

HIGHWAY 99 SUB-AREA DESIGN STANDARDS

Open House Survey Results

September 23, 2009

Survey results below are summarized from completed surveys and discussions with participants at the open house. Approximately 30 people attended the open house.

1. **General Comments About the Draft Standards**

Feedback was generally positive for the direction and intention behind the Standards. Incentives for developers to help facilitate a quicker change to Hwy 99 were requested.

2. **Comments on the Activity Centers** (boundaries, uses, height limits, street designations, allowed frontage types and standards, parking lot location, setbacks, and density – Chapters 2-4)?

Most responses appreciated the proposed standards as a big improvement over current conditions. One respondent wants the site planning to ensure walkability within developments. Another wants to see more flexibility to entice development sooner.

3. **Comments on the Transitional Areas** (boundaries, uses, height limits, street designations, allowed frontage types and standards, parking lot location, setbacks, and density – Chapters 2-4)?

The concept of the flexibility that the Transitional Areas offer was favorably received (by property owners with land within the proposed Transitional Area).

4. **Comments on Site Design Standards** (boundaries, uses, height limits, street designations, allowed frontage types and standards, setbacks, and density – Chapters 2-4)? (side/rear lot design, open space, pedestrian access, vehicular access, and parking – Chapter 5)?

Generally favorable comments. The pedestrian-centered focus was preferable to the current auto-centric development – particularly in the proposal to locate parking to the side/rear of buildings in the Activity Centers. One participant stressed the need to provide enough parking for new developments.

5. **Comments on Building Design Standards** (massing, details, materials, blank wall treatments, and corner buildings – Chapter 6)?

There were requests to keep the language simple and open, but to also try and avoid getting so prescriptive that the eventual developments will all look too similar.

6. **Comments on Street Design and Trails** (Chapter 9)?

The responses were enthusiastically in favor of the new Standards, especially with regard to catering to multiple modes of transportation.

7. **Comments on Other Standards** (housing types, signage, landscaping, and service areas – Chapters 7-8)?

The landscaping and signage standards were consistently appreciated by most, but not all participants. More than one respondent is anxious to have these two standards take effect immediately, with some sort of incentive for existing development to come into compliance. However, one participant noted that the monument sign standards were far

Hwy 99 AND POINTS EAST

Planning a new direction

too restrictive (in sign height and size) and would hinder the viability of many businesses.

Individual Responses

General Comments	Activity Centers	Transitional Areas	Site Design	Building Design	Street Design/ Trails	Other Standards
It appears you are on the right track. I agree on ALL of the 'unacceptable standards'	A lot of good thought has taken place	I like the idea of providing areas for people to regroup as they shop & recreate	There seems to be adequate options available to develop attractive & safe environment	Keep them open, simple-writing, safe	I like medians with trees w/room for traffic, people + bikes in both directions.	Great staff friendly, informative + helpful
I like it. We do need incentives for development sooner than later. Really like walking areas, landscaping and building frontage areas.	Flexible to encourage development sooner! Make sure you can walk it without using your car to go store to store.	Once again, flexible is best. Make sure there is enough parking. People will be driving there.	I like it.	I like them.	Excellent	I really like the signage & landscaping.
I appreciate the County's and Team 99's efforts to improve our community in the future. If we don't do something today, Hwy 99 will always look like it does now.	Huge improvement over status quo. Design standards will improve our community	Flexibility is important to encourage development	Keep in mind having enough parking available. I like the idea of no visible parking from the front	No comment.	Good quality of life designs	I do not agree with the comment about signs too small. I do not want to continue the ugly, huge signage on Hwy 99.
As a local citizen, I really want Hwy 99 to look <u>nice</u> . Sometime soon. The standards sound reasonable on paper but my main concern is they won't have an appreciable effect anytime soon (the next 10-15 years). Right now, I avoid the area if possible- it doesn't look nice, it's inconvenient, and I actively go to other areas that I enjoy more- downtown Vancouver even. I'd like that to change!	Seems reasonable	Seems reasonable	I really like the increased pedestrian access ideas.	Please don't let things get too generic. We need to have <u>nice</u> character, but not bland, cookie-cutter, or the same as every other street in the area.	Yay! Changes would be lovely.	I really like the proposed signage changes. Much needed! Landscaping is also something that shouldn't wait! It would make it much more pleasant. Thank you for all the hard work in planning! Please continue so we can get these <u>soon</u> !
a) Very beautiful and	Love all of it.	Looks good.	Fine.	Excellent!	Great!	Again, I wish the

Hwy 99 AND POINTS EAST

Planning a new direction

<p>contemporary design.</p> <p>b) Will raise tax revenue & property values tremendously.</p> <p>c) Vancouver will be as "people friendly" as the nice parts of Portland.</p> <p>d) Hwy 99 is <u>such</u> an eye sore.</p> <p>e) County should provide incentives for existing businesses to comply now.</p>	<p>Very inviting!!!</p>	<p>Clean, orderly, trees, etc. Very inviting.</p>		<p>Long needed! Beautiful cost effective.</p>		<p>county could offer cash incentives for signage & landscaping now! Hwy 99 is the ugliest street on the West coast as far as a popular main thoroughfare.</p>
---	-------------------------	---	--	---	--	--

Other Individual Comments:

- "If you build it, they will come."
- 20' minimum building setbacks on designated Landscape Streets is too much for non-arterial streets (10' minimum is more reasonable)
- Provide for crosswalks
- Ped-safety projects: pedestrian refuges north of bridge (from NE 121st to NE 129th Street) could be 1 travel lane east-west / turn lane + sidewalks
- How about a cost analysis to help convey potential return on investment? i.e. what increased percentage in cost will allow for the pedestrian amenities that attract higher rents and allow for increased tenant income?
- It's good that you recognize Hwy 99 as auto-centric
- Consider land assembly by the County to maximize the developers' potential
- If we could get BRT to come through here, that would increase access to the area and make it more viable for additional residents and developers
- The Standards remind me of Bridgeport Village. I like some aspects of it and go out my way to visit there, but I would want the character of Hwy 99 to be unique.