well as preserving our life style. We may have to move if certain decisions are made and that makes me very sad.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ♦ I would like to add that overall I deeply appreciate what Boulder has created and is trying to maintain in terms of open space and limited development, quality of life, opportunity for business, and cultural expression. However, as previously mentioned, I am seriously concerned that less affluent areas of Boulder County will become 'victim' to the urgency to create more affordable and dense housing to handle population and business growth, without consideration to the current residents. Specifically, I am very concerned about the proposed developments in Gunbarrel. I am also extremely disappointed that Boulder allows developers to cash out of affordable housing requirements and build rentals instead of ownable residences. This trend may have a short-term gain of cash flow and City revenue, but will ultimately deepen the problems of lack of affordable housing (as rents will rise), inequality in the community, and degradation of the environment and setting (as apt owners are typically not invested in improving nature and grounds). I think the City should absolutely require that new development be balanced between apartments and condos and houses, and absolutely require that affordable house be integrated without a cash-alternative option, and ensure that these elements are present in all new key developments, if it wishes to achieve some of its diversity, residence and equality goals. Thank you.
- ♦ I would like to hope that the opinions in these surveys are considered when making decisions regarding our neighborhoods. I hope that we are not just going through the motions of expressing ourselves to appease us, when the Plan will proceed to develop structures that neighbors do not want.
- ♦ I would like to say that I appreciated having input in this survey and hope others take the time to do so as well. I would encourage the people who read and advise on this survey to listen to the communities that are impacted by the purposed changes, giving each person a voice in these decisions. Thank you.
- ♦ I would like to see emphasis on preservation of existing neighborhoods' character. Do not up zone neighborhoods in order to achieve the new urban density design. Keep higher density in appropriate areas. I think that preservation of existing neighborhoods is not exclusive of new urban development - just contain the new urban development to the city's urban core and don't export it to the surrounding residential areas. I am seeing the up zoning of quiet out of the way neighborhoods and I do not think this is a good trend. I am very much in favor of continued work on connecting multi-modal trails in the county and city for ease of travel between different areas. I would like to see work on art in the city. Maintain open space. Work on unique solutions to transportation issues - e.g. commuter vans, better public
- ♦ I would like to see us look at zoning to allow more tiny houses and in-law units in neighborhoods that are currently zoned for only single-family residential homes.
- ♦ I'd like to express my admiration for the work Boulder officials and council have done over the years - the results speak for themselves. However, regulations on individual owner occupied property owners are excessive and unproductive. The same enforcement resources focused instead on rental properties would give a much better outcome.
- ♦ I'd like to see the widespread use of lawn pesticides banned in Boulder. Boulder bills itself as a healthy city and yet my child can't safely play on many of the lawns. I once ended up in the hospital for a few days due to Chemlawn exposure. This stuff is toxic, dangerous, and should have no place in an eco-friendly Boulder. Commercial and professionally managed residential properties seem to be the worst offenders.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ I've lived in Boulder since December 1991. I love it here. And the city has made good decisions over the decades to guarantee our quality of life. The only project I haven't liked is Boulder Junction. The view west coming into the city on Pearl is now blocked. And the buildings in Boulder Junction look like crappy stuff from the 1950s-1970s. If this is our future, I don't care for it. I'm okay with having a high density project in that location if we also get our train station. But if we're not going to, I don't see that it adds much to have all of those buildings sprouting up there. On the other hand, I am fine with Google coming to Boulder. Let's just make sure we don't let developers put up junky buildings wherever it suits them.
- ◆ I've lived in Gunbarrel nearly 17 years as a homeowner. Why hasn't the Twin Lakes Trail that dead-ends west of Spine Road been extended to the Cottonwood Trail off of Jay Road? This connector would keep
- ◆ If Ballot initiatives 300 and 301 pass, can the Comp Plan please permit exceptions for affordable housing (i.e. higher density, increased height, reduced parking)
- ◆ If I haven't said it enough, Boulder is extremely expensive! I work at a non-profit in Boulder, so I'm doing good work and making a moderate \$37,000 salary. My fiancé and I want to live close enough to walk to the grocery store, restaurants, shops, trails, etc, and we want to be able to bike or walk to work. The only place that we can afford is a 400 sq. ft apt. It's tiny, and we make do, but it would be so nice to make Boulder a place where young people doing work in the public service field can live comfortably too - not just my millionaire neighbors. For such a progressive place, Boulder is not very progressive when it comes to affordability.
- ◆ If the city continues to add population indefinitely, the quality of life will go down. The streets are clearly not designed to accommodate the traffic we already have, much less additional inhabitants and cars. Encouraging biking and public transport is great, but daily use is not realistic for the majority of current or new residents.
- ◆ If the implementation of development so far were in keeping with stated BVCP values, Boulder would be able to move forward in a collaborative manner. Try looking at what Ft Collins did several years ago and what they have now.
- ◆ If you don't curtail the train whistle at Pearl, Valmont, 47th, and Independence you're going to have some angry residents in all this new housing that's being built along the tracks. It's quite possibly my biggest complaint about where I live in Boulder (I know that's small potatoes but it's awful at 4 am).
- ◆ If you want more housing, why not consider the giant acres of open land north of 36 and south of Boulder Valley Ranch, rather than jamming high density into places that it doesn't belong
- ◆ Improve traffic flow in Boulder - allowing growth to continue without improving ingress and egress has made Boulder a horrible place to drive. Growth in Longmont should go east, not west, to keep green space between the town and foothills.
- ◆ In case you're not seeing these results comprehensively you need to reverse course on your abandonment of county streets. You're being horrible stewards of our communities. If you want to condemn our non-city homes make us an offer. I'll take your \$1 million and gladly move the heck out for this that is going to go downhill. If you can afford to give money to people in other counties for open space you should be re-evaluating your priorities. Also, grown spines and don't let the City of Boulder boss you around. You should be ashamed.
- ◆ In my dreams, we could have grand circle of passing the 'talking stick' like Native Americans used to do. Elevate the conversation, so people can be heard but also be listening. Something happens when a 'sacred container' for such conversations is well handled, all our hearts synchronise. Really! Mayor Applebaum (bless his heart) went to see the Pope; we need a spiritual (non-religious) sensibility in the commons.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ In this update we need to add a land use designation of 'affordable'. Affordable Commercial/Affordable Residential/Affordable mixed use. We also need to find out if our job creation is helping or hurting our long term economic and social sustainability. Answer the question: is there a middle? Or, are we creating high paying jobs that trickle down to create only low paying service and retail jobs?
- ◆ It is indeed comprehensive - hopefully it can be as equally successful
- ◆ It seems like the BVCP is generally shoved down the throats of the voters. Your outreach has been generally 'here's what we've done and what we're doing next' vs. 'what would you like to see and how can we help with YOUR vision?'
- ◆ It's crazy that parking is being reduced with all the people that commute in. Some people NEED their cars because of kids, sick family members, etc.
- ◆ It's time to seriously consider developing the Planning Reserve. Hogan Pancost should be developed.
- ◆ Keep Boulder green. No new development. Continue fracking moratorium. Thank you!
- ◆ Keep it 100 Boulder. Leave wild spaces wild.
- ◆ Keep up the good work! I know people love to complain, but my family thinks Boulder is the best run city in which we've lived.
- ◆ Let it be.
- ◆ Let neighborhoods have a greater voice in land use designations that will have a significant effect on their quality of life and in maintaining the character of their neighborhoods. Don't let developers, real estate agents, and other financial interests determine the types of communities we live in or the direction of Boulder. Once they make their money and leave, the citizens of Boulder and the surrounding areas are the ones who will have to live with the decisions that were made.
- ◆ Let's don't ossify and let's be truly urban - Boulder wants all the benefits of an 'urban' place but is not willing to accept what it really takes - density; Boulder wants a rich person's version of urbanity - limit the community and then only the rich can afford it. Let's be more! Live on the 'wild' side and impress the ideas that made Boulder great and not worry about 55 foot limits - let's be great
- ◆ Let's make the tough, uncomfortable choice of doing the right thing and filling in the green belt to preserve our environment and provide housing opportunities for lower wage earners.
- ◆ Lift the occupancy limit. It will increase density without destroying our mountain views, and lower the cost of living in Boulder, making our community truly inclusive and welcoming...not just to rich two-kids-and-a-dog yuppies and retired engineers.
- ◆ Listen to the community. When making decisions about where we live, we--not a ruling body such as city council over which we as unincorporated Boulder County residents have no control--are the best-equipped to understand local needs and impact.
- ◆ Listen to the residents of Gunbarrel and respect their viewpoints which are very different from those in central Boulder. Now that you have dramatically increased the residents in Gunbarrel with the addition of the dense apartments near King Soopers, improve transportation in the area. This includes, expanding roads - Lookout is now very congested at rush hour and needs to be expanded and traffic lights added. Also, 63rd south of Twin Lakes Road becomes very congested. Finally, the RTD routes that Gunbarrel make it un-useable - to get to Table Mesa Park-n-Ride takes an hour - so that is not an option for most residents.
- ◆ Make housing more affordable for middle income families. Especially for those that work for the City.
- ◆ May the force be with you! Thank you!
- ◆ More community engagement is needed prior to development that affects everyone. Currently, there are some efforts to get community feedback but there are no results residents see from their input that change what seem to be pre-ordained plans on the part of the city of Boulder.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Need to enforce standards in the comp plan. Right now it doesn't have any teeth. Don't let another Boulder Junction or PearlWest happen. Prioritize residents above developers.
- ◆ No matter how you feel about 300/301 (I personally am voting 'no') there is no doubt that a lot of people in this town are sick and tired of the way things are being done with respect to growth. I think these folks have a real point and should be listened to. We have grown and added jobs in a disheveled and random manner. I hope this comprehensive plan addresses this void.
- ◆ No more new housing in Boulder! Traffic and crime are on the rise. Let's keep Boulder what Boulder has always been: small, safe, beautiful views, fabulous open spaces resulting in healthy citizens and neighborhoods.
- ◆ No, just please listen to residents and don't foist all the city's problems on Gunbarrel or North Broadway or wherever you see an open field. Thanks.
- ◆ no...
- ◆ Nuisance rental properties owned by landlords who do not care if their renters fit into the neighborhood are a growing concern for neighborhood quality of life in South Boulder. Wall to wall cars, trash, unkempt yards, snow never shoveled etc.. It's not just the renters fault alone, it's the absent home owners that just collect rents with no regard for quality of life in the neighborhoods where their property exists. S.44th just south of Table Mesa is a prime example. Nuisance rentals seem to be getting worse.
- ◆ Oh yeah. Ya got 8 hours?
- ◆ One fundamental issue with the comp plan is that it seems to function more as a guiding document rather than an enforceable document.
- ◆ Only that it would be nice if I could access the squares -
- ◆ Open space has always been proposed as supporting many uses but the board has been anti dog, anti bike, anti runners, basically anti anything more active than bird watching. This needs to change. It is ridiculous to assume you can add more housing and more traffic lanes on US36 to bring more traffic into town and at the same time reduce the number of traffic lanes on streets like Iris, Folsom, 55th, 63rd, 30th without increasing congestion and adversely affecting air quality. It may be possible to get by with the number of lanes we have as we continue to grow but not take away existing capacity.
- ◆ Open space has been a huge benefit to Boulder valley. I worry the enterprise is becoming too large and will cost too much to maintain in the future. I would not increase the open space supply we have enough. Too much of a good thing is too much. Thank you!
- ◆ Organic growth is the best growth. General limitations, as set by zoning, help segregate commercial and residential areas. However, too many regulations (overly-restrictive height limitations, residential building limitations, etc.) prevent density and increase prices, which increases the city's carbon footprint. Allowing a greater number of affordable residential units in/around work/recreation/retail centers enables more people to drive less, creating a better life for everyone.
- ◆ Pave the roads. Stop municipalization don't over-invest in Open space at the expense of other services, like paving roads. No more right-sizing experiments
- ◆ Perhaps the people responsible for this BVCP should visit the neighborhoods they are suggesting changes in and listen to the people of those neighborhoods. We have feelings and ideas and have a strong understanding of what is the best for our neighborhoods because we live there. Stop putting an agenda out there that isn't at all supported by reality.
- ◆ Please add more open space!
- ◆ Please be more welcoming to great companies that are considering relocating here as they seem to be bringing great, green, hi paying people here.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Please consider affordable housing expansion by why of the planning reserve.
- ◆ Please do not build on open spaces. Please do not build on open spaces. And please do not build on open spaces. And please just stop planning and building a bigger Boulder. This place is not what it used to be and its really sad. Bigger is not better!
- ◆ Please do not let the only voices heard be rich older people who want to preserve the Boulder of their memories. Many young people and young families want mixed use developments, want to be able to walk/bike to a grocery store/bus stop/library/open space etc within 15 minutes of their home. Mixed use is the 'community character' that I want in Boulder.
- ◆ Please do not put high-density low-income housing on twin lakes road in the open fields. It is not fitting with the character of the surrounding neighborhoods. It would be much better used as a park, school, sports fields, etc. If it is to be developed for residential, I think it would be much more fitting to be single family homes or townhomes / condos for middle class folks. Boulder has squeezed out the middle class by policies that encourage super expensive housing and subsidized low income housing over middle class.
- ◆ Please don't limit development. Instead, please push developers to create compelling streetscapes, mixed-income housing, mixed-use development, walkable neighborhoods, high-density residential, and other key components to a vibrant, economically prosperous, innovative urban community.
- ◆ Please find ways to improve alternative transportation without making car traffic worse. 'Right sizing' Folsom was good example of what not to do. Some pedestrian crosswalks on 28th make traffic worse. The one on 28th just north of Pearl is a good example of something that makes traffic much worse while benefiting just a few. Keep investing in affordable housing.
- ◆ Please keep Gunbarrel rural. The city and county seem determined to fill it up with more and more development. It's not too late to stop, but it's on the brink.
- ◆ Please please please, can we make this fun? So many people get burned out or bored to death by the long, grinding process. And can we make it more online and interactive? More asynchronous engagement opportunities (that are still interactive).
- ◆ Please please prioritize infrastructure repair. It's ridiculous to be a city with more planners per capita than anywhere else in the nation when our water mains are breaking, snow is only plowed on the biggest streets, and the streets have potholes. The City looks ridiculous, fighting climate change but wasting water from an aging infrastructure. The municipal utility has been a terrible waste of money. It's time to take that offramp.
- ◆ Please preserve our rural neighborhoods in Gunbarrel and keep the zoning at 6655 Twin Lakes Road as it currently is.
- ◆ Please protect Boulder from a frenzy of change for the sake of change. We don't need to remake this city. We need to protect what brought us here and make sure we don't wreck it. Change is fine and inevitable, but please protect us from grandiose and potentially disastrous change.
- ◆ Please realize that even modest growth is unsustainable and that there is a limit to how much any place can/should grow.
- ◆ Please rethink and rework your growth initiatives. They are currently, misplaced, and interpreted by residents as being greedy and undemocratic.
- ◆ Please slow the growth. We can't be expected to house everyone who desires to live here. I worked hard as a R.N all my life and to afford to live and work here. This is not an elitist city. I came here from a crowded urban area. Why turn Boulder into just another overcrowded front range city? Boulder is fast losing its character and genuine beauty.
- ◆ Please turn 6655 Twin Lakes Road into protected open space! This is a vital wildlife corridor for raptors, song birds, foxes, and more.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Please, please do not ruin our neighborhood, the wildlife, the environment (water table is very high and additional housing on the Twin Lakes Road parcel will have a negative impact on flooding in the area.
- ◆ Prepare for a future where we tear down our land gobbling interchanges and put this land to better use, like housing, jobs and parks. I'm thinking of table Mesa PnR, U.S. 36 and baseline, etc. There is valuable land in our city currently being wasted.
- ◆ Proposal 300 is pure nimbyism. But it arose because the city makes dumb rules that don't fit every n'hood. Let the n'hoods experiment with a rationale and city guidance. In effect, n'hoods can compete to become great places to live, with city guidance which could increase how much I care what happens in my n'hood. Instead we're all just tolerating the bad decisions council makes by trying to please everyone, especially the squeaky wheels.
- ◆ Proposed Housing on 6655 Twin Lake Road and across the street. Please build your affordable housing projects somewhere else. And please convert 6655 Twin Lakes Rd and former school district property to open space; or grand school district property back to the school district and build a small school there with lots of trees and open space. Please construct your multi-use trail, propose partially for Williams Fork and Twin Lakes rd, on the area east of Northern Colorado Water ditch. So drivers are not hurt trying to cross the street to get into cars; and so people are not trying to Park on Brandon Creek or steel other parking places and creating a lot of conflict.
- ◆ PVCP is too conservative! We should be planning for 20 -50 years into the future, no more parking!
- ◆ Rezone the entire city as multi-use if you're at all sincere about getting people out of cars and making 15 minute neighborhoods. Separate bikes from cars (transit infrastructure) if you ever expect a large transition from cars to bikes. Enlarge the off-street bike trail network to several major north - south and east - west bike paths like the Boulder Creek Path, but larger.
- ◆ Right now the BVCP update is being used to spring annexation and upzoning plans on unsuspecting neighborhoods. This is absolutely against the stated goals of the plan, and a further demonstration that local government does not want to hear the voices of the people who will be affected by their decisions. Open a dialogue with the citizens. Adjust plans to address their concerns. Above all, really listen. Consensus can be reached.
- ◆ Road maintenance and traffic mitigation need to be top priorities. Adding bike and bus lanes is not going to fix the traffic problems which are made worse by the dense housing areas. People will not stop driving until there is rail service to and within Boulder. Every time another road project is completed and ignores car traffic people are unhappy. And really, the county must allocate funds for road maintenance from our taxes. Really. It's time to follow the law and honor your comittment to county residents.
- ◆ Seek a balance and reduce favoring any single group or type, i.e., business, real estate, developers
- ◆ Since recreation is not listed anywhere, even though it is certainly one of the largest components of quality of life, I find this Comp Plan to be biased out of the gate and thus scientifically lacking.
- ◆ Some areas in Boulder like the Table Mesa/Highland park/Rolling hills are getting to be very expensive and out of reach of the upper middle class even. No attempt is being made to reign in the home values in those areas by restricting investors from buying and selling for a 200K profit in a few months or by building affordable high density housing there. Some other areas are however considered fair game for Socialist activities and practices. As in most cases some people are always more equal than others. The title says 'Our Legacy/Our Future' but it should actually read 'Some peoples legacy/Some peoples future'.
- ◆ Something needs to be done about The Hill commercial district. I'm a home owner and have lived there for 10 years and it's getting worse. I really want to raise my kids in this neighborhood, but the police are never engaging with anyone but the students. It doesn't feel as safe as it did.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Stop all the development in Gunbarrel and honor your commitment to pave our neighborhood roads. Listen to the citizens. Stop trying to push policies on us that fix no one problems, but instead push your agenda of what you think we need.
- ◆ Stop building in Boulder and ruining our once beautiful town!
- ◆ Stop building ugly apartments! There are too many people here! No more stupid bike lane ideas!
- ◆ Stop North Boulder homeless problem (outdoor gatherings with alcohol, drugs, sex and abuse)
- ◆ Stop trying to make Boulder 'better'. It's not working.
- ◆ Students need to be incorporated into our community in a way that gives them a maintainable lifestyle without destroying the infrastructure of close to campus neighborhoods. They need to be housed in units they can afford with the reality that they cannot properly maintain single family houses and that denser living in all-student properties maintained by owner management fees removes the responsibility from the tenant. These do not need to resemble old style dorms but provide a safe environment where they can live independently, in apartment, condo style buildings that are modern and safe.
- ◆ support mobile homes and alternative transportation get the commuter rail going and please, please reduce the rental trend
- ◆ Take great care with the Mapleton Center redevelopment. That spot is a gem. Having single family homes terracing up the hill side would be tragic. (see Douglas County) And keep the smokestack.
- ◆ Thank you for asking for input from the broad community. This is not an easy task and the issues at hand are pronounced.
- ◆ Thank you for listening. I love Boulder, I think it can continue to be a better version of itself and I hope to be lucky enough to live here for many years to come!
- ◆ Thank you for producing this content and providing it to the community in an online form. I hope this is provided to the BVSD school district and distributed widely. I am curious about the metrics for evaluating qualitative data you are receiving.
- ◆ Thank you for providing this online survey
- ◆ Thank you for the work that you have put into helping to keep our community livable.
- ◆ Thank you for your hard work
- ◆ thank you for your history of support and innovation over the years - especially open space.
- ◆ Thank you!
- ◆ Thank you.
- ◆ Thanks for all your hard work and efforts!
- ◆ Thanks for asking for feedback and listening. I am proud and grateful to live in Boulder, but I worry about some of the rapid changes I'm seeing in some areas while other areas feel neglected. I hope this plan benefits everyone (young/old, rich/poor, traditional/diverse) equitably.
- ◆ Thanks for asking!
- ◆ Thanks for doing this work! I know you can never make everyone happy but people need to remember there are a lot of diverse interests in Boulder. Let's try and make this the most livable, workable place possible and make sure to include different groups in the planning. Planning for the future is so important- there's a reason we are all here but more people want to be included too and that is not going to change. There's a lot of things that are great about Boulder and Boulder County but certainly a lot of work to do as well.
- ◆ Thanks for this opportunity to hear citizen opinions.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ thanks for trying hard, being patient and doing an amazing job balancing lots of diverse opinions. Lets now plan like a City for City changes that enrich opportunities for all and lets strategically focus those changes and opportunities on the places where we can demonstrate how to build well(BCH) and update outdated suburban infrastructure with form based design plans and codes!
- ◆ The 'right-sizing' Folsom project was an example of council rushing into something that was a bad idea. Council and County Commissioners should focus on accomplishing things that are more important.
- ◆ The bottom line is that sooner or later we must get to the point where the city is not becoming ever larger. We need to reach an equilibrium with our surroundings where we do not have the need, for example, to find additional water. Where we do not need to densify, which, in many ways, is roughly equivalent to having a slow growing cancer inside the city. If we densify now, when will we stop densifying? If we build taller buildings to house people and businesses now, what will we do when all buildings have reached the maximum height? We don't need to stop renewal, remodeling, and redevelopment within current envelopes but we need to decide what limits we will abide by. We need to decide if a population of 105,000 is enough, or, if we grow at 1% a year whether in 2085 a population of 210,000 is enough, or if in 2155 a population of 420,000 is enough. If we don't want to reach those numbers, then how and when will we stop growing? Do we believe that somehow our population will stop growing without any action on our part? If so, then we need to state the reasons and justify our logic. My thought now is that I would like to see the Comp Plan present scenarios out for 100 years and indicate whether we are working toward each scenario or if we are trying to ward them off. Let's clearly lay out the long term consequences of whatever plan we contemplate.
- ◆ The Boulder Housing Authority's plan for Twin Lakes property is not the way to go. Build townhomes, not apartments, or let Habitat for Humanity build homes. Still affordable housing but a lot less density, traffic. Keep the property more open with public spaces.
- ◆ The City Council members of Boulder are best, most concerned AND he best at following thru with action not just words of any city I have ever lived in. These Comp plans are likely to be successful due to our city council and other public 'servants' I appreciate the 'reachability' and transparency of council members and their actions.
- ◆ The city does not NEED to grow jobs just because land is ZONED to allow it. Higher buildings where jobs are located just mean that jobs grow faster. This is not necessary. New development must pay for improved roads, libraries, schools, not just at their intersection.
- ◆ The City is over-regulated today. Need to focus on the preservation of the 'ring' around Boulder, but allow for much more intense development to create a compact, vibrant city.
- ◆ The City needs to recognize that some properties should not be developed because of the specific geological and hydrological characteristics. One way to meet the goals outlined in this survey is to incorporate these areas into either purchase them as Boulder City Open Space areas or make them Boulder County Rural Preservation areas.
- ◆ The City of Boulder doesn't have to put so much pressure on itself to create new affordable housing within the City limits if it would figure out how to get federal and state grants to build rail infrastructure. Cars in Boulder, in my opinion, are the culprits in bringing down the quality of life for City of Boulder residents. Driving in Boulder on weekends is such a joy compared to weekdays. It is commuters that need to use cars to come for work from outside the City. Rail would GREATLY ameliorate this problem of congestions and allow for more space in the County to build mixed income/mixed use developments for affordable housing to the professions (teachers, nurses, social workers, fire fighters, etc.) and housing for the poor and working class. Thanks for listening!

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ The City should make it easier for homeowners to make improvements to their homes.....short of pops and scrapes.
- ◆ The City should not allow developers to buy out of building 20% affording housing within their developments which is what happened in the Gunbarrel housing developments near King Soopers of nearly 600 units. This area was IDEAL for affordable housing with a medical clinic, banking, shops, restaurants, grocery and gas station all near by, but instead now the City wants to annex property in Twin Lakes and build the entire quota of up to 140 units of affordable housing (actually public housing) where the land itself is not suitable for a high density development because of a high water table that could flood neighborhood basements and property. This area can not provide any of services and especially services needed by people with special needs or disabilities. It is a mile walk into Gunbarrel or a half mile walk to the bus stop on 63rd Street and a 5 mile drive into Boulder. It was extremely bad planning!!! Or, was it intentionally planned to dump this high density development far away into a rural residential Boulder County neighborhood in Gunbarrel???
- ◆ The Comp Plan is an important tool in our local and county planning efforts. Absent any top down planning from the state, or mandated regional planning from the state, the Comp Plan has provided a very important framework to guide the Boulder city and Boulder county growth and development the 35 years I have been in town. I support this process!
- ◆ The Folsom 'Living Lab' bike lane debacle was horrendous. I am pleased to see that the city council returned a portion of the 'experiment' to it's regular 4 lane auto traffic, but I would like to see it all restored to previous conditions. Folsom was one of the only and best North-South means of getting to and from Central Boulder and Downtown. Suggestion: make wider bike lanes on a quieter, smaller road like 19th, and leave the successful auto routes alone. Boulder is getting more congested all the time and taking longer to get around. It is not feasible for me to get my 3 kids to schools/sports and other activities in any way other than a car.
- ◆ The infill policy is ruining boulder neighborhoods and destroying much of what I moved here for 35 years ago. e don't all hang out in the mountains. The urbanizayion of Boulder is so sad.
- ◆ The only example of permanent growth is cancer. And it ultimately kills its host.
- ◆ The policy commitments in the Plan are good, but I am cynical that when push comes to shove City and County officials and staff will do more than cherry-pick the ones that conveniently agree with their ideologies...and pay lip service to the rest.
- ◆ The towns around Boulder contain a sea of undeveloped land. There is plenty of room for development of residential neighborhoods outside the city. Boulder has an extraordinarily high quality of life, and I see no need to discard that in an effort to get 'bigger'. If people want to live in an urban environment, Denver has plenty to offer. Let's keep this mid-sized city mid-sized.
- ◆ The world changes and we need to acknowledge that. When the last plan update was done I don't think there was such a thing as a Smart Phone. By the time the next one is done the main means of automotive transport may be self driving electric cars. The original advocates of open space (Baby Boomers) were bird watchers, but now the people paying for it (Millennials) want to actually use it to stay active and healthy by running, riding bikes and horses, playing with their dogs. The old guard has pushed out 'fun Boulder' no more Red Zinger or Kinetics, no Folsom Field concerts. Loosen up!

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ This may not be a part of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan, but I want to take this opportunity bring this subject up. I live in Heatherwood and am reasonably far from the source of the annoyance. To me, it is just an interesting phenomenon that I hear at night. To others who live much closer it has to be really distressing. The issue is BNSF trains blasting their horns along the Diagonal at night. At NIGHT, when everyone is sleeping or trying to sleep and nobody is around. All the road intersections that I'm aware of have gates with flashing lights and bells. Why does BNSF feel the need to demonstrate such corporate arrogance and wake everyone up? Is this a DOT requirement? What can Boulder City and County do about this?
- ◆ This needs to be a city that addresses core community needs, not special interest needs.
- ◆ This was a thoughtful survey. Continue to make the community aware of it and encourage engagement. Thanks
- ◆ Though I understand that there is a requirement for affordable housing, I do not agree nor support it be in the Twin Lakes area. We need to preserve the beauty and environment of the area for our wildlife... It is what drew me to the area in 1991. Thank you..
- ◆ Times have changed but our values remain largely the same. Problem is people who have been here 30 years think open space = environmental stewardship when it actually means environmental degradation because it prevents people from living here affordably and thus increases our carbon footprint. So today density is key to addressing climate change which is our biggest environmental threat. We need education on this.
- ◆ Too many cars in our streets because of unenforced over occupancy in rental houses.
- ◆ Traffic- time lights in town to help traffic flow, so you don't get stopped every single block.
- ◆ tread carefully
- ◆ We all want to be the last ones to arrive here..... It's getting very congested like a big city instead of a small town.
- ◆ We desperately need to find a way to improve facilities for the homeless, especially the truly outcast homeless (as distinguished from the transients who stop by in the summer and take advantage of the generosity of strangers). Maybe we should look into tiny houses? Similarly dense housing units? We need to also find better ways to support DIY art venues. There's so much talent in this county, and so few opportunities for it to be displayed.
- ◆ We have a moral issue to create a sustainable City for ourselves and the next generations. Let's do this by making the City a city for people first, not closing ourselves off by creating an exclusive community like Aspen. Let's not create another 60,000 in-commuters. Let's be a regional leader that inspires other areas of the Front Range to follow our footsteps.
- ◆ We have a multitude of people that will be seniors in the future, many are not wealthy. We need to work with the private sector to provide quality affordable living conditions for them - from independent to extensive care. Our wealthy seniors are most likely to get the help they need as they get older - the city needs to ensure others, that are not wealthy have great conditions. All housing development should be required to provide affordable housing on the site being developed.
- ◆ We need to protect public access to public lands in Boulder County. Many landowners sign and seal off access illegally and no one does anything to correct this.
- ◆ We should do subarea or area planning for all parts of Boulder. We should have a discussion on how big we should be. Community benefit should be required for height modifications as well as parking reductions.
- ◆ What about Boulder County?? Nothing asked. Not much about transportation or open space.
- ◆ What are the geographical boundaries of Boulder Valley for the purposes of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ When implementing the Plan, we must do a better job of assessing what can be left alone, and for developing multiple scenarios for consideration when we want to improve something. For instance - we don't need to make the downtown Civic Area inescapably busy; and there were a number of alternatives for bike lanes other than the Folsom debacle. We need to think 'and' not 'or'. It can't be a zero-sum game.
- ◆ While I can see the benefit of relatively dense multi-use communities along the urban corridor, I believe a truly vibrant area will support a mixture of different types of neighborhoods. Those of us who live in rural-residential areas of Gunbarrel have chosen this type of neighborhood for a reason. We are not interested in a more urban lifestyle. If we were, we wouldn't live here. The plan to build large high-density apartments in the middle of our neighborhood will destroy the semi-rural feel we have grown to love. In addition, as our neighborhood is rural-residential, it lacks access to amenities which people who typically would choose to live in such buildings require.
- ◆ would like to see regular reports from City staff about progress and projects
- ◆ Would love to see a boulder city bus pass for all residents to ease growing traffic and increase alternative transportation. Current bus rates are too expensive for local trips.
- ◆ Yay Boulder!
- ◆ You need to ask for age in response to these survey. Most of the involvement is by older long term residents and not representative of Boulder's future.
- ◆ Your stock answers to the above questions already present one specific point of view. It is very likely that your film in the blank options will carry much less weight than the stock answer choices. This needs to be considered in evaluating the survey

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.27: Where do you work? (OTHER)

- ◆ Gunbarrel
- ◆ All over the US. I own my company with customers all over the place
- ◆ Author
- ◆ Berthoud
- ◆ Boulder & Denver Metro
- ◆ Boulder and Denver (should allow for more than one response)
- ◆ boulder county
- ◆ Boulder County
- ◆ Boulder County
- ◆ Commute to Denver on occasion for work (2x weekly)
- ◆ From home
- ◆ From home
- ◆ From home office in Gunbarrel.
- ◆ Golden
- ◆ Gunbarrel
- ◆ Gunbarrel
- ◆ Home office (Boulder County)
- ◆ Lakewood
- ◆ Loveland
- ◆ My office is in Boulder but I am in Denver a lot for my job.
- ◆ NYC
- ◆ Out of my home.
- ◆ out of state
- ◆ Out of state until I retire to this house in 2 years.
- ◆ out of state/commute
- ◆ Realtor, mostly Boulder county, but all over
- ◆ remote...telecommuter
- ◆ self-employed
- ◆ self-employed, home office
- ◆ Superior
- ◆ telecommuter
- ◆ Thornton
- ◆ Westminster
- ◆ Wheat Ridge
- ◆ work at home for san francisco company
- ◆ work from home
- ◆ work from home

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.28: Do you ever work at your home? (OTHER)

- ◆ 1/2 day per week from home.
- ◆ have outside business
- ◆ I currently work full time in Denver without the option of telecommuting but prior to my current position I worked from home full time for 8 years, and I plan to do so again in the future
- ◆ I have a home business and I work outside for an employer.
- ◆ I occasionally work at home
- ◆ No, and I will never ever ride a bike to work.
- ◆ Normally work at employers facility but occasionally work at home.
- ◆ Occasionally work at home but usually at employer's location
- ◆ once a week
- ◆ Only very occasionally work from home
- ◆ rare telework
- ◆ Rarely
- ◆ Self Employed work from home and at business outside of home
- ◆ sometimes
- ◆ Very infrequently
- ◆ Very occasionally work at home
- ◆ yes but very rarely
- ◆ Yes, but not often
- ◆ Yes, I take work home a lot. Living and working downtown allows me to create a flexible lifestyle in which I can easily walk home. I wish others could do the same.

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.30: Please check the one box that most closely describes the type of housing unit you live in. (OTHER)

- ◆ A co-op (owned by Boulder Housing Coalition)
- ◆ A duplex
- ◆ co-housing
- ◆ cohousing
- ◆ Duplex
- ◆ Duplex
- ◆ duplex home
- ◆ Housing Cooperative
- ◆ Separate living area in single-family home - shared kitchen.
- ◆ SFR with an ADU
- ◆ Single family home
- ◆ townhouse

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.31: Do you own or rent your residence? (If you own a mobile home but pay a lot fee, then you own your residence) (OTHER)

- ◆ Own
- ◆ Rent from a group equity cooperative, which we manage collectively.
- ◆ Wife Owns

2015 BVCP Open Link Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.36: Which best describes your race? (OTHER)

- ◆ anglo norsky
- ◆ Anglo/Chilean
- ◆ Canadian Indian
- ◆ European American
- ◆ European American
- ◆ Human
- ◆ human.
- ◆ Mixed
- ◆ Mixed - Hispanic & White
- ◆ None of your business. There is no such thing as race, so stop asking questions like this.
- ◆ this should be none of your business