DRAFT

Date 17_0201 | Subject King City Urban Reserve Area 6D Concept Plan

To Mike Weston, Keith Liden | From Marcy McInelly, Erika Warhus

Stakeholder Interview Summary

In December and January, we received contact names from Michael Weston. Some of these had phone and/or email contact information, and we were able to collect additional contact information from the web. Following the initial interviews, people passed along our information and in some cases provided us with additional names and contact information.

Between January 18th and January 30th, we were able to conduct **a total of 11 interviews** with 18 people. Below is a summary of the interviews by area.

Interview summary by Area

Area	Contacts	Interviews conducted
Rivermeade / SW River Lane	3	1
Rivermeade / SW 137th Avenue	1	1
Existing King City / Edgewater	1	1
Planning Area: West	1	1
Planning Area: Central	4	4
Other (no specific area / at large)	8	3
Totals	18	11

Interviews

Interviewees were asked whether they lived, worked, rented and/or owned property in their area. In addition, they were asked:

- Based upon your connection to the area, what are the most critical issues that we should consider in this
 planning effort?
- Based upon your connection to the area, what would you like to see improved or changed?
- Based upon your connection to the area, what should we be careful to preserve?
- Based upon your connection to the area, what would represent a "win" for you?
- Based upon our conversation, how would you like to be involved in the design charrette?
- What is the best way to communicate with you about the planning process?

Summary of feedback

The following table summarizes the comment received.

Theme	Comments	
Background and history of project	 Angry about incorporation into King City Poor communication and not enough inclusion in process from King City during Edgewater development 	

DRAFT

	10 00 1 0 0 0 0
	 King City is a retirement community and it should stay that way and not expand Resentment of Rivermeade neighborhood towards King City and their politics
	Ready for development because land is no longer suitable for farming
Questions about the process	 Respect people's rights Concerned about process and outcome being predetermined Concerned about public engagement as checking boxes for Metro Concerned about forced annexation Land should go back to rural reserve designation
Concerns about change generally	 There should be no changes, no improvements; it should stay the same Concerned about traffic and congestion Concerned about losing the rural character Development is inevitable and there's no way to stop it
Concerns about infrastructure and costs	 Concerned about costs of infrastructure Development should pay for new infrastructure Concerned about increased assessment and taxes New infrastructure should take into account stormwater capacity Concerns about current Bull Mountain run off into planning area
Land use, zoning, character of development	 Provide a range of housing types and affordability Farmland should remain farmland; density should be limited to cities Protect open space; keep the area rural in character; preserve wildlife Preserve views Preserve livability Preserve green space and watersheds Preserve sense of openness Recreation on the river for all different ages Opportunities for younger seniors who want a more active lifestyle Preserve the privacy and don't develop Preserve wildlife refuge and limit access points Preserve farmland and agricultural uses Preserve private Rivermeade park Protect the river Make river publicly accessible with river walk and parks Preserve the character of Rivermeade neighborhood Provide mixed use area with places to shop and eat Walkable downtown feel (like Progress Ridge and downtown Sherwood) Commercial center that is not strip-based development
Concerns and comments about mixed use area	 Opposes mixed-use Favors designation of mixed-use area Provide some neighborhood-serving retail and services Integrate new mixed-use area with current downtown Wants to see dense mixed-use development

DRAFT

Transportation, streets, trails and general connectivity	 No connection between Rivermeade neighborhood and King City Concerns about cut-through traffic Beef Bend needs safety improvements for bicycles and pedestrians Want to see the Westside Trail develop Farm equipment on Beef Bend is not safe Speeds along Fischer Road are too fast and need traffic calming Connect the new development through to the old development Consider trails for golf carts as well as bikes/pedestrians Traffic congestion at 99W and Durham Road is a problem Street and path connections can be a good thing but concerned about loss of privacy and more people coming through
Other	 King City has a chance to rebrand itself as more than just a retirement community Growth in the area will impact schools Current area acts as a needed buffer between development to the north of Beef Bend and the river and should stay the way it is

Desired Outcomes

In response to the question, "Based upon your connection to the area, what would represent a 'win' for you?" interviewees said development in Urban Reserve Area 6D should:

- Preserve sense of community that exists now and keep it as is without developing
- Preserve the rural character of the place and never develop the area
- Development in a careful way that is mixed use and has connections to the river, including a river boardwalk
- Public parks and fishing along the river
- Preservation of the river and wildlife habitats
- Inclusion of "old" King City and the seniors who are living there
- Commercial and residential development
- Trails along the river and connecting to other trails in the area
- Less traffic along Beef Bend road
- Not being brought into the UGB and a Rural Reserve designation for the area
- Vibrant and thriving downtown area with new shops and places to eat
- Walkable mixed-use area with a movie theater
- Development that maintains small town feel and character of King City
- Urban farms with activities for kids