



Lake Stevens South Master Plan Summary of Public Comments Public Workshop #1 February 7, 2008

Conversation Café

Attendees of the first public workshop for the Lake Stevens South Master Plan were asked to participate in a “conversation café” exercise as part of a community visioning process. The exercise consisted of participants rotating in groups among five stations. Participants were asked to respond to a question at each station by writing their comments on butcher paper. Below is a summary of comments received during this exercise. Numbers indicate the quantity of identical or very similar comments received.

How do you envision open space and park facilities within the proposed urban growth area?

Types of facilities people would like to see:

- Many different types of facilities
- Ball fields (3)
- Skate park
- Jogging track
- Dog park (2)
- Frisbee area
- Recreational areas for children
- Well-lit walking paths
- Parks accessible by bike and pedestrian path (2)
- Parks with views west to Everett
- Open space mixed with limited parks
- Build Cavelero Park (3)
- Build an additional park
- Parks that can handle more people
- Improve what we have

Park/open space-related concerns:

- Conserve open spaces and wetlands (4)
- Who will pay for parks?
- Open space should be left alone (2)
- Don't need parks (3)
- Yards provide enough open space for people (4)
- Protect wildlife (3)
- Formal parks not necessary-open space/woods enough
- Plenty of open space currently (2)
- Want all parks to developed by City of Snohomish (2)

- Protect trees (5)
- If area stays rural, then don't need parks

Other comments:

- No change (7)
- Leave us alone, send people away
- I like the open, rural quality and diversity of this area now (3)
- More development means less safe for our kids to walk to parks
- Don't expand UGA
- Don't want "dense" housing and "urban" activities
- Don't want to live in a regular suburban development
- Don't make area like Marysville
- Tom Marks Rd. area/Joywood identifies with Snohomish (4)
- Is Lake Stevens' growth area the example?
- Your process ignores our input (2)

What areas within the proposed urban growth area do you feel need to be conserved and how?

Comments directly pertaining to conservation:

- Wetlands (11), no relocation of wetlands
- Identify wetlands correctly and classify for proper development consideration
- Preserve 100ft each side of creek.
- Wildlife areas/habitat (5)
- Large lots (7)
- Protect larger farm lots as open space zoning
- Private woods, fields, etc for kids to play in (2)
- Native growth big trees and shrubs (2)
- Preserve the rural feel of area
- Quiet atmosphere
- Housing diversity
- Natural quality and variety of terrain
- Birds seem to be decreasing
- Need to leave natural areas-not dense population
- Build in a green manner to preserve wetlands and habitat and care for sensitive areas
- Fewer restrictions
- Conserve everything, leave it the way it is
- Take care of what we have
- Open space between cities and houses (3)

Other Comments:

- Don't change UGA, don't make like Marysville
- Say no to developers
- We want to stay in Snohomish (7)
- Don't like the way Lake Stevens develops, too aggressive, rural sprawl
- No commercial building (2)
- Is Lake Stevens more strict, environmentally-friendly than County?
- Make Hewitt the south boundary of Lake Stevens, not US2
- Does not need to be either/or as far as growth is concerned. We must do what is necessary to accommodate both growth and the environment.
- Have all opportunities been accomplished in the current UGA?
- There are still drainage issues from Cavelero Hill
- Flooding from school to 78th Ave SE
- We must plan our growth and infrastructure better
- What happened to the "Vision" for the existing UGA?
- No covenants
- Make Cavalero park

How do you see new commercial development and employment taking shape within the proposed urban growth area?

Types of commercial development:

- Need very little retail, have enough (4)
- Need more services
- Don't want to see Safeway or a business park in my backyard
- New commercial not necessary now-shop at Turners Grocery
- High tech, higher education (3)
- Little or no industrial (2)
- This area should not be used for commercial purposes (3)
- Campus-like setting for job creation areas
- Need more high-tech/office employers so we are closer to home, don't have to go to Everett
- No more strip malls

Employment

- Enough employment here- look at Bickford Ave
- Need more business and family wage jobs on Bickford Ave
- Quality family wage jobs
- Commercial is not family wage jobs

Location for Commercial Development

- Leave commercial along SR 9
- Hubs of commercial activity linked to major transportation intersections
- Mixed-use - living/working/shopping

- Do not build businesses along SR 9-it is congested enough.
- Lake Stevens needs commercial services on this side of the Trestle
- Need more retail
- Jobs on this side of the trestle would cut down on traffic and stress (3)
- 20th could support development
- The US 2/ SR 9 area will eventually have commercial.
- Keep quiet neighborhood, leave commercial in Everett and Monroe

Other comments:

- Effort should be made to preserve existing quality of life.
- The area is already too crowded, keep rural (2)
- We chose a bedroom community and chose to commute
- There is no infrastructure for commercial buildings; need more roads, sewers and sidewalks (2)
- It appears that the attitude is to just keep building until there is complete gridlock
- Construction as green as possible, low impact on environment
- Fix transportation problem before adding commercial employment (4)
- Less is better!
- You're wasting City of Lake Stevens money
- We want to stay associated with City of Snohomish, it is where we shop and go to schools (7)
- Proposed annexation is a hostile take-over
- Change can be good. Public discourse, dialog is important.
- Open space is necessary. Growth is not a bad thing.
- Get your economic house in order before you encroach on our territory
- Leave us alone (3)
- This area should not just be the overflow (dumping ground) for the pristine housing along the lake.
- This area needs to be incorporated to Lake Stevens – tired of being in no man's land
- More police to keep up with crime increased crime that will follow development
- Commercial takes away trees
- Build in existing UGA
- Retrofit existing buildings
- Put commercial development in Snohomish
- Snohomish doesn't need more commercial development
- If lake Stevens annexes, should pay for infrastructure (3)
- Keep Snohomish school district boundary (3)

How do you see new residential development taking shape within the proposed urban growth area?

Comments directly pertaining to residential development:

- R-5 (2)
- Not high density, ½ acre or larger lots (3)
- Remain rural (3)
- Contingency for urban growth with defined plan, Snohomish affiliation

- Need density to support growth needs – GMA
- Consider roads first (2)
- There is no infrastructure to support medium or high density housing
- Keep as much as the existing community as possible
- Mixed-use (5)
- Mixed use with lots of open space (2)
- Not mixed-use
- Stop the “hodge-podge” stuff that is causing our area to look like a mixed use mess
- Variety of housing price ranges
- Quality development is key
- Connections via pedestrian/bikeways to commercial and other areas is vital
- Keep it the same-no more development (10)
- Land use should be developed in partnership with residents
- Med, low, and high density ok (2)
- Low density to medium density residential
- Plan it carefully (4)
- Residential only
- A lot of private yards
- Urban cluster to the south with open space in sensitive areas
- Density in any part of this area would be a blight

Other comments:

- No more room to grow without better transportation and less cars.
- Land use should be determined by, or in partnership with, residents or, not dictated by a city council
- How does this meet Lake Stevens' vision of keeping small town character?
- Tom Marks Rd. area should stay in Snohomish (6)
- Can't “see” it
- New area will cause more water runoff that is now not controlled
- Existing property owners should not pay for Lake Stevens' expansion plans
- Stay “natural”, not “urban” or “city”
- Lots of open space, large lots
- City annexing should provide any new required infrastructure
- Don't want Lake Stevens cheaply built housing
- Lake Stevens would be more responsible than Snohomish County and Everett
- Traffic and sewer concerns

How do you see existing public facilities and services within the proposed urban growth area improving?

Transit

- Better transit into Everett and south to King Co
- Buses from Frontier Village to Snohomish, Monroe, Woodinville (2)
- Could use a bus route between our area and the east side via SR 9
- Better public transportation easier to access
- Commuter rail between Snohomish and Woodinville

Roads

- Roads with sidewalks
- Sidewalks at SR 9 and Hewitt
- Traffic congestion must be relieved before new development occurs (3)
- Improve SR 9 and US 2 (4)
- Roads need improvement (5)
- Need one more trestle
- This area should remain rural-can't afford new roads
- Ways to connect the communities to parks and commercial areas that are healthy and gentle on the environment
- Existing roads suit our rural needs

Police/Fire

- Utilities, police, fire ok now (2)
- Need police due to increased crime in the area
- Lake Stevens police is much better than county

Water/Sewer

- Sewer where necessary
- Sewer would help some of the flooding (3)
- Water run-off should be controlled so streets are not flooded
- No drainage between 20th and Lake Stevens Rd
- Septic works fine
- Sewer too costly
- Very concerned about the cost of sewer hook-ups (5)
- Need to expand sewer service in this area (4)

Schools

- Snohomish school district is great

Other Comments

- City of Snohomish is better positioned to provide urban services efficiently for the southern portion of the study area (4)
- Would rather be served by City of Snohomish as it is closer and our city of choice (2)
- Lake Stevens go away
- We can have a successful community if we invest in the critical infrastructure to support the people in the area
- Not interested in planning by Lake Stevens
- Joywood and its surrounding area needs to stay with Snohomish (3)

Comment Sheets Received at Workshop #1

Thirteen comment forms were received at public workshop #1. The following is a summary of these comments.

General Comments

- Stop development until you (Snohomish County, WA) have addressed transportation infrastructure first. Snohomish County is becoming unlivable.
- Leave us rural
- I would like to see low/med/high growth on South Lake Stevens Road, not 1 per 5 acres
- I do not want to have Lake Stevens develop this area. Prefer Snohomish develops it.
- Please advise as to what each cities intended design, purposes are.
- Is it a “done deal”? What say do we have in this?
- How will adding 1000s more homes improve our quality of life and our commute?
- Joywood development belongs with the Snohomish community rather than the Lake Stevens community because of proximity to shopping and banking within the Snohomish city limits, children attending Snohomish schools, and the many relationships and networks developed with Snohomish. (6)
- Tom Marks Road area identifies very strongly with Snohomish, not Lake Stevens
- We all have an allegiance to Snohomish schools, sports, and clubs. (2)
- Five generations is a long time to pass along the pride and loyalty to Snohomish schools.
- Right now my home is being threatened by development – please do not threaten my identity on top of that by trying to annex me to Lake Stevens.

Comments about the Workshop Format

- Workshop concept was a great idea
- Maps were difficult to read