

Edgemoor Neighborhood Questionnaire Report

Introduction

In order to obtain community input in preparation for the updating of the Edgemoor Neighborhood Plan the Edgemoor Neighborhood Association conducted an opinion survey of the entire neighborhood. A questionnaire with a stamped, addressed return envelope was sent out via U.S. mail to all residents, renters and owners within the neighborhood. Addresses were obtained from county tax records.

This is brief report on the tabulated results obtained by compiling the answers to the questionnaire which were returned to the Association.

From a total of 949 questionnaires sent out 402 were completed and returned, which makes for a response rate of 42.4 %. This high response makes the survey statistically very significant.

Another 30 forms, arriving after the deadline, brought the response rate to 45.5 % but only their comments were used.

Results

Attached are summary sheets of the survey results by district and overall total. Here are some of the highlights of the survey:

(circled numbers indicate the question number in the questionnaire.)

- (2) 98 % of respondents own their property, only 2 % rent.
- (3) 55.8% of the respondents have lived in the neighborhood for over 10 years with a significant 26% who have lived in the neighborhood for over 20 years.
- (4) 80% of the residents run, walk or bicycle in the neighborhood every week and 21% who use the streets for other than driving every day.
- (5) 89% of respondents do not have children or whose children do not walk to school.
- (6) On the question what features to preserve:
 - 22 % gave top priority to "Quiet Residential Character"
 - 20% gave top priority to "Single Family Zoning"
 - 17 % rated "Preservation of Views" their top priority
 - 15 % gave top rating to "Preservation of Natural Features.
 - (for the remaining 26 % see summary "what to preserve".
 Respondents were asked to rank order their choices as to which of the characteristics of the neighborhood from a list of eight items of planning significance they felt were important to preserve and to enhance. We were

hampered in our analysis since many of the respondents did not do the rank ordering while others did. However, of those who did do the rank ordering, the items with the highest ranking in sequential order from most listed first included Quiet Residential Character with a weighted rank order of 21.94%, Single Family Zoning (19.90), Views (16.63%) and Natural Features with 15.41%.

- (7) Characteristics to improve included the same items in another order with views (16.68%), Natural Features (15.57%), Quiet Residential Character (15.36% and Single Family Zoning (13.91%. It is worth noting that on a rank order basis 12.89% felt that Public Safety should be improved and 11.89% felt that Waterfront Access should be improved.
See the Appendix for further explanation of these items.
- (8) 89 % of respondents agree that Edgemoor should remain zoned “Single Family Residential” (80.4 % strongly agree, 8.5% somewhat agree)
- (9) On the question as to whether the City policies adequately protect views, 33% of the respondents were neutral and 46.67% disagreed, 25% strongly.
- (10) As to height limits on houses, 57% of the respondents generally felt the 35 ft. height limit was adequate.
- (11) Question 11 asked of the resident felt that new development should be “In Harmony of Scale”. No definition was given for the term “Harmony of Scale” but 82% of the respondents agreed.
- (12) On the subject of better enforcement of maximum dwelling size:
65 % voted for strict enforcement of the present maximum size of 5,500 sq.ft.
8 % voted for no size limit
24 % voted for a size limit of 4,00 sq.ft.
Taken together these numbers are a clear vote against Megahomes. (89 %)
- (13) “Infill” did not get much of a favorable vote with 42.1 % strongly against and 19.5 % against for a 61.6 % against.
- (14) “Preservation of Views or Trees” got a 52.8 % vote for “Balance” and another 19.4 % for favoring views over trees.
- (15) “Minimum Removal of Trees for Optimum Dwelling Placement”
39.8 % of respondents strongly agreed and 22.0 % somewhat agreed for a total of 61.8 %. Only 22.8 % disagreed strongly or somewhat with the concept.
Questions arose concerning what was meant by this question which asked if optimum placement of a dwelling should take removal of trees into account so it was possible to see the question in a variety of ways. We think that a positive response indicates a concern to preserve trees where possible or at least to take their preservation into account.

- (16) 16% of respondents thought that Adequate Recreational Opportunities were not available to Edgemoor residents. Comments indicated the importance of opportunities in adjacent neighborhoods.
- (17) 42% of residents voted that Provisions for Waterfront Access are inadequate (“poor”) for Edgemoor.
- (18) A mass of data was gathered concerning the public facilities of Edgemoor which were listed as “Sidewalks, Streets, Lighting, Intersections and Pedestrians Safety”. Questions were not asked concerning other public facilities such as storm sewers, water, electricity and gas service. Of those asked, 49% voted sidewalks “Poor”, 45% voted pedestrian safety “poor”, but the majority of all items were voted to be “good” or “adequate”.
- (19) The response to the questions concerning sidewalk improvements were strongly influenced by the district in which the respondent lives. Respondents in district 1 voted strongly for the addition of a sidewalk on Bayside from Hawthorn to Acacia. The overall top choice was for the extension of a sidewalk on Fieldston from Hawthorn to Willow.
- (20) The response to the question concerning the adequacy of 12th, Chuckanut, Hawthorn et al intersection overall was 13% “good”, 52% “adequate” and 35% “poor”.
- (20A) Details about the intersection design included a 31% response indicating capacity and but a 3% response concerning lighting. Comments indicated concern that additional development, particularly of housing on Fairhaven Highlands would overload the intersection and that now a lane is need on the northbound approach on Chuckanut.
- (21) Of the details concerning the 12th Street Bridge, again the question of capacity was paramount with 48% of respondents voting it as “poor”
- (22) The Chuckanut Ridge Development question drew a strong reaction. 73.6 % of respondents disapproved of the project, while 12.0 % approved and 14.4 % stayed neutral. Although the development would not be part of the Edgemoor district, many people made comments expressing concern about traffic congestion spilling over into Edgemoor via Viewcrest Street (the only exit other than Chuckanut Drive from a development planned for 750 dwelling units). Also much concern was expressed about capacity and age of the 12th Street bridge on Chuckanut Drive.
- (23) A Chuckanut Ridge park instead of the housing development drew 58.4 % approval with no alternative of significance identified.

Conclusion

A primary conclusion to be drawn from this survey is that the residents of Edgemoor are generally satisfied with the existing conditions in the neighborhood. However, the majority of respondents (who may represent an unprecedentedly high proportion of the residents of any neighborhood) are concerned about the proliferation of mega-houses, infill, the lack of sidewalks and the potential for traffic congestion due to the development of Chuckanut Ridge/Fairhaven Highlands/100 Acre Wood (particularly at the 12th Street Bridge intersection).

Appendix

Questions 6. and 7. asked the respondents to rank order their choices. Some of the respondents had difficulty with this since they ranked all their answers as first priority, in fact, there was a wide variety of the rank ordered responses. The rank ordering was designed so that a mention of any of the items would be given a significance relative to its rank. For our analysis, a rank of 1 was given a significance of 8, a rank of 2 was given a significance of 7 and so on so that a rank of 8 (least important) was given a significance of 1. Each of the items was then ordered by the sum of all the significances attributed to that item. The result is a weighted significance for each item and has been so reported.

Clearly, many of the respondents did not recognize the need to prioritize their selections on questions 6. and 7. which concerned the feature of the neighborhood which they most wished to preserve and which they wished to improve. However, among those who simply checked their selections the overwhelming response to the features to preserve (105) was the quiet residential character of the neighborhood followed by single family zoning (92) views (80) and natural features (71). In question 7, the response was lighter but followed a similar pattern with votes for views (52), quiet residential character (46), natural features (44) and single family zoning. Affordable housing was not in the running.

Note that the complete tabulated results of Questionnaire are included in this report by reference including comments.

- Attachment:**
1. Questionnaire Results tabulation
 2. Comments on Questionnaire returns