

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Stockpiling

Would you be in support of a revision to the code expanding the definition of stockpiling to include the accumulation of items in a quantity not customarily associated with residential properties?	Comments:
<b>No</b>	It's a free county if you collect wagon wheels and like them, then 8 ot 10 of them is ok. Didn't move here to be overregulated.
<b>Yes</b>	Stockpiling in our neighborhood is a problem, residents leave wood on the side for years that is never used, old cars that don't work, trash that is unattractive and attracts rodents
<b>Maybe</b>	There may be a reason for stockpiling. That needs to be taken into consideration. If it is for a short time I see no problem.
<b>No</b>	This is not Highlands Ranch
<b>No</b>	I think it is not reasonable to put this kind of a restriction on the property owner.
<b>No</b>	I have 8 children, so what you are saying is they cannot ride their bikes and park them at the house. Is the city going to get into regulating the size of families next?
<b>No</b>	What gives you the right to come in and tell me what is junk? What if i have 8 kids and they all want bicycles? Am I going to be forced to not buy my kids bicycles because my neighbor thinks that 8 are too many to have? Should I also limit the number of children I have based on what my neighbor thinks? If so then I think we should all move to China and terminate any births after the first.
<b>No</b>	No actual numbers, that's great! No subjectivity or prejudices could be read into this one.
<b>Maybe</b>	Stockpiling should be allowed as long it's not visible from the street and/or properly covered in side/back yards so as not to be visible to neighbors and interrupting their sight lines.
<b>No</b>	I am not in favor of telling people that they can only have a certain number of anything. If I have extra bikes around to allow visiting family or friends to ride it is of no concern to busy body neighbors
<b>Yes</b>	We have an HOA code that addresses this but I've seen communities where this happens and it is unsightly and says to me "I'm glad I don't live in this neighborhood".
<b>Yes</b>	This is obviously more difficult since the definition of 'not customarily associated' is subject to interpretation, but I do favor such restrictions in a general sense.
<b>No</b>	NO " As it is ordinarily not unserviceable items but rather a large family or side business that causes multiple bikes or lawn mowers, I think such code is too heavy handed.

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Stockpiling

<b>Yes</b>	Yes, but you need to define this further or you will have a code that is easily challenged and worthless.
<b>No</b>	If I wanted to live in a "covenant controlled community" I would have bought a house in one. Keep the government's hands off my property!
<b>Yes</b>	This revision is urgently needed.
<b>Yes</b>	Only if they are not within the front setbacks.
<b>Yes</b>	I would support an ordinance that prohibits stockpiling on the residential property as a whole, not just from the front or street view.
<b>Yes</b>	If a homeowner is piling rock, mulch etc for improvements short time like a couple of weeks it should be ok. But not bicycles, lawn mowers,etc.
<b>No</b>	I believe the current code is adequate to deal with creation of "varmint habitat."
<b>Maybe</b>	The term "customarily found in a residential setting" is vague at best. Does this mean only one lawn mower, or three, or four? What about families with lots of children? Maybe they need eight bicycles. If someone is using the the residential property as a business storage site, that is another issue. What about garage sales with multiple items?
<b>Maybe</b>	This ordinance would have to be drafted in a way that makes it difficult to use to harass neighbors. I think that might be difficult.
<b>Yes</b>	Junk appliances, vehicle parts, non-patio furniture and inoperative stuff should not be accumulated. Prohibition should not only prevent unsightly messes but also locations for potentially dangerous/undesirable animals and weeds. Extreme numbers of otherwise useful objects should also be prohibited, unless a commercial application is allowed at the site, although defining such numbers would be difficult.
<b>Yes</b>	I trust that the wood pile would not be eliminated, but rather would be limited to say 1 or 2 cords.
<b>Yes</b>	Stockpiling should be better defined but should definately not be permitted where it can be seen from the street.
<b>Yes</b>	In some cases these property owners are buying, repairing and reselling these items. If these trash collectors can't be regulated with the current ordinances then I agree we need something to put a stop to it.
<b>Yes</b>	Does the code prohibit the permanent storage of extension ladders in backyards? This invites crime not only for that neighbor but for nearby homes as well.
<b>No</b>	Too intrusive on peoples' lifestyles.

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Stockpiling

<b>Maybe</b>	Only if it is visible from outside the property and obviously not for short term.
<b>Maybe</b>	This is tricky. Are the items in a shed, or displayed in full view? Suppose items are enclosed in a back yard in a picket fence enclosure, but not roofed. They can be seen from a second story, but not at ground level. Otherwise, the yard is neat. Would an unusual accumulation be subject to a "junk" definition? Nothing should be allowed to be stored on front or side yards under any circumstances.
<b>No</b>	I don't like the way this item is described by Code Enforcement and that goes for all the others in this survey. This one is particularly offensive for many reasons. "Customarily associated" and "customarily found" are very general terms and statements and not defined in any reasonably acceptable manner. PUSH POLLS NEVER ARE USEFUL BECAUSE THEY EXPRESS THE BELIEFS OF A FEW PEOPLE, MOSTLY POLITICANS AND BUREAUCRATS, WHO ARE TRYING TO GET THE RESULTS THEY WANT TO SEE AND, PERHAPS, NOT OF A REAL CONCERN OF THE CITIZENS. I seriously doubt the veracity of the term and statements "often receives inquiries". That's no one's business beyond the property owner and may frequently just be a nosy or unfriendly neighbor who doesn't like their neighbors. They have an option... they can move somewhere else because their neighbor also has rights! It can often be treated as harassment. Code Enforcement and Zoning might want to talk with Counsel about the definition of the word/term harassment. What is the definition of "often", "customarily found" and "customarily associated"? And, who decided the definition? Let those who live in neighborhoods with strict covenants enforce their own covenants, but they and government do not have a right or the privilege of forcing dictating those covenants on other neighborhoods. That's also not the role of government.
<b>Yes</b>	Citizens should be required to dispose of unused articles, which are visible by your neighbors. These items should be locked up in a garage or other storage area to prevent the invitation of theft in a neighborhood.
<b>Maybe</b>	My concern is that the city and code enforcement officials will take this entire code update to an extreme. If a family has 8 bikes so what as long they are not a hazard to anyone. Lets differentiate between a good reason and someone's perception of what they want to see when looking out of their window.
<b>No</b>	8 bikes for my family of 4 is not unreasonable if we each have road and trail bikes.
<b>Maybe</b>	Would support if it applies only to those things stored where in public view. Would not support if applied to items stored in garages, sheds or behind privacy fencing.
<b>Maybe</b>	Only if visible from the street.

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Stockpiling

Yes	The business located on the corner of Dry Creek and S Marion stockpiles lawn equipment in their garage.
Yes	Same as above.
No	Paragraph above the question is worded with a bias
No	if my neighbors have reasonable curb appeal I dont mind them doing their "thing" as long as its not a health or safety hazard for my family
Maybe	It may be written such that stockpiled items remain out of site.
Maybe	This is very difficult to define in terms of what quantity would or would not be stockpiling. However, I think it would be much easier to address what is acceptable when viewed at least from the public right-of-way.
Yes	If a resident needs to stockpile for their business the area need to be so that the neighbors cannot see it. This should include all sides of the property. I've seen too many home devalued due to their neighbor's junk in the back yard. Property values go donw
Yes	People need to keep what they use and not hoard junk!!
No	As a home owner, I would hope that others would be mindful of the fact that we live in neighborhoods and are respective of those who live around us. More importantly, the government should not have more control over our lives and how we live them.
No	Let neighborhood HOA's do it if they want to.
No	I don't believe I should be telling a neighbor how many bicycles or lawn mowers he/she may own.
Yes	We have a lot of stuff on the side of our house, not seen from the front of the house, which needs to be "pitched".
Yes	We have a lot of stuff on the side of our house, not seen from the front of the house, which needs to be "pitched".
Maybe	I would favor an ordinance that limited the number of obvious "trash" items such as inoperative appliances, inoperative lawn machinery,and obvious junk.
No	I collect porcelian dolls. How will you address each individuals collections?
Maybe	Somewhat depends on numbers of items and what types of items would fall under the ordinance and that might be hard to be inclusive enough in the ordinance
No	No change
Yes	Absolutely! People
Yes	please hurry on this one

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Stockpiling

<b>Yes</b>	Wording to address how long items are stockpiled in plain view could be added to prevent someone from keeping items on the side of their house or their front lawn for many years. Junk and debris should be used occasionally or it should be stored properly or removed completely.
	Depends on what is being stockpiled and where it is on the property. If the neighbors don't care why should you worry about it?
<b>No</b>	There is no consistent way to enforce.
<b>Maybe</b>	It depends on where they are stored and how excessive it is. Is it a hoarding problem? I am in favor of keeping yards and porches reasonably clear of excessive items, but I hate to live someplace too restrictive and controlled.
<b>No</b>	It is not the city's job to decide what is excess
<b>No</b>	Aren't you supposed to be here to serve us? If people want to live where there is nothing unsightly anywhere, there are plenty of covenant controlled neighborhoods. Those people can live there and let the man tell them what they can do. Leave the rest of us alone. Spend our money more constructively.
<b>Maybe</b>	You haven't made it clear if this junk is behind a fence or if it is in the driveway or along the house where people who drive through the neighborhood can see the mess. If it is behind the fence, I'd say it is nobody's business.
<b>Yes</b>	This is another thing that is annoying. is people leaving all there junk out front, again, it diminishes property values
<b>No</b>	What happens with the family that has 8 children or the entrepenuer who owns his own lawn mowing company? We live in a land of freedom and should not be told what and how much we can own. As long as we maintain our property the city should not be involved in what we put on it.
<b>No</b>	Some families have many children and so they are going to have many bikes or other recreational items. Again if you are concerned with these issues a person should buy a house with HOA protections.
<b>Yes</b>	Such as multiple trash cans kept in the driveway at all times.
<b>Maybe</b>	Does this also include sheds?
<b>Yes</b>	But only within reason. Like if someone is working on there yard it takes more than a couple days sometimes to finish and haul debris off. So be reasonable!!!
<b>Yes</b>	We currently have an elderly neighbor who has seven lawnmowers stored on the side of his home.

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Stockpiling

**No**

Again, who decides and why should they have the right to make me remove my six bicycles; all of which are usable and some times even used.

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Visibility From Private Property

Would you be in support of an amendment to the code that would allow the City to enter upon private property on a limited basis, only when invited and after obtaining a signed complaint, to investigate and determine alleged violations?	Comments:
Yes	With signed permission from owner of neighboring property to visually check neighboring property. Very much needed.
Yes	People who collect building materials and trash in their backyard, attract rats and other vermin.
No	Never go for more restrictions especially if it is not seen from the street. If people want to live in overly restricted areas move to highlands ranch or some other God Forsaken areas where people want to control other peoples actions that do not need controlled
No	Get a court order, otherwise never.
Yes	Many homeowners in Southwood store trailers, boats, etc. in the rear of their homes. The problem simply shifts from public view to private view from others' back yards. I think if the ordinance(s) against parking trailers is in force, it should be enforceable on any part of a neighbors property if a complaint is sent to the city and the violation is visible from the complainants property.
No	NO - not unless a life was at risk. When and what equates to appropriate gov't intrusion into a citizen's property rights? Frankly, I don't think nuisance complaints, be they true or false, warrant overriding the inherent privacy of homeowner property rights.
No	Private property is just that. Covenants cover this sort of thing, therefore, if someone moves into a neighborhood with covenants, this is what they get. We, personally, wanted a neighborhood without covenants, therefore, sometimes this is what goes along with that. Keep this sort of code for covenant-associated neighborhoods--not the government.
Yes	This would help greatly in dealing with issues visible from neighboring properties.
No	If I wanted to live in a "covenant controlled community" I would have bought a house in one. Keep the government's hands off my property!
Yes	One step further, if a car has been cited for not being registered and next time out the officer sees that it's just been turned around, the code enforcement officer needs to run the license plate to see if the vehicle has been registered and then ticket the owner, if not.
No	what is in someones backyard isn't the city's business

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Visibility From Private Property

<b>No</b>	What about fences? There needs to be a definition and code coverage, and it needs to be consistent with the HOA's.
<b>Maybe</b>	Only for vacant or unmaintained yards where weeds and grass get over eight inches tall.
<b>No</b>	A safety threat on a neighbor's property is already acceptable grounds for obtaining a warrant. I am concerned about the rise of "busybody government" here, which I consider a betrayal of the original "promise of Centennial."
<b>Maybe</b>	It is not clear who would be doing the inviting. Is it the complaining neighbor or the accused offender? A government agent can always come on private property pursuant to an invitation from the owner or occupant.
	If entry were the most reasonable or only means of ascertaining the nature of the problem, entry should be permitted. As an alternative or at least as a starting point for lodging a complaint, a complainant could submit a photograph of the view to which he/she objects.
<b>Yes</b>	If you need permission from these folks, you'll never get it, so let's make it a given that they have to permit code enforcement to inspect if there is a complaint. If you live in Centennial you must permit code enforcement to come on your premises. All attempts will be made to make an appointment, but if there is no cooperation, the inspector can make the inspection unilaterally. It's called "implied consent." If there is a feud between two neighbors and both complain over and over about each other that will be another matter.
<b>Yes</b>	As long as the city doesn't go looking for problems that aren't existing and as long as the city doesn't take sides with the reporter of such violations in a neighbor to neighbor disagreement. The violation needs to be causing a hazard and not just a disagreement between fences.
<b>Yes</b>	ALL of these issues, to me, are just plain common sense and keep property values elevated as much as possible. I am from the suburbs of a large East Coast city and have never experienced issues such as these until I moved here. Ordinances such as these need to be passed and enacted ASAP for the good and safety of our City and its citizens.
<b>No</b>	The code guys skulk around enough as it is. This is just plainly extreme.
<b>Maybe</b>	Perhaps only for fire violations.
<b>No</b>	NIMBY
<b>No</b>	I thought this was the United States of America. I didn't realize we had moved to Nazi Germany. Is the Code Enforcement staff so worried about their jobs, that they have to find more reasons to justify their existence?
<b>Yes</b>	Keep in mind due process

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Visibility From Private Property

<b>No</b>	That's an unnecessary interference smacking of "nannyism". If the city thinks it needs to check for a violation it needs to get a Court Order! And, it better be fully justifiable. In this country, spying on others can become a real problem. The last thing any neighborhood needs, is a neighbor war and it's better if they just avoid and ignore each other in the sake of keeping the peace.
<b>Yes</b>	If a homeowner operates a business in his home, we don't need to see his advertising on his vehicles parked in front of his home.
<b>Yes</b>	Obtaining a signed complaint should not be a part of the code wording. This pits resident against resident that could lead to avoidable confrontations or worse. A phonecall to the code enforcement office should prompt a look see as to whether there really is code violation. If there is (and its highly probable there would be) then the code enforcement officer would act accordingly and make the city safer, sitelier, etc. consistent with the objectives of the code.
<b>No</b>	Not enough information here. Why? And would a search warrant come next? How can you possibly compare the stockpiling of bikes or lawnmowers in someone's back yard to a criminal action that would give you this kind of authority or require this kind of action? Think about where this kind of thinking leads to. On the other hand, if you think that the person is conducting an actual business isn't there already a statute that prohibits that?
<b>No</b>	if it can't be seen from the right of way, how can it possibly affect anyone else's home value "only when invited" and what would you do if you were not invited??
<b>No</b>	This survey is biased... the statements are worded to encourage certain responses. This is a poorly worded survey.
<b>No</b>	Violates right to privacy
<b>No</b>	I think an ordinance for this is not needed. If the guy next door to me has a situation I can already have anyone that I want come by my house to peek over the fence...code enforcement, cops, mayor....who wants to see? point is this seems like the city getting a little pushy
<b>Yes</b>	Make sure proper precautions are included.
<b>Maybe</b>	In theory I like the idea, but it would need to be crafted <u>VERY</u> carefully.
<b>Yes</b>	In my subdivision, residents can keep anything in their back yards. Residents in adjacent homes don't want to look at this junk. This amendment would be a great improvement.
<b>Yes</b>	My main concern with the code violations in Centennial have to do with the building of ridiculously large homes withing a moderate neighborhood - you need to have codes around building like homes in neighborhoods!!!!!!
<b>No</b>	Absolutely not. Whether we sign something or not, there is the concern that the local government would cross a boundary...legal or real...once given permission.

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Visibility From Private Property

<b>No</b>	I moved to this area prior to Centennial becoming a city because I wanted to have the ability to manage my own property. I believe the city could better spend thier time with real issues rather than catering to the whims of a few whining pious individuals. Let us keep our freedom. Hasn't the Obama catastrophe taught our leaders anything?
<b>No</b>	Sounds like a neighbor peeing contest. City stay out of it.
<b>No</b>	These new amendments would substantially take away freedoms and rights. While I may not want a trashy neighbor, to take away their rights to be trashy is wrong.
<b>No</b>	Absolutely not! The term "Private Property" should be self-explanatory and respected by all, including any city government.
<b>No</b>	Unless code enforcement officers are up on a deck or other high surface, this probably wouldn't do much as a 6 ft. privacy fence would screen from sight in the back yard. Most people probably look out their upstairs windows and see the mess, and that would mean a code officer inside the home. This over stepping private property rights.
<b>Yes</b>	I have in issue with a neighbor about having to many bird feeders. She has about 4 or 5 including having a table set up with food on it also.She is attracting tons of birds and it is a real nuisance. I The birds are loud and poop all over. They are destruying property. I have called everyone and nobody will do anything about the issue. I was hoping something in the new code re-write could could say that people cannot have more than a certain amount of bird feeders or something to that affect. thank you
<b>Maybe</b>	If this would be beneficial to HOAs
<b>Yes</b>	I have not used my deck for 4 years because of the junk yard backing up to my property. Junk cars, boats, metal, you name it, and they do not mow. It is a hazard to the surroundindg homes.
<b>Yes</b>	Code enforcement means "ENFORCE THE CODE"!
<b>Yes</b>	yes we have cars parked and rotting in backyards
	City action against a property owner should be minmal....if at all.
<b>No</b>	City employees have plenty to do in the areas that are not within private property.
<b>Maybe</b>	This is tricky. I'm not sure what "obtaining probable cause" means. I'm not sure how I stand on this because I hate to think the city can tell us what is in our backyards, but I can see all of my neighbor's backyard and I'd hate it to be a real eyesore. It would prevent me from enjoying my own backyard or watching the wildlife out my window.
<b>No</b>	If it is not scene from the street it is not an eyesore to the "public"
<b>No</b>	Never
<b>No</b>	Now you are acting like comunists. I am moving as far away from you idiots at the first oportunity.

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Visibility From Private Property

<b>Yes</b>	Your code inspectors can't see anything they don't want to see. How much money is this revision study costing taxpayers?? What a waste of time, since you won't enforce any meaningful code enforcement.
<b>Yes</b>	perfect example is my neighbor with wrecked cars in his backyard as well as a completely overgrown back yard
<b>Yes</b>	We have cars that the city does nothing about because you can not allow your code enforcers to look at a car plate that has been expired for 8 years and I have to look at it out my window and nothing gets done to remove the car.
<b>No</b>	The less government, the better. REMEMBER the reasons this City was Incorporated. Staff has not been hired to make work nor grow the City Bureaucracy, and doesn't need to meddle in the personal affairs of people or property owners. Exception: MAJOR SAFETY ISSUE.
<b>No</b>	Big Brother
<b>Yes</b>	This is very important, as so many homes are close together and something may not be visible at the front but still present a significant issue.
<b>Maybe</b>	It seems to me that this could lead to serious enforcement issues.
<b>No</b>	Too many times there could be an ongoing spat between neighbors and I believe that too many manpower hours would be spent working this through for no reason.
<b>No</b>	I feel that less government meddling in the lives of private citizens is better than more government intrusion. Private property should be free from government interference. Neighbors should work out their differences between themselves rather than getting the government involved.
<b>No</b>	As long as public health and safety is not threatened, people should be able to do what they want to in the parts of their yard that cannot be "seen from the public right-of-way". If a neighbor complains due to health or safety issues, a police officer can obtain a warrant to inspect the property directly. Public codes are meant to keep the public safe and not dictate how we live or breath in our private areas.
<b>Yes</b>	There needs to be a way to deal with back yards of properties adjacent to those being properly maintained, whose property values are being eroded by irresponsible residents.
<b>No</b>	I believe that the ordinance should be changed to allow for violations seen from outside of the public right of way, to include a neighbor's yard. I am not in favor of city code enforcement personnel being allowed onto private property, even on a limited basis, because of the potential for abuse.
<b>Yes</b>	I would like something in the code that has to do with to many birdfeeders. I have a neighbor that is out of control in this matter.

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Visibility From Private Property

<b>No</b>	The only parties impacted by messing backyards are the immediate neighbors. I think this is their problem and is solvable by installing more shrubs or fences to shield themselves or to try to negotiate a solution with the messy neighbor.
<b>No</b>	Absolutely not! Disagreements between neighbors become city business. Lawyers at ten paces. Again, we can't afford it and it is not a city function.
<b>Maybe</b>	Only for used appliances, disgarded automobiles, disgarded motorcycles, disgared bicycles, disgarded portable basketball hoops, boats, the type of massive or large volume, say one cubic yard or more items that have no function, are not used, and are an eyesore, and are not attempted to be concealed or covered.
<b>No</b>	NON-COVENANT AREAS SHOULD BE LEFT AS SUCH.
<b>No</b>	do you want to search our houses too?
<b>Yes</b>	The city needs to become a little stricter on the removal of any dead trees that are allowed to remain in a residential lot.
<b>No</b>	I am sooo AGAINST this! If you canNOT see if from the street, you have NO RIGHT to go in to someone elses backyard to get a cheap peek! This would just be a way for BAD neighbors to cause trouble.
<b>No</b>	Not a chance. I'll stick with the constitution. A search warrent based upon probable cause. Can you imagine how neighbors could use this against each other? Can you imagine how much time this will take to inspect? Keep us safe from the bad guy. That is governments job, not to harass its citizens.
<b>Yes</b>	Assuming the violation is either dangerous or infringes on the safety and welfare of the neighbors.
<b>No</b>	Absolutely not. Why in the world would you ask me again if you can send the Nazi police to my yard to look for obstructions? If there is an obstruction in my yard that is blocking the right of way when it is needed by the city then don't you think the logical thing to do would be ask me to move it? Why in the world would I want my tax dollars spent on someone snooping in my back yard? Would you allow me to come and look in your back yard to see if you have violations? Wouldn't this be an invasion of my privacy? What if my wife is home alone and you send some strange idiot who didn't have a background check done and he see's my wife then breaks into my home and rapes her? How would you feel knowing that YOU allowed this?
<b>No</b>	Invited...by who? How are you going to pay for these "investigations"? So we'll have crazy neighbors signing complaints left and right with no repercussions? Absolutely not! You all are treading on a slippery slope with all of these! I will be watching where this ends up and if passed, back any candidate running against whoever supports these measures! Seriously, did Gladys Kravitz the nosy neighbor from Bewitched write all of these? Darrin Rynders

# Comments from 2009 Citizen Survey

## Visibility From Private Property

<b>Yes</b>	Our neighborhood is a voluntary HOA. We are experiencing all of these problems. Code Enforcement could not correct backyard issues that are dangerous, empty swimming pools, noxious fumes from vehicles.
<b>No</b>	ABSOLUTLY NO!! What an intrusion of private property rights.
<b>No</b>	All I can say is Intrusion.
<b>No</b>	Are you kiding
<b>No</b>	Hell No!