EXCERPTS FROM
FALL 2007 UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS CITIZENS SURVEY

Proposed Scenarios for Future Growth and Development 1

Regulation of Density (Multi-Family Development) 7

Commercial Development 9

SURVEY - PAGES 10-11

The [2006 University Heights' Comprehensive Plan] proposes three scenarios to guide future growth and development in University Heights. **...** *Which scenario would you prefer?*

☐1 ☐2 ☐3
☐No preference, all are fine
☐None are acceptable
☐No opinion

What specifically do you like about your preferred choice?

What are the key issues the City needs to address in the next 5 year?

AREA	**Total Responses**	None Are Acceptable	Scenario One	Scenario Two	Scenario Three	No Preference/ All Are Fine	No Opinion/ No Response
Citywide	**142 (100%)**	36 (25%)	45 (32%)	12 (8%)	10 (7%)	8 (6%)	31 (22%)
Oakcrest, Mahaska, Ridgeview, Koser or Highland (West of Sunset)	**44 (31%)**	15 (34%)	15 (34%)	4 (9%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	4 (9%)
Sunset, Grand, Golfview, Prospect or Glencrest	**35 (25%)**	12 (34%)	12 (34%)	3 (9%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	5 (14%)
George, Marietta, Koser or Highland (east of Sunset)	**35 (25%)**	5 (14%)	14 (40%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)	11 (31%)
Leamer or Olive	**12 (8%)**	2 (17%)	3 (25%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	4 (33%)
Melrose Corridor	**11 (8%)**	2 (18%)	1 (9%)	3 (27%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	3 (27%)
Area Not Indicated	**5 (4%)**	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)

COMMENTS

NONE ARE ACCEPTABLE *(comments made by 20 of 36 respondents)*

What specifically do you like about your preferred choice?	***What are the key issues the City needs to address in the next 5 year?***
Too Much traffic, Rentals change safety and stability of community	reputation. Gameday traffic. Supervise rentals(decrease)
No Commercial, Apts, Mixed Use	Control Growth To Maintain Quality of Life
No Info On Commercial	Recreation Facility
City Needs Park and Play Area	Sign Initiative On Global Warming, Fire Service From IC, Parks, Enforce Rental Rules, Permit For Street Parking
Multi Family Is Risk For Property Value And Character Of City	Enforce And Restrict MultiFamilies. Preserve Family Aspect. Transparency Of Expanded Athletic Club
don't want more multi-family development period. Quality of life is on decline now	multi family housing no illegal single family housing
don't want commercial development or multi-family	family environment
keep the same	keep taxes low
I dislike expanding multi-family developments. I am also wary of commercial expansion, as it might endanger the character of my neighborhood	I think we need to consider annexing the neuzil property as the only entrances to the area are through UH. I would like to have more input as to how its developed and I don't feel we have that as its part of Iowa City
no more multi family	
no AC condos or apts on Melrose	
no SF homes into Commercial	
stay SF	
keep SF	
more parks, no condos	
No Change	
Remain Single Family	
	Restrict Rental Property!

	1. Don't expand sidewalks on Melrose - if you want space for bicyclists make more bike lanes 2. Do not permit condos by Athletic Club 3. Port-o-potties should be brought in only for the weekend of a game. 4. Tree trimming - have a service and let each res
	Rental Property

SCENARIO 1 *(comments made by 28 of 45 respondents)*

What specifically do you like about your preferred choice?	***What are the key issues the City needs to address in the next 5 year?***
Scenario1 Seems to Keep U Heights Quaint, Family Friendly	Better Control of Rentals
Town Will Suffer From Large Development. Rentals Already a Problem	Control Student Housing, Evict Problem Tenants
Maintain Community Character	Maintain Character. Regulate Development To Be Consistent. Control Cost Of Police
Maintain Integrity, Protect Owners Against Multi Family and Commercial	Rental Violations
Keep City As A Neighborhood	Police Involve UI Activities
while content with more commercial use, I would prefer less multi-unit housing rather than more	greater police presence on game days. Installing public restrooms or port-a-johns. I'm sick of fans using my yard as a toilet.
I would not want to see multi-family development and commercial development in the area of the Athletic Club. That would be way too much congestion and detract from the feel of the neighborhood	we need to work through the zoning commission to halt development of the athletic club. It is out of scale for the area.
focus on area remaining single family	snow removal; rental housing; police department size/use; pr image
we prefer things to remain as they are now	no more development
I want to reduce mix-use development except for the area near Athletic Club. However, we need smart growth in that area	Smart growth for revenues purposes. Enforcement and strengthening of existing rental property ordinances
commercial development. Less multi-family housing	rental homes, low-income housing

Maintain single family emphasis #2 and #3 are creating drastic changes which would negatively affect current property owners	control of rental housing, parking in yards, access to Neuzil property
No multifamily on south side of Melrose	Development vs. green space of Neuzil property
Commercial would bring revenue without building apartments	Rental properties, Keeping UH family friendly, Homes lived in by owners
preserve green space, no more apartments or multi-family, no additional commercial space, no high rise	lower property tax, not allow front yards to become parking lots
Remain Single Family	Density, Parking
Option #1 has least number of multi-family use areas. Prefer single family residential with some commercial at either end of Melrose	
Scenario 2 would be acceptable if the commercial development served pedestrians, not cars.	
Maintain Lifestyle in UH	
wants SF	
limit MF	
No Change	
It limits multi-family developments to one area	
as little commercial development as possible but the need for affordable housing is growing	
	Rental property not following the law
	merge w/ IC
	Determine Number of People Who Use Library, It Is Wasteful
	More Bike Paths. Better Recycling
	Garbage Bags On Game Days, Bikes Obey Laws
	how to maintain the quality; monitoring rental properties and home maintenance of said properties; traffic route to UIHC from four to two lane

SCENARIO 2 *(comments made by 6 of 12 respondents)*

What specifically do you like about your preferred choice?	***What are the key issues the City needs to address in the next 5 year?***
Should Provide More Revenue Potential In Controlled Fashion	Revenue Generation
it allows the housing development by the athletic club, without changing the use of the rest of Melrose	1. yearly clean up day 2. more convenient/more locations to purchase weekly garbage tags 3. make bike lanes on sunset and koser 4. a school zone crosswalk for Melrose/Sunset corner.
no commercial development near the university athletic club	development
limited new commercial dev	more ped and bike friendly
no commercial	
	Selling Goods From Taste of Melrose Not Fair

SCENARIO 3 *(comments made by 7 of 10 respondents)*

What specifically do you like about your preferred choice?	***What are the key issues the City needs to address in the next 5 year?***
Promotes Walkable Communities. Will increase Tax Base. Help Diversify Neighborhood	More Bike and Pedestrian Trails. Assure Athletic Club Development Is In Accordance With Architecture. Develop Town/Community Center
Melrose could be good mixed use if the traffic is controlled. With all the plans, the design and execution is key. If more property like the PUD on Melrose is proposed I reject any change with its poor design and offensive wall.	rental property control--too many cars. Growth with good design, business that fits -- no bars.
Melrose is now too busy of a street to maintain as a single family area. More revenue if more commercial and multi-family development	lower overall property values if we have too much rental housing that isn't kept up
University Heights need to allow for mixed use and managed densification	Managed densification, Increased speed enforcement on neighborhood streets, neighborhood parking permits, more sidewalks, increased revenues
Commercial Near Athletic Club is Good [2/3]	Joining IC, Lower Expense of Police, Fire Protection [2/3]
More Multifamily and Commercial is good	
	Street Lights

NO PREFERENCE, ALL ARE FINE *(comments made by 3 of 8 respondents)*

What specifically do you like about your preferred choice?	***What are the key issues the City needs to address in the next 5 year?***
for growth subject to reduction in taxes	
	More Street Lights
	rental property

NO OPINION & NO RESPONSE *(comments made by 6 of 31 respondents)*

What specifically do you like about your preferred choice?	***What are the key issues the City needs to address in the next 5 year?***
City Should Not Be Developed	Rental Properties. Traffic Light On Melrose And Golfview/Grand
hoping if development is super nice development	keeping area family I love, rental policy discouraging rentals
I prefer single family houses, no more multi family units [no response]	
	Parking Permits For Residents On Game Days Recycle Bins Street lights [no response]
	Koser/Melrose Pedestrian Light. Rental Inspection Violations. Over Use Of Rental Parked Cars
	what to do with Neuzil's lot at end of olive court

SURVEY - PAGE 11

In general should the City regulate density to: (check all that apply)

- ☐ *Permit higher density (multi-family)*
  - ☐ *In all business/commercial zones*
  - ☐ *In only selected business/commercial zones (where)_____*
  - ☐ *In all residential areas*
  - ☐ *In selected residential areas (where)_____*
  - ☐ *Along major thoroughfares*
- ☐ *Prohibit new multi-family buildings*
  - ☐ *In any business/commercial zone*
  - ☐ *In any residential neighborhoods*
- ☐ *Maintain current multi-family regulations*
- ☐ *Do not regulate*
- ☐ *No opinion*

Comments_____

[TABLE ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

COMMENTS

- Uheights will Ultimately have to Develop B/C Location
- the height of new multi-family buildings should not be increased from past standards
- Comply With Master Plan. Need To Agree On One Scenario
- No radical growth
- Maintain Current And ENFORCE IT!

			Prohibit New Multi-Family Buildings			Permit Higher Density (Multi-Family)				
AREA	**Total Responses**	Maintain Current Multi-Family Regulatons	In Any Business/ Commercial Zone	In Any Residential Neighborhoods	Not Indicated	In All or Selected Business/ Commercial Zones	Along Major Thorough-fares	In All or Selected Residential Areas	Not Indicated	Do Not Regulate/ No Opinion/ No Response
Citywide	**142 (100%)**	33 (23%)	9 (6%)	34 (24%)	12 (8%)	7.33 (5%)	6.33 (4%)	5.33 (4%))	7 (5%)	28 (20%)
Oakcrest, Mahaska, Ridgeview, Koser or Highland (West of Sunset)	**44 (31%)**	10 (23%)	2.5 (6%)	12.5 (28%)	3 (7%)	3.83 (9%)	2.83 (6%)	3.33 (8%)	1 (2%)	5 (11%)
Sunset, Grand, Golfview, Prospect or Glencrest	**35 (25%)**	7 (20%)	2.5 (7%)	10.5 (30%)	4 (11%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	8 (23%)
George, Marietta, Koser or Highland (east of Sunset)	**35 (25%)**	10 (29%)	1 (3%)	7 (20%)	2 (6%)	1.5 (4%)	1.5 (4%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)	8 (23%)
Leamer or Olive	**12 (8%)**	3 (25%)	1 (8%)	4 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (25%)
Melrose Corridor	**11 (8%)**	3 (27%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	3 (27%)
Area Not Indicated	**5 (4%)**	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)

SURVEY - PAGE 12

Should the City allow more commercial development

☐ In commercial areas
☐ In some residential areas
☐ Only along thoroughfares
☐ No
☐ No opinion

*Comments*_____

AREA	**Total Responses**	No	In Commercial Areas	Only Along Thoroughfares	In Some Residential Areas	No Opinion/ No Response
Citywide	**142 (100%)**	51 (36%)	49.5 (35%)	22.5 (16%)	1 (1%)	18 (13%)
Oakcrest, Mahaska, Ridgeview, Koser or Highland (West of Sunset)	**44 (31%)**	18 (41%)	17.5 (40%)	5.5 (13%)	0 (0%)	3 (7%)
Sunset, Grand, Golfview, Prospect or Glencrest	**35 (25%)**	15 (43%)	12 (34%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	7 (20%)
George, Marietta, Koser or Highland (east of Sunset)	**35 (25%)**	10 (29%)	13 (37%)	7 (20%)	1 (3%)	4 (11%)
Leamer or Olive	**12 (8%)**	4 (33%)	1 (8%)	5 (42%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)
Melrose Corridor	**11 (8%)**	3 (27%)	5 (45%)	3 (27%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Area Not Indicated	**5 (4%)**	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)

COMMENTS

- On Both Ends of Melrose
- Commercial In Athletic Club In Exchange For Concession On Building Height And Architecture