

Table 1

| | Yes | No | | |
|---|-----|----|--|--|
| Municipalities should define and enforce property maintenance standards | 21 | 6 | | |

Note: Some Respondents said “yes” for commercial properties and “no” for residential properties. Their responses were not included in the total numbers.




Table 1

| | Yes | Mostly | No | |
|--|-----|--------|----|--|
| Properties in your neighborhood meet your standards for maintenance and appearance | 15 | 11 | 3 | |

Please be kind to older residents. Hook them up with someone who can help them maintain their property (like teens).

Leave residential standards lower, don't bother with "weeds" or how it looks, but definitely downtown!




Table 1

| | Just Right | Too Loose | Too strict | |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|--|
| Does LAC strike the right balance in enforcing property maintenance standards? | 12 | 6 | 9 | |




Table 1

| Years lived in Los Alamos | < 5 | 5 - 10 | 10 - 20 | > 20 | |
|---------------------------|-----|--------|---------|------|--|
| # Respondents | 4 | 4 | 8 | 12 | |

General Comments

1. A lot of the rules I know about seem a little too focused on maintaining an image that seems strange. I think looks should be ignored, safety less so.
2. Vacant commercial properties should not be an eyesore.
3. Tourists drive down Trinity and see unkept private properties and weed-filled vacant lots.
4. Less enforcement for residential and more for empty store fronts and rental to LANL.
5. Put out dog poop bags across from lower Esperanza.
6. More enforcement for yard maintenance/weed control; storage of excess number of vehicles.
7. County should maintain their properties better before policing residents.