

Town Center Building Height/Density Proposed Amendment Comments

Tom Odell

Sammamish City Council, February 4, 2025 Meeting

The 2025 Sammamish City Council is considering proposed changes to the housing and commercial densities in the Sammamish Town Center project that were originally approved by the 2010 City Council.

The following chart from the draft 2007 Town Center Environmental Impact Statement outlines the four density options that were extensively discussed for Town Center by both the Planning Commission and City Council in the 2008 – 2010 time period.

The City Council adopted **Alternative 3** in 2010. **Alternative 1** is now under consideration.

Table 2-1. Sammamish Town Center Land Use Scenarios

Land Use	Alt 1 Commercial Focus	Alt 2 Low Intensity	Alt 3 Civic Focus	Alt 4 No-Action
Building Areas (1000 square feet)				
Commercial/Retail	385 – 415	150 – 175	185 – 215	0
Commercial/Office	65 – 85	0	115 – 130	0
Civic/Institutional ¹	90 – 110	50 – 70	180 – 200	20 -30
Open Space (acres)				
Public Parks	31	42	38	30
Streams, Wetlands & Buffers	60	60	60	60
Private Open Space ²	55	45	50	NA ³
Total Open Space ⁴	136	137	137	90
Housing Units				
Low Intensity				
Detached Single-Family	15 – 25	230 – 250	30 – 40	300 – 350
Townhouses	160 - 175	515 – 530	115 - 130	0
Medium Intensity				
Mid-rise Multi-family and Mixed-use (3 - 5-stories)	2,500 – 3,000	315 – 330	2,500 – 3,000	0
High Intensity				
High-rise Multi-family (12-stories)	485 – 515	0	0	0
Total Housing Units	3,000 – 4,000	1,000 – 1,500	2,500 – 3,000	300 - 350
Parking (1000 square feet)				
Surface Parking	275 – 325	200 – 250	400 – 450	0
Structured Parking	325 – 375	0	75 – 100	0
Total Public Parking	600 – 700	200 – 250	475 - 525	0

¹ Civic/institutional includes City Hall (~26,000 square feet) for all alternatives.

² The amount of private open space is dependant on numerous individual development decisions; these quantities are provided as working assumptions.

³ Open space under the No-Action Alternative is assumed to include existing parks, wetlands, and buffers.

⁴ Total open space does not equal the sum of open space types because some areas overlap.

It may be unlikely that very many people got the notice from the city last month requesting public input on the change to Alternative 1. There is only a requirement that this notice be distributed to the affected and immediate “neighborhood”. The current definition of the required notice area is very geographically limited. Others living outside must request to be notified (I did), most likely during a prior city open house on Town Center. It is likely that very few Sammamish residents have done this latter step (I did).

The Current Town Center Plan:

I was a member of the 2010 City Council. The 2010 Council’s decision was to approve Alternative 3 with a lower maximum housing unit limit of 2,000 living units. All alternatives were previously evaluated in considerable detail by both the Planning Commission and the City Council. At that time there was a concerted push by certain interests for adopting Alternative 1. This was rejected by the 2010 Council.

The current City Council is again considering changing to Alternative 1. This will result in a major increase in density and have an undesirable impact on current city residents in terms of both their quality of life and cost. It is a major shift in the project’s originally approved plan.

The Proposed Changes:

1. Building height would double to 12 stories – to 150 feet from the 75 foot current height limit.
2. Approximately 500 additional residential units would be added to the 2,500 – 3,000 permitted under the current plan (Alt. 3). This means 1500 – 2000 additional new residents in the middle of Sammamish.
3. Commercial retail space would increase by 100% from 200,000 to 400,000 square feet. Office space would change from a maximum of 85,000 sf. to 130,000 – up 53%. This is an added total possible increase of around 240,000 square feet – a combined 85% increase.
4. Civic use space would drop from a maximum of 200,000 sf. to as low as 90,000 – over 50%.
5. Retail space would go up 45%.
6. Public parking (for ALL uses) would increase by a lesser percentage – 30%, from 475-525 spaces to 600 – 700 spaces. This is for all users, including TC residents.
7. Vehicle movements in the immediate area and throughout much of Sammamish could increase by 5,000 to 10,000 daily trips above today’s volume levels.

Vehicular trip generation is generally calculated as 10/day/residential unit. It includes private cars, ride share vehicles as well as delivery activities like Amazon, UPS, door dash, plus other delivery trucks and service vehicles.

The increase in traffic from the proposed changes in Town Center density in Alternative 1 will negatively affect ALL SAMMAMISH RESIDENTS, not just those who will move here from elsewhere to occupy the new residential space.

Residents in the western two-thirds of the city will be particularly affected.

There are several major concerns with this revised plan. These issues need further study and serious discussion by a much broader community audience than has occurred thus far.

These issues include:

City Traffic:

The additional traffic from an enlarged Town Center will be largely concentrated mid-Sammamish on 228th, 212th, and SE 8th Streets but would also flow through the city especially on our northern and southern gateway roads which are already significantly congested at peak traffic times.

Before this revised project gets final approval, we need a better understanding of changes in future traffic volumes and flows in both the immediate Town Center vicinity and in the surrounding neighborhoods from Sahalee to Pine Lake.

Further study is needed.

To my knowledge, no additional trunk road capacity will be provided within Sammamish at any time in the foreseeable future. 228th Ave SE – the major conduit through the Town Center area – will likely be increasingly jammed. This road is already very congested in the mid-to-late afternoon on weekdays. An additional 5,000 to 10,000 daily vehicle trips created by the proposed TC plan changes will significantly extend the congestion period. This will negatively affect the quality of life for every resident of the City of Sammamish, particularly those living in the western 2/3 of the city.

- Any future expansion of 228th Avenue SE (if even feasible) and any other city roads would be prohibitively expensive and significantly strain city finances. Traffic during reconstruction would be awful for Sammamish residents and negative for businesses.
- The additional traffic volume resulting from increased density will further congest heavily used city access points to the north and south of the city. Plans for road improvements on these corridors have been on the city's Traffic Improvement Plan for years but have not been implemented nor are they likely to happen. They are also likely to continue to be cost prohibitive.

- The city's few major efforts at roadway improvements have been significantly over their original cost estimates and budgets. This has been a major factor in draining the city's financial reserves.
- If current and historical usage rates are any guide to the future, public transit is unlikely to be a significant factor in Sammamish in reducing the number of additional daily vehicle movements. The presence of light rail in Redmond will still require at least one – and possibly more – connections vs. driving directly in a car. This is a big disincentive, especially for upper income residents.
- King County Metro has historically been reluctant to add or significantly improve our existing bus service. Significant improvements need to be made to bus stop facilities (e.g. adding shelters and protected crosswalks) to make bus riding more desirable. There is no current plan for any kind of transit center in the Town Center zone.

Public Safety Considerations:

Both the commercial and residential areas in Town Center will require a different kind of policing and a disproportionate increase in staffing relative to the current city levels. Different and more costly – police and fire fighting resources will be needed to handle new policing and fire-fighting challenges.

Emergency response times will go up – even with the use of emergency lights and sirens – due to the increases in TC area traffic congestion, especially after full TC buildout.

- The increased building heights require different firefighting capabilities and much more expensive equipment than we have at Eastside Fire & Rescue today. Additional training will be needed across EF&R, and at least some crew sizes will have to increase. EMT personnel and equipment will likewise need to similarly increase.
- Fire trucks with ladders that can reach the top of a 12-story building will have to be procured. At least two (possibly more) such units will need to be purchased by EF&R notwithstanding mutual aid agreements with other fire agencies. The capital cost of these trucks is several million each. They also require bigger crews than our current 3-person crew size.
- An additional – or significantly enlarged – fire station may be needed to house these larger trucks and staff as well as to maintain response time standards in view of the increased traffic congestion.

Emergency Evacuations:

Recent experience in other parts of the US have shown that in the event of earthquakes, severe storms, and wildfires any large scale evacuations will be very difficult if not impossible due to the limited number of and relatively restricted capacities of the exit options from the Sammamish Plateau.

A major earthquake will likely result in major structural damage and/or loss of one or more of our major access roads. Fire and heavy wind often result in multiple road closures due to downed trees and utility poles.

Recent wildland fire experiences in Maui, Los Angeles, and other areas of California resulted in massive traffic jams on the highways. Our own recent windstorms have similarly highlighted the need for well-designed community access with the ability to handle large surges in traffic volume. Adding 6,000 to 8,000 more residents in a relatively small space in the center of Sammamish – as opposed to spreading them throughout the city – will severely overload the surrounding roads on a normal day and be totally chaotic in a mass evacuation event. Firefighting and emergency medical services may be very difficult or impossible to deliver under such conditions.

Schools and Parks:

An increase in Town Center density will generate significant additional children and further stress on our schools. The same is true for city parks and ball fields which will also be used by all Town Center residents.

The Sammamish schools already have the largest class sizes in the Lake Washington School District. The district will need to find additional facilities and resources to deal with the increase in students. The same may be said for our city's Parks department.

- New schools – with additional staff – come with a cost that will largely be borne by current Sammamish residents, not those who chose to move here in the future.
- Building any additional schools in the Town Center zone will only aggravate what promises to be an already bad traffic problem. No new schools should be built along 228th Avenue or almost any other major city arterial roadway.
- Sammamish sports fields for kids and adults are already overscheduled and facing pressure for additional access by the school districts. Many existing fields have already been converted to all-weather turf and that added capacity has already been absorbed by the community. Further conversion opportunities to increase overall playing hours availability are limited. In addition, existing sports field facilities have and will continue to be under neighborhood pressure to restrict nighttime use.

- Solutions in both cases will not be cheap. The added tax revenues collected from new arrivals plus school and parks impact fees from the developer are unlikely to come close to offsetting the added public cost of schools and parks.

Water and Sewage:

Demand for potable water will increase and add to water demands and potential storage needs. Both water districts indicate there is currently a sufficient supply. However, the density increases proposed for Town Center will require water supply above what was previously identified in utility plans per water district management.

Similarly, the additional sewage generated will add to further stress on the local system which has already needed to make local capacity improvements due to the regional system not providing adequate conveyance to our local sewer districts. The planned diversion line to King County's Brightwater sewage treatment plant has now been delayed until 2037 by King County. Current Sammamish sewage capacity will need to be evaluated based upon how and where the developer plans to discharge sewage. Additional capacity may need to be added to accommodate the additional demands from the increase in Town Center housing units. This may result in another building moratorium.

Adding significant additional sewage capacity will be very costly. Depending upon where King County chooses to locate the Sammamish Plateau Diversion, this work may require digging up and then replacing a good deal the East Lake Sammamish Parkway or East Lake Sammamish Trail, further increasing total project cost.

Is this affordable? Unlikely.

Storm Water Runoff Effects on Lake Sammamish:

The Town Center is at the headwaters of both the Ebright and Zackuse Creeks, two of the best remaining spawning streams for the Kokanee Salmon. The Lake Sammamish Kokanee is a threatened sockeye salmon subspecies that is genetically unique and largely found only in Lake Sammamish.

The two streams also host a significant year-round resident trout population.

The City of Sammamish – through its sponsorship of the Kokanee Work Group – a collaboration between the City of Sammamish, the Snoqualmie tribe, King County, plus the State of Washington and other local communities – has spent many hundreds of thousands of dollars in efforts to sustain the Kokanee salmon in our watershed. This effort of over 15 years is showing positive results and should not be endangered by development.

Large variations in runoff are very harmful for all salmon and trout and will add significantly to the survival challenges for the endangered Lake Sammamish Kokanee and our region's financial investment in sustaining our Kokanee population. The potential for increased stream "flashiness" will rise in direct proportion to the amount and frequency of runoff from hard

surfaces in this area. Dry season normal stream flow rates may also decline, perhaps substantially, due to more limited ground water recharge. Large, paved surface areas also increase typical stream temperatures – also not a good thing for salmon and trout.

Additionally, the growth in vehicle trips will increase the pollutants dropped onto city roads. Some of these – such as brake lining materials and 6PPDQ from tire dust – are fatal to native salmon and trout species – and increase stream and lake pollution. This is already a significant ecological issue. An increase in the scope of the Town Center will only aggravate the problems for the fish.

Limitations on Future Sammamish Growth:

It has been suggested in the past by certain people who favor the higher Town Center densities that this is a way the city can handle ALL of its future growth requirements arising from King County growth objectives.

This is false.

Future city growth cannot legally be restricted to just the Town Center area.

Courts regularly side with the property owner in allowing this infill development in contested situations. We will not stop normally organic development and higher density redevelopment from occurring elsewhere in the City of Sammamish by increasing the Town Center densities from that approved in 2010. That theory is wishful thinking and unrealistic.

Many lots in the city already have higher density underlying zoning with lower as-built densities. These are subject to redevelopment pressure by both current owners and developers. Other owners will seek to have their properties rezoned to allow higher densities, again for personal financial reasons.

The Impact on City Finances:

The Town Center, contrary to what some believe or say, will not be revenue positive for the city. It is NOT the answer to the city's current financial challenges. The added – and different – policing and firefighting requirements will be major future increased cost drivers. **THE TOWN CENTER PROJECT IS and WILL REMAIN FINANCIALLY NEGATIVE FOR SAMMAMISH! The Council – and the current residents of Sammamish – should not approve this proposed revised plan.**

We need a much more inclusive and robust city-wide review and discussion of these many significant issues and any possible alternatives. Remaining with the current plan limits and conditions is the best option.

Who Really Benefits?

This project will financially benefit a very small number of people who may or may not be city residents. **The people who will really gain from the proposed changes to the Town Center Project are the Town Center developers. It will NOT be the vast majority of the current Sammamish population!**

An expanded Town Center will to a large degree likely serve people who do not live here today. The proposed increase in population will significantly stress current city transportation, public safety, school, and water district resources. It will not prevent or limit future building and development activity elsewhere in the city. It will just further increase our density and add to future city ongoing expenses. This is a real cost to those of us who live here now.

Concurrency – the standard for provision of services to the public – by their government does not just apply to traffic. It relates to the adequacy of the provision of all aspects of civic services and infrastructure to the public. It is doubtful that Sammamish will meet those standards given these proposed Town Center changes.

The result will also be a very significantly different – and degraded – quality of life in Sammamish from that currently enjoyed by our current residents – and voters.

Perhaps any decision to revise the current Sammamish Town Center plan should best be put to a vote by the current residents of the City of Sammamish so they can have their say in the matter. After all, *Sammamish is their community.*

Our quality of life – today and in the future - is the real issue here.

This proposed change should not go forward.

Tom Odell

**Former Mayor and City Council Member
City of Sammamish**

Sammamish resident since 1989

Town Center Public Comments Summary
Feb 18 City Council Meeting - Agenda Item 8, Exhibit 3: Pages 97 - 167
Summarized by Tom Odell

Following below are summaries of all 200 comments received through the JotForm entitled SEPA and Scoping Comments for the Town Center Plan and Code Amendment Project submitted by the public before the end of the 21 day comment period ending 5:00 pm on Jan 29, 2025 as printed on Pages 97 - 167 in Exhibit 3 of the Feb 18, 2025 City Council Meeting Packet.

Commenter #	For	Against	Neutral	Basic Comments
1		1		Concerned about congestion. crowding, expense, surface water, fire and emergency issues
2	1			Wants additional/affordable housing, city-wide survey of needs.
3		1		Opposed to new heights and density, concerned about traffic gridlock.
4			1	Concerned about comp plan alignment.
5		1		Congestion and traffic concerns.
6		1		Multiple concerns/issues.
7		1		Traffic/congestion on 228th.
8		1		Congestion/schools overcrowding.
9	1			Believes density should be increased.
10		1		Multiple concerns.
11			1	Concerns in certain areas.
12		1		Multiple issues - infrastructure, environmental, etc. Affordable units unrealistic.
13		1		Multiple issues - infrastructure, environmental, etc. Affordable units unrealistic.
14			1	Primarily commented on TDRs.
15	1			Commentor is STCA.
16		1		Traffic, emergency, environmental, crowding, school impacts....
17		1		Against building height increase. Impact on schools, traffic, infrastructure.
18			1	Wanted to be added to list for future notifications for this project.
19		1		Building heights concerns + inadequate roads.
20		1		Against building heights increase. Does not want to become Bellevue.
21			1	Sammamish Plateau Water comment - requesting to be kept in loop. Concerns about adequate sewer/water capacity.
22		1		Opposed to higher buildings.
23		1		Multiple areas of concern.
24		1		Multiple areas of concern.
25			1	Snoqualmie Tribe comments
26		1		Keep TDRs. No density increase beyond 2000 units.
27		1		Density and negative environment impacts.
28	1			Don Gerend comment. Keep TDR program; allow 8000 units.
29		1		Traffic congestion, schools impact.
30		1		Increase in density, environment negatively impacted, 150'building heights should not be allowed
31		1		Infrastructure concerns, view impact, shading
32		1		No action - congestion, traffic, view
33		1		High rise buildings not compatible with the city ambiance
34		1		Opposed to height and density increase.
35		1		Slap in the face of residents who participated in current plan development.
36		1		No increase in building height/size - due to infrastructure impact.
37		1		20 year resident. Community impact - crowding, traffic, community character.
38		1		Road congestion, crowded schools, disruption from construction. Need to prioritize current residents.
39	1			Wants vibrant Town Center.
40		1		Community impact - schools, traffic, overall environment.
41			1	Wants to know what amenities will be available (to general public)
42		1		20 year resident. Community impact - crowding, traffic, community character.
43		1		Traffic. Safety concerns for kids and elderly in immediate area.
44		1		Need further study of infrastructure. Community should vote on it.
45			1	"Duping your constituency" on impact and benefits.
46		1		Traffic on 228th.
47		1		No building height increase.
48		1		Community should vote on any changes.
49		1		Opposes increased building height. Eyesore.
50		1		Too many units and too much traffic. Stop yielding to developer interests.
51		1		20+ year resident. Put residents ahead of developers. Too much traffic etc.
52		1		Keep original plan. 228th already crowded. Emergency egress from Plateau concerns.
53		1		Crowding concerns. No unit increase. Current residents will have to pay for solutions.
54		1		Too much congestion on 228th TODAY.
55		1		10 storey building too high for Sammamish. Detracts from city image.
56		1		14 year resident. Keep Sammamish as is - leep current plan.
57		1		228th crowding. Additional density and fixes have negative impact on existing city residents.
58		1		Impact on schools and roads.
59		1		No height increase.
60		1		Council not concerned about beauty of the city. Lack of adequate infrastructure. Impact on disaster evacuation and environment.
61		1		Against height increase.
62		1		Concerned about impact on city resources.

Town Center Public Comments Summary
Feb 18 City Council Meeting - Agenda Item 8, Exhibit 3: Pages 97 - 167
Summarized by Tom Odell

Commenter #	For	Against	Neutral	Basic Comments
63		1		Community should vote on change. No real plan to improve and fix infrastructure. Congestion will degrade city quality.
64		1		Opposed to major departure from original TC plan. Overall negative community impact.
65		1		Traffic increase, evacuation in emergency.
66		1		25+ year resident. Keep original TC plan. No height increase or add'l units. Impact on city character.
67		1		10 story buildings incompatible with city character.
68		1		Don't become Redmond or Bellevue. Don't try to be a big city.
69		1		Concerned about negative traffic/schools impact.
70		1		8 year resident. Keep 2008 TC plan. New plan has too many negative impacts.
71		1		Don't emulate Redmond. Keep city character as is.
72		1		No unit increase. Crime and traffic concerns.
73		1		Opposed. Residents should decide, not developers.
74		1		Negative effects on infrastructure, green spaces, traffic, schools.
75		1		39 year resident. Proposal inconsistent with character of Sammamish. Negative effects: traffic, schools, environmental safety issues, city services.
76		1		Issues: traffic, infrastructure inadequacies, school overcrowding, loss of green space.
77		1		Issues: unmanageable traffic growth, overburdened community services, school crowding, environment negatively affected.
78		1		5 year resident. Strongly opposed: height and density increases. Keep original plan. Align growth with needs and values of current city residents.
79		1		Strongly opposed to changes to TC plan. Height increase devalues views for others. Local roads and egress options already stressed.
80		1		Brixton HOA opposed. Traffic congestion, school overcrowding, strained infrastructure and city services, negative impact on community character.
81		1		Roads will not support. Project neither needed nor wanted.
82		1		28 year Sammamish resident. 15 story buildings ruin city character and 4000 more units too much for already bad traffic.
83		1		Also a 28 year resident. 15 story buildings ruin city character and 4000 more units too much for already bad traffic.
84		1		Roads cannot handle the traffic increase.
85		1		Evacuation concerns. Already have basic infrastructure issues. Concerns re maintaining current quality of life.
86		1		Evacuation concerns. No 10 story buildings. Already have basic infrastructure and schools issues. Concerns re maintaining current quality of life.
87	1			Long time TC resident. Pushed for relaxed regulations for development.
88		1		Traffic and infrastructure
89		1		Environmental mitigation lacking, safety/evacuation, traffic/parking, street standards, population decline. Building height. Only developers benefit.
90		1		Many questions and concerns consistent with other respondents.
91	1			Wants a concert/convention hall!
92		1		Drastic change to character of the community with urban congestion worsening. Infrastructure stress, additional pollution, decreased quality of life.
93		1		30+ year homeowner. Against additional height and density altering community character. Stick with 2008 plan.
94		1		No to 4,000 housing units in TC.
95		1		Stick w/original plan. Wants less crowding/density than developers want.
96		1		Disputes SEPA checklist. Housing not "affordable" within Sammamish and won't be. Negative effect on environment.
97		1		27 year Sammamish homeowner strongly opposed to changes to plan. Honour the original plan.
98		1		Proposed changes totally irresponsible. Existing problems not easily fixable, changes would worsen the problems/
99	1			Former Planning Commissioner - favors added density.
100		1		Strongly opposed. Lack of public notification. Strain on city of proposed changes.
101		1		Stress on city services, infrastructure character. Don't let developers drive.
102		1		Public transportation not solving traffic growth. Road system is/will be inadequate.
103		1		Long time resident. Opposed to drastic departure from original plan. Honour original plan.
104		1		Keep current plan limits. Ecological concerns.
105		1		Keep current plan limits. Traffic and esthetic concerns..
106		1		Adamately opposed. Challenged large number of non-applicable SEPA claims. Wildlife and fish impact.
107		1		Adequacy of city infrastructure/services, esp the road network. Lack of public transportation. And geophysical issues affecting egress. Quality of life.
108		1		Environmental impac. Traffic. Schools.
109		1		No taller buildings. Do not be another Bellevue or Redmond.
110		1		Strongly opposed to density increase.
111		1		15 year resident. Increased congestion and cost to fix. Disaster evacuation. 10 stories is an eyesore.
112		1		"Don't you fucking Dare!"
113		1		Resident since 1974. Will be an election issue thei fall. Firmly opposed.
114		1		Homeowner strongly opposed. Likes the 2008 plan - not the revised one. Financial and other impacts on city.
115		1		Cannot accommodate 4000 more people. Emergency exits inadequate.
116		1		Schools already beyond capacity.
117		1		Put community safety and sustainability ahead of profit. Do not have the infrastructure.
118		1		"Absolutely NOT!" Sammamish is an island. Do not need more cars.
119		1		"This will ruin the city."
120		1		Stay with 2008 plan limits.

Town Center Public Comments Summary
Feb 18 City Council Meeting - Agenda Item 8, Exhibit 3: Pages 97 - 167
Summarized by Tom Odell

Commenter #	For	Against	Neutral	Basic Comments
121		1		Current infrastructure inadwquate for the proposed changes.
122		1		Traffic, city budget impacts.
123		1		Gateway roads from Redmond and Issaquah are already struggling.
124		1		Lack of infrastructure; keep open green spaces; maintain city character.
125		1		"Keep Sammamish a good place to live for the peoplewho already live here by investing in necessary infrastructure and capital projects FIRST!"
126			1	Wants to have future notifications for project. Lives in adjacent area.
127		1		Keep Sammamish the way it is for those who moved here for it.
128		1		Plenty of building opportunities elsewhere in the city Already ahead of growth targets. High rises will change city character.
129		1		Comparison with Paradise, CA fire safety issues.
130		1		10+ year homeowner strongly opposed. Multiple reasons
131		1		14 year resident. Supports 2008 plan, multiple concerns about changes.
132		1		Traffic
133		1		No
134		1		20 year resident. Community impact - crowding, traffic, community character.
135		1		Infrastructure cannot support further major development. Geography/terrain limitations
136		1		30+ year homeowner strongly opposed. Multiple concerns.
137		1		20 year resident wants to stay with 2008 plan due to impact of revised proposal.
138		1		Infrastructure deficiencies.
139		1		Traffic problems with no effective plans to fix.
140		1		No 10+ story buildings.
141		1		No 10+ story buildings.
142		1		Traffic proplems today will be worse.
143		1		Schools and public services already under pressure - will get worse. Current traffic and lack of emergency exits.
144		1		Alteration of community character. Serious degradation in traffic. Loss of small town feel. Lower quality of life.
145		1		Build infrastructure before housing.
146		1		"City can't hold more traffic or people that it already has. Stop the greed."
147		1		"Our current infrastructure does not support the original plan, and it won't support the amended plan."
148		1		"Our roads and schools can't handle what we have now."
149		1		This proposal is a drastic departure from the original vision presented to residents and threatens to irreversably alter the character of our community."
150		1		40 year homeowner. Quality of life and nature of the community. Infrastructure strain, traffic congestion, public services, etc.
151		1		150' building heights inconsistent with city ambiance.
152			1	??
153		1		10 year homeowner. Change is major departure from original concept and will irreversably negatively impact the city's character. Retain original plan.
154		1		25+ year homeowner. Roads and other civic services already under pressure. 2008 plan more balanced & should be kept.
155		1		20+ year homeowner. Retain original plan for multiple reasons.
156		1		No. Lack of public transport, crowded schools and roads.
157		1		Strongly oppose changes for multiple reasons.
158		1		Roads do not support proposed changes.
159		1		10 year resident. New proposal a big change to nature of the city and original plan. Keep old plan.
160		1		Makes more sense for Redmond and Issaquah to take additional growth given better infrastructure and terrain.
161		1		30+ year homeowner likes 2008 plan. New proposal has multiple issues.
162		1		Infrastructure lacking.
163		1		No
164		1		No buildings higher than the trees.
165		1		Traffic and inadequate road capacity.
166		1		20+ year homeowner. Retain original plan for multiple reasons.
167			1	
168		1		Insufficient infrastructure.
169		1		Insufficient school capacity.
170		1		Moved here for village feel. This development incompatible with that
171		1		Limit building heights to 3-5 stories.
172		1		Poor road design and limits. Emergency evacuation concerns.
173		1		Traffic already horrendous.
174			1	Wants a walkable downtown like Issaquah or Redmond.
175		1		Higher buildings are incompatible with bedroom community.
176			1	Assumes the city could protect wild and human life and that city budget will provide all necessary services.
177		1		Increased density in small location complicates safety and traffic issues. Need to focus on quality of life for current residents. Greed?
178		1		Blasted city council
179		1		Build infrastructure and community services first.
180		1		Concened that tax revenue will be less than expenses.
181			1	
182			1	Lawyer w/clients concerned about development application process.

Town Center Public Comments Summary
Feb 18 City Council Meeting - Agenda Item 8, Exhibit 3: Pages 97 - 167
Summarized by Tom Odell

Commenter #	For	Against	Neutral	Basic Comments
183		1		Impact on already crowded schools.
184			1	Other city's planner comments.
185			1	Wants more info.
186		1		Fire and evacuation concerns. Other city infrastructure lacking.
187		1		Multiple issues with financial burden on existing city residents.
188			1	Multiple EIS issues.
189		1		Infrastructure, fire danger, roads adequacy.
190	1			Likes plan, concern about infrastructure.
191			1	
192	1			Likes plan and added housing.
193		1		Streets inadequate for traffic. Schools overcrowded already. Evacuation plans lacking.
194		1		Traffic. Schools overcrowded now.
195		1		Traffic and inadequate infrastructure. Wildfire evacuation.
196		1		Increased traffic congestion. Water and sewer systems already at capacity.
197		1		% of 4000 units actually affordable. How much add'l traffic. Traffic mitigation measure adequacy.
198		1		City infrastructure does not support 4000 additional units.
199			1	Wants more info.
200	1			Wants more residential.
Total Commenters	For	Against	Neutral	
200	11	169	20	
	5.50%	84.50%	10.00%	