

# Alternatives Workshop Results

February 26 Workshop, 2015

Below are summarized and tabulated results from the goal dot exercise and survey results from 64 completed individual surveys and small group exercises (which included 17 groups).



## Dot Exercise Results

Top ranked Comprehensive Plan Elements, by dots:

Element	Total Dots
Economic Development & Tourism	179
Housing	128
Land Use and Community Design	127
Parks, Recreation and Open Space	121
Transportation	88
Conservation / Sustainability	55
Capital Facilities & Utilities	48
Natural Hazard Reduction & Climate Change	38
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>784</b>

Top ten ranked individual goals:

	Key Goal	Element	Dots
1	Encourage housing types and design that reinforce and enhance the character and scale of established neighborhoods.	Housing	34
2	Increase the variety of housing choices in all price ranges throughout the city to help meet the changing needs and preferences of a diverse population.	Housing	33
3	Encourage planning for and improve non-motorized infrastructure in the city to reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles, improve the environment, reduce road infrastructure costs and encourage a physically active community.	Transportation	31
4	Increase the opportunities for public enjoyment of the shorelines.	Parks, Recreation and Open Space	30
5	Strengthen, preserve and enhance Downtown, South Commercial Avenue, and the central waterfront area (north of 22nd to marina) as active and economically viable places to shop, conduct business and government, live, and enjoy cultural events.	Economic Development & Tourism	30
6	Maintain and enhance the city's parks and forestlands' habitat, aesthetic, and recreational values.	Parks, Recreation and Open Space	28
7	Encourage the development of affordable/workforce housing to meet local needs.	Housing	27
8	Encourage expansion of existing employers and attraction of new employers that pay wages sufficient to support family households and fund needed public services.	Economic Development & Tourism	25
9	Encourage location and retention of manufacturing, industrial, marine trade, high-tech and sustainable industry jobs that pay wages necessary to live in Anacortes.	Economic Development & Tourism	25
10	Develop an economic strategic action plan.	Economic Development & Tourism	25

# Survey Results

## Preliminary Goals

---

Comments or suggestions on Preliminary Goals? Concept with multiple votes/references are reflected in the number in parentheses (#).

- Need retail in Anacortes—medium box store, no strip mall (2)
- Design guidelines NOT standards; No Leavenworth; the idea is to have input (2)
- Generally good, comprehensive (2)
- Support branch campuses for high tech companies - —facebook/google etc. (2)
- More affordable housing; housing to meet the needs of 55+ population. Cluster/cottage/count housing (2)
- View corridors: Need to maintain view corridors to see Mount Baker—some higher height limits along waterfront South of 17th. Increase public access to waterfront with visible park space.
- Our population will be out of balance (no children) and we can't support or justify all the money on schools.
- Planning for climate change needs to include reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, especially renewable energy, as well as preparing for the effects of climate change.
- Implementation: Goals are pretty general, how they are implemented makes a difference
- Tax base: We need more tax base for the City
- R-2 change alternative—should be 7,500-6,00; R-3 change alternative—should be 6,000-5,000; these measurements fit evenly into the typical 30,000 square foot ½ block area
- Keep Anacortes a great small town—big growth isn't necessary
- Design standards for commercial areas
- Create planned retail for residential growth. Develop waterfront, increase height limits throughout, allow regional retail
- Need to rezone/draw new lines
- Strategy/vision of what we want the City to look like (attract which demographic?). needed before we can decide on building development
- Case studies of cities that have successfully done what we want to do
- Re-work parking requirements to allow for in-fill housing. Protect historic buildings with increased density and height restrictions. Sloping height restrictions: the highest on commercial, slightly higher on side streets and lowest elsewhere.
- Good process—the boards with topics and the green dots; a good way to do this and give those of us who do not know what is going on to find out what is going on—it is all very clear and informative
- More cottage-type housing, especially for 55+ years
- As you consider new multifamily units in R4 segment, ensure adequate parking
- Preserve atmosphere
- Really like allowing single purpose residential use in CBD and commercial
- Many seem like duplicates, could be combined into a single goal vs. 2 or 3

## Alternative Concepts

---

Favorite concept(s) in any of the alternatives and why? Concept with multiple votes/references are reflected in the number in parentheses (#).

- Greater density close to downtown (4)
- Retaining small scale (4)
- Need for design standards and/or guidelines (3)
- Affordable housing for families-if our kids are on school lunch, where do they live? (2)
- Regional retail out on SR 20
- Design objectives or guidelines—not standards
- Greater heights N of 12<sup>th</sup>
- Design standards (for human scale interest—not "Leavenworth" flavor) requiring some percentage affordable units with multifamily housing, and required public amenities at parks
- Small but diverse retail makes more sense than regional/big box retail
- Neighborhood transit for those who can't walk/bike/drive but aren't disabled
- MJB North of 22<sup>nd</sup>. Residential apartments and condos at 28 units per acre not more than 50% of property. Hotel and conference center is 65', all other 50'.
- Provide appropriate mix of housing while maintaining existing (SF) character of neighborhoods
- Maintain scale of Anacortes by keeping R-2, R3, R4 lots. Design standards need to be developed to keep the feel of the town. 40' height restrictions with a conditional use exception for hotels.

- More flexible use and lot sizes
- Upzone C and CBD to allow residential on side streets
- Economic long term strategy with mandatory timed updates
- Greatly improve and prioritize non-motorized pathways for increased biking and walking
- Reduce 'conditional use' reliance, advocate by right per zoning
- Break up Anacortes into smaller areas to work with
- F Alt2—it is time to enjoy that waterfront; Willatte business park should be mixed use
- Waterfront development
- Mixed use possibilities, planned growth. Old Town improvements, responsible development.
- R3 rezone
- Infill—increased housing without destroying history/style of Anacortes
- A mixed use (retail, high tech)
- Maintain character of existing neighborhoods
- Glad the City is open to rezoning. Maybe not 65' height limit, but 50' height limit
- Mixed use in key areas
- Protection of environment/awareness of climate change

Least favorite concept(s) in any of the alternatives and why?

- Regional retail anywhere in city – unsightly; potential to really change the character of Anacortes (3)
- R-2—Alt-2 (increasing density)— particularly with current set back restrictions 10' and 5' each side of property. Would need to change setbacks (3)
- Regional retail in town (2) – maybe OK out by March Point
- UGA expansions (2)
- Don't exempt Old Town from change (2)
- Retail on Highway 20
- Big square, ugly industrial buildings—too much dry boat storage
- We need a general store, not a big box store
- Changes to CBD
- Smaller lot sizes in R-2 and R-3
- "Regional Retail" assumes interception of traffic, but folks will still drive. No guarantee that RR will capture projected sales.
- No height limit increases
- My biggest worry is to continue to rely on conditional use.
- The increases are large SF increments—could be smaller
- The developer must reflect "the spirit" of Anacortes (ie-brick instead of just cold concrete)
- Concerns about cottage housing. I have seen bad examples (Shoreline) and good (Kirkland). Need to be thoughtful of design elements and buffers between existing housing
- Public transportation expanded beyond Skagit transit seems like a lofty goal for this size of a community.

## Changes to Existing Residential Zones

### A. R-2 zone.

This is the largest zone in the city by land area. Thus far, participants have expressed an interest in promoting compatible “infill” development (adding homes on vacant lots and dividing large lots into smaller lots).

#### Individual Survey Results

<b>No change:</b> Keep existing zoning as is 30%	<b>Alt 1:</b> Allow minor reduction in lot size (7,500 sf to 6,500) 32%	<b>Alt 2:</b> Allow modest reduction in lot size (7,500 sf to 5,000) <b>38% favored approach</b> (24 /63)
--	--	--

#### Small Group Exercise Results

<b>No change:</b> Keep existing zoning as is <b>(tie) 35% favored approach</b> (6/17)	<b>Alt 1:</b> Allow minor reduction in lot size <b>(tie) 35% favored approach</b> (6/17)	<b>Alt 2:</b> Allow modest reduction... 30%
---	--	--

### B. R-3 zone (excluding Old Town).

This zone covers a large area west of Downtown and Commercial Ave (generally between M and D Avenues) and now allows single family and duplexes with additional opportunities for 3-4-plexes. Similarly, there’s been an interest in encouraging more compatible infill development.

#### Individual Survey Results

<b>No change:</b> Existing zoning 16%	<b>Alt 1:</b> Allow modest reduction in lot size (6,000 sf to 4,500) <b>47% favored approach</b> (30/63)	<b>Alt 2:</b> Allow reduction in lot size to match historic lot pattern (6,000 sf to 3,000) 37%
---	---	--

#### Small Group Exercise Results

<b>No Change</b> 9%	<b>Alt 1:</b> Allow minor reduction in lot size (7,500 sf to 6,500) <b>59% favored approach</b> (9/16)	<b>Alt 2:</b> Allow reduction..... 31%
------------------------	---	---

### C. R-4 zone.

The R-4 zone functions as the city’s multifamily zone, though many of the lots now contain older single family homes. This zone generally covers two blocks between M and O Avenues. With close proximity to commercial services and transit, many participants see this as an opportunity for more housing growth.

#### Individual Survey Results

<b>No Change</b> 5%	<b>Alt 1:</b> Allow assisted living facilities as “by right” use 31%	<b>Alt 2:</b> Eliminate density limit and let existing 40’ height limit, parking req’s, design standards & market dictate density. Allow assisted living facilities. <b>64% favored approach</b> (41/ 63)
------------------------	---	--

#### Small Group Exercise Results

<b>No Change</b> 6%	<b>Alt 1:</b> Allow assisted living... 31%	<b>Alt 2:</b> Eliminate density limit..... <b>63% favored approach</b> (10/16)
------------------------	---	---

## Changes to Existing Non-Residential Zones

### D. CBD zone.

This zone covers the greater Downtown area. Height limit is 50' and residential is only allowed on upper levels over shops or offices. Participants thus far have expressed interest in encouraging more residential development in this zone, particularly on side streets.

#### Individual Survey Results

**No change**  
6%

**Alt 1:** Allow single purpose residential uses on side streets and keep existing 50' height limit.  
**48% favored approach (31/64)**

**Alt 2:** Allow single purpose residential uses on side streets and raise height limit to 65'.  
46%

#### Small Group Exercise Results

**No change**  
6%

**Alt 1:** Allow single purpose residential uses...  
**50% favored approach (8/16)**

**Alt 2:** Allow single purpose residential uses...  
44%

### E. Commercial zone.

This zone generally follows the South Commercial Ave corridor and stretches one block west and east. Residential is only allowed on upper levels over shops or offices. Participants thus far have expressed interest in encouraging more residential development in this zone, particularly on side streets.

#### Individual Survey Results

**No change**  
6%

**Alt 1:** Allow single purpose residential uses on side streets and keep existing 40' height limit.  
41%

**Alt 2:** Allow single purpose residential uses on side streets and raise height limit to 50'.  
**53% favored approach (34/ 64)**

#### Small Group Exercise Results

**No change**  
6%

**Alt 1:** Allow single purpose residential uses on side streets.....  
**71% favored approach. (12/ 17)**

**Alt 2:**  
24%

## Changes by Location

### F. Waterfront (14<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup>).

This area was discussed extensively in the waterfront workshop last August. There was broad consensus to allow for a pedestrian-oriented mixture of uses – provided the design integrated publicly accessible open space and retained some east-west view corridors. The alternatives feature differing levels of height and intensity.

#### Individual Survey Results

**No change:**  
10%

**Alt 1:** Change to new Marine Mixed Use and maintain 40 height limit. Allow limited single purpose multifamily in addition to the existing mix of permitted commercial uses. Increase residential density limit to 40 units/acre.  
**53% favored approach (32/60)**

**Alt 2:** Same as Alt 1, except height limit of 65'. Relax strict floor area limits for multi-tenant commercial uses.  
37%

#### Small Group Exercise Results

**No change:**  
18%

**Alt 1:** Change to new Marine Mixed Use...  
**(tie) 41% favored approach (7/17)**

**Alt 2:** Same as Alt 1, except height limit...  
**(tie) 41% favored approach (7/17)**

## G. R to T Ave between 22nd & 28th.

This area also was discussed extensively in the waterfront workshop last August. This area is currently zoned Industrial, but there was considerable interest in allowing for a mixture of uses to complement the adjacent trail.

### Individual Survey Results

**No change:** Keep Industrial  
30%

**Alt 2:** Change to allow for a mixture of retail, office, and housing with a 50' height limit and residential density of 50 units/acre

**70% favored approach (44/63)**

### Small Group Exercise Results

**No change:** Keep Industrial  
35%

**Alt 2:** Change to allow for a mixture of retail, office, and housing....

**65% favored approach (11/17)**

## H. R Ave Regional Retail Overlay.

Participants also discussed regional retail uses in the Waterfront workshop last August (that meeting only addressed properties north of 28<sup>th</sup>). The Alternative 2 concept creates an overlay over the existing Industrial zone along R Avenue that would allow for regional retail uses (and smaller accessory retail to go with it) down to 34<sup>th</sup> Street.

### Individual Survey Results

**No change:** Keep Industrial

**54% favored approach (29/54)**

**Alt 2:** Apply a Regional Retail Overlay to area

46%

### Small Group Exercise Results

**No change:** Keep Industrial

47%

**Alt 2:** Apply a Regional Retail Overlay to area

**53% favored approach (8/15)**

## I. SR-20 Corridor.

There's been some discussion throughout the process on long term uses along this corridor, with strong interest in adding more flexibility to the types of uses allowed here – including one option with regional retail.

### Individual Survey Results

**No change:** Keep as is (LM1 zone)  
20%

**Alt 1:** Allow more flexibility in the types of commercial uses allowed surrounding SR-20 intersections.

33%

**Alt 2:** Apply a Regional Retail Overlay to the area along SR-20 from approximately Christianson Rd to the eastern City limits.

**47% favored approach (25/55)**

### Small Group Exercise Results

**No change**

21%

**Alt 1:** Allow more flexibility...

29%

**Alt 2:** Apply a Regional Retail Overlay....

**50% favored approach (7/14)**

## J. Sharpe's Corner Business Park Property.

This property sits southwest of Sharpe's Corner and includes some roadway and infrastructure improvements, but no new development has occurred under its current LM1 zoning. There's been interest in allowing residential uses here.

### Individual Survey Results

**No change:** Keep LM1 zoning.  
24%

**Alt 1:** Change to R3 to allow small lot single family & low density multifamily

34%

**Alt 2:** Change to R4 (multifamily) with a Live/Work Overlay

**42% favored approach (25/68)**

### Small Group Exercise Results

**No change:** Keep LM1 zoning.

**40% favored approach (6/15)**

**Alt 1:** Change to R3...

27%

**Alt 2:** Change to R4....

33%

## K. Skyline Marina.

The area is now zoned CM and only allows residential uses through a conditional use permit process. Thus far, participants have expressed an interest in integrating more multifamily uses to help revitalize the area.

### Individual Survey Results

**No change:** Keep existing CM zoning as is.

31%

**Alt 2:** Allow single purpose multifamily as a "by right" use together with same current mix of marine/commercial uses.

**69% favored approach** (42/61)

### Small Group Exercise Results

**No change:**

21%

**Alt 2:** Allow single purpose multifamily....

**79% favored approach** (11/14)

## Urban Growth Area Expansion Concepts

### L. UGA Expansion – Scimitar Ridge Area.

Property owner requested inclusion of subject property southwest of Sharpe's Corner into the UGA. These expansions are unlikely to meet WA Growth Management UGA expansion criteria unless City doesn't pursue many of the concepts in Alternatives 1 and 2 that provide for expanded residential capacity.

#### Individual Survey Results

**No change:** Keep as is

**70% favored approach** (43/61)

**Alt 2:** Expand the UGA = R2

30%

#### Small Group Exercise Results

**No change:** Keep as is

**71% favored approach** (10/14)

**Alt 2:** Expand the UGA...

29%

### M. UGA Expansion – Heart Lake.

This includes property requested by property owner to be included in the City's UGA plus adjacent property to reach City limit to north. These expansions are unlikely to meet WA Growth Management UGA expansion criteria unless City doesn't pursue many of the concepts in Alternatives 1 and 2 that provide for expanded residential capacity.

#### Individual Survey Results

**No change:** Keep as is

**75% favored approach** (45/60)

**Alt 2:** Expand UGA = R2

25%

#### Small Group Exercise Results

**No change:** Keep as is

**96% favored approach** (8/13)

**Alt 2:**

4%

## Group Survey Results on Other Concepts

#### R-1: (1 group voted)

- No change/Alternative 1: **0 votes**
- Alternatives 2: Re-designate most of R1 to R2: **1 vote**

#### R-3 – Old Town: (3 groups voted)

- No change/Alternative 1: **2 votes**
- Alternatives 2: Same as R-3 proposal above (Reduce lot size min from 6,000sf to 3,000sf): **1 vote**

#### R-4a: (1 group voted)

- No change: **1 vote**
- Alternatives 1 & 2 (Consolidate with R4 in both alternatives): **0 votes**

**R-4b:** (1 group voted)

- No change/Alternative 1: **0 votes**
- Alternatives 1 & 2 (Consolidate with R4 in both alternatives): **1 vote**

**SR-20/Ferry Terminal Rd:** (3 groups voted)

- No change/Alternative 1: **1 vote**
- Alternative 2: Redesignate from CM to a new Marine Mixed-Use designation that allows single purpose multifamily (as a limited permitted use) in addition to the existing mix of marine uses plus other commercial uses. **2 votes**

**Ship Harbor CM Residential:** (2 groups voted)

- No change: **0 votes**
- Alternative 1: Redesignate to R-2 **1 vote**
- Alternative 2: Redesignate to R-3 **1 vote**

**Hospital Overlay** (2 groups voted)

- No change: **0 votes**
- Alternative 1: Add overlay to area requested in Hospital Master Plan: **0 votes**
- Alternative 2: Apply a larger overlay – but exclude Commercial Ave properties **2 votes**

**R3 area between 34<sup>th</sup> Street and SR-20 east of Commercial Ave:** (4 groups voted)

- No change/Alternative 1: **1 vote**
- Alternative 2: Redesignate to R4 with a Live/Work Overlay that allows extra live-work flexibility. **3 votes**

**Fidalgo Bay Trestle CM:** (no groups voted)

- No change/Alternative 1: **0 votes**
- Alternative 2: Redesignate to R-2: **0 votes**

**Fidalgo Bay Rd. LM1 (north of Hwy 20):** (no groups voted)

- No change/Alternative 1: **0 votes**
- Alternative 1 & 2: Redesignate to R-2 or other low intensity designation in both alternatives **0 votes**

**Scandia Ct. area:** (no groups voted)

- No change: **0 votes**
- Alternative 1: Redesignate from LM1 to R2: **0 votes**
- Alternative 2: Redesignate from LM1 to R3: **0 votes**

**Sharpe's Corner:** (no groups voted)

- No change: **0 votes**
- Alternative 1 & 2: Redesignate from LM1 to C: **0 votes**

**Other comments and suggestions?**

- Relax parking requirements for all residential and commercial zones, drop outside parking requirements for 2<sup>nd</sup> units, etc.
- I relocated here because I like the character of the existing community. Need to be thoughtful to maintain the existing character of Anacortes—design elements needed.
- Plan for school growth capacity, ferry traffic, attract employment?
- Attract which demographics? Young families, retirees, work force, etc.
- Increase density in R1 to at least 4 du/acre
- Upzone R Ave residential to incentivize redevelopment
- Hospital zone to allow medical uses by right
- Preserve existing character of residential East of Q between 4<sup>th</sup> and Market; should be a small business/residential zone
- There are areas that would be appropriate for cottage housing in the R2 R3 zones. If higher densities could be obtained for appropriate properties.
- Population “growth” assumes 2.25 people per household: is this valid? What if more singles move here? Need more units!
- Alternatives that create higher density residential areas need to be complemented by improvements to public space and public access to community/recreational space—as lots and dwelling units get smaller, people will want higher quality public space and will spend more time in public space. Indoor and outdoor meeting areas, welcoming streetscapes, pedestrian and bike friendly streets, etc will make higher density residential areas more livable.