



## COMMUNITY PLANNING

### MILL CREEK SUB-AREA PLAN OPEN HOUSE SURVEY RESULTS FEBRUARY 4, 2009

47 participants; 37 surveys received

#### **GENERAL**

1. Do you own property within the Mill Creek sub-area boundary? Yes (26) No (11)
2. Do you own property in Mill Creek Forest subdivision? Yes (5) No (26)

#### **ZONING**

1. If you own property within the Mill Creek sub-area boundary, do you agree with the proposed zoning for your property? Yes (12) No (11)

If No, how should it change? Prefer smaller lots and more housing density (4)

Prefer larger lots and less housing density (10)

Other: (3)

#### **Comments:**

- If it's going to change then make the change worthwhile.
- As long as larger lots are allowed, prefer larger lots R-20 but absolutely do not want the current R-6.
- Prefer larger lots and flexibility.
- Other: Special district
- No, make sure lots on water are smaller.

2. Do you agree with the proposed zoning for the overall sub-area? Yes (12) No (18)

If No, how should it change?  
(check all that apply) Prefer smaller lots and more housing density (4)

Prefer larger lots and less housing density (12)

Mixed use area should be smaller (5)

Mixed use area should be larger (2)

There shouldn't be any mixed use area (1)

Other: (2)

**Comments:**

- R1-7.5
- Use R1-10 for all areas
- Stick to what you promised in the start of all this – R1-6. Don't be pushed around by horse people.
- Should have public school zone for school property
- Yes, if there is agreement from the community.
- Stick to the plan

3. Should new lots abutting Mill Creek Forest have to meet or exceed the average lot size of adjacent Mill Creek Forest lots (17,550 square feet)? Yes (21) No (11)

Note: Without this requirement, lots abutting Mill Creek Forest would be at least 9,000 square feet under the proposed R1-10 zoning.

**Comments:**

- They don't meet this now.
- Yes, must be larger or equal

STREETS & TRAILS

1. Do you agree with the proposed location of the future street connection between NE 174<sup>th</sup> Street and NE 179<sup>th</sup> Street? Yes (35) No (2)

If No, in which direction should this street be shifted?  
To the east (1) To the west (1)

**Comments:**

- No, I own this property.
- I would rather no road at all. However, if a road is to be built, then I agree with the proposed location
- Yes, if road is put in before further development. You must have a safe road in place to 179<sup>th</sup> from the area before any further development. Do not add more houses or traffic until adequate transportation routes from 174<sup>th</sup> to 179<sup>th</sup> are in place.
- Yes, it appears to be the best given the information available.
- Yes, but should not be done until 179<sup>th</sup> is improved.

2. Do you think that a new public road connection to NE 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue or NE 174<sup>th</sup> Street should be assured prior to approval of any development that would add traffic to NE 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue? Yes (34) No (3)

**Comments:**

- Road connection should be to 179<sup>th</sup> from 174<sup>th</sup>.

- Yes, no more traffic should be allowed without safe transportation routes for cars, biking, riding, walking
- Unsure
- Proposed zoning is OK but no density transfers should be permitted.

### 3. How do you think off-street trails should be funded and built?

By willing developers (27)  
 By neighborhood volunteers (10)  
 By Vancouver / Clark Parks (23)  
 By forming a Local Improvement District (5)  
 Trails aren't important to me  
 Other: (1)

#### Comments:

- Not at all
- None
- Workwise, but not moneywise
- Contributions from all sources
- A cooperative open space/trail organization between private and public groups.
- Use a sustainability district overlay, special zoning; work with state, regional, local groups
- Undecided

#### **OTHER COMMENTS OR CONCERNS**

- Prior to allowing future development, transportation improvements for 174<sup>th</sup> & a new road tying 40<sup>th</sup> to 179<sup>th</sup> must be completed
- I would like to have pedestrian/bike trail from Mill Creek Sub-area south to WSU-V. We did have one under BPA lines until bridge washed out and a locked gate blocked the access road to the pump station by Mill Creek
- I don't want to have a road built on the north side easement of my property as it would require a lot of trees to be cut down but probably can't do anything about it, would prefer a road at 174<sup>th</sup> St.
- R1-10 or 20 like 40<sup>th</sup> Ave south; estate lots
- Trail should be paved if funding is available for all weather walking, jogging & biking
- Thank you for putting this together. This area should be preserved because there are too many geological, wetlands, habitat and transportation issues. This needs to be a special area.
- This should be a special district area with a focus on community, trails, ecological protection.
- I believe any new development needs to be supported by adequate, safe, county-approved roads. It is unsafe to add more road traffic without road improvements on 174<sup>th</sup> and the connector to 179<sup>th</sup>.
- Mixed use is too large. Parcel to south is mostly a canyon with creek. BPA trail over creek, how? - steep canyon
- We do not need more traffic on 174<sup>th</sup> because of the danger spots of the road, also the danger spots on 50<sup>th</sup>.