



Accessory Dwelling Units/Owner Accessory Units (ADUs/OAUs)

Central Boulder:

- 300-400 square feet owner occupied
- All over! Current regulations make ADUs/OAUs difficult. Specifically need to change 1) 1/3 sq ft area 2) Parking requirements 3) ban on new construction.
- This seems appropriate city-wide
- The current regulations are a defacto prohibition. Remove owner occupied requirement, lot size, distance requirement.
- Located where most viable in Central Boulder
- Should be larger lots.
- Great for seniors- age in place - what about parking. How can the city regulate parking for this? Could require off-street parking requirements. Maybe these people would not have as many cars, especially seniors and students. Required to have owner on site. ADUs already being added illegally. Relaxing code may just have illegal ones become legal rather than adding new housing. Need to be sure ADUs are added as housing not just Airbnb, which won't add more housing. Great opportunity for infill. Could be more hidden. How about district parking or upping cost of on-street permits to pay the actual cost of parking (land cost).
- Central Boulder needs to allow OAU's (not Airbnb) - let's share - regulate # of occupants reasonably - prefer to regulate behavior!
- It is difficult to do an ADU today: only one in ten homes in a neighborhood, lot size >6,000 SF, limited to a very small 450 SF unit.
- Each of these should be discussed for the tradeoff between impacts to a neighborhood vs. providing affordable housing. Not yes/no: evaluate the tradeoffs.
- The potential conflict with VRBO/Airbnb is genuine. We don't want people building ADU's or OAU's only to use them for short term, non-resident rentals. Although this may also be a way to keep lower income households in their homes.
- Zoning -> maximize prop value -> create giant house. ADU/OAU - a good ways to give people flexibility to maximize investments.
- Current low threshold in areas. Could raise limits - wouldn't take much reg. change
- Could be allowed in most neighborhoods / historic homes designed to facilitate these.
- Good potential with existing infrastructure
- Would like to see rules - e.g. number of cars to address potential changes to neighborhood character
- Amend occupancy limits in a "common sense" manner - address issues
- Benefits of communal living – with charter; intentional
- How can the city regulate if increased occupancy limits. Find ways for enforcement - could have reps for the house.
- Need to consider size of units - not take up the whole back yard.
- Address with transportation/transit - Shouldn't preclude more units. e.g. neighborhood parking permits.
- Not everyone will want one - self-regulating

- No radical changes in a short time.
- Located where most viable in central Boulder map.
- Helps with senior problem.
- Uses existing infrastructure.
- Intensifies viability of public transportation.
- Affordable option for owner/renter.
- Better used space.
- No regulations for good subsidy.
- Place in very low density location (yellow)
- Barrier of separation clause (ADU, not OAU)
=> allow landmark houses to get around.
- Landmarking as benefit.
- Neighbor restriction not fair.
- What are impacts (parking) on neighborhood?
- Density question needs basic res??
- Rent control stipulation.
- Low density in R1.
- More opportunities for people to live on land.
- Enable only new houses to remain and be economically viable (no parking).
- One size does not fit all.
- Current 300" radius / 10% saturation per neighborhood not working, too restrictive - has worked everywhere it has been tried. So let's just let them happen - makes a lot so interesting little building.
- If you don't have a car, easier to add an ADU. If in neighborhood where parking is a problem, add parking spaces.
- Requiring owner occupancy is good.
- Let's put ADUs in places where people can walk to downtown work/etc.
- Area planning.
- A problem: requiring parking spaces with new developments is restrictive
- Requires neighborhood approval.
- Flex between coops & ADU's.
- Eliminate constraints on building granny flats.
- DRCOG - interactive regional maps - they plotted what different development patterns vis. a vis. transit would look like, so we should not develop.
- We need public private sector cooperation at a regional level - red region near old hospital could hold more housing (on our map).
- More dense areas like North Boulder - folks like that density it's a nice way to live.
- Could be sold to families (at 30th in East Boulder, for example). Need to support the middle class. But how to convince owners of those rental to sell off instead of renting?
- 1/3 existing space is a problem.
- Helps middle income families - is it affordable for renters long-term? concern about lot size
- Offer incentives like tax breaks for ADUs .
- Remove owner occupant requirement - remove 300 ft. requirement
- Separation requirement unfair
ADU - Allow now in all zones
OAU - Allow if you landmark homes

- Applicable to back? Could a garage be expected to provide 3 x 500 sq ft apartments?
- Could even incentivize building granny flats.
- ADUs, small & tiny homes would be a great way to in fill in-between existing houses.

East Boulder:

- Traffic; creates more density; near transit
- Perhaps [in] some LR neighborhoods, but only if strictly enforced so there is one owner-occupied unit, not used for vacation rentals, high fines for violations, and no second chance.
- State does not allow rent control. This must change.
- Area specific.
- Cincinnati, Denver, Boulder all allow may need to remove regulatory barriers.
- Everywhere (if there are parking issues, parking should be addressed)
- Reasonable, creates community/family comfortability.
- Keeps seniors in community.
- Seniors => want to live in extension, not basement, want empowerment not to be "put away."
- Encourage people to build smaller houses, not big ones.
- Will require changing regulations.
- Could commercial buildings move further out to make room for residential?
- Let neighborhoods vote on these changes 1st!
- More ADU/OAU in all neighborhoods. Share the wealth.
- Only if strictly regulated and owner occupied.
- More, more, more! Excellent solution to the housing!
- Should be explored but not sure needs to exceed 10%. Certainly no more than 15%

North Boulder:

- What is incentive for entity single family neighborhood to allow ADUs?
- Need to let them be spacious enough to accommodate a family or more than 1-2 people
- What about Airbnb for an ADU - mixed opinions on this
- Appeals to older
- OAUs make sure it's easier to have a roommate in their own space and not everyone wants to live in a basement. Rent is dictated by size - can regulate from Airbnb
- Yep - we need smaller options for us as we get older could house a caregiver or adult child.
- This is one of our BEST options for affordability - please give this TOP priority!
- This could allow people to continue to afford to live in town, while also providing possibly affordable housing
- It seems to me that without limits on rents, what will keep rental rates of ADUs & OAUs from continually climbing and becoming unaffordable
- It's definitely needed. We're all getting older we need someone to live with us so they can take care of all our old age need.
- Appropriate in neighborhoods with larger houses + garages/yards
- Link parking + occupancy
- I would like to live in my beautiful ADU - but am not allowed! Please help.

- Not great in neighborhoods like Holiday
- No - my neighborhood is dense enough.
- Policy to allow more 1 owner lives there.
- More in all parts of the city.
- Density issues can be mitigated by requiring bike transit, limiting cars and watching impact necessary to ease restrictions on OAU & ADU.
- Seniors are not going to live in 450 square feet above a garage. They are actually renovating their homes in order to age in place, stay in their homes and have space to have their children & grandchildren visit.
- Yes - more of this in all parts of city.
- Invest in own properties, increase housing supply.
- Where garage exists.
- In neighborhoods, where there is room and in few enough numbers to avoid impacts on neighbors.
- Seems to be easily implementable - older neighborhoods - could limit occupancy and number of cars.
- Good option - concern about regulations. I would suggest a requirement that owner live on premises.
- This seems an important flexibility for appropriate neighborhoods. A way of providing additional density. Only if owner occupied.
- Could house a caregiver or family. Any neighborhood but with appropriate rules relative to size of house and yard.
- Owner occupied required.
- Get neighborhood buy in, car coops instead of more parking.
- Yes - top three choice.
- Capture value in home.

South Boulder:

- Anywhere
- South Boulder houses well suited to this option, especially basement apartments. Would result in some more affordable units
- If building a unit, must incorporate on land, off-street parking
- No - Increase in population and population density ruins Boulder
- Owner occupied? Sale of property = ever be a rental? Way to maintain owner occupancy requirement with sale of property
- Love South Boulder - There are ways to add flexibility and affordability - options without too many impacts
- Advantage in South Boulder - wider streets and more parking/fewer impacts
- Could help seniors - find ways to do it carefully
- Age in place - risk turn into short term rental
- Anywhere it could work - on case by case basis
- Needs regulation to maintain & not become rentals
- Need to consider - densification - too much can make city unlivable
- Jobs and housing balance - important

- Need to consider transportation/traffic/transit infrastructure before adding density - e.g. Table Mesa school pick up
- Consider / need neighborhood acceptance of changes/pilot/ conditions
- Establish maximum size/ process easier/ rent limits - tie to rental license/ consider impacts.
- Additional parking.
- Enforcement of parking.
- Inventory of current ADU/OAU.
- Transportation major consideration re options.
- Meets economic realities.
- Everywhere because it allows responsible homeowners to rent out more spots/allows for non traditional families and multigenerational families to live together.

Employers/Employees:

- Beware the presumption of vehicle demand/use as necessarily corrective.
- Bring realtors into discussion. They could encourage this *
- Near transit with TDM bundled pass (eco pass, b-cycle, car share)
- Promote use of alternate transportation.
- With neighborhood approval, with bikes & bus support
- Only appropriate for 0.5 acre or larger
- This will destroy the character of many existing neighborhoods. Unfair to existing residents.
- Our neighborhood should remain an R-1. Do not allow accessory units to be built - We bought our home with a large lot for the privacy and quiet it affords us - We don't want dwelling against our back against our fence line - Our privacy and peace and quiet are why we bought in this neighborhood this area should remain R-1
- Yes! I have one. Increase density limit.
- ADUs/OAUs are intrinsically affordable, and low recourse use too. Seem like a no-brainer we should enable.
- Allowing units in an existing dwelling (basement, etc.) is OK unless it makes parking and traffic issues.
- Small house in my backyard or a chicken coop? What makes more sense - let's see.....
- Yes! Please make it easier to build these in our SF neighborhoods. They can help with affordability for the owner of the home and add rental housing options.
- Yes - this feels like a low-impact opportunity to expand low-cost rentals/housing transition for older adults. Martin Acres.
- It may be appropriate on the Hill, but could encourage speculators and needs to be carefully monitored.
- Allow greater flexibility for ADUs and in more zone districts - you could even cap square feet and/or establish the max monthly rent (and set at affordable level).
- Yes! Seems like concerns of parking, privacy noise can be easily addressed. It *is* a way for our aging population be able to have in-home help.

Bonuses for Higher Affordability and Certain Housing Types

Central Boulder:

- Absolutely, and this complements #9, exceeding the height limit in select locations
- I am convinced that property developers may be getting a sweet deal and would like to understand the details.
- Yes.
- Use vacation rental tax revenue to build affordable housing units.
- Reduce number of cars allowed in exchange for ADUs.
- Including market rate developers.
- Concerns in capitalizing unintended consequences, reactors, manipulate outcomes; rules don't produce outcomes, if city gave me opportunity to do something different I would.
- Know property that would accommodate 6-7 houses.
- Incentivize people to come to areas around city improve seniors to unity.
- Coops in the greenbelt? Sacred cow.
- Need to follow through on Boulder Junction.
- A reduction in paperwork would be better.
These tend to turn into Realtor Boondoggles
- I love the idea of increasing density/coziness on thoroughfares, transit-oriented development; make it cozier in core of the city! Increase occupancy limits in this area.

East Boulder:

- Awful.
- Depends on where you have in mind.
- Not bonuses...mandatory affordable units in conjunction and on site with new development. Combine with ADU's!! And Land use Designation.
- This is good politics. Buy older apartment complex and rebuild to more affordability.
- Don't like variances - something's got to give - zoning shouldn't be varied on.
- Don't want to see Boulder go the way of Aspen.
- 35% onsite affordable for keeping units onsite.
- Like Thistle and Habitat for Humanity. Yes, good stuff.
- There is no such thing in this affluent city - Can't be done.
- Against. People moved here and live here for a certain quality of living. Fact is - not everyone can move in.
- No! Unfair to neighbors if within a neighborhood. Is a defacto rezoning - should be treated as such.

North Boulder:

- Address additional concerns
People - size of house, not numbers
Creative parking - cars, like little lots for parking or parking head on, or give certain # of permits
Noise
Owner occupied for increased occupancy

Increased density automatically accompanies variety in a city

Variety

Density - more important

I want to live not make money

- Good creative ideas.
- Yes any methods to make housing more affordable. It costs so much to build & buy & rent.
- Only if in a planned community setting - Be creative.
- NO - not in neighborhoods where residents want low density to remain.
- Yes - please explore Opland & Violet 19st - 22nd.
- Not until there are methods to hold developers accountable for actually implementing what they promise.
- Reward those making a difference for others - encouragement, assistance.
- Bonuses for integrating, especially rental.
- Opposed - affordable housing seems to be exacerbating the divide between those who can afford and those who can't.
- Yes - a good tool/lower cost way to subsidize housing to make it affordable.
- Win-win.
- Try to get developers to build affordable instead of cash in lieu.
- No.
- Not in neighborhoods.

South Boulder:

- Crowding.
- Must do because development does to higher end.
- Correct to require on-site; no off-site, no Cash in-Lieu.
- Anywhere available.
- Architectural advances, container houses.
- Most scalable and cost effective.
- East Boulder.
- Adds population.

Employers/Employees:

- Why bonuses?
- I thought this limit has been exceeded so many times already.
- Transit, TDM.
- No, let the market determine pricing.
- Increase density in current mobile home parks.
- Have city purchase units in new multi-family complexes for affordable units.
- Yes and don't allow developers to pay out rather than build. They should increase mixed unit.
- Properties to include affordable units alongside pricier units.
- Yes this is good, but don't let developers pay their way out OR increase buyout level.
- Find ways to incorporate feedback from families in the process.

Cooperative Housing

Central Boulder:

- This seems appropriate city-wide.
- Co-op housing should be made legal and simple throughout Boulder.
- Equity co-ops too much risk under current requirements. Environmental benefits of co-ops very positive. Equity co-ops a great idea. Clear point of contact in co-ops with neighbors. Illegal co-ops can't develop relationships with neighbor because of fear of being shut-down. Works very well for a small group. Very important to change current requirements, but is a small group. Needs to be part of a multi-prong solution. Current legal co-ops are only low income so people need to income qualify and many get kicked out if you earn too much. Should get some input from neighbors. Some off street parking. Why is there a restriction on the number of people if you own the house?
- Area planning.
- Being made worse planning.
- Ownership structure with accountability.
- Remove ordinance barriers.
- Newly developed as coop housing (top floor)
- Underground coops in every neighborhood
=> neighborhood specific approach will marginalize some
- Extraordinary demand/urgency.
- Occupancy limits might remove barriers.
- Heavy organization as resource for accountability.
- Area planning questionable.
- Boston's neighborhood plans (E.g. Newlands)
=> to connect to maximize market value.
- Politically won't work if not at neighborhood level.
- Fuzzy line of rental coops vs. plain over occupied rentals.
- Get creative about parking -> car share + bus pass.
- Fix co-op ordinance - possible to build new co-ops -> Boulder Junction.
- Huge demand needs to be made easier and possible to form rental co-ops.
- Community building assets - affordable - rental + equity co-op.
- Must include in new developments.
- This could coordinate with small homes and tiny homes.
- **BEST OPTION!**
Let's improve the coop ordinance
- Co-ops: let's make it easier to start coops legally in Boulder!

East Boulder:

- This also encourages the building of community, combating isolation, teaching people through experience how to communicate well and how to live together, and sharing living expenses.
- As a housing lifestyle choice, it could be OK in medium density zoning areas, not in LR, ER RR.
- This creates community for all ages and statuses. It allows more stable environments and creates affordable housing.

- Same as occupancy limits but more organized... Also great!!
- Won't serve many.
- Everywhere! Provides options for low/middle-income families, workers, students, etc. looking for community
- Allow rent and own. Fix the ordinance.
- But do not allow them everywhere. Not in Cherryvale.
- Co-op would be regulated have lawn care. Want low turnover, long term. Give a good feel to the neighborhood.
- Separate leases per person in house to be protected if renter stops paying rent.
- Co-op housing charter – each house has its own to govern each house. Responsibilities per house designated. City could create. Boulder Housing Coalition have basic template.
- Want communication w/in each community and adopt HOA-style standards for that neighborhood to have an agreement specific to neighborhood.
- Co-ops need consensus process to make decisions to demonstrate it's a community.
- Boulder Housing Coalition recognizes co-ops are owner by BHP policy.
- Co-op housing policies have to host guests & can't stay for more than 4 days per house member is host.
- Guest policy in co-op. Have guidelines. Only one guest at a time.
- Buy food together.
- Only in medium density.
- These are extremely important as students are doing this already! Make sense
- Owner occupied group housing - like we use to have.
- Include renter co-ops that have agreed upon neighborhood norm standards (clean, loud noise)
- This allows for lower income, more energy efficient community housing options for seniors, students, families with children

North Boulder:

- Advantages of cooperative culture are only possible when they are legal
- Support for it & need some flexibility + experimentation - allow people to come together
- Sharing resources, not necessarily for each other
- Cooperative housing ecovillage & affordable housing
- Only way can afford living in Boulder - invite neighbors for dinner, etc. Bridge gap
- Co-op homes are innovative and sustainable. Yes!!!
- Yes good idea! More co-housing!
- Only small ones - 4 people
- Yes! Please allow senior coops
- Great idea.
- Yes! Saves \$ & fosters community
- Yes!! They help create more active commitment & help communities grow
- Coop purchase can't be done with a loan - one rich guy or many members have to put in CASH
- Allow choice. It works for some, not everyone. But for those that it works for, it makes all the difference.
- Yes! More, but make the rules more sensible - shouldn't have to own.
- With willing participants in multifamily housing without increasing density
- Northaven. Makes living affordable for those who otherwise could not afford to live here.

- No brainer
- I live in co housing and strongly support cooperative housing of all types. They provide flexibility and financially feasible housing - allows more density without more building.
- In single family neighborhoods and medium density. It should feel like you are in a neighborhood.
- Use already built houses. Be neighborhood-sensitive, get "buy in" from neighbors
- Yes - top three choice

South Boulder:

- Too many cars - not an neighborhood.
- Yes, city wide.
- Cross over with tiny houses.
- Only where space allows (buffer between houses)
- Coops have oversight to limit impacts
- Anywhere
- Everywhere, cooperation is the solution.
- Best for seniors + singles. Need their own standards that community can agree upon. Current noise and parking standards should be enforced
- No - Would increase population and/or density
- TAXES? How do higher occupancy "houses" pay their way for community services - their property taxes - certainly their combined income could be greater than some neighbors
- Valuable tool. Fear of increased cars not warranted as car share part of co housing. Where - Near transit
- Enforcement of # residents & cars
- Parking, trash, noise alleged, not problem per co-op resident.
- 12 D, 3 cars in one coop.
- Limit number of cars
- Talk to and know neighbors
- Landlord responsibilities.
- Need for co-op legality.
- Sustainability values of co-op residents.
- Allows more density as well as affordability. Transportation as mechanism for affordability.
- Everywhere because it allows for more nontraditional families, creates communities
- Easy to add in to existing homes. Would be nice to have relatively cheap was of implementing
- There are so many different types of co-op housing - would love to see more options!

Employers/Employees:

- Number of people per home should be increased/eliminated - "problems" can be addressed via other code violations
- Youth boarding.
- Talk to ReMax of Boulder. There are big houses which don't sell. The City could own them & turn into coop housing - or partner with Realtors to market them to buyer as multi-unit rental.
- Where? Near transit with TDM, with other contingencies, check in w/ neighborhood first like Thistle? BHP? City?

- Promote use of alternate transportation
- Only appropriate for 0.5 acre or larger
- Wonderful idea in keeping with the spirit of Boulder
- Co-ops are a great way to build community and create affordable/sustainable housing. Please enable them at least in the zones with multi-family units!
- Yes. Love them. Would be great to somehow incentivize areas to convert to cohousing if a group of owners wants this.
- Will add to parking and traffic problems, but better than increasing building height and density.
- Will this membership-based corporation require legal input?
- I see parking and traffic issues if this is allowed in already established neighborhoods - Build new communities in areas where high density living will work.
- Against this idea.

Height Limit

Central Boulder:

- Going up makes sense, I believe in form based zoning, often going higher makes better design and is more efficient
- This is a no brainer!
- Remove height limit east of downtown
- In the transit corridor only but yes
- It's not just a number. It involves shadows, solar, views, neighborhood context, design compatibility and other factors.
- Not every neighborhood has a view. Not every lot is the same elevation. Higher buildings may be appropriate along transit corridors and east of 28th.
- Adding a story is a much better use of land than sprawl.
- Step backs help soften the effect of a higher story.
- Much of the concern about height could be about design or density, not height.
- General chagrin about the recent denial of height variance in south Boulder on a down-sloping lot.
- 55 feet is the limit, not 30. One number doesn't fit all.
- There are a few larger parcels (like 28th & Iris and some surface parking lots) that need plans for the entire sites - incorporating multiple owners. City should not be afraid to initiate these conversations.
- People at our table object to changing height limits (would bring in trucks that would have to service those buildings.)
- mod for height limits for seniors
- Exemption for seniors! Need high density for access to transit & services (e.g. high rise across from library)
- Nowhere
- This could significantly affect the character of the town & neighborhoods.
- I think increasing height limit beyond 55 feet/ residential buildings over 35 feet IS ok in several places around Boulder

East Boulder:

- Not appropriate; not willing to consider negative side of it.
- Do not raise the 55' height limit.
- No raising only outside of downtown area and west to the mountains.
- Wherever (maybe won't succeed where majority of property values >> \$1 million).
- No! No! No! Stop increasing density. Stop!
- No! to height limit increase.
- Hold the limit. 55' only with top-floor setbacks. Use rooftops for people.
- Should be strictly enforced. Few exceptions. Neighborhood reviews before exceptions.
- Hold it at 35' and 55'.
- Where a view of the mountains is not obstructed.

North Boulder:

- There are places in city where we can't.
- The Armory construction defeat litigation - too bad.
- Armory is being villanized because of 35 ft.
- Need to encourage to use buses from North Boulder congestion.
- I favor densification in high traffic areas -> support as transit
- East and Central Boulder.
- Option to address affordability & seniors.
- Maintain 55 ft in Central Boulder and allow for residential.
- Pockets of density.
- Concern for view shed, impact on neighborhoods.
- Process around height exemptions including neighborhood.
- Height is important but DESIGN is IMPERATIVE.
- Would reduce enjoyment of mountain views - a huge downside.
- Changing height limit only allows builders to build MORE places I can never afford!
- NO
- The idea to allow greater height in certain areas seems creative and useful.
- The appeal of Boulder today is largely due to height limits. Do not cease height limits.
- NO
- Downtown only.
- Along transit corridors and commercial centers – yes.
- Design as important as height.
- Opposed - I don't feel increasing density is the most complete solution. Working to preserve Boulder's land feeling is important.
- In places now allowed.
- Change base definition of sloped lots!
- More density!
- Only east of neighborhoods already built - convert industrial east side.
- I dislike the high density projects popping up in Boulder.

South Boulder:

- We like our views in South Bldr. Don't ruin it.
- Yes to 55, yes to 35 - armory, elsewhere.
- Yes - keep on the table - all options must be considered
Only in select locations.
- Terrible idea.
- perhaps 55 in some urban areas - not neighborhoods - not block views.
- Valuable - keep limit.
- Maybe people need to see more examples that keep the character.

Employers/Employees:

- I don't think we should look at the height limits until we are more efficient with our current space.
- terrible idea
- Strongly against this idea.
- Carefully in East.
- Create better transit options for higher density housing.
- NOT HERE.
- Terrible idea in most locations - will destroy the views of the Flatirons that make this town special and unique.
- I am opposed. I bought in Boulder when the height limit was 3 stories!
- I'd rather see us grow up and then out!

Housing the Homeless

Central Boulder:

- Not important to me - we just keep attracting more homeless - but we should provide mental health services and facilities.
- Yes, more like 1175 Lee Hill.
- Many of the homeless seem to be so by choice.
There are a few that meet the above criteria.
- Longmont should share the caring of homeless.
- House the homeless! It is cheaper than incarcerating folks & more compassionate

East Boulder:

- This is too complex to be addressed as part of the general overall housing issue. This is a social issue, separate from just housing.
- (Not for East Boulder...) Downtown/North.
We can definitely develop them here.
- Boulderites complain about homeless people but do nothing to remove hardship.
Economically feasible! Everywhere.

- Need much more outreach to those now living near or those who have lived near and relocated due to noise, undesirable "visitors", drug and alcohol use, etc.
- Too many problems to resolve. There are so many reasons they cannot rent existing housing - needs more study. We need to be more compassionate and get more housing into place. It's been far too long.
- Depends on where.

North Boulder:

- Allocate some percent of IH to Housing First units
- Need Section 8.
- Need to go citywide.
- Used to be against 1175 Lee Hill, now pro. Housing 1st -> more 1175 Lee Hill.
- Issues with TSHP Property management.
- We can't build our way out of homelessness or expensive housing in Boulder.
- City of Boulder cannot house all homeless. Other cities need to step up & share responsibilities.
- Build it and they will come. The city can't solve homelessness by itself. It has to be a regional solution.
- I agree.
- Yes, a regional solution. But why can't we lead the way? Homeless people don't come to Boulder for the housing.
- Spread throughout the city to avoid overconcentration in North Boulder.
- Providing housing frees people up to move on to the next step - find work, support themselves, start over. The homeless come here anyways for varying reasons, providing housing is not going to increase the homeless population - that is a backward notion.
- Seems a separate issue.
- Seems like an unrelated issue.
- We don't need more shelters we need more homes for the homeless. I think such housing should be dispersed more broadly throughout Boulder.
- Near access to transit and services.
- More compassion.
- It's a moral imperative, but too big to deal with in Boulder alone.
- Provide more housing first city wide.
- Citywide solutions.
- In locations near services, transportation, and shopping.

South Boulder:

- Anywhere - saves taxpayer money and provides basic human needs.
- This especially might be good to integrate with community integration programs.

Employers/Employees:

- Where is the challenge, and the notion that this is a regional issue, how about the L-towns picking up their end?

- Tiny homes on public lands.
Boarding houses - youth hostile.
- Options to rent on a scale - they want to work + live on their own with a little help
Homeless options for people trying
Affordable scale for homeless
Rent scales that are affordable
- Cost effective
- This is only worth considering as a limited time opportunity. Don't give the homeless more incentives to come to Boulder.
- Would you like homeless housing near your home?
- Why? The more you accommodate them, the more keep showing up! Every street corner, every day, all day long.

Land Use Designation and Zoning Changes

Central Boulder:

- Multi-family zoning should be increased, single family zoning reduced.
- Base occupancy on number of bedrooms
- We made this situation - STOP PUTTING MORATORIUMS IN PLACE. Moratoriums drive the price of housing up, up, and up!
- Transportation is such an important component of affordability. City should carefully develop sites in Area 2 with good transportation access.
- Don't be afraid of Area 3.
- Can City incentivize quality redevelopment of larger parcels; this will benefit the community and can offer housing?
- Look at initiating small rezoning of areas along transit corridors: Broadway and Sumac to Upland is zoned lower density residential but should be townhomes; now is too late as lots are being built as spec houses two per block.
- The hospital and a developer/purchaser should not be the only ones coming up with plans for the BDH site; the City and neighborhood must be partners up front.
- Supports higher density at Boulder Junction because it makes sense in support of transit.
- Closer to bus stops allow increased density.
- Land use changes affecting neighborhoods need to have input from that neighborhood. City outreach is qualitative, but used for quantitative decisions.
- Residents should have a right to vote on these matters. Influence not enough. They should decide.
- Boulder is bikeable; don't need to have concentrated densities because of transit.
- Need to narrowly define these changes and what they mean, not just "upzone" and "more density."
- Could unbundle parking to create more units.
- Seems related to everything else.
- Precious feeds into everything -> Flood issues -> Impacts the neighborhood
- Broadway & Iris is rising due to alluvial fan -> improve Broadway drainage

- Applicable to back? Could a garage be expected to provide 3 x 500 sq ft apartments?
- Why high-rise near school that already has parking & traffic problem flooding

East Boulder:

- Only with Neighbor OK.
- 10 to 36 month review process?
- Lots of public process, remove incentives for big houses, under scrutiny, specific areas out of the downtown.
- Allows for 15 minute neighborhoods
- Not if it increases density in existing neighborhoods. Okay if converted industrial/commercial to residential.
- Strongly reject land use change to encourage density. This is a quality of life issue.

North Boulder:

- Transit corridors should be identified and greater density allowed
- Prohibit housing to commercial turn
- Zoning change to support a tiny house
- Lots of homelessness / charities/sensitivities can't go in shelters (improve materials) (open year round)
- Allow PUDs to be dissolved to by-right zoning
Allow low density single family to build ADUs
Allow more live work
Change single zoning to multi-use
- Allow & encourage subdividing large lots
- Unfreeze DUDs to allow diverse development options
- Allow by right developments
- Citizens are creative. Staff is oppressive, obstructive. We have lost a lot of creative people & ideas because of arbitrary rules
- Mixed use multi-use neighborhood/diverse use
- UNFREEZE PUD'S from 1970. 1995 time warp. Change single family house uni-zoning to multi-use to facilitate 15 min neighborhoods
- Fund opportunities to densify - allow housing diverse options
- Limit AIRBNB & VRBO rentals with zoning rules - these are businesses masquerading as housing
- Citizens should be encouraged to apply for zoning if they have a creative idea
- People spend/invest hundreds of thousands of dollars on properties in particular zones expecting the zoning to remain as is.
- Do not change zoning or allowable uses in existing zones.
- What changes? This is too vague to respond to.
- Don't know enough about this option
- Need more detail - seems worth pursuing - flexibility
- We need more flexibility for higher density
- Right now, all zoning seems to support the "status quo" - the types of housing we needed in the past. So many new, innovative ideas mean we need new codes.
- Smaller lots - transit corridors need to be in the code!

- More density!
- Must have intense neighborhood discussion and education
- Not in neighborhoods

South Boulder:

- Where transit investments have been made.
- Strongly disagree if it would increase population or density
- May be necessary for some of the changes
- Potential for huge controversy, great way to become cozier

Employers/Employees:

- Changing zoning on the whims of the city? Not fair.
- Increased density can only work near existing commercial areas. Consider allowing 2nd story residential on top of existing 1-story commercial, such as on north 28th St.
- The Comp Plan is the time to make land use changes. We should explore land use changes related to housing density during the update.
- Comprehensive look that includes value of economic vitality

Occupancy Limits

Central Boulder:

- Remove all occupancy limits.
- I can't rent my house. I live in a 4 bedroom house alone. Maybe it is # of bedrooms, rather than arbitrary # across the board. Is there a way that is more rational? Agreement on discussion of # of bedrooms rather than just this arbitrary # would allow large houses to house more people.
- 2+
- Living on the Hill demonstrates the neighborhood impacts of high occupancy: noise, trash, lack of maintenance.
- Increased occupancy will mostly be used to cram more students into houses and apartments.
- Current rules are not enforced against landlords.
- Don't resolve the desire for cooperative living by just raising occupancy limits citywide. One person commented, "Doing this to legalize over-occupancy is like making speeding legal because a lot of people speed".
- Cooperatives should only be located in suitable places with already-higher densities, considered on a case by case basis and only if the owner lives on site or is a nonprofit organization.
- Issues of parking, trash, noise, or other "behaviors."
- Lots of students in Goss Grove.
- Noise, trash and parking are the main impacts. Can't just raise the occupancy without addressing these impacts.
- Could pilot this in an area based on parking availability, unit size, or other factors.

- Is occupancy the issue, or is it the impacts, and can city regulations be strengthened in these areas?
- Sharing economy platforms - e.g. uber, lyft, Angies' City participates // Enforce
- Could waive occupancy subject to good neighbor agreements that limit impacts to levels associated with single family dwelling?
- Resistance - seniors - was based on there not being rules - hard for neigh to accept.
- Develop rules to protect neighbors if there is abuse.
- Support for coops - consider #s in each neighborhood. Would be self-selecting.
- Certain areas of neigh - ? Criteria edges - could relate to parking avail. Need metrics for solutions
- Disagree with there being a single occupancy # that applies citywide. Could be based on square feet per person or higher in Transit Oriented Development.
- Should at least consider # of bedrooms!
- Based on bedrooms or if owner lives on site.
- Why not change the rules to agree with the reality?
- Nix occupancy limits in certain parts of city; In a 10 or an 8 bedroom home, let more people live in the houses
- Higher occupancy for seniors: legalize the golden girls in Boulder!

East Boulder:

- Remove from list!! Do not raise except for approved co-op houses where they are allowed.
- * Seniors shared homes.
- * Young families shared homes/childcare.
- * Student housing.
- * Safety concerns, "trash" neighbors
- Raise 2 per bedroom and basement use as well
- Remove to maximize housing choice & legalize people who don't know limits
- More cooperative housing/better community
- 5-Bedroom should allow five occupants
- Should owner occupancy be required for higher rates of occupancy?
- Would allow childcare sharing, "Golden Girls", students looking to afford rent.
- Historically, occupancy limits were put into place to address urban blight and overcrowding.
- Occupancy limits are a poor proxy for the concerns (nuisance behavior, etc.) that they are used for in Boulder.
- Four unrelated people, allowed under current codes, can be terrible renters too. More does not mean worse.
- Accept personal form of density without being forced to.
- Cars may be a problem.
- Tie in walkability/mass transit.
- Sustainable practices/bike lanes.
- Ties into senior housing options.
- Over occupancy = illegal, but happens commonly; people have no option
- Parking huge issue -> less for students.
- More impact on students.
- Good for landlords, not neighbors.

- The Hill -> outlier but center of a lot of tension
- Base it on parking? What if no one has cars?
- Combining commercial & residential
- If we eliminate cars - is it possible? people commute out of Boulder
- Paid parking for second car
=> unbundle parking from housing
- Car sharing
- Make other forms of transportation easier, safer
- parking lots that used the majority of the day
- Works with 2 families – 10 people when owner occupant there.
- Owner occupied different than rental.
- Less control over things – as in co-ops.
- Count children? Question if children are counted?
- Decide by square footage – how it's done California.
- Not as good when rental. If there owner present then make more liberal standards.
- Square footage # of bedrooms combination - good formula to determine number of occupants.
- Need accountability so organization - to hold people residents accountability for issues, e.g. year, conflict resolution.
- Very supportive as tool for senior to age stay at home important option to have a caregiver in the home.
- Should be a very limited tool. Noise, traffic, "churning" and occupancy a concern.
- How does this mirror the distribution of jobs/incomes available in Boulder?
- * 5 year renewal should be retained.
* Not convinced 10+ is needed & feel that high a number invites discard with surrounding community.
* Parking should be limited for co-op
- Remove limit occupancy limits everywhere.

North Boulder:

- Want to support each other as we age
- Is there a way to protect community from nuisance
- Don't want it eliminated just tweaked
- I hear from surprising number of people in interest in some sharing
- Affordable rental? \$650/month where can this be?
- Connects with Land Use Designation and Zoning Changes, Senior Housing Options
- For certain population, city workers, don't put in one place
- Fear that a co-op can't accept everyone. Servers concerns (agent).
ASSUMPTIONS about large groups by together.
- Developers run the town - lack of enforcement of the all development
- For seniors, with at least one owner on the property
- RELATED TO SIZE OF HOUSE.
- This one is extremely important. For reasons listed, but also to help create a larger co-op culture that has much to offer.
- Please relax limits!

- Higher Occupancy limits can also help housing be better and more efficiently used. Better use of space, lower utilities.
- Absolutely - let people 55+ share. Should be related to the size of the home/ # of bedrooms not arbitrary
- A necessity
- Remove limits for seniors 55+ over
- Very important for seniors 55+ Yes!
- No cost to anyone, no votes needed, #1 change needed
- No way - let's not let every neighborhood become the hill
- Yes - in the 19th St area/Linden Dr. So many of the houses have many more than 3 rooms and it is easy for more than 3 unrelated persons to live in 1 house - waste of space/resources otherwise.
- Opposed - this will inevitably impact currently "affordable" neighborhoods most as investors buy up homes to rent.
- Support - context for affordable housing
- Make it more flexible - related to the size of the home, # of bedrooms. Could make reasonable rules about this, parking, # cars, etc. Great for 55+ people!
- Need to relax
- Where appropriate modify
- Depends on neighborhood - what cost is it to services? (Sewer, water, etc.). Careful about cars - make such households buy into car co-ops.
- Dependent on # of bedrooms?

South Boulder:

- More problems/impacts; not city-wide
- Regulate impacts better
- What's responsibility of owner?
- Maybe for owners only
- Raise them, de facto solution
- No - more cars. Maybe in other areas of the city - big house neighborhoods
- Let houses with > 3 bedrooms be occupied with > 3 humans
Enable organic cooperation everywhere
- Terrible idea
- Prefer co-ops with regulation
- Issue of equity - discriminates - unrelated - evaluate
- Raise them to Allow Sharing and affordability, Limit cars not people
- enforcement a Joke, over occupancy is a concern with 10 or 12 people in house, IF occupancy limit is Not Being enforced then what is the Concern of Removing it
- Not opposed to Co-ops but need a bigger footprint, more space
- Enforcement of occupancy is hard, enforcement of impacts is easier
- Complaints are possible with noise, trash, parking, renters want a permanent spot
- Discourage sharing, use NPP Districts
- People want to follow the Rules, up to Landlord to follow the Rules, Let Landlords decide property values are a concern
- Impacts: parking, noise, trash, is the real concern with High Occupancy

- People want to Live 1 Person per Bedroom.
- Prevent sharing and prevent affordability.
- Let's focus on Impacts, Rentals have bad yards, maintain outside, traffic and cars area concern
- Don't allow one in every home.
- Everywhere - homes are rarely 3 bedrooms or fewer in Boulder. The occupancy limits should be removed, as there are other.
- Such a great way to allow for changing needs over time.

Employers/Employees:

- Smart regulations contradict this.
- Bad idea in practice since parking and infrastructure has not been developed to handle the extra population.
- Everywhere - ordinances for noise, litter and parking are all enforceable. Transparency is good for everyone.
- Yes, for seniors.
- Yes - if a home is safe and built to code, all of its usable rooms should be able to be rented to related or unrelated people.
- Change limit to size of house and # of bedroom delete "must be related if more than 3".
- Occupancy limits should be tied to # of bedrooms.
- Absolutely allow more of this, especially in neighborhoods where there isn't so much of it now.
- Near transit with TDM, with other contingencies, check in with neighborhood first like Thistle? BHP? City?
- Minimize impact with eco pass, etc
- In specific areas: areas with ample parking
- NEVER
- Occupancy limits should not be increased. More traffic and parking issues are not solutions.

Preservation of Rental Affordability

Central Boulder:

- Rent controls in other cities have not worked - long term!
- Multi-family is inherently more affordable than single family
- VRBOs hurting rental affordability. People can make more money as VRBOs than rental driving up costs of rentals & making fewer rentals available. Big problem in Whittier, Drives up property taxes as values of houses nearby goes up because property value goes up. Maybe allow owner-occupied VRBO. How to maintain/keep rents lower? Non-profit housing not just for low income.
- How?
- For all considerations - don't "tear down" good things in neighborhood.
- Need to come through subsidy or incentive -> perm affordability.
- Expand the "pot" of funding -> Carbon tax - discourage 1-person commuting. Use revenue to subsidize // Revenue neutral carbon tax.
- Carbon tax - not impact people of low-income who must commute in. Take care not to harm.
- Linkage fee for employers - support workforce.

- Property tax incentive for charging lower rent if you're a landlord.
- There are programs for bottom but police teachers / firefighters / middle / working people. How do we name what affordable would be for a person on earning \$30K? Energy efficiency makes housing more affordable for people.
- critical, because we can't build our way out of crisis
- Jumped to map!!
=> BHP to buy to keep affordable
- We need to buy mobile home parks
- Mixing houses in
- Combining commercial & residential growth management strategy
- Systematic, regularly-updated sub community plans
- Particularly important since majority of those in Boulder are renters. Mobile home parks and others.
- Council should buy mobile home parks
- Planning on making new discoveries??
- Existing apartments and duplexes doesn't change character of existing neighborhood
- 30% of income
- PLEASE preserve rental affordability!

East Boulder:

- Rent Control?
- Anywhere they already exist might be okay if upgraded so the worst are not a nuisance with bad tenants.
- Keeping rent affordable will create lower costs for the city to care for people who become homeless due to unaffordable housing.
- Sounds good. Boulder City should buy old and refurbish.
- Public owned housing is problematic. Mixed motives.
- Rent control would be nice!
- Maybe if aimed at keeping families in existing neighborhoods
- Stop bringing in high paying jobs which only create more demand for luxury housing. (This is what is increasing rental \$.)
- Expand Section 8 vouchers.
- Consider tax incentives or "other valuable consideration" for homeowners who will rent at a certain price level.
- Students, diversity, employment opportunities - mobility

North Boulder:

- Could have high impact
- Need covenants to lock rate in
- MOST important priority for Boulder - preserve affordable housing now!
- Yes, yes neighborhoods can't flourish with only high and low end housing.
- NO
- Rent control is a terrible tool - check out NY
- Wherever affordable housing exists, preserve it instead of building more

- Lots of potential. There is a tremendous number of pre 1980 apt. inventory which BHP and city should purchase and rehab.
- I strongly support more reliance on market rate affordability - all the stuff you can do without building new - need all affordable housing without reliance on city money
- Market rate affordable?
- Save existing affordable housing for all ages
- Impossible. Rent controls lead to all kinds of problems.
- No - doesn't work over long term - quality decreases

South Boulder:

- Renters > 50% in Boulder - owned by investors
- City could have right of 1st refusal [city doesn't pay prop tax when they own land!]
- Anywhere available
- South Boulder has lost affordability of single family homes - for families and students. Big loss for the city (this loss in South Boulder)
- Rent control agreements
- > 50 % pop renters - majority of population
 - Preserves existing density (does not increase population)
 - Maintains current housing
- CU housing more students - i.e. Bear Creek
- State statute try for rent control
- Encourage ownership
- Where there is current density

Employers/Employees:

- A city wide property tax to pay for such units - if we really believe in this, everyone should chip in.
- Sales tax or percentage of open space tax
- Rent control where appropriate
- Have an incentive for homeowners that rent to students to rent or sell to those who want to live and work in Boulder.
- CU should house more students.
- More supply of homes for families will lead to more affordable housing.
- Many problems in town - like the Emerald ash borer - are due to high % of rental units, many of which are not properly cared for.

Regional Solutions and State-Level Advocacy

Central Boulder:

- RTD
 - State level already
 - Mobile Homes
- This seems necessary but only as a long term strategy.
- Make BRT very functional
- Limit increasing jobs (new)
- Better regional transport
- State advocacy re mobile home abuses
- Prohibitive on city rent control.
- Airbnb include jobs.
- Pressure of housing costs. Going up all over.
- Whatever we come up with here, our solution will last 15 years tops? Need to look at transportation because that's going to be place where we make the most change.
- Are there riders? If we build our transit? If we don't build transit people will rely on their cars. How to change from post war automotive land uses?
- Boulder can't solve its problems alone - let's look at transit corridors that already exist but we don't use them yet.
- Look at subsidies to companies who can telecommute.
- Do more house at nodes at edges to the city where they can catch RTD.
- Jobs/housing imbalance a major contribution to un-affordability; more people with high incomes raises the cost of housing.
- Allowing in lieu payments doubles up the density (the development that opted out + the new one that was built with the money)
- Want more detail re: state restrictions on rent control.
- Rent control - must be some lessons learned from elsewhere to craft better laws
- Tiny homes and mobile homes need state advocacy.
- 60K in-commuters with 90% SOV is a big problem. Regional TDM!
- Where is my Light Rail? I want my Money Back!
- Where is light-rail

East Boulder:

- Very important. Jobs
- Don't know what this is.
- Need to tie in transportation - bike paths and reliable buses (which we already have and are great.) Also ties linkage fees and can bring boost to nearby cities.
- Work with neighboring communities regarding income businesses don't attract all here
- Advocacy for more mobile home parks and more of them or tiny homes on vacant lots.
- Advocacy for rent control
- Deserves *lots* of attention and effort. One of the best tools.
- I need more information - Increasing access to public transport to reduce parking in high population density - Rent control to keep housing affordable

North Boulder:

- Had traction -> look at other regional best practices
- Longmont - free bus to residents for intracity travel
- Charge eco-pass to employees.
- Head tax for Businesses of certain size
- I'm against Boulder kicking housing cost to other communities -> go to Area III instead
- More open space, not gobble it up
- Boulder can't do it alone. People want what Boulder can't offer for housing
- We need people to work in the communities and use other modes of transportation
- Boulder build parking garages in other communities
- Municipalize transit
- Better easier faster and more regulate bus service
- Rent control / reverse the Telluride decision
- Transit (improving the mass transit for in-commuters) is the ONLY solution
- North-South protected transit for bikes.
NO MORE CREEK PATHS
Give us safe passage on existing streets.
- Better transit connections to where housing is more affordable. Get legislature to allow rent control.
- Rent control? Would allow mixed income apartments. Transportation.
- Reverse the Telluride decision re: rent control. Better transportation, outer suburbs which offer bigger homes for families/rent control
- Seems like it would be silly to ignore our borders and how regionality affects us
- Would not want regional solutions to slow what Boulder does.
- We need to find out how to get better transportation. Somehow RTD should work for Boulder County or we should get rid of RTD.
- The only realistic solution - free eco passes and B-cycle for all in commuters? Boulder will never have enough housing for everyone who works here - need to work on transit.
- Do not push the problem down the road. Build park n rides in other cities specifically for Boulder.
- Train: commuter rail; sooner now than projected

South Boulder:

- More transit. south of town + east of town - outlying parking lots
- Support advocacy for rent control - Boulder should take a leadership role.
- Purchasing equity in cooperative housing
- Multiple cars and awkward parking concerns.
- Limit number of cars per home
- Only if Boulder voters could accept or reject solutions affecting Boulder
- Hear complaints about in-commuters - facilitate transit
- Encourage regional cooperation - tax sharing/jobs/revenues - regional sales tax sharing
- Rent control would be great (but also requires lots of resources)
- Seems important but also like a cop out - let other communities deal with it...

Employers/Employees:

- Points to transit as the true issue, more in our control re: infrastructure
- When it already takes 4 to 5, stop lights to get thru Table Mesa and Broadway after school?
- This must be a component of any solution since the issue is a regional one.
- Why not?
- Better, faster transportation for people outside area
- Yes - take regional look at affordable housing.
- Rail issue
Eco passes
- Commute optimization helps people work closer to home. It can reduce in-commuting. See commutematters.com
- Regional biz & city coalition to get VRT and arterial BRT & coordinate on TOD regionally
- State level advocacy - rent control

Senior Housing Options

Central Boulder:

- Legalize senior co-ops, remove occupancy limits
- Mapleton campus - but I want to be able to walk to a store! (grocery)
- Only if you allow more houses to be built in Boulder
- Hospital site?
Transit village?
- Sustainability/green building should be priority
- Small homes encourage in Boulder hospital property.
- Lack of clarity on what senior housing means
- Consider height exemptions in order to provide services, especially transit
- Close to services amenities, multigenerational, improved transit near services, in Europe multi-generational model
- Land use tools to develop senior housing
- Tax breakers - city make up different for state (bonus for remaining in place)
- Not clear what is meant
- Incentivize seniors moving out of long occupied houses by restoring tax break
- Increase occupancy limits for seniors that want to age in place by making coops

East Boulder:

- How much does senior housing cost?
- The ADU/OAU addresses this
- Location: affordable
- Everywhere
- So many of us
- Seniors are leaving

- Safety reasons
- Coop + granny may be the best tools for this
- This is one of our most important issues. We are needing to be more responsible for our elders
- This makes sense - but within current established height/zoning limitations.
- *No* to raising occupancy limits in low density.

North Boulder:

- We do not need to house everyone who wants to live here!!!
- Not for groups, but stay where they are-Age in place very sympathetic
- Unable to see how possible to stay in place
- A few of many out => where
- How w/o destroying property values - Does not where they move to
- Property value staying – with affordable housing more on next door
- ADU fan
- Seems like a no brainer!
- More co-housing in current neighborhoods
- Create affordability solutions
 - age in place
 - allow roommates
- We have to keep
 - SAVE - the affordable senior apartments we already have so we don't have to build as many new ones!
- Afford for acc people??
- Allow more houses to add ADU on their properties
- By BCH for housing, offices, city offices & services
- Need to keep alive mobile housing
- Seniors can't compete with students for rental costs.
- Aging in Place - is crucial to me - I am doing all I can to stay out of institutions. This is a HUGE struggle in Boulder
- Need 1 story homes, mostly centrally located
- Intergenerational cooperative housing?
- Because of demographics
- Again North Boulder!
- Some housing should be encouraged throughout Boulder - but preferable close to transit lines and medical facilities. The recent development in the Trinity parking lot is an excellent example.
- I will be one in 10 years!
- We have enough old people. Need more families!
- Tie into cooperative housing tool
- Good idea - better to retrofit homes than build high rises
- Yes - top three choices (very important!)
- In locations near transit, services and shopping

South Boulder:

- In next 25 yrs: senior pop. doubles (1 in 4 people = senior)
- Yes. Near recreation centers / senior centers + buses
- Anywhere
- South Boulder senior population is growing but few options to age in place in South Boulder. 2 new projects are a start. Everyone can relate (unique to this item) less NIMBY
- No, if it would increase population or density
- Pilot programs
 - CU Discipline - specific housing for seniors, CU Partnership for senior housing
- Large homes are hard to afford can seniors down size, moving to smaller homes
- Senior have more stuff
- Choice to Live in Groups of Seniors Greater than 3
- Occupancy limits - address - allow more - could help
 - Encourage - dispersed in neighborhood
 - Could have fewer impacts
 - Stay in houses - facilitate - reverse ADU - more affordable
 - Consider of affordability of large facilities
- Aging in place
- Apts. so elderly can move there & free up single family home. support services
- Where - near transportation recreation centers, near shopping centers cluster areas
- Yes, increase occupancy limits for seniors.
- Yes - more ADU's
- Good idea - needs to be near retail.
- Very important!
- Yes. The more things we can do to make our community a place for all seasons of life the better.
 - Increase the occupancy limits for 55+ households.
- (I am one) is a rational problem - not just here. Cradle to grave care? Socialism
- Yes. Great ideas on how to accomplish this.
- Utilizes other tools

Employers/Employees:

- * They discuss w/ seniors what to do as they cannot stay in their existing homes.
- Yes
- Can work well in various neighborhoods if there are not extra cars
- * Should include ecopass and have access to busses.

Small Homes

Central Boulder:

- This doesn't seem viable - we should be building larger buildings and towers - more efficient.
- Prohibiting expansion is counterproductive. Small units should be included, not just small houses
- Anything to nix from tools kit: not small "homes" - small "lots".
- Are there easy ways to incentivize?
- Yes - as long as
- Limited applicability but possible
- Small lots not just small houses
- ADUs, small & tiny homes would be a great way to in fill in-between existing houses.

East Boulder:

- May help keep them affordable, but won't provide more units.
- This would be appropriate in student, elderly, and low income areas.
- Such interesting community possibilities!!
- Historical necessity
- Will have to allow smaller lots maybe smaller setbacks. Boulder needs to maximize sales price against lot price.
- Where new houses are being built
- More affordable
- More effective use of space
- Create better community
- Tear down/scrapes - Consider ordinance to limit/prohibit or allow "only by exemption"
- Inequity in small house tax liability relative to the community services or neighborhood amenities; traffic and transportation maintenance, etc.
- These are an important part of our history. Quaint neighborhoods.
- Where to put? No if it is used to increase density in existing neighborhoods.

North Boulder:

- Simple, eco-friendly
Affordable
shared
where is it feasible though?
Need to keep affordable over time
- Should be moratorium on anything over 3000 sq. ft.
- More small homes is best
- High limit for affordable - helping with density in certain areas
- Appropriate for north Boulder
- Affordable without city involvement (money, regulations)
- Yes - small is a good fit for me - lots of us live alone!
- Small home or small lot proportionate home? What do you mean?

- Need to address parking, city services / address impacts
- Encouraging smaller homes is greater: regulations to enforce smaller homes are heavy handed.
- Yes - If developers want to build them.
- Excellent idea! Stop the giant trophy homes!!
- Explore in our neighborhood: upland-violet, 19th-22nd
- If they are as cute as these, would be great
- Should be clustered with shared open area, not on tiny postage stamp lots that separate people
- In higher density neighborhoods
- More realistic option compared to tiny homes - very practical
- I think this is a good option
- I support disincentives for larger homes
- Yes - for younger couples and empty nesters - single seniors who want to stay in Boulder
- No new dwellings over 2,000 sq ft
- Don't tear down small houses - retrofit, improve
- I hate the giant house in Newlands

South Boulder:

- Too restrictive for small house owners
- Should be incentivized, not regulated
- No more houses
- Limit value + can't own
- Ridiculous that can build 10,000 sq ft. homes.
- Tax incentive for small homes.
- Allow lots to be split.
- Re-zoning.
- Tends to happen in less expensive neighborhoods which leads to higher density.
- How work with sprawl - look for pockets to re-develop.
- Consider areas w/ already small lots *OR* large lots that could be divided for a small house.
- Good idea.
- Traffic is getting heavier all the time. More density creates problems on roads not designed to handle it.
- A reasonable idea but only for undeveloped parts of Boulder - not practical in South Boulder which is already built out.
- Yes - Allow some single family residential properties to be demolished and sub-divided into small homes. Or if not large enough, multiple properties to be combined and then sub-divided.
- We don't have much buildable open land in Boulder left. Small homes & small lots would make the most of it in single family neighborhoods
- Might as well move to a dense city instead
- Yes - smaller homes on smaller lots and w/in existing neighborhoods. Also HOAs contribute to un-affordability
- Good for where development occurs if apartments/condos aren't desired
- Interesting to see what would make people happier with smaller houses. Neighborhood guest rooms? Neighborhood party hosting rooms...what else? (also better for sustainability)

Employers/Employees:

- Sounds like home size restrictions = un-American
- Fix- this is a no brainer. Eliminate barriers to bldg more small homes.
- Tricky. Could be over reach

Tiny Homes

Central Boulder:

- Tiny home and/or manufactured home parks.
- This doesn't seem viable - we should be building larger buildings and towers - more efficient.
- Remove regulation except health and safety for tiny homes
- Tiny homes need to be safe (fire protection)
- Make them legal
- Allow them to be grouped on large lots where
- Limited applicability but possible
- ADUs, small & tiny homes would be a great way to in fill in-between existing houses.

East Boulder:

- Silly.
- These are cheap to make, even by amateur builders, they are accessible and affordable to people. They are mobile for precariously employed people, including the houseless.
- Can't think of anywhere to put them, unless used as an ADU. Otherwise small apartments and subsidies are the only option.
- Please consider Tiny Home Communities with organic farming for zoning changes. These would be along sustainable designs.
- Use semi tractor trailer
- Tiny come community w/ organic garden w/ owners occupants ability AHA
- Member of tiny house enthusiasm or in process of selling here to live in tiny home. 20 people gathering. Everyone wanted a tiny home community garden site - work land together. Great w/ organic farming.
- More community based solutions to density in scarcity of resources. Want regulation change to allow them in Boulder. Like a mobile ADU. Ideal on a larger lot homeowner backyard.
- Know person building for low income affordable, quick to build. Lower carbon footprint.
- Use fewer resources for retired couples, elders, small families. Elder want to be near healthcare.
- Lease property where homeowners are. What about city property and lease it e.g. city golf course. Want the city to be more active encourage sustainable living. City rent land at an affordable rate.
- Buy tiny home to be debt free. No mortgage. Can anchor here they winder high
- Might be too extreme -> people want small homes -> more room
- people use it to get around building restrictions
- they're more efficient but issue with water & septic

- convenience for people
- Where to put them?
-> fees for parking, can supplement income & communal
- Would they go into trailer parks? It's per night money
- Buying large lots & putting multiple tiny houses on it
- I think we should look into this as a permanent solution to mobile housing.
- Tiny Housing Communities. May also wish to do organic farming. Please consider zoning for this.
- Allow in mobile home parks - but only after conforming to growth limits < 1% (hopefully)
- Where to put? No if it makes more units in existing neighborhoods
- Yes! Explore! We need to look at tiny house *communities* as well.

North Boulder:

- Tiny house for homeless
- Addresses senior housing
- Replicate the cottages (~1000 sq ft)
- Need zoning for that public-private job to develop. Tear down parking lots and put up tiny home sustainable communities
- Great idea! We support!
- Zoning needed
- Tiny homes are new and innovative. Let's allow them maybe with a limit on # of permits
- Not as ADUs or OAU's
- Boulder has the ability to join in this adventure (Portland, Austin = innovation). Such a creative way to address housing. Not everyone has a family - don't forget singles. A great investment instead of losing \$ in rent.
- Allow properties on big lots to add small homes to increase housing in Boulder.
- Need zoning & provide funding people can't afford to buy separately.
- Substandard housing - nowhere
- These make great additions to properties with large amounts of unused land. Can function much like an accessory dwelling unit. They create much less waste. Also more affordable long term owning a home versus paying rent.
- Impractical but cute
- Possibly a good option
- Maybe - good for a few people
- Also look at tiny "hotel" or apartment units for students (GOOD)
- Find some land for a tiny house community - similar to mobile home parks
- Great way to add to existing stock

South Boulder:

- Not sure where ... land needed
- No more houses
- Great for small communities (where space permits) and as ADUS for home owners who are ok with it

Employers/Employees:

- Seems to be the same as ADUs but would be seen as distinct tactic needing its own rules - avoid the headache
- Mobile homes
- Intriguing
- Yes. Alternative to mobile home parks. Tiny home parks.
- Agreed - backyard tiny homes.
- Ridiculous! Who maintains these? Sanitation? Facilities? Park in *your* drive way?
- This form of densification is practical only if it doesn't add to our traffic and parking problems.
- Yes - allowed by right in specific locations - form-based code - allows more public input

Other

Central Boulder:

- Can't just say "there are neighborhood concerns about impacts." Let the neighborhoods roll up their sleeves and talk to each other about what they value and fear.
- There needs to be more information that quantifies issues—just how many "affordable" units are there in my neighborhood and what has been the result to our quality of life.
- People won't shift to a city-wide view if they believe they need to protect their own neighborhoods.
- Any changes will have benefits and costs/impacts. The neighbors should discuss these among themselves; maybe they will see things differently.
- For example, the myth that density reduces property values—it doesn't in Boulder. Or the fear about "affordable" housing hurting the social fabric
- The City should explore ownership models to keep pad fees low, avoid oppressive rules and encourage community.
- Can mobile home parks include space for Tiny Houses?
- Seems like this type of living is affordable, has low environmental footprint, and builds community.
- Explore this model for low-income singles.
- Work with CU to encourage students into higher density area & free up some houses.
- One person in our group wants to see expanding the city, using open space land, maybe moving open space and buying further out lands - would make a big difference to how Boulder grows.
- unused open space as potential
- student housing & students
- Wealth tax!
- NIMBY's have too much say
=> they're doing planning
- advocacy for mixing housing types
- More high paying jobs upward pressure on housing prices - not addressed
- utilization of appropriate parcels of our open space
- City buy mobile home parks

- Provide a variety of housing options in new development - coop, apartment, and senior, (mobile?)
- We need those remaking our city present @these events (e.g. developers)
- Please be careful about demolitions/over occupy in historic neighborhoods!
- Telecommuting
- Illegal home businesses?
- Let's shoot for more than 10 % affordable...10 % is not even enough

East Boulder:

- In my group, I was the only person from East or Southeast Boulder
- Charge new business Development fees then build 2-level affordable housing.
- Decide on values to focus the process. Example:
 1. Effective use of land
 2. Sustainable use of resources.
 These values then funnel the decisions.
- Put laws into place to limit job growth. Job growth causes housing affordability
- Pass a minimum wage - even if at state level
- We need density. Create spaces for people that work for people by combining progressive housing policy with solid transportation plans that shift our city away from single-owner cars towards public transit, bikes and walking.
- Limiting job growth/charging businesses
=> how you prevent gentrification.
- Development pays its way
- Allow nearby County-neighborhood residents to have some say in this!
- All are contact sensitive
- Agriculturally productive, very low density neighborhoods
- Raise minimum wage, if you can't lower cost, get people more money
- Regional planning
- Subsidize low + middle income housing
- Maybe only some people should be able to live in Boulder
- Advocate for a RE or doc fee to go toward a state affordable. housing fund
- Coordinate move with the county.
- Shouldn't we have a higher permanently affordable goal? 10% does not address the demand created by low wage jobs.
- Limit zoning, changes in neighborhood, should developer pay own way
- Need results and substance
- Need solutions for all age groups
- Density is an issue
- Don't really like any of these
- Why does all development have to be rental? Owner your property better.
- Give up the Nazi approach to Landmark and Historic.
- These are not "tools" - they are stated more as objectives or "ideas".
- Preserving the ideals that are in place now - open space, design compatibility, height restrictions.
- 1. ADU + OAU; 2. Senior Housing; Regional Solutions; Advocacy for Mobile Home Parks

- Lots of density in the center of Boulder. I live 29th Bluff, not any green space!
- What is the current %? 7.5?

North Boulder:

- If CU could house more student housing, rentals in Boulder could be used by seniors & the work force.
- 15 minute neighborhoods is unrealistic - people need to drive to work, to grocery, to hardware store, to day care & to open spaces
- This assumes that affordability is possible - that is a desirable goal.
- Build on open space
- Pay teachers so they can afford to live here
- Bus passes are too expensive (difficult transportation)
- Millennials don't mind density
- We need pedestrian sidewalks
- Can boulder be Affordable? Is it possible 10%? What is affordable?
- How do you put in affordable housing w/o lower property values next to?
- Laws in place - price control
- No rent control.
- Combine small tiny homes ADUs need to look at existing models / don't reinvent the wheel - inspiration needs to be in context
- I'd like to comment on the schedule - who do you expect to be able to attend these meetings if they start at 5pm?
- Want tools that focus on reliance on existing development
- Want tools that focus on reducing reliance on the permanently affordable program.
- Allow integrated affordable market rate and rental developments.
- Building out Boulder will not reduce housing costs; it will just cause more congestion and loss of Boulder's current lifestyle.
- Plan review and permit fee waivers or reductions for affordable housing developers.
- No safe North/South corridor. No separation between cars bikes
- What are the problems and concerns now and for the future? We need more conversations and listening before we start debating tools.

South Boulder:

- Don't try to attract new jobs; commercial growth limit
Encourage local companies
- Maintain good quality of life. Prevent increasing %age of landlord owned housing. Increase owner owned homes.
- Use planning policies to shift commercial potential to housing
- Support linkage fee
- Challenge the state to allow local rent controlled units
- Buses full on east Arapahoe
- Manage growth gracefully
- So many people commuting

- Square foot options too many - think BIG (small or tiny homes) redevelop to alternative housing type
- City Purchase single-family homes, convert to affordable housing - rent and own
- Collaborative planning - Madison WI
Develop better mechanisms for neighborhood involvement/voicing concerns
- Explore rent control options
- All tools have an adverse impact on quality of life.
- City should adequately study all impacts of increasing population and/or population density.
- Additional services and infrastructure needs.
- Neighborhood planning programs - get neighborhood plans
- Emphasize the preservation of Boulder's quality of life
- Designate open space for affordable housing
- Identify small pockets
- Concerns about losing views
- Covenants so neighborhoods have a say in what changes - rather than having it imposed
- Lots of open space to work with
- Acres of tax roles, Loss of revenue from open space
- Keep things as they are does not work, affordability
- South Boulder is well suited already
Some new developments - mixed use - not working, e.g. Peloton
- Can make things less affordable
- People want single family homes
- Role of CU
- Neighbors would like as much input on changes as possible, e.g. South Campus, US 36 changes
- Consider essential workers/ critical jobs - ways to house - benefit to community
- Disagreement about criteria for affordable housing
- Get employers involved in housing/incentives
Rental units for people who work nearby - preference
- Use zoning.
- Self regulate
- Can't keep bringing in more jobs.
- Importance of transit.
- Desirability a good thing.
- In-commuting is miserable for commuters and city traffic.
- Investment in transit most important
- What is going to be the best as central approach by city recommended.
- Subsidized housing should be removed vs. keep limited supply of subsidized housing (disagreement)
- Don't fight supply and demand
- Start with neighborhood/district planning
- What if you incentivized individual innovative and creative solutions instead of being so prescriptive in the regulations around solutions?
- It seems like one of the biggest concerns is how neighbors will react - so maybe the solutions needs to be around increasing community communication and openness to diversity.

Employers/Employees:

- CU as labor source and impacts on housing. The impact of occupancy limits + manipulation of new renters not necessarily a "problem" of lack of employee housing - becomes a transit issue. Density comes with affordability (if this is needed)
Natural evolution of work force at x age, want to have home not attached dwellings.
- Companies could argue such "assistance" is part of the salary they pay.
- Transportation - not everyone can live in Boulder
Light-Rail
Eco-Pass
- I really thought this discussion was going to render around this particular tool. A discussion between Employees and employers the problems and the solutions. The other workshops were so well run - it would have been nice to have a facilitator to focus on this TOOL. Otherwise a good discussion but not what I thought.
- How can we intervene to make buying a home easier
- CU - down payments are not
- Should CU limit the number of students since that impacts housing availability.
Airbnb is part of the solution.
- Preserve and improve regulations for mobile homes
- Barrier for entry into Boulder market is cost of Childcare. Close the gap between qualifying for loan for house so live in nanny can replace childcare costs
- Incentivize condos (impact of construction defect?) address HOA fees issues.
- ECO-PASSES for all.
- More affordable childcare
- Neighborhood involvement
- More students should be housed on campus to free up residences for those who wish to live and work in Boulder.
- Density should not be increased.
- Instead of focusing only on affordable housing, please consider limiting new employers (especially large employers) from coming to Boulder. This just exacerbates the problem unnecessarily.
- Open up your open space for housing near the city. East Boulder.
- I see nothing being done to achieve this.
- Have more residential units above retail in strip malls.
- CU should have more on-campus housing. ~70% of students live off campus putting a large burden in the city of Boulder. Homes should be for those who *work* in Boulder.