

PLANNING COMMISSION: PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Planning Commission has completed its preliminary analysis of the adequacy of the existing urban growth boundary. The Planning Commission's preliminary findings are:

1. There is not a need to expand the urban growth boundary to accommodate single-family and duplex development.
 2. There is a need to provide an additional area(s) for multi-family housing.
 3. If the urban growth boundary is expanded, the highest priority area for inclusion in the urban growth boundary is an area on the east side of Highway 101, in the vicinity of E. Surfcrest Avenue.
 4. Generally, the zoning code should not be amended to permit more "intensive" development within the City's existing urban growth boundary in order to meet future urban growth requirements. However, the following standards should be reviewed:
 - No development of lots of less than 2,500 square feet;
 - Requirement for combining contiguous lots to achieve the minimum lot size, e.g. two 50'x50' lots to achieve the minimum lot size, of 5,000 square feet in the R-1 and R-2 zone;
 - Requiring a minimum lot size of 4,000 square feet for contiguous lots in the same ownership in the R-1 and the R-2 zone; and
 - The application of the RVL zone within the City limits.
- Implementation of these changes would provide for a limited increase in the number of developable lots within the City.
5. To increase opportunities for more affordable types of housing, the following amendments should be pursued:
 - Provide for "townhouse" development in the R-3 and C-1 Zone;
 - Permit accessory dwellings as an outright use in all residential zones; and;
 - Eliminate or reduce the 99 foot spacing standard for duplexes in the R-2 zone.
 6. The Comprehensive Plan, Urban Growth Area Policies should be amended to:
 - Incorporate recent amendments to State-wide Planning Goal #14, Urbanization;
 - Establish different criteria for an amendment to the urban growth boundary and annexations; and
 - Make minor changes to policy language to reflect experience with the implementation of these policies.
 7. No major changes in the urban growth boundary management agreement with Clatsop County are required. With the concurrence of Clatsop County, some minor changes in the agreement may be warranted.

