

RESULTS OF APRIL 2017 OPEN HOUSES  
PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED\*  
(recorded 6/21/17)

WHAT ASPECTS OF ANY OF THE SCENARIOS DO YOU PARTICULARLY LIKE?

- compact development/higher density (12)
- development that facilitates active (pedestrian/bicycle) transportation and transit use (10)
- containment of urban sprawl (5)
- more commercial development near residential neighborhoods (including “Apartmentland” [multiple apartment complexes in the Merman Dr./Terre View Dr. area]) (3)
- development of the Pullman-Moscow corridor area (2)
- preservation of farmland (2)
- sufficient housing variety
- plentiful opportunities for commercial land use
- mix of residential/commercial/industrial in all four of the city’s quadrants
- mixed residential density in College Hill Core
- practical industrial corridors
- protection of College Hill Core from high density residential development to protect remaining charm of this neighborhood
- relative clarity of scenarios/ease of comparison
- provision of ample low density residential land to meet the needs of the city’s expanding population

WHAT ASPECTS OF ANY OF THE SCENARIOS DO YOU PARTICULARLY DISLIKE?

- allowing for additional development in the Pullman-Moscow corridor—the city should attempt to retain the pastoral appearance of the corridor and direct development to the urban core (9)
- emphasis on high density residential areas, especially in the College Hill Core (concern regarding land use conflicts between neighbors) (9)
- residential development too dispersed and sprawling in some scenarios—doesn’t facilitate active transportation (8)
- industrial development south of SR 270 would have an impact on Chipman Trail users (4)
- lack of open space and greenways represented (4)
- industrial development along Park Street problematic due to flooding and poor appearance (2)
- too much residential development designated near the airport (2)
- need more convenient commercial services near residential areas
- need more mixed use (commercial/residential) areas

\*Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of times the comment was mentioned.

- lack of water/sewer lines in corridor area is a concern
- pedestrian/bicycle routes are not shown on the maps
- industrial/commercial land use along transportation corridors presents a poor appearance
- no design review standards presented to accommodate increased density
- expansion of industrial land use in the area outside the city limits west of the wastewater treatment plant would disturb that picturesque valley and its pedestrian/bicycle trail opportunities
- the addition of industrial land use along SR 27 north of the existing Port Industrial Park would interfere with the pleasant landscape there

IN GENERAL, IS THERE ONE SCENARIO FOR ACCOMMODATING COMMUNITY GROWTH THAT YOU PREFER OVER THE OTHERS? PLEASE IDENTIFY (A, B, OR C), INCLUDING ANY REASONS FOR YOUR SELECTION.

- SCENARIO B (18 votes)
  - REASONS:
    - promotes compact development
    - facilitates active transportation
    - focuses on the city center
    - minimizes Pullman-Moscow corridor development
    - more efficient / less costly infrastructure overall
  - CAVEATS:
    - College Hill cannot successfully accommodate increased density
    - scenario needs more open spaces and greenways to make it work
- SCENARIO C (10 votes)
  - REASONS:
    - expansion toward Moscow makes good sense
    - provides for medium density in College Hill Core
    - takes advantage of existing corridor transportation facilities
    - would bring investment and jobs to the city
    - fairly compact development
    - facilitates active transportation
    - provides for sufficient housing variety
    - expansion of housing with commercial nearby would increase the sense of community
- SCENARIO A (2 votes)
  - REASONS:
    - provides ample land for low density housing in quiet, pleasant neighborhoods with some “elbow room”
  - CAVEATS:
    - consider more industrial land use around airport, more high density residential land use north of the airport and along Bishop Boulevard, and more low density residential land use in the Pullman-Moscow corridor

- COMBINATION OF SCENARIOS B AND C (2 votes)
  - REASONS:
    - allows for a more sustainable community with a clear and deep respect for the environment
  - CAVEAT:
    - consider the addition of more commercial land use in the Pullman-Moscow corridor

WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES YOU BELIEVE PULLMAN IS FACING WITH RESPECT TO GROWTH IN THE COMMUNITY?

- traffic congestion, particularly in the downtown area (need other route options [e.g., bypasses]) (20)
- retain the small town character of Pullman (7)
- encourage densification to facilitate pedestrian/bicycle travel and use of public transit (7)
- provide for a sustainable water supply (6)
- parking availability (3)
- emphasize greenways/waterways (3)
- develop land in a more environmentally friendly, sustainable fashion (3)
- provide for sufficient variety of housing in type and cost (2)
- as airport expands, attempt to limit noise impacts for community (2)
- account for impacts to historic resources and established neighborhoods (2)
- plan green spaces and neighborhoods for families (2)
- establish ample shopping opportunities close to all residential areas (2)
- promote mixed use neighborhoods (2)
- create adequate housing for seniors
- require dedication of parkland, or a fee in lieu of, with each new residential development
- reduce conflicts between long-term residents and others in the community
- accommodate student housing in the vicinity of the WSU campus
- promoting growth while maintaining a small town atmosphere requires designing new developments around people, not cars
- need for infrastructure to accommodate compact growth
- need for increased services as areas become increasingly dense (e.g., sidewalks, code enforcement, complete streets)
- protect corridor from development
- attract more entertainment-related businesses
- use of R1 zones for rental housing
- reinvigorate downtown
- provide for sufficient waste water treatment for a growing population
- emphasize quality over quantity (i.e., need design review standards)

## OTHER COMMENTS:

- establish commercial services in close proximity to residential neighborhoods
- develop more green spaces
- protect historic resources in the community
- plan for a 20-year time horizon rather than 50 years (to account for new techniques and efficiencies)
- add open space to compensate for increased housing density
- designate airport as industrial rather than commercial
- develop ring roads to reduce downtown traffic congestion
- along streams, provide for greenways rather than industrial corridors
- keep the safe, small town feel of Pullman
- abate ugly buildings in the city (e.g., Mimosa)
- keep the urban growth area relatively small
- implement a “percent-for-art” program to help incorporate art in community projects
- establish a satellite development—a self-contained live/work/play area detached from the city proper but connected by transit
- promote mixed use areas, especially downtown and on College Hill
- build neighborhoods instead of mono-functional sprawl / include pathways in all developments
- increase the number of travel lanes on Grand Avenue from Paradise Street to Davis Way
- consider development in the area north of Davis Way and east of SR 195 for variable density housing with commercial development
- develop a plan to implement complete streets
- College Hill is already being re-developed to its maximum allowable density, with little variation in types of housing offered
- schools and parks should be planned
- recent renegeing of trail building by developers tells citizens that the city cares more about developers than residents’ quality of life
- new growth best placed west and south of SR 195 and north of Military Hill near new Kamiak Elementary School
- establish large parks at the outset of development
- need more visible art everywhere
- make development attractive and commercial areas accessible
- facilitate growth on the north end of town to take advantage of SEL growth / more employees leads to growth in housing and shopping opportunities
- promote more commercial land use on the north side of the city
- connect new development with downtown by means of well-designed trails
- make it easier to recruit new businesses through well-designed shopping and industrial areas
- the city would benefit from having a central gathering place—a downtown community center
- add sidewalks/pathways in every residential area
- maintain existing commercial development on College Hill (e.g., taverns on Colorado Street)
- is it assumed that Pullman will grow rather than contract?

- if the community fills its large urban growth area with only residential development, it becomes much harder to encourage a vibrant downtown, and maintain our historic, walkable neighborhoods
- encourage more involvement in the community from all sectors (city, WSU, students, businesses, residents, etc.)
- when new major public facilities (e.g., schools, fire stations, hospitals) are being considered, the city should bring together all applicable parties to address appropriate location, access, utilities, etc. for the proposed development
- need to balance high density residential areas with sufficient low density residential land that offers housing in quiet, pleasant neighborhoods
- consider pedestrian/bicycle routes in a “cloverleaf of trail connectivity” to serve the neighborhoods of Pullman’s four major hills