CLARK COUNTY FORM BASED CODES: HWY 99 SUBAREA

Workshop Survey

Forty-eight survey forms were submitted at the October 6 workshop. The results are as follows:

	Survey Score				
Proposal/Concept	Great Idea	Neutral/ Unsure	(Did not respond)	Bad Idea	**Summary of Individual Comments** *(NOTE: #'s in parentheses indicate the # of repetitive comments)*
1. TOWN CENTER (TC)					
1a. Hwy 99 and NE 78th Street Frontage: Storefronts on sidewalk required; Office and residential OK above; Parking to the side or rear of buildings.	33	12	1	2	• No large parking lots out front (4). • Sounds like previous Transit Overlay District, which negatively impacted development. • Only if BRT is in place. • Make sidewalks extra wide. • Access to storefronts difficult to control from two sides. • Too restrictive. • No driving on parts of Highway 99? • Landscape setbacks.
1b. Other Streets in TC: Allow option of storefronts OR modest landscaped setback; Allow retail, office, and multifamily or any mixture (market dictates); Uses face street; Parking to side or rear.	41	6	1	0	• Landscape setbacks (4). • Parking to side or rear is good (3). • Allow flexibility. • Screen parking with vegetation. • Especially off of 88th!
1c. Prohibited Uses: Prohibit uses that do not contribute to the desired pedestrian-oriented setting. Allow large-scale retail only if the design meets pedestrian-oriented code/ standards.	33	11	3	1	• Big Box OK if in back or designed to be pedestrian friendly (7). • No Big Box stores (5). • No gas stations (5). • Gas stations OK in parts of TC or near offramp (4). • Would like trails. • Like the Mill Creek concept.

	Survey Score				
Proposal/Concept	Great Idea	Neutral/ Unsure	(Did not respond)	Bad Idea	**Summary of Individual Comments** *(NOTE: #'s in parentheses indicate the # of repetitive comments)*
1d. Maximum height and density: Provide opportunity for 6-story buildings throughout TC with provisions that can allow taller buildings in core area of TC.	31	12	1	4	• Lower height limits better (4). • Taller buildings mixed in here or there. No too many (2). • It would offer a great downtown feel with cafes and small shops. • 164th is a bad model. • Maximum height: 6 stories only! • Like shops below, residence above. • Distinguish between downtown Vancouver and Hazel Dell. • The more density, the better.
1e. Minimum height and density options: • Buildings fronting Hwy 99 and NE 78th must average at least 2-stories	26	11	5	6	• Like idea of creating a sense of enclosure, hiding parking behind buildings (2). • Too restrictive. • Need density to support transit. • A huge cost for construction.
• Buildings fronting Hwy 99 and NE 78th must average at least 3-stories"	8	24	6	10	
• Residential developments within the TC must achieve a minimum density of 25 dwelling units/acre.	14	22	8	4	• 25 is too much (3). • Should be higher density to meet and support mass transit, such as light rail or BRT.
1f. Focal Open Space: Seek public/ private partnership opportunities to develop a centralized plaza space (1 acre or more) that is integrated with pedestrian-oriented mixed-use development and functions as the subarea's focal point and primary gathering spot.	35	10	3	0	• I don't feel a focal space is important, but open spaces are. • Makes cohesive neighborhoods. • Need several focal points. Why just one when Highway 99 is so linear? • Uses that appeal to all ages: bandstand, water feature. • It would give us a true town center. • Love the square in Esther Short Park & gazebo at Officer's Row. • Park, play area for children.

	Survey Score				
Proposal/Concept	Great Idea	Neutral/ Unsure	(Did not respond)	Bad Idea	**Summary of Individual Comments** *(NOTE: #'s in parentheses indicate the # of repetitive comments)*
NOTE: Shaded proposals below would be applicable for all commercial and multifamily areas unless otherwise noted					
1g. Open Space: Require at least 5% of all commercial/mixed-use development to be designed as publicly accessible open space. Space could be designed as a plaza, park, or garden. Spaces must be safe, accessible, and inviting.	33	7	5	3	• 5% seems too low (4). • Who maintains? Condo fees? (YES) • 5% is too high, restrictive. • I suspect more standards need to be included with this concept.
1h. No Single Architectural Theme: Do NOT require buildings to conform to a special architectural theme, but instead require buildings that meet proposed pedestrian orientation, massing, articulation, and detailing standards.	29	11	6	2	• Should not require a particular theme, but need some guidelines for general compatibility (5). • Do not want a theme! Too monotonous. Variety is great (4). • Would like more of a similar architectural type. • Less restriction is important.
1i. Building Massing and Articulation Standards: Provide a toolbox of façade articulation techniques/options and require buildings to incorporate "some" of them. Provide articulation features at 30' intervals for storefronts and multi-family uses and 70 feet for other commercial buildings.	36	8	3	1	• Must do. • Cost-effective? • Too restrictive. • Don't want match box architecture.
1j. Maximum Façade Width Standards: Provide for maximum façade width standards. Buildings longer than 120' must incorporate design features that effectively break up the massing of the façade.	36	8	4	0	• Must do on all sides visible from the street.
1k. Building Details: Require commercial and multifamily buildings to incorporate "some" building details. Include a toolbox of desirable options and require buildings to incorporate two or three of them.	38	5	4	1	• Items other than in toolbox should be allowed if suitable. • Lighting, rain cover, how about a 1% for art policy? • Don't skimp on aesthetics. • Good idea for town center. Unsure for commons.

	Survey Score				
Proposal/Concept	Great Idea	Neutral/ Unsure	(Did not respond)	Bad Idea	**Summary of Individual Comments** *(NOTE: #'s in parentheses indicate the # of repetitive comments)*
1l. Landscaping: Adopt standards that promote "Low Impact Development" techniques, emphasize native and drought-tolerant plant materials & provide for parking lot landscaping/ screening.	40	3	3	2	• Good on the parking lot screening. Landscaping should have some variety. Allow for color. • Love the rain gardens! • Excellent, but can you enforce this? • Yes to native plants. • LEED development and certification. • Present code is adequate.
1m. Side yard treatment: Provide a number of appropriate side yard treatment options for all commercial and multifamily development to choose from. Examples range from shared pathways and zero-lot line firewalls to 15' setbacks with a combination of landscaping, pathways, and fencing for multifamily developments where units face the side yard.	29	13	5	1	• Too restrictive. • Love it if no narrow pathways.
1n. Signage: Prohibit all free-standing signs – signs must be on buildings (wall signs, hanging signs, window signs); Provide generous sign size allowances for wall signs provided they are in proportion to the facade.	31	8	4	5	• No pole signs (4). • Monument signs have always been desired by Team 99 members (3). • Not huge signs (3). • Require all existing uses to conform. No grandfathering. • Too restrictive. • No back-lighted signs. No moving, neon signs. • Need visibility for businesses not adjacent to 99.
1o. Streetscape designs: • Hwy 99 and NE 78th Street: Consistent design with 14' minimum sidewalk width, trees within grates, supplemental pedestrian lighting, landscaped median and TC banners.	34	7	5	2	• Need more detail to decide. • Too wide (2). • Sounds too suburban. • Need area for landscaping (2).
• Other streets with commercial/ mixed- uses: Minimum 8' sidewalk widths (12' for areas with storefronts) and street trees.	28	13	6	1	• 8-foot minimum, no; 12-foot, yes.

	Survey Score				
Proposal/Concept	Great Idea	Neutral/ Unsure	(Did not respond)	Bad Idea	**Summary of Individual Comments** *(NOTE: #'s in parentheses indicate the # of repetitive comments)*
2. GATEWAY VILLAGES					
2a. Minnehaha Village – Hwy 99 frontage: Allow storefronts OR modest landscaped setbacks *provided buildings are setback far enough south of NE 63rd St to allow for a second row of trees along the sidewalk*; Flexibility of streetfront uses (retail, office, residential, or any mix); Uses face the street; Parking lots to the side or rear.	29	10	7	2	• Area does not have depth to allow proposals. • Not enough information to decide. • Stores at street level are exactly what soured development. • Prefer some landscaping.
2b. Salmon Creek Village – Hwy 99 and NE 129th frontage: Allow storefronts OR modest landscaped setbacks; Require commercial on ground floor along street with residential OK above; Uses face street; Parking to side or rear.	29	9	8	2	• Parking is already terrible, but to limit too would increase traffic. • Needs to blend with what is already there. • Modest landscaped setbacks!
2c. Prohibited uses: Prohibit uses that do not contribute to the desired pedestrian-oriented setting – but perhaps there is a little more flexibility than in TC.	22	15	10	1	• Allow more flexibility (4). • No car lots (4). • No Big Box stores.
2d. Maximum height and density: • Minnehaha: Limit building heights to 3 stories south of NE 64th and 4-stories elsewhere; DO NOT use a maximum dwelling unit/ acre figure.	23	13	8	4	• This makes for good transition to single-family homes nearby. • Too tall. • Allow 6 stories. You're on a ridge. • Must incorporate residential above ground floor.
• Salmon Creek: Provide opportunity for 6-story buildings in Commercial designated areas with provisions that can allow taller buildings in a core area. Do NOT use a max-imum dwelling unit per acre figure.	22	15	7	4	• Limit height to 4 stories (3). • Solve traffic situation before allowing 6-stories (2). • Add residential above ground floor. • Only north of 129th. • Limit to 25du/acre density.

	Survey Score				
Proposal/Concept	Great Idea	Neutral/ Unsure	(Did not respond)	Bad Idea	**Summary of Individual Comments** *(NOTE: #'s in parentheses indicate the # of repetitive comments)*
2e. Minimum height and density options: • Minnehaha: No minimum height or density.	18	16	10	4	
• Salmon Creek: Buildings fronting Hwy 99 must average at least 2-stories. Residential developments must achieve a minimum density of 25 dwelling units/acre.	24	10	10	4	• 25 is too much (3). Don't make this area as dense as the town center. • Taller. • Concerns about NE 20th Avenue south of 129th and north of 119th.
2f. Signage: Prohibit all new pole signs and discourage all other free-standing signs (signs should be affixed to buildings - wall signs, hanging signs, or small window signs); Provide generous sign size allowances for wall signs provided they are proportional to the facade.	29	6	8	5	• Get rid of free-standing signs. • Set a maximum limit on size. • Too restrictive. • "Proportion" is the key word and is subjective without written criteria. • Monument signs okay (3).
2g. Streetscape designs: • Minnehaha: Emphasize a gateway boulevard design south of NE 63rd with a landscaped median where practical, 2 rows of street trees/ planting strips along sidewalk; North of NE 63rd: Wide sidewalk with a row of street trees.	24	13	10	1	• Don't understand. • This area streetscape needs some help.
• Salmon Creek: Emphasize a gateway boulevard design north of NE 129th with a landscaped median where practical, two rows of street trees/planting strips along sidewalk; South of NE 129th: Wide sidewalk with a single row of street trees in grates.	26	11	10	1	
3. COMMONS					
3a. Development frontage for all commons: Allow storefronts or modest landscaped setback; Require commercial on ground floor along Hwy 99 and NE 78th, except allow opportunity for ground floor residential in Klineline Village; Allow residential above or behind arterial frontage in all commons;	27	10	9	2	• Require modest landscaped setback. • Could have some frontal parking. • No ground floor residential.

	Survey Score				
Proposal/Concept	Great Idea	Neutral/ Unsure	(Did not respond)	Bad Idea	**Summary of Individual Comments** *(NOTE: #'s in parentheses indicate the # of repetitive comments)*
3b. Prohibited uses: Prohibit uses that do not contribute to the desired pedestrian-oriented setting – but perhaps there is a little more flexibility than in TC.	23	10	12	3	• Stay flexible (3). • Gas okay. Still no car sales. • Convenience stores.
3c. Maximum height and density: • Tenny Creek and 99 Commons: Provide opportunity for 6-story mixed-use buildings throughout and 4-story max multifamily buildings; Do NOT use a maximum dwelling unit per acre figure.	21	13	8	6	• Shorter heights. • Should have a maximum dwelling units. • Too tall here.
• Klineline Commons: Provide opportunity for 6-story buildings adjacent to Hwy 99 and 3-stories for other commercial/ multifamily areas; Do NOT use a maximum dwelling unit per acre figure.	17	17	8	6	• Should have max density (2). • Three-story only (2). • 6-story is okay for some buildings. • No maximum density.
• NE 78th: Provide for up to 3-story buildings, but NOT use a maximum dwelling unit per acre.	21	14	9	4	• Three stories seems low. • Should have a maximum density.
3d. Minimum height and density: • Tenny Creek and 99 Commons: Buildings fronting Hwy 99 must average at least 2-stories. Residential developments must achieve a minimum density of 25 dwelling units/acre.	26	7	10	5	• 25du/acre is too dense (2). • Density to support/make economic BRT or Light Rail. • Higher.
• Klineline Commons: Buildings fronting Hwy 99 must average at least 2-stories.	28	10	8	2	• Could average 4 stories. • Higher.
• NE 78th: No minimum height or density.	23	14	10	1	• Why no minimum? No dwellings.
3e. Signage: Prohibit all new pole signs and discourage all other free-standing signs (signs should be affixed to buildings - wall signs, hanging signs, or small window signs); Provide generous sign size allowances for wall signs provided they are in proportion to the facade.	31	5	10	2	• Set maximum size limit. • Proportion. • No poles, but monument signs should be allowed (2).

	Survey Score				
Proposal/Concept	Great Idea	Neutral/ Unsure	(Did not respond)	Bad Idea	**Summary of Individual Comments** *(NOTE: #'s in parentheses indicate the # of repetitive comments)*
3f. Streetscape designs: • Hwy 99: Emphasize a boulevard design throughout with a land-scaped median where practical, generous sidewalks, and street trees.	33	6	8	1	• This is good if practical in reconstruction. • Don't take away median turn lane.
• NE 78th: Emphasize a gateway boulevard design along the eastern edge of the corridor with a landscaped median where practical, two rows of street trees/ planting strips along sidewalk.	31	7	10	0	• Yes to two rows of street trees.
4. HWY 99 TRANSITION AREAS					
4a. Development frontage for transitional areas: Require modest landscaped setbacks for all development; Allow flexibility in building/parking lot location provided substantial landscape screening enhances the street-scape; Allow for retail, residential, or office, or any mixture of the 3; Uses face street; Direct pedestrian connections to sidewalk.	27	10	9	2	• No parking along highway (4). • To break up the look . . . • Do this all along Highway 99.
4b. Greater range of commercial uses allowed. Even allow for car dealerships – perhaps even encourage them in select areas.	12	13	9	14	• No car dealerships (9). • Allow some car dealerships provided they are well designed (4) and located along freeway. • Allow car dealerships (5). • Allow gas stations. • Move car dealers to state highway (e.g., Highway 503 in orchards).
4c. Maximum height and density: 3 stories.	21	17	9	1	• Four seems reasonable. • Allow higher (2).
4d. Minimum height and density options: None.	21	15	8	4	• Two please. • 2-story average minimum. • At least 3 stories.

	Survey Score				
Proposal/Concept	Great Idea	Neutral/ Unsure	(Did not respond)	Bad Idea	**Summary of Individual Comments** *(NOTE: #'s in parentheses indicate the # of repetitive comments)*
4e. Signage: Prohibit all new pole signs and (promote low level monument signs and building mounted signs instead); Provide generous sign size allowances for wall signs provided they are in proportion to the facade.	32	9	5	2	• Monuments signs would give better appearance (2). • More flexibility in signs, but still restrict "tent" signs. • Set maximum size limit. • Too restrictive.
4f. Streetscape design. Emphasize a boulevard design throughout the Hwy 99 corridor with a landscaped median where practical, generous sidewalks, and street trees.	32	7	8	1	• Don't prohibit turn lane (2) • Sidewalks throughout whole project (2). • Great idea.
5. MULTIFAMILY AREAS/USES					
5a. Development frontage: Require modest landscaped setbacks; Buildings face street; Parking to side or rear.	32	6	10	0	• No more apartments with large parking lots. • Can we include some multilevel parking?
5b. Permitted housing types: Townhouses and apartments in designated multifamily areas. Apartments in mixed-use buildings in commercial/mixed-use areas. No new single family homes or duplexes.	30	5	9	4	• Single-family back from main area (2). • Townhouses only. No apartments. Condos okay.
5c. Maximum height and density: 4-stories within areas on maps specified as highest and medium intensity and 3-stories in ALL other locations. Do NOT specify a maximum dwelling unit/acre limit.	23	15	8	2	• 3 stories maximum. • Great with 3 instead of 4 stories.
5d. Minimum height and density options: 2-stories minimum height and 18-25 units/acre minimum average density.	20	17	9	2	• Some one-story okay. Retirement condos. • Great with 18 (not 25) units/acre. • 3 stories minimum.

	Survey Score				
Proposal/Concept	Great Idea	Neutral/ Unsure	(Did not respond)	Bad Idea	**Summary of Individual Comments** *(NOTE: #'s in parentheses indicate the # of repetitive comments)*
5e. Usable private open space: Require at least 200sf of open space per multifamily dwelling unit. Encourage a variety of spaces including common open space, private balconies, porches, and indoor space. Reduce standard to 100sf/unit for developments incorporating structured parking.	32	7	7	2	• Think need more open space per multifamily unit. • Open but not public. • Not sure on calculation of 200 SF. • Great with "Reduce standard to 100sf/unit. . ." crossed out. Per-person usage, not just family units square footage.
5f. Usable public open space: Area = at least 15% of the land within the development must be developed as public open space.	28	8	10	2	• Off-site uses need to be close by. • May be too much. • 10% better. • Bad idea. • Costly for the developer?
5h. Streetscape design. Emphasize street design with on-street parking, wide planting strips, and generous sidewalks.	29	8	11	0	
6. SINGLE FAMILY INFILL DEVELOPMENT					
6a. Subdivision Design Principles: • Provide roadway/pathway connections to surrounding areas where feasible. • Developments must orient to natural areas and not back up to them. • Incorporate trails. • Incorporate Low Impact Development techniques into street design where feasible. • Provide sidewalks and street trees. • Discourage cul-de-sacs.	32	6	9	1	• Why discourage family-friendly cul-de-sacs (3)? • Cul-de-sacs are a big problem and make it difficult to access the neighborhood. • Try to orient facing south to help maximize solar access. • Too restrictive. • Rain Gardens! • Need plenty of open space for children to play safely.
6b. Streetfront Design: Modest landscaped front yard setbacks; Porch projections permitted; Garages and driveways deemphasized.	27	12	8	1	• Need yard space. • Need a decent setback. • Difficult on 4,000 SF lots. • Where are the de-emphasized garages? People need them.

	Survey Score				
Proposal/Concept	Great Idea	Neutral/ Unsure	(Did not respond)	Bad Idea	**Summary of Individual Comments** *(NOTE: #'s in parentheses indicate the # of repetitive comments)*
6c. Minimum Usable Private Open Space: Area = at least 10% of lot and at least 15' in width (may not be in front yard).	24	12	9	3	• Too small in terms of private open space. • Maybe more than 10% and 15 feet maximum. • Need side yard separation of at least 20 feet.
6d. Minimum Usable Public Open Space: Area = at least 15% of the land within the subdivision must be developed as public open space.	31	6	7	4	• 10%. • Cost?
6e. Allow for cottage housing: • 4-12 units around a common open space • 400sf of common open space per unit • 1,200sf max floor area/unit • Each cottage house counts as ½ a dwelling unit for the purposes of density calculations.	28	10	8	2	• Provides housing diversity. • Too small at 1,200SF maximum.
8. OVERALL CONCEPT					
8a. Overall concept of Town Center, Gateway Villages, Commons, Transitional Areas, and Residential Areas: • Are they well-located and configured? • Other suggestions?	27	7	14	0	• Need bigger town center at 99th and Highway 99. • NE 129th may be a second town center. • Good classifications: logical and reflect real life.

Summary of Other Individual Comments:

- Hazeldell does not have a good track record.
- This area is long overdue for redevelopment! Highway 99 is unattractive, and it is hazardous pulling in and out of businesses along this street.
- Good thinking went into this work. On the right track. Need to orient densities to support mass transit, make it feasible.
- Would like to see more mixed-use from 88th north.
- Park and trails with safety in mind. Bike trails/walking trails.
- No BRT. Use existing bus system with turnouts. BRT is very expensive way to move people in this instance. BRT will take up lanes needed for cars and service trucks.
- Get rid of above-ground power lines! Don't allow back parking lots to be all blacktop; require trees and landscaping so the view from I-5 is also appealing and inviting, not a sea of black.
- What about the cost of such a project?
- Too restrictive and too mass transit-oriented. You are trying to change too much for the existing building and uses along Highway 99.
- Rapid transit will not fit with our treatment of 99. A dedicated lane for rapid transit in each direction will require that the entire 100-foot ROW stay asphalt. We lose the landscaped medians, left-turn lanes, wide sidewalks, and landscape areas with canopy trees on each side of Highway 99. In 1998, Team 99 was founded on the principal of using the 100-foot ROW for something other than asphalt.
- Include Heritage Trail product and connections to current county trail system.
- Much of the work of Team 99 focused on creating a boulevard environment along Highway 99. I have concerns that to accommodate BRT, we will end up keeping the excessive width we now have and will lose the tree-lined road with which we hope to slow the traffic by design rather than by sign.
- We talked about extending the north end up to 134th/Tenny Road as commons area in several meetings. Not reflected in these documents? Confused on the residential parking. Even in developments with 2- and 3-car garages, issues between neighbors on street parking arise. Need to ensure we don't create conflict situations by limiting parking access.
- Very concerned about Salmon Creek/Klineline area. My home is 300 feet from Highway 99. How can density affect my home positively?
- What do we need to do as a community to encourage restaurants to want to build in this area?
- Buildings too tall and the occupancy is too tight. Need space.