



Public Opinion Survey

Peter Moy, FCS Group, Inc.

250 surveys mailed (w/ return envelope)

30 returned undeliverable

220 net surveys

78 completed & returned surveys

35.5% response rate

9 questions



Public Opinion Survey Overall Observations

Property owners that live in the UGA expansion area prefer the following:

- prefer residential mixes and mixed use buildings,
- favor urban land development if their property is acquired on favorable terms or else they prefer no additional land development,
- overwhelming prefer that they be part of Snohomish because of proximity and the City's community character, and
- overwhelming prefer that they not be part of Lake Stevens,



Public Opinion Survey Overall Observations

Non-resident property owners in the UGA expansion area prefer the following:

- prefer residential mixes, mixed use buildings as well as retail and employment uses,
- favor urban land development if their property is acquired on favorable terms,
- prefer that they be part of Snohomish because of proximity and availability of water and sewer services, and
- prefer that they not be part of Lake Stevens,




Public Opinion Survey Overall Observations

Property owners and residents that live near the UGA expansion area prefer the following:

- keeping the area rural,
- having no additional land development,
- are more equally divided on being part of Snohomish because of a variety of reasons such as planning, environmental stewardship, proximity, community character, and
- slightly prefer that they not be part of Lake Stevens,


Public Opinion Survey

Question 1 – Who Responded?



Public Opinion Survey

Question 2 – How much property do they own?




Public Opinion Survey

Question 3 - Preferences

Response Average

1=First Choice, 6=Last Choice

- 2.79 a. The UGA expansion area should remain rural.
- 3.19 b. If adequate streets and utilities can be provided, future land development in the study area should consist mostly of low-density, residential subdivisions.
- 3.47 c. If adequate streets and utilities can be provided, future land development in the study area should include a mix of single family subdivisions, multifamily structures, mixed use buildings with dwellings located over small shops and offices.
- 4.31 d. If adequate streets and utilities can be provided, future land development in the study area should consist mostly of regional retail/shopping centers.
- 4.69 e. If adequate streets and utilities can be provided, future land development in the study area should consist mostly of employment land uses, such as business parks, office parks, and light manufacturing.
- 3.33 f. If adequate streets and utilities can be provided, future land development in the study area should include a mix of single family, multifamily, mixed use, retail, and employment land uses.




Public Opinion Survey

Question 3 – Preferences By Location

1=First Choice, 6=Last Choice

Statement	Own and reside within	Own property in, but do not reside within	Own and reside near	Own property near
a. UGA should remain rural	3.00	5.00	2.10	2.67
b. Low-Density, Residential	3.31	4.22	2.69	3.67
c. Residential Mix/Mixed Use Bldgs.	2.94	3.00	4.00	4.22
d. Retail/Shopping Centers	4.17	3.89	4.38	4.89
e. Employment Land Uses	4.72	4.22	4.76	4.89
f. Residential/Retail/Employment Mix	3.03	2.00	3.76	4.44



Public Opinion Survey

Question 4 - Preferences

Response 1=First Choice, 3=Last Choice
Average

- 1.90** a. No additional land development or urbanization should occur in the study area.
- 2.28** b. Urban land development in the study area would be acceptable only if it can be done so that it does not directly affect me and my property remains rural in character.
- 2.00** c. Urban land development in the study area would be acceptable only if my property or residence is acquired at terms I find favorable, and I no longer have an affiliation there.



Public Opinion Survey


Question 4 – Preferences By Location

1=First Choice, 3=Last Choice


Statement	Own and reside within	Own property in, but do not reside within	Own and reside near	Own property near
a. No Additional Land Development	1.97	2.78	1.69	1.67
b. No Direct Affect & Property Remains Rural	2.39	2.44	2.14	2.22
c. Acquired via Favorable Terms	1.75	1.00	2.38	2.44

Public Opinion Survey


Question 5 – Part of Snohomish?



Public Opinion Survey By Location-Part of Snohomish?




Public Opinion Survey Question 6 - Factors




Public Opinion Survey


Question 7 – Part of Lake Stevens?




Public Opinion Survey By Location-Part of Lake Stevens?



Public Opinion Survey Question 8 - Factors





Public Opinion Survey

Question 9 – Additional Comments

7 – Supporting being part of Snohomish

3 – Not supporting being part of Lake Stevens

28 – Comments or concerns about UGA expansion area development

8 – related to keeping rural character, open space, etc.

11 – related to traffic problems and congestion

4 – related to City finances or property owner financial burden

3 – Land use planning

3 – Obtaining fair market value on property

2 – Supporting more development

9 – Miscellaneous

City of Snohomish Public Opinion Survey – UGA Expansion
Question 9 – Survey Comments

- While urban development is not preferred, should such development occur, preservation of open spaces, green belts and parklands/recreation should be a priority.
- We live on 95th Dr SE and now we can't get out on to the Highway at certain times of the day (AM & PM commute). Adding more homes/businesses would add even more congestion.
- We have availed ourselves of the services of schools, banks, medical facilities, shopping, library - and friends and neighbors for 40 years. So our preference is definitely Snohomish.
- We don't want any urbanization at this time! There is enough people living around here now - SLOW DOWN urbanization. Why would you want a strip of land on the east side of SR US 9??? About 70' wide - what's up with that?
- We do not want to be in Lake Stevens. We shop in Snohomish, eat in Snohomish, use parks in Snohomish - we love Snohomish
- We are Snohomish. We would be horrified if we got changed to Lake Stevens. We need to redraw fire district lines now too.
- We are an adult family home - selling our property would be a huge business relocation cost to us. We want sewer to come so we want some development!
- This radical change in zoning will destroy an entire neighborhood where I live. It is unwarranted and unwelcome. Highways 2 & 9 are approaching over-saturation and large scale development will result in horrific traffic. The rural area is currently a scenic asset. Many cedar trees and wildlife will disappear forever. Good luck!
- This area is for urbanization as a part of the City of Snohomish! Not Lake Stevens, they are wasting their time and ours. I and my neighbors want to be in the City of Snohomish!!
- The proposed northerly UGA line along 36th St SE cuts our property in half (Frontier Lumber Inc). Please include our property on the north side of 36th St SE
- The increased development is degrading quality of life, destroying the environment, increasing pollution. The City of Snohomish is not financially equipped nor has the capabilities to keep up with the areas it has annexed already. We do not want to look like Redmond Town Center and lose what character this area is barely hanging on to.
- The financial arrangement that the Snohomish City Council has with Mike Reid & Associates gives the appearance of collusion in what should strictly be an administrative process of one Governmental body dealing with a higher governmental

City of Snohomish Public Opinion Survey – UGA Expansion
Question 9 – Survey Comments

body. The contractual arrangement with Mike Reid & Associates (if such an agreement exists) gives the appearance of city government allowing a private individual to have special privileges and preferential treatment in the exercise of governmental processes. It is absolutely certain that the city of Snohomish will at some time in the near future find itself in the position where it will have to compensate Mike Reid and Associates in some special and valuable way for having carried the ball for the city in this land acquisition process. Is it the intention of the city council to declare eminent domain over the annexed area once it is acquired? If so, is it then the city council's intent to assign development rights to this chosen developer and his associates? Since it appears that this may be the intent, judging from the favoritism already shown this developer, we may have to reconsider rendering support to the city of Snohomish regarding the proposed annexation. In as much as this survey is a document open to public scrutiny, I request that a representative of the city council contact my wife and me before any of my comments are made public. If these remarks are made a matter of record, I reserve the right to present my concerns to the media that they may exercise their investigative prerogatives. If I may be so bold, I recommend that the Snohomish City Council abrogate all contractual arrangements with Mike Reid and Associates, that they reimburse him for financial effort and payments he has so far provided on behalf of the City of Snohomish, and that the City of Snohomish alone and entirely on its own initiative and expense proceed with the process of adding the property of interest to the Snohomish UGA. Furthermore, we advise that Mike Reid and Associates be instructed that they must stand aside and not interfere with the organizational activities of the residents of the affected area, that he make no further attempt to obtain property by any means within Joywood Development, that he present no more documentation to the County Council, or County Planning Department except through the appropriate person or authorized committee of the City of Snohomish. Furthermore it should be made absolutely clear to Mike Reid and Associates that they have incurred no special rights or privileges as a result of any activity done on behalf of the City of Snohomish and that they must not interfere with the activities of any other interested investor or developer, as well as existing property owners, who may have similar interests in the area under consideration by the City. It is further recommended that the Snohomish City council advise the Snohomish County Council that any maps, charts, and/or documents submitted by Mike Reid and Associates to them are for planning purposes only. The land use charts represent only one person's concept how the land could be utilized, that they do not meet with the approval of residents of the area, and that ultimate zoning may be based on different criteria that those used by the developer. Thank you for soliciting our input. Please read it carefully, your response is anticipated, expected and welcome. Ted and Joy Beckmeyer, Owners of Joywood Division 4

- The area is a green belt. There is too much traffic on 9 & 2. Wild life needs a home. Snohomish is expanding too quickly

City of Snohomish Public Opinion Survey – UGA Expansion

Question 9 – Survey Comments

- The "proposed land use" in the SR9/US2 comprehensive plan amendment is inconsistent and incompatible with the wishes of the residents and neighborhoods of the area in question. Two hundred acres of apartments and "air condos" would be the epitome of urban blight
- Thanks for caring about us
- Thank you for asking us
- Snohomish is a beautiful town. It has a true center that has no mega-chains. I would be proud to be a member of your community - go 44th.
- Snohomish City limits have enlarged too much already
- Question 4 did not include the possibility of self development of land. What I dislike about Snohomish's plan is the urban village model. We would be more in favor of gradual infill which would lend itself to higher quality, more valuable homes and provide more opportunity to locally based builder/developers than the rapid expansion urban village idea.
- Proper planning needs to be taken into account for traffic on and access to BOTH Highway 9 & Highway 2 from the area. Also parks and other open spaces for families to enjoy should be planned and not just put into sub divisions
- Please talk some sense into Lake Stevens. Also, please address the financial burdens associated with annexation to Snohomish and sewers. We've heard upwards of \$40,000 per d/u and I know most of us cannot afford that. Thank you.
- Please continue to press the issue of Snohomish vs Lake Stevens. I have strong feelings of association with Snohomish. Also I believe from what I've seen & heard the Snohomish development plan is far better for our community.
- Please consider what makes our area so wonderful: Rural "feel", sense of community, open space, relative lack of congestion. Also consider that the infrastructure for the UGA is already taxed (overcrowded schools ... some relief coming), limited ability to expand transportation access (Snoho River Bridge/I9 as an example). Lastly please consider that all the mitigation that developers have had to pay for in the past 20 years has not stopped the Puget Sound area from being degraded by density it just cannot handle. So don't follow the same path and think different results will occur. Thanks for your hard work in trying to balance everyone's needs and desires.
- Please choose the 103 St SE (NE of Bank Foss) urbanization development and see if you think this is improvement

City of Snohomish Public Opinion Survey – UGA Expansion

Question 9 – Survey Comments

- Our major concern with urban growth is increased traffic. We hope road improvements are mandatory with the land expansion project!!
- My family has lived on Tom Marks for 18 years and call Snohomish home.
- Many in our area are concerned that this is a struggle for tax dollars between the two cities, with little concern for the character and livability of the area. How will you address the issues of parks, local services, and congestion on SR9/SR2, both of which are already dangerously over used during peak hours?
- In question 3 I would like the area to be a destination place; people like the shops - retail with a family mix overlooking the river valley and Olympics also a combination of choice food and drink. Thank you for this excellent way of discussing our ideas to these issues.
- Improvements to Highway 9? Rural character
- If this is done, strong consideration needs to be given to the Joywood community. It is the only community in the area and the people living there could be hugely negatively impacted if they are not given consideration.
- If this area must be developed special focus must be put on the already unbearable traffic in this immediate area. (Highway 9 in particular).
- If development is truly inevitable, let's get on with it, buy out all residents at a price that is attractive to compensate for the hassle. Otherwise, leave us alone.
- I would like my property to be included in the UGA area. My property borders 36th St SE and the property west of me is already commercial (Frontier Lumber). 8829 36th St SE, I would like to see it developed.
- I would greatly appreciate information on results of survey and for area in question. Thank you.
- I don't think anybody really wants development but if it will eventually happen anyway, I don't want my house on 1/2 acre to be surrounded by high density and industrial/retail. If this happens I would want my land zoned high density to get most for selling.
- I do not want this development of my area unless you plan to give me top dollar for my property - Not BELOW like the last developer offered
- I do not want Snohomish to lose its small town appeal. Unchecked growth and cluster housing developments have become an eyesore. Examples: Seattle Hill,

City of Snohomish Public Opinion Survey – UGA Expansion Question 9 – Survey Comments

Marysville. Adding more houses and businesses only adds to already congested roads (I-5, US-2, US-9). More people and businesses also add to more pressure on Snohomish Valley's dwindling farmlands. Let's keep rural Snohomish rural and save the city's small town character. I have lived in and around Snohomish my entire life (47 years).

- I can't see the County adding this area to the City of Snohomish where there is a large section between the two that is not part of Snohomish. We would very much dislike this area becoming part of Lake Stevens.
- Highway 9 and SR2 cannot support traffic from any more development. Have you driven Highway 9 (that I like to refer to as 9th Ave) north anytime after 3pm or southbound after 5:30 am - try it! Or any other collector streets. 31 year local resident.
- Could you please supply me with results of the survey.
- Choosing to live in the Snohomish community area was because of the schools, the access to the churches and businesses - also the community atmosphere and attitude of businesses and residents. (And I love the antique shops!)