



Summary - Spring 2005

Open Houses and Community Presentations

Summary of Comments

Each of the two scenarios presented at the open houses and during public presentations – Mixed Use Corridors and Blended – had its own comment form. Participants were asked to complete both. The comment forms showed the attributes of each scenario and asked participants if they liked or disliked the attribute, and why. In addition, residents who attended the open houses and public presentations were shown the differences between the trend and the two new scenarios for further clarification.

The following pages summarized the often-repeated comments and common themes from the approximately 375 comment forms received at both the open houses and from the community presentations.

Note: The number of “likes” and “dislikes” recorded does not reflect the total number of comment sheets received. Some participants chose not to mark a “like” or “dislike” or skipped questions.

Mixed-Use Corridors Attributes:

Q1 - Less consumption of new land than Blended

Like: 139 Dislike: 33

Likes:

- Stops development of prime agricultural land
- Preserves open space
- Like smaller lot developments, more multi-family units
- Avoids sprawl – maximizes existing infrastructure
- Better for air quality

Dislikes:

- People live here for the rural atmosphere and don't want a high-density urban lifestyle – not practical
- Prefer large lot subdivisions – provides privacy
- People like to own acreage
- High density will mean more traffic on corridors, more air quality problems
- Concentrates growth in too few areas

Q2 - Regional housing mix of 50% single-family homes, 50% multi-family homes. High proportion of multi-family and other types of attached residences.

Like: 100 Dislike: 59

Likes:

- Efficient use of land – reduces sprawl
- Supports public transportation, more walk-able, reduces vehicle trips
- Provides options for people
- There is a need for higher-density residential development (low-income, senior)
- Preserves open space and agricultural land



COMMUNITIES IN MOTION

Summary - Spring 2005

Open Houses and Community Presentations

Dislikes:

- Too urban, people move here for rural atmosphere
- Prefer more single-family homes, more practical for families
- Not realistic – too different from existing
- Too many people in a small space can create social problems
- Too much separation between high-income and low-income people

Q3 - Land uses support transit and other travel choices

Like: 149 Dislike: 20

Likes:

- Public transit is essential for this growing area
- Provides opportunity for rail, a more complex bus system, cycling paths
- Good for environmental reasons, fuel conservation, aging population, reducing commute times
- Less reliance on single-occupancy vehicles, reduces congestion
- Less paved areas, more open space

Dislikes:

- This area isn't large enough to support transit – people won't support it
- Transit doesn't work for a lot of people
- Don't like subsidized public transit
- Need money for roads, not transit

Q4 - Most intensive development occurs along major transportation corridors

Like: 111 Dislike: 25

Likes:

- Infrastructure already exists, it just needs to be expanded
- Efficient use of land and transportation systems
- Reduces sprawl
- Supports public transportation
- Reduces vehicle miles traveled for commute, shopping, etc

Dislikes:

- People will not want to live near transportation corridors, will become undesirable areas for residential
- Increases congestion and slows traffic, for example Eagle Road
- Need frontage and backage roads to control access
- Increases air pollution



COMMUNITIES IN MOTION

Summary - Spring 2005

Open Houses and Community Presentations

Q5 - Highest redevelopment in existing urbanized areas

Like: 118 Dislike: 16

Likes:

- Preserves farmland, open space
- Keeps current areas from dying or becoming rundown
- Uses existing infrastructure, urban areas
- Increases density
- May bring additional jobs

Dislikes:

- Puts more low-income areas in urban setting
- Increased density is unrealistic – people don't want it
- Can plan for this, but can't enforce it
- Could harm existing residential neighborhoods

Note: The number of "likes" and "dislikes" recorded does not reflect the total number of comment sheets received. Some participants chose not to mark a "like" or "dislike" or skipped questions.

Blended Attributes:

Q1 - Greater consumption of new land than the Mixed-Use Corridors. Additional growth in existing small communities.

Like: 52 Dislike: 96

Likes:

- More realistic for the attitudes of this area
- Allows smaller communities to grow and have their own identity
- Like to be able to have larger lots
- There is enough land to continue development
- Gives more options, but still manages growth
- Less congestion on travel corridors

Dislikes:

- Takes too much new land -- discourages open space and farmland
- Encourages sprawl
- Does not solve traffic congestion and air quality issues
- Encourages new roads and discourages transit



Summary - Spring 2005

Open Houses and Community Presentations

Q2 - Regional housing mix of 65% single-family home and 35% multi-family homes. Relatively high proportion of large lot residential development in areas of impact.

Like: 64 Dislike: 75

Likes:

- Good combination of rural and urban
- Families can live closer to work, less commuting
- This is realistic because it doesn't require major changes in lifestyle
- Like more single-family homes

Dislikes:

- People want more land, not less
- Most Idahoans don't want to live in multi-family developments
- Inefficient use of land – encourages sprawl
- Need more density, should discourage large-lot residential
- Discourages transit

Q3 - Less potential for transit than Mixed-Use Corridors

Like: 24 Dislike: 112

Likes:

- Transit isn't realistic for this area, not enough population density
- If transit develops, maybe people will use it gradually
- Need wider highways
- If people are close to jobs, they don't need transit

Dislikes:

- Need to upgrade existing transit and encourage its use now
- Need to plan now for transit – it will definitely be needed in the future
- Need transit along commuter routes like Caldwell-Nampa-Boise
- Air quality will continue to worsen if transit doesn't become more available
- We shouldn't encourage single-occupancy vehicles

Q4 - Less intensive development along major transportation corridors than Mixed-Use Corridors.

Like: 38 Dislike: 71



COMMUNITIES IN MOTION

Summary - Spring 2005

Open Houses and Community Presentations

Likes:

- Less congestion and delay, major routes are already too crowded
- Need commercial, retail, jobs in each city so people don't have to travel as far
- Spreads density over a greater area

Dislikes:

- Encourages sprawl
- Inefficient – hard to centralize services, transit, etc
- Requires too much driving – discourages transit
- Need commercial and residential development along existing corridors

Q5 - Provides regional housing mix of 65 percent single-family homes and 35 percent multi-family homes.

Like: 51 Dislike: 40

Likes:

- Realistic mix of housing
- Good mix of urban development and rural preservation
- Still allows people to own property and have their own space

Dislikes:

- Inefficient, encourages sprawl – not enough density
- Need to balance housing choices more equally
- Attractive multi-family housing may appeal to more people than we realize, especially aging population

T:\FY05\600Projects\661 CIM\07-PublicMeetings\ScenarioPrelimOutreachMarApr05\ShorterSummary of Comments.doc