

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR COLUMBIA COUNTY, OREGON

In the Matter of the Application of the City of Columbia)
City for a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment) ORDINANCE NO. 2004-3
from Forest Resource and Rural Residential to Urban)
Growth Boundary)

The Board of County Commissioners for Columbia County, Oregon, ordains as follows:

SECTION 1. TITLE.

This Ordinance shall be known as Ordinance No. 2004-3.

SECTION 2. AUTHORITY.

This Ordinance is adopted pursuant to ORS 203.035, and 197.610 to 197.615.

SECTION 3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Ordinance is to approve the application of the City of Columbia City for a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment from Forest Resource and Rural Residential to Urban Growth Boundary on various property locations surrounding the City of Columbia City on approximately 71.37 acres having the following tax account numbers:

- | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 5128-000-00200 | 5128-040-01800 | 5128-024-0300 |
| 5128-024-00100 | 5128-024-00101 | 5128-024-00200 |
| 5128-024-00201 | 5128-024-00400 | 5128-040-01600 |
| 5218-040-01601 | 5128-040-01700 | 5128-040-01900 |
| 5128-040-02000 | 5128-040-02100 | 5128-040-02200 |
| 5128-040-02300 | 5128-040-02400 | 5128-042-03100 |
| 5128-040-02500 | 5133-020-00100 | 5133-020-00101 |
| 5133-020-00102 | 5133-020-00500. | |

SECTION 4. HISTORY

The City of Columbia City has completed a Buildable Lands Inventory which indicated that the lands within the City's existing Urban Growth Boundary are inadequate to provide needed housing for the City's projected 20 year growth period. Based on the Buildable Lands Inventory, the City applied for a Comprehensive Plan Map amendment from Forest Resource and Rural Residential to Urban Growth Boundary on June 8, 2003. The Columbia County Planning Commission held a hearing in the matter on September 8, 2003, to determine whether to recommend approval of the application to the Board of County Commissioners. After hearing testimony, receiving evidence, and deliberating, the Columbia County Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the application to the Board of County

Commissioners. On September 12, 2003, Jeffrey VanNatta, Planning Commission Chair, signed Final Order PA 03-08, recommending approval of the application.

SECTION 5. FINDINGS.

- A. The Board of County Commissioners adopts findings of fact and conclusions of law #1-6, and 8-22, contained in the Staff Report of the Department of Land Development Services dated January 6, 2004, a copy of which is attached hereto as Attachment A, and is incorporated herein by this reference.
- B. The Board of County Commissioners adopts supplemental findings of fact and conclusions of law which are attached hereto as Attachment B, and are incorporated herein by this reference.

SECTION 6. AMENDMENT AND AUTHORIZATION.

- A. The Columbia County Comprehensive Plan Map designation for the 71.37 acres hereby changed from Forest Resource and Rural Residential to Urban Growth Boundary, as set forth in Attachment C which is attached hereto and is incorporated herein by this reference.
- B. The Columbia County Comprehensive Plan, Part IV, Forest Lands, is hereby amended to include the Exception to Goal 4 which is attached hereto as Attachment D, and is incorporated herein by this reference.
- C. The Columbia County Comprehensive Plan, Part IX, Urbanization, is hereby amended to include the Goal 14 Urbanization Analysis which is attached hereto as Attachment E, and is incorporated herein by this reference.

DATED this 11th day of February, 2004.

Approved as to Form

By: Sarah T. Powell
Office of County Counsel

Recording Secretary

By: Jan Greenhalgh
Jan Greenhalgh, Recording Secretary

First Reading: 1-28-04
Second Reading: 2-11-04
Effective Date: 5-12-04

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR COLUMBIA COUNTY, OREGON

By: not present
Rita Bernhard, Chair

By: [Signature]
Anthony Hyde, Commissioner

By: [Signature]
Joe Corsighia, Commissioner

**COLUMBIA COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
STAFF REPORT
January 6, 2004
Plan Amendment & Zone Change**

FILE NUMBER: PA 03-08

APPLICANT: City of Columbia City
PO Box 189
Columbia City, Oregon 97018

PROPERTY OWNER: Various Property Owners

PROPERTY LOCATION: Various Property Locations Around Columbia City

REQUEST: Plan Amendment of the County Comprehensive Plan Map from Forest Resource and Rural Residential to UGB; The applicant proposes to leave the subject properties in their respective current zoning which is: Primary Forest (PF-76), Forest Agriculture (FA-19), Rural Residential (RR-5 & RR-2).

TAX LOTS:

5128-000-00200	5128-040-01800	5128-024-00300
5128-024-00100	5128-024-00101	5128-024-00200
5128-024-00201	5128-024-00400	5128-040-01600
5128-040-01601	5128-040-01700	5128-040-01900
5128-040-02000	5128-040-02100	5128-040-02200
5128-040-02300	5128-040-02400	5128-042-03100
5128-040-02500	5128-040-02500	5133-020-00100
5133-020-00101	5133-020-00102	5133-020-00500

REVIEW CRITERIA

<u>CCZO</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
Section 1603	Quasi-Judicial Public Hearings	2 - 3
Section 1605	Zone Change - Major Map Amendments	3
Section 1502	Zone Changes (Map Amendments)	4 - 9
Section 1608	Contents of Notice	9

Oregon Administrative Rules

OAR 660-004-0010

10

Goal 14: 7 Factors

11-13

BACKGROUND:

The applicant, The City of Columbia City, proposes a County Comprehensive Plan Map amendment from Forest Resource and Rural Residential to Urban Growth Boundary UGB. This will amend the city's existing urban growth boundary to include approximately 71.37 acres. Upon receiving this application County staff discussed with the DLCD representative the question of whether or not an exception is necessary for the UGB expansion. It was determined that the exception would be a good idea but was not necessary if the 7 factors of Goal 14, 'Urbanization' were addressed adequately. The city did provide documentation for taking an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 4, specifically to address criteria in OAR 660-004-0010(1)(c)(B), which shows why property now zoned forest land should be taken out of that designation and brought into the city's UGB.

Zoning will not be changed and will not be in agreement with the new comprehensive plan designation given to all land brought inside the amended UGB. The city intends to leave the properties with an outside the boundary zoning designation rather than rezone them at this time to an inside the boundary designation in order to leave them in larger parcel sizes.

FINDINGS:

1603 Quasijudicial Public Hearings: As provided elsewhere in this ordinance, the Hearings Officer, Planning Commission, or Board of Commissioners may approve certain actions which are in conformance with the provisions of this ordinance. Zone Changes, Conditional Use Permits, Major Variances, and Temporary Use Permits shall be reviewed by the appropriate body and may be approved using the following procedures:

- .1 The applicant shall submit an application and any necessary supplemental information as required by this ordinance to the Planning Department. The application shall be reviewed for completeness and the applicant notified in writing of any deficiencies. The application shall be deemed complete upon receipt of all pertinent information. If an application for a permit or zone change is incomplete, the Planning Department shall notify the applicant of exactly what information is missing within 5 days of receipt of the application and allow the applicant to submit the missing information. The application shall be deemed complete for the purpose of this section upon receipt by the Planning Department of the missing information. [effective 7-15-97]

Finding 1: The applicant submitted an application for a plan amendment that was deemed complete on July 7, 2003 after which it was reviewed by the Columbia County Planning Commission during a regularly scheduled public hearing on September 8, 2003 with the their recommendation of approval being forwarded to

the Board of County Commissioners.

- .2 Once an application is deemed complete, it shall be scheduled for the earliest possible hearing before the Planning Commission or Hearings Officer. The Director will publish a notice of the request in a paper of general circulation not less than 10 calendar days prior to the scheduled public hearing. Notices will also be mailed to adjacent individual property owners in accordance with ORS 197.763. [effective 7-15-97]

[Note: ORS 197.763 requires 20 days notice (or 10 days before the first hearing if there will be 2 or more hearings), and that notice be provided to property owners within 100' (inside UGBs), 250' (outside UGBs), or 500' (in farm or forest zones).]

Finding 2: The application was scheduled for a Planning Commission Public hearing on September 8, 2003. Notice of the hearing was published in the Spotlight and Chronicle newspapers of general circulation on August 27, 2003. Notice was also sent to 435 property owners on July 22, 2003. A Measure 56 notice was not required to be sent out since the proposed plan amendment is for a specific area and would not decrease the value of properties involved. The Application was scheduled for Board of Commissioners hearing on January 14, 2004. Notice of the hearing was published in the newspapers of record on December 17, 2003. Notice was sent to affected and surrounding property owners on December 9, 2003.

- .3 At the public hearing, the staff, applicant, and interested parties may present information relevant to the criteria and standards pertinent to the proposal, giving reasons why the application should or should not be approved, or what modifications are necessary for approval. [effective 7-15-97]

Finding 3: At the public hearing, on September 8, 2003, the staff, applicant, and interested parties presented information relevant to criteria and standards pertinent to the proposal and gave reasons why the application should be approved. There were several modifications that were made to the staff report that the Planning Commission thought were necessary for them to make a recommendation of approval to the Board of Commissioners.

- .4 Approval of any action by the Planning Commission at the public hearing shall be by procedure outlined in Ordinance 91-2. [effective 7-15-97]

Finding 4: The recommendation for approval made by the Planning Commission at the public hearing on September 8, 2003 followed the procedure outlined in the Planning Commission Ordinance 91-2.

This request is being processed under Section 1605 of the Zoning Ordinance. Pertinent sections of the ordinance follow:

1605 Zone Change - Major Map Amendment: The hearing for a major map amendment shall follow the procedure established in Sections 1502, 1502.1, 1502.1A and 1502.1B. This hearing cannot result in the approval of a major map amendment. The Commission may make a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners that such a zone change be granted. Approval by the majority of the Commission is necessary in order to make recommendation to the Board of Commissioners. The Board of Commissioners hearing on the proposed zone change - major map amendment will be on the record unless a majority of the Board votes to allow the admission of new evidence.

1502 Zone Changes (Map Amendments): There are two types of Zone Changes which will be considered by the Commission: Major Map Amendments and Minor Map Amendments.

- .1 Major Map Amendments are defined as a Zone Change which requires the Comprehensive Plan Map to be amended in order to allow the proposed Zone Change to conform with the Comprehensive Plan. The approval of this type of Zone Change is a two step process:
 - A. The Commission shall hold a hearing on the proposed Zone Change, either concurrently or following a hearing, on the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan which is necessary to allow the proposed zoning to conform with the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission may recommend approval of a Major Map Amendment to the Board of Commissioners provided they find adequate evidence has been presented at the hearing substantiating the following:
 1. The proposed Zone Change is consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan;
 2. The proposed Zone Change is consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals (ORS 197); and
 3. The property and affected area is presently provided with adequate facilities, services, and transportation networks to support the use, or such facilities, services and transportation networks are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property.
 - B. Final approval of a Major Map Amendment may be given by the Board of Commissioners. The Commissioners shall hold a hearing on the proposed Zone Change either concurrently or following a hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment which is necessary to allow the proposed zoning to conform with the Comprehensive Plan. The Board may approve a Major Map Amendment provided they find adequate evidence has been presented substantiating the following:
 1. The proposed Zone Change is consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan;
 2. The proposed Zone Change is consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals (ORS 197); and

3. The property and affected area is presently provided with adequate facilities, services, and transportation networks to support the use, or such facilities, services and transportation networks are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property.

Finding 5: This application deals solely with the amendment of the City of Columbia City's Urban Growth Boundary which is a Comprehensive Plan Map amendment. The proposed plan amendment is being processed as a Major Map Amendment. Zoning will not be changed and will not be in agreement with the new comprehensive plan designation given to all land brought inside the amended UGB. The city intends to leave the properties with an outside the boundary zoning designation rather than rezone them at this time to an inside the boundary designation in order to leave them in larger parcel sizes.

Following with the County Zoning Ordinance, Section 1502.1.A.1 requires the Planning Commission to find adequate evidence substantiating that:

1. The proposed Zone Change is consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan;

Finding 6: The applicant has applied for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to amend the city's urban growth boundary to include additional land. A zone change application was not made. The following comprehensive plan policies may be relevant to this Comprehensive Plan amendment:

Housing, Policy 3: "Provide adequate land inside the urban growth boundaries to meet housing needs and to provide for a wide range of urban housing choices." -- As a result of their "Buildable Lands Inventory" Columbia City has determined that additional residential property is necessary to satisfy the housing requirements for the projected population for the 20 year period. The County finds that the City's amendment of its UGB will meet Housing policy 3 by providing the opportunity for a wider range of urban housing choices which will meet the City's needs in the future.

Public Facilities and Services, Policy 1: "Require that adequate types and levels of public facilities and services be provided in advance of or concurrent with development." -- Columbia City receives municipal water from the City of St. Helens under an agreement. According to the city, maximum peak consumption of water was 92% of the allotted maximum. The County Finds that the city is now in the process of design engineering and construction of a 1 million gallon storage reservoir that when completed will provide more than enough water capacity for those who will reside in the areas proposed for annexation into the City's UGB. The County Finds that at this time the level of service on Columbia City Streets is more than adequate according to Section 2.6.1 Level of Service Analysis in the County Transportation System Plan to serve the trips generated by the development resulting from the expansion of additional area into the UGB.

Public Facilities and Services, Policy 4: "Encourage new development on lands within urban growth boundaries or built and committed exception areas." -- The County finds that some areas proposed for inclusion inside the City's UGB have already had a built and committed exception to forest goals justified, since the land is

currently zoned for rural residential (RR-5 zone) use. Other lands proposed for inclusion in the UGB which is currently zoned for forest use, are too small and too close to an urban area to be practicably be used for forest use. The County finds that the public facilities capabilities including increased water storage capacity, existing roadway network, sewage treatment, City Police and County Sheriff, and the Columbia River Fire & Rescue are all adequate and will encourage new development on the proposed land being brought into the UGB.

Following with Section 1502.1(A)2 which requires the Planning Commission to find that:

2. The proposed Zone Change is consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals (ORS 197);

Finding 7: The subject application is not for a zone change but rather for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to take in additional lands into the City's UGB. Statewide Planning Goals were found to be in conformance with the County Comprehensive Plan when that plan was acknowledged by DLCD. This proposal addresses the following statewide planning goals:

Goal 1: Citizen Involvement, "To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process." -- The County finds that this goal is met through compliance with the land use hearing procedures in the County's acknowledged land use regulations.

Goal 2: Land Use Planning, "To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decision and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions." Goal 2 requires coordination with affected governmental entities, consistency with acknowledged plans, and an adequate factual base.

The County finds that this proposal complies with Goal 2's coordination requirement because, prior to the filing of this application, the applicant conferred with the State DLCD and in person with Columbia County Department of Land Development Services to identify the issues and concerns regarding this application, and because this application addresses and accommodates those concerns. The County, after conferring with DLCD, suggested the need for a goal exception although an exception was not required if the 7 factors of Goal 14 are addressed. The County finds that this application accommodates both concerns because it includes the exception and because it addresses the 7 factors of Goal 14. For the reasons stated above, this application is consistent with Columbia County's acknowledged Comprehensive Plan and land use regulations. Further, the facts contained in this application and in the supporting documents and testimony provide an adequate factual base to support the application. Hence, the County finds that this goal is satisfied.

Goal 3: Not Applicable

Goal 4: An exception to Goal 4 is not required by OAR 660-004-0010(1) (c)(B).

Goal 5: Not applicable.

Goal 6: Not applicable.

Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards -- Slope hazard was considered by the city when they picked which lands to include in this amendment. The County Finds that there are no hazards other than slope hazard for lands included in this UGB amendment and that this proposal meets Statewide Planning Goal 7: which is, "To protect life and property from natural disasters and hazards."

Goal 8: Not applicable.

Goal 9: Not applicable.

Goal 10: Housing, --The City of Columbia City Buildable Lands Inventory indicates that the City needs an additional 99 single-family/duplex dwellings units outside of its current Urban Growth Boundary therefore the city proposes this Comprehensive Plan Amendment to increase areas included inside the City's UGB to provide necessary housing units needed to maintain the city's liveability. The County finds that this proposed amendment meets Statewide Planning Goal 10 Housing which is, "To provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state." The County finds that this amendment will provide additional land for additional housing which meets the intent of Goal 10.

Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services, "To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development."-- The County finds that each of the proposed areas for annexation into the City's UGB front on City streets and has both public water and sewer available. According to the city they are now in the process of adding a 1 million gallon water reservoir which will provide additional capacity necessary for the need generated by this amendment and future development. The County finds that there are adequate public facilities and services to serve the expanded UGB area.

Goal 12: Transportation, "To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system." The County Finds that the proposed areas of inclusion in the City's UGB are adequately served by either interior city streets, County Roads, or State Highway 30 The new water reservoir will not attract or add new vehicle trips to the roadway system other than operation and maintenance vehicles and thus will not significantly affect any transportation facility. The County finds that, according to the County Transportation System Plan (TSP), the level of service is now adequate and that the proposed addition of land that can be developed into dwelling units will not significantly impact level-of-service on the roadway network serving those lands therefore the existing transportation system meets the intent of Statewide Planning Goal 12 Transportation.

Goal 13: Not applicable

Goal 14: Change of the Urban Growth Boundary is based upon consideration of 7 factors of Goal 14 including:

1. Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals;

2. Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability;
3. Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and services;
4. Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area;
5. Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences;
6. Retention of agricultural land, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and class VI the lowest priority; and,
7. Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities.

The 7 factors are addressed in Findings 13-19 of this staff report.

Goal 15-19: Not applicable.”

Continuing with Zoning Ordinance Section 1502.1.A:

- "3. The property and affected area is presently provided with adequate facilities, services, and transportation networks to support the use, or such facilities, services and transportation networks are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property."

Finding 8: The subject property and affected area is presently provided with adequate facilities, services, and transportation networks to support the use. Parcels located in the proposed areas of this plan amendment, including the Chimes Crest area, are accessed by many interior city streets, State Hwy. 30., or Smith Road. The city is now in the process of adding a 1 million gal. water reservoir which should provide ample water to any development on subject properties. The subject property is presently served by electricity, phone, and County Fire and Police protection which are available to the site. The County finds that the subject properties for inclusion inside the City of Columbia City's UGB are presently contiguous with lands provided with adequate facilities, services, and transportation networks to support the use, and such facilities will be included in planned development, in conjunction with the City subdivision ordinance when development is proposed by owners.

Following with Comprehensive Plan provisions:

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

GOAL: To plan and develop a timely, orderly, and efficient arrangement of public services as a framework for urban and rural development.

Finding 9: This comprehensive plan amendment to allow the city to include roughly 71 acres of additional land in its UGB will allow the City of Columbia City the opportunity to improve timely service to their customers in an orderly and efficient manner. The addition of these properties into the City's UGB will begin the process of urbanization from the more rural fringe. In the fringe areas of an urbanizing area the facilities and services are spread out over a larger area and therefore must extend longer distances which adds to the cost of

development.

The urbanization of the rural fringe will result in a more timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public services due to "economies of scale". A denser urbanizing scale will result in economy of service provision. This means that more dwellings can be served with less cost since the pipe and roads serving them will not need to extend farther distances. Rather than one pipe or road serving one dwelling as is the case in rural areas, one pipe or road can serve many dwellings thus reducing the cost of running infrastructure great distances. The County finds that this proposed amendment that will provide the opportunity to serve a more compact and economic urbanizing scale and framework and will provide for a more timely, orderly, and efficient arrangement of public services as a framework for urban and rural development around the urban fringe of Columbia City.

Continuing with Zoning Ordinance Section 1502.1:

"B. Final approval of a Major Map Amendment may be given by the Board of Commissioners. The Commissioners shall hold a hearing on the proposed Zone Change either concurrently or following a hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment which is necessary to allow the proposed zoning to conform with the Comprehensive Plan. The Board may approve a Major Map Amendment provided they find adequate evidence has been presented substantiating the following:

1. The proposed Zone Change is consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan;
2. The proposed Zone Change is consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals (ORS 197); and
3. The property and affected area is presently provided with adequate facilities, services, and transportation networks to support the use, or such facilities, services and transportation networks are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property."

Finding 10: The Board has scheduled January 14, 2004 at 10:00 as the date and time for public hearing, deliberation and decision of the application to the above standards. The proposed comprehensive plan amendment (No zone change is involved at this time) is consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan and Statewide Planning Goals as noted in Findings 5 through 9 above. The affected area has adequate facilities, services, and transportation networks to support the plan amendment as noted in findings 8 and 9.

"1608 Contents of Notice: Notice of a quasi judicial hearing shall contain the following information:

- .1 The date, time and place of the hearing;
- .2 A description of the subject property, reasonably calculated to give notice as to the actual location, including but not limited to the tax account number assigned to the lot by the Columbia County Tax Assessor;
- .3 Nature of the proposed action;
- .4 Interested parties may appear and be heard;
- .5 Hearings will be held according to the procedures established in the Zoning Ordinance."

Finding 11: All of the above shall have been included in the Notice of Public Hearing published twice in the Chronicle and Spotlight newspapers not less than 10 days prior to the hearing.

Following with Oregon Administrative Rule; DIVISION 4; INTERPRETATION OF GOAL 2 EXCEPTION PROCESS;

660-004-0010, Application of the Goal 2 exception Process to Certain Goals

- (1) The exceptions process is not applicable to Statewide Goal 1 "Citizen Involvement" and Goal 2 "Land Use Planning." The exceptions process is generally applicable to all or part of those statewide goals which prescribe or restrict certain uses of resource land. These statewide goals include but are not limited to:
 - (c) Goal 14 "Urbanization" except as provided for in paragraphs (1) (c)(A) and (B) of this rule, and OAR 660-014-0000 through 660-014-0040:
 - (B) When a local government changes an established urban growth boundary it shall follow the procedures and requirements set forth in Goal 2 "Land Use Planning," Part II, Exceptions. An established urban growth boundary is one which has been acknowledged by the Commission under ORS 197.251. Revised findings and reasons in support of an amendment to an established urban growth boundary shall demonstrate compliance with the seven factors of Goal 14 and demonstrate that the following standards are met:
 - (i) Reasons justify why the state policy embodied in the applicable goals should not apply (This factor can be satisfied by compliance with the seven factors of Goal 14.);

Finding 12: The 7 factors are addressed below in findings 16 through 22. The applicant states that it is State policy to provide a twenty year supply of buildable lands for residential uses. The City has completed an updated buildable land inventory and made projections for housing requirements consistent with Columbia

County's population projections. Based on these documents, the County finds there is a demonstrated need for housing opportunities to maintain the livability of the community.

(ii) Areas which do not require a new exception cannot reasonably accommodate the use;

Finding 13: Columbia City has not designated any land as urban reserve. There are some rural residentially zoned lands adjacent to the UGB that have had a rural lands exception when they were originally re-designated on the County Comprehensive Plan Map and re-zoned on the County Zoning Map from resource land to rural residential.

The County zoning code allows for 1 dwelling unit per parcel in areas outside the UGBs of incorporated cities. The City of Columbia City's 'Buildable Land Inventory' and population projections developed in cooperation with the County indicate the need for higher density residential development to maintain livability for the community of Columbia City. This means that the resource and rural residentially designated and zoned lands in areas which do not require a new exception cannot reasonably accommodate the projected need for additional higher density residential development. The County finds that the areas proposed for inclusion in the City of Columbia City's UGB that do not require an exception cannot accommodate the projected use, therefore a demonstrated need has been established to include some small resource designated lands. This criteria is met.

(iii) The long-term environmental, economic, social and energy consequences resulting from the use at the proposed site with measures designed to reduce adverse impacts are not significantly more adverse than would typically result from the same proposal being located in areas requiring a goal exception other than the proposed site; and

Finding 14: The inclusion of the subject properties in the Columbia City Urban Growth Boundary results in a loss of 27.92 acres from resource designation to UGB. The current forest zoning; PF-76 and FA-19: is not supported by the small size of these parcels when considered in conjunction with adjacent urban development including single family residences, existing access provided by city streets, existing availability of municipal utilities at each site and a significant wetland and riparian corridor along McBride Creek. Each of the resource parcels are located immediately adjacent to the existing UGB and fully developed residential subdivisions. The small parcel size and surrounding urban development are inconsistent with the production of forest products with the expectation of a reasonable economic return. There is a need in Columbia City for residential development in order to augment the economic base for the city. Residential development provides a growing tax base for essential services in the city such as schools, roads and public safety. The city has demonstrated through its buildable lands inventory that lands within the existing urban growth boundary are incapable of provision of needed housing for the projected 20 year growth period.

(iv) The proposed uses are compatible with other adjacent uses or will be so rendered through measures designed to reduce adverse impacts.

Finding 15: The inclusion of the proposed resource sites in the Columbia City UGB would not have any major impact on the availability of resource lands in Columbia County and is compatible with the land uses in the area. This is due to several factors including: existing adjacent urban development, small size of existing parcels, existing single-family residential uses on the proposed parcels for inclusion, physical separation in uses provided by existing roads and steep terrain, and the availability of municipal services at or near the proposed sites.

...and following with the seven factors of Goal 14:

Urban growth boundaries shall be established to identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land. Establishment and change of the boundaries shall be based upon consideration of the following factors:

- (1) Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals;

Finding 16: Based on the City's 'Buildable Lands Inventory', population projections agreed upon by Columbia City and Columbia County, and housing projections of the adopted Columbia City Comprehensive Plan, the city has determined that additional residential property is necessary to satisfy the housing requirements for the projected population for a 20 year planning horizon. The County finds that the City of Columbia City has demonstrated a need to accommodate lang-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals.

- (2) Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability;

Finding 17: The City has completed an updated 'Buildable Lands Inventory' and made projections for housing requirements consistent with Columbia County's population projections. This study recommends additional land be included in the Urban Growth Area for needed housing construction. The construction of housing in the areas proposed for inclusion inside the UGB will provide employment opportunities during their construction period and thus will employ workers in the construction industry and ancillary economic activity and be good for the economy in general. The County finds that the City has a demonstrated need for additional housing opportunities to maintain liveability of its community.

- (3) Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and services;

Finding 18: Residential development in areas proposed for inclusion into the UGB will provide a growing tax

base for essential services in the City, such as schools, roads, public water and sewer, and public safety. The subject properties are generally adjacent to existing city streets which have water and sewer infrastructure in place. The County finds that this UGB amendment will provide a more orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services.

- (4) Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area;

Finding 19: The addition of additional land into the UGB should actually provide an economy of scale since it is always more cost effective to provide infrastructure to higher density development such as that found in an urban growth area as opposed to a rural lower density fringe. The County finds that this proposal will provide maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area of Columbia City.

- (5) Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences;

Finding 20: The inclusion of the subject properties in the Columbia City Urban Growth Boundary results in a loss of two parcels totaling 6.39 acres in the PF-76 and four parcels totaling 21.53 acres in the FA-19 zones. The current forestry zoning is not supported by the small size of these parcels when considered in conjunction with adjacent urban development including single-family residences, existing access provided by city streets, existing availability of municipal utilities at each site and a significant wetland and riparian corridor.

Environmentally, the topography and vegetation including steepness of slope, and existing wetland and riparian corridors and their related soils and vegetation have been considered by the city when it decided on areas to be included in this proposal.

Energy conservation economic consequences will result from the economies of scale that will be found in the more compact higher density urban growth area proposed for inclusion in the UGB of Columbia City. This means that the energy savings will occur when infrastructure is provided to a more compact development as will be provided by this UGB amendment. It takes less energy to pump multiple sewage or water connections than it does to pump one connection. The pump must run for one as well as multiple. A marginal efficiency of energy savings will accrue to the more compact development that provides for economies of scale that will result from these amendments. Efficiency of energy translates to cost savings since it will cost less to provide more service.

Social consequences include an increased variety of housing types and choices inside the City's UGB. Higher density development provides the opportunity for increased social interaction and exchange of ideas.

The County finds that the environmental, energy, economic and social consequences of this proposed UGB expansion have been adequately considered.

- (6) Retention of agricultural land, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and class VI the lowest priority; and,

Finding 21: There are no designated agricultural lands (PA-38) within the areas proposed for inclusion although some of the property is zoned Forest Agriculture (FA-19) and allows agriculture as does the Primary Forest (PF-76) zone and the Rural Residential (RR-5) zone. It must be noted that agricultural use is allowed outright on all lands proposed for inclusion inside the UGB including; the PF-76, FA-19 and RR-5 zones. The County finds that the retention of agricultural land has been carefully considered and that there is little, if any, agricultural uses on land that is proposed as part of this UGB amendment.

- (7) Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities.

Finding 22: There are no nearby agricultural activities on lands proposed for this amendment, therefore all proposed existing areas are compatible with intended urbanizing uses within the UGB.

COMMENTS:

1. The County Sanitarian has reviewed the application and has no objection to its approval as submitted.
2. The Columbia River PUD has reviewed the application and has no objection to its approval as submitted.
3. The County Roadmaster has reviewed the application and has no objection to its approval as submitted.
4. The Columbia River Fire & Rescue District has reviewed the application and has no objection to its approval as submitted.
5. Von Smith of the St. Helens CPAC has reviewed the application and states:

"Speaking only for myself as one CPAC member, I feel that this request should be approved because #1 Columbia City has always been conservative in its expansion and #2 the properties represent a wide range of ownerships - not one or two "primary land developers".
6. Sally Ann Marson of the St. Helens CPAC abstains , "Since I voted for the above subject matter as a member of the Col. City Planning Commission.

7. The City of St. Helens commented: "The City Council of the City of St. Helens reviewed your notice of pending amendment to the Columbia County Comprehensive Plan to adjust the Urban Growth Boundary of the City of Columbia City and decided by consensus not to object to the above referenced pending amendment."

No other comments have been received from adjacent or nearby property owners or government agencies as of the date of this staff report (January 6, 2004).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Planning Commission met at their regularly scheduled public hearing on September 8, 2003 and after reviewing all testimony and after consideration of the application and the Planning Commission Staff Report, PA 03-08, dated 8/28/03 hereby forward a **Recommendation of Approval** for this plan amendment to the Board of County Commissioners as follows:

1. The Official Comprehensive Plan Map designation shall be changed from Forest Resource and Rural Residential to Urban Growth Boundary for the subject properties.

Attachments:

Application
Exception to Goal 4
Vicinity Map
Comprehensive Plan Map
Area Maps

ATTACHMENT B

SUPPLEMENTAL FINDINGS

CCZO Section 1502.1(A)(2), requires that the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment is consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals. Statewide Planning Goals 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, and 14, are applicable to the proposed Urban Growth Boundary expansion. The Board of County Commissioners finds that the Urban Growth Boundary expansion meets all applicable Statewide Planning Goals, as follows:

- A. Goal 1. Goal 1, Citizen Involvement, requires the County to develop a program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process. The proposed plan amendment was processed under the County's citizen involvement program. The area CPACs reviewed and commented on the Application, notice was sent to individuals and agencies, and two public hearings were held giving both individuals and agencies the opportunity to comment. Therefore, the Board finds that Goal 1 is met.
- B. Goal 2. Goal 2, Land Use Planning, Part I, is to establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decision and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions. The Goal also requires coordination among governmental agencies and special districts. The Board of County Commissioners finds that the County has complied with the coordination requirement. The County conferred with DLCD, and sought comments from the City of St. Helens. The Board also finds that its land use planning process, implemented through the County's Zoning Ordinance, assures an adequate factual base for all land use decisions.
- Goal 2, Land Use Planning, Part II, Exceptions, allows the County to take an Exception to a Statewide Planning Goal using one of three alternative analyses. The third Exception analyses is for a "Reasons Exception". According to Statewide Goal 14, Urbanization, if a governing body proposes to change a boundary separating urbanizable lands from rural land, the local government shall follow the procedures and requirements as set forth in Goal 2, Part II, Exceptions. The County proposes to take a "Reasons Exception" to Goal 4, in order to bring resource lands into the Urban Growth Boundary. Findings of fact and a statement of reasons which demonstrate that the standards for the Reasons Exception have been met will be adopted into the Columbia County Comprehensive Plan.
- C. Goal 4. Goal 4, Forest Lands, is to conserve forest lands by maintaining the forest land base and to protect the state's forest economy by making possible economically efficient forest practices that assure the continuous growing and harvesting of forest tree species as the leading use on forest land consistent with

sound management of soil, air, water, and fish and wildlife resources and to provide for recreational opportunities and agriculture. This Goal is not met for the portion of the proposed expansion that has been designated as Forest Resource in the County's Comprehensive Plan, specifically for tax lots 5128-000-00200(3.3 acres) 5128-040-01800 (2.51 acres), 5128-024-00300(5.43 acres) , 5128-024-00100(7.13acres), 5128-024-00200 (8.37 acres)and 5128-024-00201 (.6 acres). However, the County is adopting an exception to Goal 4 for the above property, which meets all of the exception standards as set forth in Attachment C. The Goal is met for the property currently designated as Rural Resource.

- D. Goal 7. Goal 7, Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards, is to protect people and property from natural hazards. The Board of County commissioners finds that the City of Columbia City considered potential hazards due to slope instability when it determined which properties to include in its Urban Growth Boundary. The City proposed to include properties in the Chimes Crest area which has less of a slope than other non-resource land adjacent to the Columbia City urban growth boundary. The Board finds that no other hazards exist on the property proposed for inclusion, and the Board finds that Goal 7 is met.
- E. Goal 10. Goal 10, Housing, is to provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state. The Board of Commissioners finds that the City of Columbia City submitted its Buildable Lands Inventory which provides substantial evidence in the record to show that additional housing will be needed in the next 20 years to accommodate the projected growth in the City. According to the Inventory, the City will need an additional 99 single family dwellings/duplexes on land outside of the current Urban Growth Boundary. The inclusion of the proposed non-resource lands will provide approximately 55 units, and the inclusion of the proposed resource land will provide approximately 49 additional units, which will satisfy the 20 year projected housing need. Therefore, the Board finds that the proposed amendment meets Goal 10.
- F. Goal 11. Goal 11, Public Facilities and Services, is to plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development. The Board of County Commissioners finds that each of the proposed areas for annexation into the City's Urban Growth Boundary fronts on existing city streets and have both public water and sewer available. In addition, the City has recently added a 1 million gallon water reservoir to its system will provide additional capacity necessary to serve the proposed future development. Therefore, the Board finds that there will be adequate public facilities and services to serve property within the expanded Urban Growth Boundary, and Goal 11 is met.
- G. Goal 14. Goal 14, Urbanization, is to provide for an orderly and efficient

transition from rural to urban land use. The Goal sets forth 7 factors which must be considered before urban growth boundaries may be expanded. After considering the following 7 factors, the Board finds that the application to expand the Urban Growth Boundary around the City of Columbia City is appropriate.

- 1) Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals. The Board finds that based on the City's Buildable Lands Inventory, population projections over the next 20 years, and housing projections in the City of Columbia City's Comprehensive Plan, additional residential land will be necessary to satisfy the projected housing requirements. The Board finds that the City of Columbia City has demonstrated a need for 301 additional single family dwellings/duplexes for the next 20 years to accommodate the projected growth. According to the City's Buildable Lands Inventory, there are 56.0884 acres available in the existing Urban Growth Boundary for residential development. Of that acreage, 4.164 acres is zoned non-residential and almost three acres is on land located west of McBride Creek having slopes exceeding 25%, no existing access or public services. The remaining 48.9 acres is projected to provide 212 dwelling units, including 202 single family dwellings/duplexes and 10 multi-family dwelling units. The inventory projects a need for an additional 99 single family dwellings/duplexes outside of the existing Urban Growth Boundary. The Board of Commissioners finds that the City cannot meet its projected need for housing within the existing Urban Growth Boundary and therefore, the County must accommodate this need by expanding the Urban Growth Boundary.
- 2) Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability. The Board finds that the City's Buildable lands Inventory provides substantial evidence in the record that additional land must be included in the Urban Growth Boundary to accommodate the additional housing construction. The construction of housing in the areas proposed for inclusion inside the UGB will provide employment opportunities and stimulate ancillary economic benefits. The Board finds that the City has a demonstrated need for additional housing opportunities to maintain livability.
- 3) Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and services. The majority of the parcels proposed to be included are adjacent to existing city streets and have water and sewer infrastructure readily available. Other parcels which were considered for inclusion were on slopes greater than 25%, making the provision of public facilities and services cost prohibitive. The fact that facilities and services are already in place for the parcels proposed for inclusion ensures an orderly and economic provision

of public facilities and services.

- 4) Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area. The Board of County Commissioners finds that the addition of the proposed land into the Urban Growth Boundary will provide for maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area. The Board finds that, in this area, an urban area is most recognizable by the presence of municipal water and sewer, served by City streets. According to the City's Buildable Lands Inventory and Statement of Reasons to Expand the UGB, of the 22 tax lots proposed to be included, 14 (64%) are presently served by Columbia City municipal water, and the remaining 8 (36%) have municipal water and sewer adjacent to the property. Also, all proposed properties, when aggregated, are adjacent to either City limits or the existing Urban Growth Boundary, and all properties are served by public streets. The City's projected housing needs cannot be accommodated within the existing urban area as demonstrated in Supplemental Finding 1(G)(1), above.

- 5) Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences. The inclusion of the proposed property in the Urban Growth Boundary will result in the urbanization of 2 parcels of forest land, totaling 6.39 acres in the PF-76 zone and four parcels totaling 21.53 acres in the FA-19 zones. The Board finds that the relatively small size of these resource parcels does not support keeping them resource parcels, given their location adjacent to existing urban development, including single family dwellings, urban public facilities and services. The Board finds that the land would be put to better use economically if urbanized. The Board also finds that the topography and vegetation of the resource lands, including the steepness of slope and existing wetland and riparian corridors on much of the available non-resource property, the inclusion of the proposed parcels in more environmentally sound.

In addition, the Board finds that energy conservation consequences will result from the economies of scale that will be found in the more compact, higher density urban growth area. Energy savings will occur when infrastructure is provided to a more compact development. Finally, the Board finds that the amendment of the City's Urban Growth Boundary will provide positive social consequences, due to an increased variety of housing types and residential areas within the Urban Growth Boundary, and due to the projected economic benefits.

- 6) Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority. The Board of County Commissioners finds that none of the parcels proposed for

inclusions are designated as primary agricultural (PA-38). However, some of the property is zoned Forest Agriculture (FA-19) and all of the properties allow agricultural uses outright. Nevertheless, there is little agricultural use of the parcels proposed for inclusion. The Board finds that there are no agricultural lands that have priority for retention given their existing forest and residential uses.

- 7) Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities. The Board finds that there are no agricultural activities on lands near the lands proposed for inclusion in the Urban Growth Boundary. Therefore, the proposed urban uses will be compatible with surrounding uses.

ATTACHMENT C

Tax Account Number	Current Comprehensive Plan Designation	New Comprehensive Plan Designation
1. 5128-000-00200	Forest Resource	Urban Growth Boundary
2. 5128-040-01800	Forest Resource	Urban Growth Boundary
3. 5128-024-00300	Forest Resource	Urban Growth Boundary
4. 5128-024-00100	Forest Resource	Urban Growth Boundary
5. 5128-024-00101	Forest Resource	Urban Growth Boundary
6. 5128-024-00200	Forest Resource	Urban Growth Boundary
7. 5128-024-00201	Forest Resource	Urban Growth Boundary
8. 5128-024-00400	Forest Resource	Urban Growth Boundary
9. 5128-040-01600	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
10. 5128-040-01700	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
11. 5128-040-01900	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
12. 5128-040-02000	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
13. 5128-040-02100	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
14. 5128-040-02200	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
15. 5128-040-02300	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
16. 5128-040-02400	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
17. 5128-042-03100	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
18. 5128-040-02500	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
19. 5133-020-00100	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
20. 5133-020-00101	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
21. 5133-020-00102	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary
22. 5133-020-00500	Rural Residential	Urban Growth Boundary

ATTACHMENT D

EXCEPTION TO GOAL 4

City of Columbia City Urban Growth Expansion Exception Statement

The following tax lots require an Exception to Goal 4:

5128-000-00200,	3.88 acres,	zoned PF-76,	residence water and sewer to site
5128-040-01800,	2.51 acres,	zoned PF-76,	city water at site
5128-024-00300,	5.43 acres,	zoned FA-19,	residence water and sewer to site
5128-024-00100,	7.13 acres,	zoned FA-19,	vacant, water and sewer to site
5128-024-00200,	8.37 acres,	zoned FA-19,	vacant, water and sewer to site
5128-024-00201,	0.60 acres,	zoned FA-19,	half ROW, water to site

Because the City of Columbia City proposes to expand the Urban Growth Boundary into lands that are currently designated as Forest Resource in the Columbia County Comprehensive Plan, the protections of Statewide Goal 4 apply to these parcels. For an urban growth boundary expansion OAR 660-004-0010(1)(c)(B) requires that a Goal 4 exception be justified pursuant to ORS 197.732 and OAR 660 Division 4. A Goal exception constitutes an amendment to the affected County Comprehensive Plan. Here, the exception to allow six small resource designated parcels, ranging from 0.60 acre to 8.37 acres, to become an urban designation is justified for the following reasons:

1. **Reasons Why the Policies in Goal 4 Should Not Apply**

This factor can be satisfied by showing compliance with the seven factors of Goal 14:

Goal 14. Goal 14, Urbanization, is to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use. The Goal sets forth 7 factors which must be considered before urban growth boundaries may be expanded.

1. Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals. The Board finds that based on the City's Buildable Lands Inventory, population projections over the next 20 years, and housing projections in the City of Columbia City's Comprehensive Plan, additional residential land will be necessary to satisfy the projected housing requirements. The Board finds that the City of Columbia City has demonstrated a need for 301 additional single family dwellings/duplexes for the next 20 years to accommodate the projected growth. According to the City's Buildable Lands Inventory, there are 56.0884 acres available in the existing Urban Growth Boundary for residential development. Of that acreage, 4.164 acres is zoned non-residential and almost three acres is on land located west of McBride Creek having slopes exceeding 25%, no

existing access or public services. The remaining 48.9 acres is projected to provide 212 dwelling units, including 202 single family dwellings/duplexes and 10 multi-family dwelling units. The inventory projects a need for an additional 99 single family dwellings/duplexes outside of the existing Urban Growth Boundary. The Board of Commissioners finds that the City cannot meet its projected need for housing within the existing Urban Growth Boundary and therefore, the County must accommodate this need by expanding the Urban Growth Boundary.

2. Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability. The Board finds that the City's Buildable lands Inventory provides substantial evidence in the record that additional land must be included in the Urban Growth Boundary to accommodate the additional housing construction. The construction of housing in the areas proposed for inclusion inside the UGB will provide employment opportunities and stimulate ancillary economic benefits. The Board finds that the City has a demonstrated need for additional housing opportunities to maintain livability.
3. Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and services. The majority of the parcels proposed to be included are adjacent to existing city streets and have water and sewer infrastructure readily available. Other parcels which were considered for inclusion were on slopes greater than 25%, making the provision of public facilities and services cost prohibitive. The fact that facilities and services are already in place for the parcels proposed for inclusion ensures an orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services.
4. Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area. The Board of County Commissioners finds that the addition of the proposed land into the Urban Growth Boundary will provide for maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area. The Board finds that, in this area, an urban area is most recognizable by the presence of municipal water and sewer, served by City streets. According to the City's Buildable Lands Inventory and Statement of Reasons to Expand the UGB, of the 22 tax lots proposed to be included, 14 (64%) are presently served by Columbia City municipal water, and the remaining 8 (36%) have municipal water and sewer adjacent to the property. Also, all proposed properties, when aggregated, are adjacent to either City limits or the existing Urban Growth Boundary, and all properties are served by public streets. The City's projected housing needs cannot be accommodated within the existing urban area as demonstrated in Supplemental Finding 1(G)(1), above.
5. Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences. The inclusion of the proposed property in the Urban Growth Boundary will result in the urbanization of 2 parcels of forest land, totaling 6.39 acres in the PF-76 zone and four parcels totaling 21.53 acres in the FA-19 zones. The Board finds that the relatively small size of these resource parcels does not support keeping them resource parcels, given their

location adjacent to existing urban development, including single family dwellings, urban public facilities and services. The Board finds that the land would be put to better use economically if urbanized. The Board also finds that the topography and vegetation of the resource lands, including the steepness of slope and existing wetland and riparian corridors on much of the available non-resource property, the inclusion of the proposed parcels in more environmentally sound.

In addition, the Board finds that energy conservation consequences will result from the economies of scale that will be found in the more compact, higher density urban growth area. Energy savings will occur when infrastructure is provided to a more compact development. Finally, the Board finds that the amendment of the City's Urban Growth Boundary will provide positive social consequences, due to an increased variety of housing types and residential areas within the Urban Growth Boundary, and due to the projected economic benefits.

6. Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority. The Board of County Commissioners finds that none of the parcels proposed for inclusions are designated as primary agricultural (PA-38). However, some of the property is zoned Forest Agriculture (FA-19) and all of the properties allow agricultural uses outright. Nevertheless, there is little agricultural use of the parcels proposed for inclusion. The Board finds that there are no agricultural lands that have priority for retention given their existing forest and residential uses.
7. Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities. The Board finds that there are no agricultural activities on lands near the lands proposed for inclusion in the Urban Growth Boundary. Therefore, the proposed urban uses will be compatible with surrounding uses.

2. Areas Which do not Require a New Exception Cannot Reasonably Accommodate the Use.

Areas which do not require a new exception include existing rural residential designated lands in the Columbia County Comprehensive Plan which are contiguous to either the city limits of Columbia City or contiguous to the existing urban growth boundary of the City. There are no properties to expand to the south of the City and east of Highway 30 that do not require an exception, because the City shares a common Urban Growth Boundary with the City of St. Helens. The other parcel is a 22 acre parcel which is designated for Rural Resource in the County Comprehensive Plan, and would require an exception. There are no properties to expand to the east because the City borders the Columbia River. There are no properties to expand to the north that would not require an exception. All lands are either developed, located in a steep ravine of McBride Creek which serves as a natural buffer to rural industrial lands or are designated as Resource Industrial Planned Development or Manufacturing in the Columbia County Zoning Ordinance. An exception to Goal 3, Agricultural Lands and Goal 9, Economic Development would be required to override the existing

exception approved by Columbia County during the initial adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. The City's need for an additional 99 units of single family dwellings/duplexes cannot be accommodated on the north side of the existing city boundary because of a Goal 5 protected stream or adjoining existing industrial area.

Most properties to the west are hillside forested areas. Such lands would require an exception and are designated Forest Resource with extreme slopes of greater than 25%. One small area west of the City proposed for inclusion in the UGB expansion, for which an exception is required contains five parcels with less than 25% average slopes. These 5 tax lots are located on more gradually sloping land near the top of the incline before the land slopes dramatically to McBride Creek on the west. The usable portion of these lots are committed to nonresource use, neighboring properties are developed as urban density residential and city water & sewer abut their border. The only anomaly on the west side of the City that would not require a new exception is a tract of approximately 33 acres designated rural residential, served by a private water system and a private road, Miloris Way. This tract of 7 rural 2 acre residential view lots, with possible expansion up to 10 dwellings on top of a higher ridge, was considered by the City for inclusion in the urban growth boundary. But, this area was discounted because it has slopes greater than 25% in the tract, urban housing densities would be difficult to achieve, extending City services would be cost prohibitive and the owners strongly objected to being brought into the urban area.

The remaining area for expansion to the south and west of Highway 30, an area called Chimes Crest, is non resource land, and therefore, an exception is not required. This area is being proposed to be included in the urban growth boundary expansion. There is a small parcel retained by Willamette Industries in the middle of the residentially designate properties that is designated forest resource. It is a 200' x 700' property that was historically created for access to the Columbia River by a mining company many years ago and is sandwiched by rural residential land. This property is needed by the City to add some potential housing, but cannot reasonably be omitted from inclusion in the boundary expansion because of it's location. An exception for this 2.51 acre property is warranted because adjoining properties are committed to residential uses.

3. Long Term Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy Consequences

The third consideration in taking an exception is whether the long term economic, social, environmental and energy consequences resulting from the new use at the proposed sites are significantly more adverse than would typically result from the same proposal being located in other areas requiring a Goal exception. The other areas requiring an exception that were considered in the expansion have been described above in #2, above

The area to the south and east of Hwy. 30 that would require an exception is a wetland area identified in the Comprehensive Plan as a significant wetland, Dalton Lake area. Residents view much of this area as natural open space, supporting various plant and animal wildlife. Including this area for urbanization would have significantly more impact than the proposed resource parcels, whether considered economically, socially, environmentally or by the energy to support fill for development. The area to the east has no parcels, being the Columbia River.

The area to the north that would require an exception is rural industrial land designated to attract base economic jobs for the benefit of the region. Converting this area to urban density residential could have severe economic consequences for the livability of the area and the economic health of the region. The environmental and energy consequences would remain relatively constant if this area was developed as urban residential.

The area to the west is forested hillsides. Urban residential development in this area would be cost prohibitive and energy supply would be expensive because of extreme slopes. Environmental damage to the Goal 5 protected McBride Creek ravine may be unavoidable if developed for housing, and the land is better served by forest production. The resource lands chosen for inclusion in the expansion are smaller, without much forest production potential, and on more gradual slopes.

The area to the south and west of Hwy, 30 has no other resource lands needing an exception with which to compare. Again the resource land included for urban expansion and exception to the forest goal in this area is a small narrow parcel adjoined on both sides by committed residential lands.

4. Compatibility with Other Adjacent Uses

As previously noted, the lands proposed for inclusion are all adjoining the City and existing urban development. Most have existing residences, are served by city water and sewer, and have been compatible with neighboring uses for many years. The parcels are rural in nature and have historically been used for rural uses, albeit on the fringe of the urban area. The Board finds that all proposed expansion properties are compatible with urban uses.

ATTACHMENT E

GOAL 14 URBANIZATION ANALYSIS

City of Columbia City Urban Growth Boundary Expansion

1. Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals. The Board finds that based on the City's Buildable Lands Inventory, population projections over the next 20 years, and housing projections in the City of Columbia City's Comprehensive Plan, additional residential land will be necessary to satisfy the projected housing requirements. The Board finds that the City of Columbia City has demonstrated a need for 301 additional single family dwellings/duplexes for the next 20 years to accommodate the projected growth. According to the City's Buildable Lands Inventory, there are 56.0884 acres available in the existing Urban Growth Boundary for residential development. Of that acreage, 4.164 acres is zoned non-residential and almost three acres is on land located west of McBride Creek having slopes exceeding 25%, no existing access or public services. The remaining 48.9 acres is projected to provide 212 dwelling units, including 202 single family dwellings/duplexes and 10 multi-family dwelling units. The inventory projects a need for an additional 99 single family dwellings/duplexes outside of the existing Urban Growth Boundary. The Board of Commissioners finds that the City cannot meet its projected need for housing within the existing Urban Growth Boundary and therefore, the County must accommodate this need by expanding the Urban Growth Boundary.
2. Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability. The Board finds that the City's Buildable lands Inventory provides substantial evidence in the record that additional land must be included in the Urban Growth Boundary to accommodate the additional housing construction. The construction of housing in the areas proposed for inclusion inside the UGB will provide employment opportunities and stimulate ancillary economic benefits. The Board finds that the City has a demonstrated need for additional housing opportunities to maintain livability.
3. Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and services. The majority of the parcels proposed to be included are adjacent to existing city streets and have water and sewer infrastructure readily available. Other parcels which were considered for inclusion were on slopes greater than 25%, making the provision of public facilities and services cost prohibitive. The fact that facilities and services are already in place for the parcels proposed for inclusion ensures an orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services.
4. Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area. The Board of County Commissioners finds that the addition of the proposed land into the Urban Growth Boundary will provide for maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area. The Board finds that, in this area, an urban area is most

recognizable by the presence of municipal water and sewer, served by City streets. According to the City's Buildable Lands Inventory and Statement of Reasons to Expand the UGB, of the 22 tax lots proposed to be included, 14 (64%) are presently served by Columbia City municipal water, and the remaining 8 (36%) have municipal water and sewer adjacent to the property. Also, all proposed properties, when aggregated, are adjacent to either City limits or the existing Urban Growth Boundary, and all properties are served by public streets. The City's projected housing needs cannot be accommodated within the existing urban area as demonstrated in Supplemental Finding 1(G)(1), above.

5. Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences. The inclusion of the proposed property in the Urban Growth Boundary will result in the urbanization of 2 parcels of forest land, totaling 6.39 acres in the PF-76 zone and four parcels totaling 21.53 acres in the FA-19 zones. The Board finds that the relatively small size of these resource parcels does not support keeping them resource parcels, given their location adjacent to existing urban development, including single family dwellings, urban public facilities and services. The Board finds that the land would be put to better use economically if urbanized. The Board also finds that the topography and vegetation of the resource lands, including the steepness of slope and existing wetland and riparian corridors on much of the available non-resource property, the inclusion of the proposed parcels in more environmentally sound.

In addition, the Board finds that energy conservation consequences will result from the economies of scale that will be found in the more compact, higher density urban growth area. Energy savings will occur when infrastructure is provided to a more compact development. Finally, the Board finds that the amendment of the City's Urban Growth Boundary will provide positive social consequences, due to an increased variety of housing types and residential areas within the Urban Growth Boundary, and due to the projected economic benefits.

6. Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority. The Board of County Commissioners finds that none of the parcels proposed for inclusions are designated as primary agricultural (PA-38). However, some of the property is zoned Forest Agriculture (FA-19) and all of the properties allow agricultural uses outright. Nevertheless, there is little agricultural use of the parcels proposed for inclusion. The Board finds that there are no agricultural lands that have priority for retention given their existing forest and residential uses.
7. Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities. The Board finds that there are no agricultural activities on lands near the lands proposed for inclusion in the Urban Growth Boundary. Therefore, the proposed urban uses will be compatible with surrounding uses.