

POPULATION, HOUSING & LAND USE

POPULATION, HOUSING & LAND-USE

POPULATION

The city population was 495 in 1960, 779 in 1970 and 1182 in 1980. The City's population grew by 55% between 1960 and 1970 (this included the annexation of Tolovana Park), and by 52.4% between 1970 and 1980. (The P.S.U. population estimate for 1983 is 1215.)

Between 1970 and 1980, Cannon Beach had the highest growth rate among Clatsop County cities.

During the past decade Cannon Beach's population grew by 52.4% while that of the county grew by 14.1%. Cannon Beach's population as a percentage of the total Clatsop County population has been gradually increasing. In 1960, Cannon Beach's population was 1.8% of the total Clatsop County population; in 1970 it was 2.7% and in 1980 it was 3.7%.

AGE

The major trends affecting various age categories in Oregon between 1970 and 1980 were:

- 1) A substantial decrease in the percentage of the population under the age of 15 as a result of a decline in fertility rates. However, there were opposing trends within the under 15 age group. While the school-age population (5-14) decreased, the number of preschool children increased. The increase in preschool age children is attributable to women of the "baby boom era" entering the reproductive years;
- 2) A very large increase in the 15-34 age group as the result of the aging of the baby boom generation;
- 3) A modest increase in the 45-64 age category due to the entry into this age group of person born during the Great Depression; and
- 4) A slow but steady increase in the 65 and older age group as the result of increased longevity.

The changes in Cannon Beach's age structure are reflective of some of these general demographic changes, but are divergent in some important ways.

The most important demographic change in Cannon Beach between 1970 and 1980 was the large influx of persons between the ages of 15-24 and 25-44. These age groups grew by 132% and 247%, respectively. The growth in these two age groups represented 96% of the total population growth in the City during the decade. Conversely, the City's population aged 45 or older decreased by 5%.

As a result of these trends, the City's median age decreased and is now only slightly higher than the County median age (33.0 vs 31.5).

The younger character of the City's population is also apparent when comparing Cannon Beach with other Clatsop County cities. In 1970, among Clatsop County cities, Cannon Beach had the smallest percentage of its population in the 25-44 age group and the second smallest percentage in the 15-24 age group. In 1980, it had the highest percentage in the 15-24 age group and second highest percentage in the 25-44 age group. Conversely, in 1970 Cannon Beach had the highest percentage in the 45-64 and 65 and over age groups. In 1980, it had the lowest percentage in the 45-64 age group, but still had the second highest percentage in the over 65 age group.

Cannon Beach's population, by age group, exhibited the following additional trends between 1970 and 1980:

- A 100% increase in the population aged 0-4. Clatsop County's population in this category increased by 25.1%.
- A 5% increase in the population aged 5-14. Clatsop County's population in this age category decreased by 10%.
- A 230% increase in the population aged 18-24. Clatsop County's population in this age category increased by 32%.
- A 10.6% decrease in the population aged 45-59. Clatsop County's population in this age category decreased by 14.2%.
- A 2% decline in the population aged 60 years and older. Clatsop County's population in this age category increased by 14%.

Cannon Beach's median age in 1980 was 33.0 years, with the median age for males being 32.8 and females being 33.3.

TABLE 1

POPULATION BY AGE GROUP, 1970 & 1980

	1970					1980				
	0-14	15-24	25-44	45-64	65+	0-14	15-24	25-44	45-64	65+
Cannon Beach	125	101	104	242	207	165	234	361	214	213

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL POPULATION
BY AGE GROUP, 1970, 1980

	1970					1980				
	0-14	15-24	25-44	45-64	65+	0-14	15-24	25-44	45-64	65+
Cannon Beach	16.0	13.0	13.4	31.1	26.6	13.9	19.7	30.4	18.0	17.9
Clatsop Co.	24.1	17.2	19.7	24.6	14.3	21.1	17.7	26.9	19.7	14.6
OREGON	27.2	17.5	23.0	21.4	10.8	22.4	17.6	29.8	18.7	11.5

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN POPULATION
BY AGE GROUP, 1970, 1980

	TOTAL	0-14	15-24	25-44	45-64	65+
Cannon Beach	52.4	32.0	131.7	247.1	-11.6	2.9
Clatsop Co.	14.1	-0.2	17.4	56.0	- 9.0	16.4
OREGON	25.9	3.5	26.7	63.4	9.5	33.7

RACE

In 1980, 1.7% of Cannon Beach's population was non-white. Persons of Spanish origin comprised 0.8% of the total population. In comparison, 3.5% of Clatsop County's population was non-white and 1.4% was of Spanish origin. In 1970, 0.2% of Cannon Beach's population was non-white.

HOUSEHOLDS AND HOUSEHOLD SIZE

The average household size increased from 2.15 persons per household in 1970 to 2.23 persons per household in 1980. Cannon Beach was the only city in Clatsop County whose average household size increased during the decade. Between 1970 and 1980, Clatsop County's average household size decreased from 2.7 persons to 2.5 persons. Even though Cannon Beach's average household size increased, it still had the smallest household size among Clatsop County cities.

In 1980, 38.3% of Cannon Beach's households were one person households, 50.8% consisted of two or three persons and 10.9% had four or more persons. Among Clatsop County cities, Cannon Beach had the highest percentage of one person households and the lowest percentage of households containing four or more persons.

In 1970, 32.4% of Cannon Beach's households were one person households, 55.2% consisted of two or three persons, and 12.4% had four or more persons.

Between 1970 and 1980, the percentage of one person households increased, while the percentage of 2 and 3 person households and four or more person households decreased.

HOUSING UNITS

The total number of housing units increased from 881 to 1274 between 1970 and 1980, an increase of 44.6%. The increase in housing units was smaller than the increase in the number of households (44.6% vs. 47.2%). This indicates that some housing units that were second homes became available for use by full time residents during the decade.

The Census classified 691 housing units as being second homes. In 1970, 488 housing units were classified as second homes. The growth in second homes between 1970 and 1980 was 41.6%. During the

same period the number of dwelling units for permanent residents increased by 47.3%. As a result, the percentage of the total housing stock in seasonal housing units decreased slightly from 55.4% to 54.4%.

The decade from 1970 to 1980 saw a sharp increase in the number of the City's housing units that consisted of two or more units in 1970, 93% of the City's housing stock was single-family residences and 6% were housing units consisting of two or more units. In 1980, 79% of the City's housing stock was single-family residence and 20% were housing units consisting of two or more units.

The number of mobile homes increased from two to twelve. In comparison with all of Clatsop County, Cannon Beach has a higher percentage of single family residences and lower percentages of 2 or more unit structure and mobile homes.

HOUSING TENURE

The number of owner-occupied housing units increased from 270 in 1970 to 291 in 1980, a 7.7% growth rate. The number of renter occupied housing units increased from 92 to 242, a 163 percent growth rate. As a result of the large increase in the renter occupied housing units, the percentage of the city's housing units that are owner occupied decreased from 74.6% in 1970 to 54.6% in 1980.

For comparison, the percentage of occupied units that are owner occupied in Clatsop County decreased from 66.8% to 64.5% between 1970 and 1980.

HOUSING

The following illustrates the age of housing by the structure's tenure. Renters occupy older housing - 66% of renters live in homes built in 1940 or earlier, whereas the percentage for owner-occupied housing is 45%, and in second homes it is 49%. Conversely, 33% of owner-occupied housing and second homes have been built since 1970, while only 16% of renter occupied units have been built since 1970.

TABLE 4

HOUSING UNITS AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL BY YEAR BUILT

YEAR HOUSING BUILT	TOTAL	OWNER		
		OCCUPIED	RENTAL	SEASONAL
1979 to 1980	6	4	3	7
1975 to 1978	9	18	5	7
1970 to 1974	15	11	8	19
1960 to 1969	7	11	5	8
1950 to 1959	11	10	13	11
1940 to 1949	23	18	31	22
1939 or earlier	29	27	35	27

HOUSING COST

The median value of owner occupied housing in 1980 was \$63,800. This was the highest median value among Clatsop County cities and is substantially higher than the County median value of \$50,400. The median contract rent was \$184. The median contract rent in Clatsop County, in 1980, was \$164.

As income increases, the percentage of total income that households spend on rent decreases. Of the households earning less than \$5,000, that were compiled, 85% spent 35% or more of their income on housing. For renters earning \$5,000 - 9,999, the percentage was 56%. For renters earning between \$10,000 - 14,999 the percentage was 6%. No household earning more than \$15,000 paid more than 20% of their income for rent.

TABLE 5

RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME

<u>INCOME</u>	<u>LESS THAN 20%</u>	<u>20-24%</u>	<u>25-34%</u>	<u>35%+</u>
Less than \$5,000	5%	5%	5%	85%
\$5,000 - 9,999	6%	9%	29%	56%
\$10,000 - 14,999	31%	29%	33%	7%
\$15,000 - 19,999	100%			
\$20,000	100%			

As with renters, the percentage of total income that homeowners spend on housing costs decreases as income rises.

TABLE 6

OWNER OCCUPIED MONTHLY HOUSING COSTS, AS A

YEAR HOUSING BUILT	TOTAL	OWNER		
		OCCUPIED	RENTAL	SEASONAL
1979 to 1980	6	4	3	7
1975 to 1978	9	18	5	7
1970 to 1974	15	11	8	19
1960 to 1969	7	11	5	8
1950 to 1959	11	10	13	11
1940 to 1949	23	18	31	22
1939 or earlier	29	27	35	27
<u>HOUSING COST</u>				

The median value of owner occupied housing in 1980 was \$63,800. This was the highest median value among Clatsop County cities and is substantially higher than the County median value of \$50,400. The median contract rent was \$184. The median contract rent in Clatsop County, in 1980, was \$164.

As income increases, the percentage of total income that households spend on rent decreases. Of the households earning less than \$5,000, that were compiled, 85% spent 35% or more of their income on housing. For renters earning \$5,000 - 9,999, the percentage was 56%. For renters earning between \$10,000 - 14,999 the percentage was 6%. No household earning more than \$15,000 paid more than 20% of their income for rent.

TABLE 5

RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME

<u>INCOME</u>	<u>LESS THAN 20%</u>	<u>20-24%</u>	<u>25-34%</u>	<u>35%+</u>
Less than \$5,000	5%	5%	5%	85%
\$5,000 - 9,999	6%	9%	29%	56%
\$10,000 - 14,999	31%	29%	33%	7%
\$15,000 - 19,999	100%			
\$20,000	100%			

As with renters, the percentage of total income that homeowners spend on housing costs decreases as income rises.

TABLE 6

OWNER OCCUPIED MONTHLY HOUSING COSTS, AS A

PERCENTAGE OF INCOME

INCOME	LESS THAN 20%	20-24%	25-34%	35%+
Less than \$5,000	9%	11%	43%	37%
\$5,000 - 9,999	40%	20%	10%	30%
\$10,000 - 14,999	50%	-	28%	22%
\$15,000 - 19,999	48%	18%	18%	18%
\$20,000	87%	8%	5%	-

INCOME

The median household income in 1979 was \$10,927. This was the lowest median household income among Clatsop County cities. The median household income in Clatsop County was \$15,262 and in Oregon it was \$16,781. Table 7 shows household income in 1979:

TABLE 7

HOUSEHOLD INCOME

<u>INCOME</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
Less than \$10,000	274	46%
\$10,000 - 19,999	163	30%
\$20,000 - 29,999	72	13%
\$30,000 +	58	11%

The median family income in 1979 was \$13,500. This was the lowest median family income among Clatsop County cities. The median family income in Clatsop County was \$18,820 and in Oregon it was \$20,028. Table 8 shows family income in 1979.

TABLE 8

FAMILY INCOME

<u>INCOME</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
Less than \$10,000	98	34%
\$10,000 - 19,999	102	35%
\$20,000 - 29,999	51	17%
\$30,000 +	43	14%

The Oregon Community Development Program identifies households with annual incomes of less than 50% of the county median household income as "low-income," and those households with annual incomes between 50 and 80% of the county median as "moderate income". Applying these criteria to Cannon Beach's permanent households demonstrates that 187 (33%) have annual household incomes of less than \$7,631 (50% of the Clatsop County median annual household income of \$15,262), and that 136 (24%) have annual household incomes between \$7,631 and \$12,209 (50 and 80% of the Clatsop County median). Thus, 33% of the permanent households in Cannon

Beach in 1979 could be considered low-income, and 24% moderate-income.

Cannon Beach had the second highest percentage of persons with incomes below the Federal poverty level in 1979 (12.4%). Clatsop County had 11.6% of its population below the poverty level, and Oregon has 10.6%.

ALTERNATIVE POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENTS

I. Method - Increasing percentage of Clatsop County population based on past trends. Assume that the City's share of total county population increases by 0.5% every five years.

1960	<u>495</u>	= 1.8%
	27380	
1970	<u>779</u>	= 2.7%
	28473	
1980	<u>1187</u>	= 3.7%
	32489	

	<u>County Population</u> <u>Projection</u>	<u>Cannon Beach</u> <u>Percentage</u>	<u>Cannon Beach</u> <u>Population</u>
1985	34,000	4.2%	1,428
1990	36,400	4.7%	1,711
1995	38,800	5.2%	2,018
2000	41,500	5.7%	2,366

II. Method - Assume the same growth rate for the period 1980 - 2000 that occurred between 1970 and 1980 (52.4%).

1985	1,498
1990	1,809
1995	2,283
2000	2,757

III. Method - Assume a slightly lower growth rate than during the period 1970 to 1980. A three percent annual rate.

1985	1,377
1990	1,595
1995	1,849
2000	2,143

IV. Method - Project future population growth based on permanent housing units constructed. Based on 1980 Census information, the stock of permanent dwelling units increased at an annual rate of 18.6 units between 1970 and 1980. Applying the same rate to the year 2000 results in the following population projections, assuming a household size of 2.2:

1985	93 du.	205 residents = 1,392
1990	93 du.	205 residents = 1,597
1995	93 du.	205 residents = 1,802
2000	93 du.	205 residents = 2,007

Population Projection Range

	<u>1985</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>2000</u>
Low	1,377	1,595	1,849	2,007
High	1,498	1,809	2,283	2,757

PLAN POPULATION PROJECTION

Population Projection Method III was selected for planning purposes. Because the long and severe recession of 1981-83 has depressed population growth rates throughout Oregon, it is anticipated that Cannon Beach's 1985 population will be less than the 1,377 persons projected. However, over the planning period, 1980 -2000, it is assumed that the 3% growth rate will prevail because long-range growth factors will overcome growth lags associated with the present economic difficulties of Oregon.

LAND USE SURVEY - 1982

A land-use survey was conducted of the Cannon Beach urban growth boundary in the summer of 1982. The results of the survey are shown on Table 9.

TABLE 9

CANNON BEACH URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

1982 LAND-USE SURVEY
(in acres)

LAND USE	NORTHSIDE	DOWNTOWN	MIDTOWN	TOLOVANA	TOTAL
Single-family Residential	13.24	1.71	20.09	22.56	57.6
Single-family Residential - Vacation	10.00	3.56	23.80	32.95	70.28
Duplex & Multi-family (units)	.69 (11)	1.37 (28)	3.44 (56)	3.60 (45)	9.10
Condominium (units)	7.13 (72)	-	-	3.61 (106)	10.74
Retail Commercial	-	8.03	2.19	1.29	11.51
Retail Commercial with Residential (units)	-	.52 (5)	1.63 (4)	.32 (3)	2.08
General Commercial	2.70	-	.77	-	3.47
Motels (units)	.82 (20)	8.97 (168)	6.44 (181)	4.62 (98)	20.85
Public Institution & Open Space	36.30	47.14	25.02	17.41	125.87
Vacant Land	50.78	1.76	116.41	88.52	257.47
TOTAL	121.66	73.16	199.78	174.85	568.97

TABLE 10

CANNON BEACH URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

VACANT LAND*
(in acres)

PLAN DESIGNATION AND ZONE	NORTHSIDE (With S/W) (No S/W)	DOWNTOWN (With S/W) (No S/W)	MIDTOWN (With S/W) (No S/W)	TOLOVANA (With S/W) (No S/W)	TOTAL (With S/W) (No S/W)
RVL	1.93	-	18.37	-	1.93
RL	1.93	-	11.56	15.23	28.72
R1	-	-	-	31.50	31.50
R2	12.32	.11	24.91	-	37.34
R3	-	-	-	5.38	5.38
RM	.11	.23	2.59	.74	3.67
RAM	-	-	4.88	-	4.88
MP	-	-	7.84	-	7.84
C1	-	1.42	9.60	-	9.60
C2	-	-	2.39	3.33	7.14
OSR	-	-	1.47	-	1.47
TOTAL	16.29	1.76	70.08	56.18	120.56
	34.49	-	46.33	32.34	136.91

* Based on 1982 Land-Use Survey.

The urban growth boundary's land use is: 148 acres residential, 38 acres commercial, 126 acres public/open space, and 206.5 acres of vacant land that are zoned for residential use. Of this acreage, 113.4 has ready access to sewer/water facilities and 93.1 does not. There are approximately 12 acres of vacant commercial land.

RESIDENTIAL LAND REQUIREMENTS 1983-2000

Using a population projection of 2,143 permanent residents in the year 2000 results in a need for 111.4 acres of residential land. The following are the calculations for arriving at this figure.

A. Assume

1. That the household characteristics of the permanent population will continue to become like that for Clatsop County as a whole. Therefore, a household size of 2.5 persons per dwelling unit is assumed.
2. The construction of 21.8 permanent dwelling units per year (3% annual growth rate the number of additional permanent du's needed would be $(2143 - 1215 \div 2.5 = 371)$).
3. The construction of 20.7 seasonal dwelling units per year (average construction rate 1970-1980).
4. A vacancy factor of 2% for permanent dwelling units and seasonal dwelling units.
5. Two dwelling units demolished per year (one seasonal and one permanent).
6. 75% of the housing units will be single family (including mobile homes) and 25% will be multi-family or duplex. This percentage is assumed to be the same for both permanent and seasonal housing.
7. The density of single family dwellings will be six dwelling units per acre, the density of duplexes will be 10 dwelling units per acre and the density of multi-family dwellings will be fifteen dwelling units per acre.

B. Land Requirements

1. Dwelling units constructed (1983-2000)

- a. Permanent dwelling units: $21.8\text{du/yr} \times 17\text{yrs} = 371\text{du}$.
- b. Seasonal dwelling units: $20.7\text{du/yr} \times 17\text{yrs} = 352\text{du}$.
- c. Vacancy factor $.02 \times 723 = 14 \text{ du}$.
- d. Demolished units replaced = $2 \times 17 = 34 \text{ du}$.
- e. Total dwelling units = 771

2. Type of dwelling units

- a. Single family residential dwellings: $771 \times .75 = 578$
- b. Multi-family & duplex: $771 \times .25 = 193$

3. Land requirements

- a. Single family residential dwellings: $578 \text{ du} - 6 \text{ du/acre} = 96 \text{ acres}$.
- b. Multi-family or duplex: $193 \text{ du} - 12.5 \text{ du/acre} = 15.4 \text{ acres}$
- c. Total residential acreage required 111.4

CAPACITY OF THE URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

An inventory of the vacant land available for development within the City of Cannon Beach's Urban Growth Boundary, by sub-area, plan designation/zone, and current availability of sewer/water services is shown on Table 10. The vacant land designated/zoned for residential use (vacant land in the RVL, RL, R1, R2, R3, and RAM designations/zones plus 1/2 of the vacant land in the RM designation/zone, where both residences and motels are outright permitted uses) totals 206.5 acres, of which 113.4 are currently serviced with sewer and water. Furthermore, it is expected that the 93.1 acres which are currently unserviced will be provided with sewer and water services during the planning period. The amount of vacant residential land available within the City's UGB thus compares favorably with the City's projected 1983-2000 residential land need of 111.4 acres.

The vacant land designated/zoned for duplex and multi-family use under the following designations/zones -- R3, 1/2 of RM (assuming only seasonal multi-family dwellings could compete successfully with motels for this land), 1/4 of R2 (assuming that 3/4 of the R2 designated/zoned land will actually develop as single family residences) -- totals 17.57 acres, of which 16.56 acres are currently serviced. This total meets the projected need of 15.4 acres to be developed as duplexes or multi-family dwellings.

PROVISION OF ADEQUATE LAND FOR LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSING TYPES

Low and Moderate Income Permanent Housing Needed

1. Assumptions

- a. Percentage of additional low income permanent households = 33%.
- b. Percentage of additional moderate income permanent households = 25%.

(See Income section, at page 164, for derivation of percentages.)

2. Dwelling Units Needed (1983-2000)

- a. Low income = $.33 \times 371 \times 1.04 = 127$
- b. Moderate income = $.24 \times 371 \times 1.04 = 93$

The 127 units of additional low-income permanent housing projected to be needed can be provided for adequately by multi-family dwellings and mobile homes on the vacant R3 and RAM designated land. The 5.38 acres of vacant R3 land are expected to be developed as multi-family dwellings at 15 units/acre, producing 80 dwelling units. In the RAM designation, there are 26 vacant lots in an existing mobile home subdivision; an additional 3.15 acre RAM area northeast of the existing subdivision which could be developed at at least 6 mobile homes/acre (19 units); and a 2.6 acre RAM area southeast of the existing subdivision which, because of slope constraints, is unlikely to develop at more than 4 mobile homes/acre (10 units). These three areas provide for a total of 55 mobile home sites. Thus, a total of 135 lower-income housing opportunities are provided in the R3 and RAM zone. This exceeds the projected need of 127 units.

In addition there is a vacant 7.3 acre area which is currently designated/zoned RVL, but which under Midtown Policy #4 will most likely be given an RAM designation/zone when conversion to urban use occurs. Development on this site at 4 units per acre (due to slope factors) could provide another 29 mobile home sites.

The need for 93 additional units of moderate income housing can be provided for adequately by duplex dwellings on vacant R2 designated land. Assume that 1/4 of the vacant 41.36 acres of R2 designated land is developed for duplexes at an expected density of 10 units/acre, this would provide for 103 moderate income dwelling units. This is greater than the 93 units projected to be needed during the planning period.

ATTACHMENT E

Section 3.100 Mobile Home and RV Park Zone, MP

Purpose: The purpose of this zone is to provide for lower income housing in the form of mobile homes in mobile home parks and on individual lots, recreational vehicle parks and accessory uses, and campgrounds.

1. Uses Permitted Outright

The following uses and their accessory uses are permitted outright in the MP zone:

- a. Placement of recreational vehicles in an approved recreational vehicle park;
- b. Placement of mobile homes in an approved mobile home park;
- c. Tent camping in an approved campground;
- d. Public park or publicly owned recreation area;
- e. Utility lines necessary for public service;
- f. A trailer or mobile home used temporarily during the construction period of a permitted use for which a building permit has been issued, but not to exceed one year.

2. Conditional Uses Permitted

In an MP zone, the following uses and their accessory uses are permitted subject to the provisions of Article 6:

- a. Recreation vehicle park;
- b. Campgrounds;
- c. Mobile home parks;
- d. Structural Shoreline Stabilization: Rip-rap, bulkhead or seawall consistent with Section 6.230;

e. Mobile home on an individual lot.

3. Standards.

In an MP zone, the following standards shall apply:

a. Lot Size. A mobile home on an individual lot shall have a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet. A mobile home placed in a mobile home park shall have a lot size in conformance with Section 6.185. Recreational vehicles placed in a recreational vehicle park shall have a lot size in conformance with Section 4.140.

b. Lot Dimensions.

(1) Mobile homes on an individual lot shall have a minimum lot width of 40 feet and a minimum lot depth of 80 feet. The front yard shall be at least 15 feet. The sideyard shall be at least 5 feet, except on a corner lot, the minimum side yard on the street side shall be 15 feet. The rear yard shall be at least 15 feet, except on a corner lot, it may be a minimum of five feet.

(2) Mobile homes placed in a mobile home park shall meet the lot dimension standards of Section 6.185.

(3) Recreation vehicles placed in a recreation park shall meet the lot dimension standards of Section 4.110.

c. Solar Access. Mobile homes shall be positioned to meet the Solar Access Protection requirements of Section .

d. Building Height. Maximum height of a structure shall be 24 feet, measured as the vertical distance from the average elevation of existing grade to the highest point of a roof surface of a flat roof, to the top of a mansard roof, or to the mean height level between the eaves and the ridge for a pitched roof. The ridge height of a pitched roof shall not exceed 28 feet. Pitched roofs shall be considered those with a 5-12 pitch or greater.

e. Mobile Homes. Mobile homes shall be located in accordance with the requirements of Section 4.500.

- f. Signs. As allowed by Section 4.040.
- g. Parking. As required by Section 5.010.
- h. Design Review. All uses except mobile homes and their accessory structures are subject to Design Review of Section 4.100.
- i. Geologic or Soils Engineering Study. As required by Section 4.110.

ATTACHMENT F

AREA 1

Area 1 is proposed to be designated/zoned MP. It is adjoined on the west, north, and southeast corner by areas designated/zoned, or proposed to be designated/zoned, RAM and on the east by the UGB. On the south, Area 1 is adjoined by land designated/zoned C1, C2 and RVL. The designation/zone of the C1 property adjoining the southwest corner of Area 1 was changed to C1 for the purpose of providing an accessory service station and convenience store to serve an RV park to be located in Area 1 (see Ordinance No. 83-17). In addition, the RVL designated/zoned area to the south of Area 1 is ultimately destined, pursuant to Midtown Policy 4, to itself be designated/zoned RAM or MP. With the exception of the 28 unit Elkland Village Mobile Home Subdivision to the west, only two of which sites are developed at present, the areas surrounding Area 1 are currently undeveloped.

Adequacy of Public Facilities and Services

Sewer. There is an eight-inch sewer main running along the south and west boundaries of Area 1. This main is sized adequately to allow for either mobile home or RV park development of Area 1 at the densities allowed under the City's comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance. The Elkland Sewage Lift Station is located near the southeastern corner of Area 1. It receives all of the sewage from the area east of Highway 101 and north of Elk Creek Road by gravity flow and pumps the sewage back to Highway 101.

With its present impellers (pumps) this lift station has an optimum design capacity of 110 dwelling units. Its maximum design capacity, with the present impellers, is between 200 and 300 dwelling units. This means that the current pumping capacity of the lift station is more than adequate to handle development of the

28 lots of the Elkland Village subdivision, the 19 dwelling units which would be likely to be developed in Area 2 at a reasonable density of six per acre, the 10 dwelling units likely to be developed in Area 3 at a reasonable density of four dwelling units per acre, the 7 dwelling units which might be developed in the RVL area under its present designation/zone, and the 36 dwelling unit equivalents (three RV or camping units would be the equivalent of one dwelling unit for sewage system purposes; $9.6 \times 11 : \text{by } 3 = 35.2$) which would exist if Area 1 is developed as an RV park or campground at the maximum density allowable in the MP designation/zone of 11 per acre (a total of 100 units). Even if Area 1 were to develop in mobile homes at a reasonable density of six units per acre (57 units), and the designation/zone of the RVL area eventually were changed to RAM, and accompanying mobile home development (considering slope constraint) were at a reasonable four units per acre (total 29 units), the dwelling units in the area served by the sewage lift station would only total 143, well within the maximum design capacity of the lift station.

The recent completion of Cannon Beach's Wetlands Sewage Treatment System insures that there will be adequate sewage treatment capacity to handle the sewage generated from Area 1, regardless of whether the area is eventually developed as mobile homes and/or an RV park.

Water. A six-inch water main is located along the west and south boundaries of Area 1. This main is sized adequately to handle the needs of Area 1 regardless of whether eventual development is mobile homes or an RV park. The City of Cannon Beach's water system has adequate capacity to provide the water needed by Area 1 regardless of ultimate development in mobile homes or an RV park.

Electricity. A Pacific Power & Light substation is located immediately across Elk Creek Road south of Area 1. There are existing transformers at the southwest corner of Area 1 and along Elkland Drive. An Electrical conduit runs up Elkland Drive west of Area 1. Empty electrical conduits available to provide service to Area 1, are located at the northwest and southwest corners of Area 1. Electrical lines are also installed along the southern boundary of Area 1 as far as the Elkland Lift Station. Electrical service could be delivered to Area 1 through these existing lines and conduits or, if the area develops as an RV park, from a single location at the entrance to the RV park, with underground lines within the park.

Telephone and Cable TV. There are terminal junction boxes located on the west side of Elkland Drive, opposite the southwest corner of Area 1. There is an empty conduit already running under Elkland Drive along the west edge of Area 1. Area 1 can be served from these facilities, as either a mobile home development or as an RV park.

Roads. Elkland Drive, which runs along the western boundary of Area 1, was designed to be a collector street and currently provides a paved surface 28 feet in width, in a 75 feet wide right-of-way. Section 9.2.F of the Subdivision Ordinance requires collector streets to be 22 feet in width and have a minimum right-of-way width of 40 feet. The usual average daily traffic (ADT) range for collector streets is 800 to 3,000. Studies reported by the Institute of Traffic Engineers found an average of 8.7 trips per dwelling unit on weekdays and Sundays, and an average of 10 on Saturday. Therefore, Elkland Drive has more than adequate capacity to serve 80 to 300 dwelling units.

The existing Elkland Village Subdivision contains 28 lots. As described above, under the MP designation/zone, Area 1 could be developed with approximately 57 mobile homes (probably not all of which would be accessed from Elkland Drive), and Area 2 (plus the remaining 0.8 acre RAM area outside the existing subdivision) with approximately 19 dwelling units. Therefore, a maximum of 104 dwellings (only 47 dwellings if Area 1 is developed as an RV park with access from Elk Creek Road) would conceivably be accessed from Elkland Drive. This is well within Elkland Drive's capacity.

Elk Creek Road, which runs parallel to the southern boundary of Area 1, but 150 feet to the south (on the other side of the C1 and C2 areas adjoining Area 1), is currently a rocked road with some gravel, 18 feet in width in a 40 foot right-of-way. It extends from the U.S. 101 right-of-way east of the UGB. At present three public facilities structures (Elkland Sewage Lift Station, the P&L Substation and the City Water Reservoir) are the only development accessed from Elk Creek Road.

An RV park in Area 1 could be accessed from Elk Creek Road, through the intervening C1 commercial area, to which the C1 designation/zone was applied for the specific purpose of providing accessory services to such an RV park. In addition, Area 3 will eventually be accessed from Elk Creek Road, either by a new road running directly north from Elk Creek Road or by an extension of the road

which currently runs from Elk Creek Road to the sewage lift station.

Development of Areas 1 and 3, as well as development of the existing commercial areas, would require improvement of the Elk Creek Road. Under the City's Comprehensive Plan, the Planning Commission and Public Works Committee have the authority to set standards for city street projects and streets in private developments. Also, under the City's Subdivision and Zoning Ordinance the City can and no doubt will require any potential developer of Area 1, Area 3 or the commercial areas to improve sections of Elk Creek Road to standards appropriate for the type and density of development allowed by the areas's plan designation/zone as a condition of approving the proposed development. This will ensure that future development in these areas will proceed concomitantly with necessary improvements, and will not overburden Elk Creek Road.

Fire. There is an existing fire hydrant at the southeast corner of Elkland Drive and Kramer Court, at the northwest corner of Area 1, and also at the intersection of Elkland Drive and Elk Creek Road. Fire protection can be provided to Area 1 by the Cannon Beach Volunteer Fire Department. Adequate access for Fire Department vehicles into Area 1 can be designed and provided for regardless of whether the area develops as mobile homes or as an RV park.

Police. Police protection can be provided to Area 1 by the Cannon Beach Police Department.

Storm drainage. Area 1 does not drain onto any of the adjacent areas, but rather drains into the natural wetland located to the east. Thus, a drainage plan for Area 1 can be developed independently without affecting any of the adjoining properties. Since any development of Area 1 under the proposed new MP zone will require conditional use approval, a specific drainage plan can be required as part of the process.

Impacts on Adjacent Uses and Neighborhoods

Under the MP designation/zone, development of Area 1 with mobile homes as conditional uses could occur either on individual lots or in a mobile home park, whereas the adjacent RAM areas allow mobile homes only on individual lots. Both the MP and RAM designation/zone have a 5,000 square foot minimum lot size for mobile homes on individual lots. The minimum area requirement for double-wide

mobile homes in a park is also 5,000 square feet, and that for single-wide mobile homes is only slightly smaller, 4,000 square feet. Thus, the density of development in a mobile home park in the MP designation/zone would be only slightly greater than that of mobile homes on individual lots in the RAM designation/zone.

The main difference between mobile home parks and mobile homes on individual lots is that mobile home parks generally have private streets with controlled access. This would create no additional impact on adjoining uses. In appearance, and all other respects, a mobile home park in Area 1 would be very similar in use to the existing mobile home subdivision in the adjoining RAM area to the west. Thus, the impacts on adjacent areas would be minimal, and probably negligible.

The major respect in which development of Area 1 may differ from that of the surrounding residential areas is that under the MP designation/zone Area 1 may be developed as an RV park or campground. Therefore, my testimony will center around possible impacts of RV park development (which would also cover any possible impacts of campground development) of Area 1 on adjacent mobile home or other residential uses and neighborhoods, and methods which the city could use under its existing condition use permit authority to minimize and eliminate any adverse affects. Where any exist, possible impacts of RV park development on the adjacent C1 and C2 areas will also be noted and discussed.

Traffic. RV parks must accommodate long vehicles that cannot turn around easily. Problems may occur if these vehicles stray into residential areas which do not have through streets. RV parks frequently have additional traffic not experienced in adjacent residential areas in the form of service vehicles and guests visiting the park occupants. The density of people and vehicles in an RV park will be greater than in most residential neighborhoods, and especially so on weekends. This is the opposite of the standard pattern for a normal residential area, but is typical for residential areas in Cannon Beach. RV park traffic will not adversely affect adjacent commercial areas in that commercial areas are designed for a high volume of traffic.

There are measures available which can virtually eliminate adverse traffic impacts of an RV park. Adequate signing can prevent RV's from inadvertently straying into neighboring residential areas. Keeping the entrance of the RV park as close to a main thoroughfare as possible will reduce the possibility of RV's finding their way

into residential neighborhoods. In the case of Area 1, access to an RV park could be from Elk Creek Road through the C1 area created to provide accessory services to the RV park, rather than from the residential Elkland Drive. The C1 area is at the intersection of Elkland Drive and Elk Creek Road, virtually adjacent to the Highway 101 interchange. RV parks generally have only one entrance and exit, which is controlled, reducing the possibility of RV's inadvertently wandering through residential neighborhoods. Furthermore, requiring adequate parking spaces to be provided within the RV park itself for guests of the RV park users, and providing adequate off-street RV parking in the vicinity of the RV park office and check-in area will eliminate possible problems of RV and guests parking in adjacent residential areas or blocking access to adjacent commercial areas and uses.

Another aspect of RV park-related traffic problems is the potential effect upon other parts of the City as the RV's travel to the downtown area for shopping and to recreation areas such as the beach. Potential problems would include increased traffic along these routes and parking congestion at the destinations. Access from Area 1 to downtown Cannon Beach is entirely along arterial streets. No RV traffic will need to traverse residential streets in order to reach the downtown area or the beach. With respect to parking, the City has recently provided a new RV parking area from the downtown and beach areas near the City's sewage treatment facility. Another way to decrease RV traffic in the downtown area would be to provide a mini-convenience store near any RV park in Area 1 in order to provide basic food and personal items.

Noise. In instances where increased noise is observed in the vicinity of an RV park, it usually arises from the increased density of people within the park or from the use of self-contained generators in the RV's. There are several methods which could be used to eliminate these excess noises. If full electricity is provided to the RV park, as would be the case in Area 1, it would not be necessary for park guests to run their generators. A playground or other recreational area could be required to be situated in the central or eastern portion of Area 1 away from adjoining residential areas. Other possible noises from an RV park could be screened out by earthen berms around the perimeter, or could be reduced by vegetative plantings or the use of buffer zones between the RV park and residential areas.

Lighting. While residential areas generally have street lighting (although the residential areas adjoining Area 1 do not at

present), and RV park is required to have area lighting. In addition, vehicles may be entering, leaving and driving around an RV park at night to a greater degree than occurs in adjoining residential areas. Adverse impacts of such area lighting and of RV headlights on adjacent residential areas can be minimized through the use of low-level (in both height and intensity) lighting, by screening with vegetation or can be eliminated through use of earthen berms around the perimeter of the RV park and by providing access to the RV park away from residential streets.

Visual appearance. OAR 333-31-020(1) requires the management of an RV park to maintain buildings, grounds, rental units, spaces, and furnishings in good repair and appearance and clean condition. Nevertheless, inhabitants of neighboring residential areas many consider RV's themselves and the offices, restrooms, bathing facilities, laundry facilities, etc. which accompany an RV park visually offensive. This problem can be avoided through good design of the RV park and its accessory structure, and use of buffer zones, vegetative screening, fences and earthen berms so that the RV park is not actually visible from adjacent residential areas, and by designing access to the RV park to keep RV's off of residential streets.

Recreational Character. It is possible that the recreational and tourist character of an RV park could have adverse impacts on adjacent residential neighborhoods, in the form of increased trespass by adults, children, or pets from the RV park. One solution to this problem is to impose strict requirements on restraint of pets in the RV park and to provide both people and pets with adequate recreational opportunities so that they won't need to go wandering in adjacent residential areas. Such wandering can also be effectively discouraged through use of earthen berms, fences or other barriers.

In the case of Area 1, the nearby beach and ocean can, of course, be used for recreational purposes, but there is also an adjacent natural area to the east in common ownership with Area 1. Nature trails, bike trails, picnic areas, etc. could be provided by the RV park owners in this natural area. The City could also require a certain amount of recreational facilities, such as tennis courts, to be located in an RV park itself.

Impact on Adjacent Lake & Wetlands Use. The adjacent area to the east is under common ownership with area 1, but is outside of the Urban Growth Boundary and, except for the area of the old Highway

Division fill, is currently zoned Lake and Wetlands (LW-Section 3.160, Clatsop County Land and Water Development Use Ordinance). The purpose of this zone is to allow for the conservation of wetlands and shorelands. Permitted uses include low intensity recreation use.

Potential negative impacts on this Lake and Wetlands zone from RV park or mobile home development of Area 1 include disturbance of the wetlands due to construction of improvements on the adjacent property and disturbance of the outdoor recreation nature of the area. In fact, irregardless of the proposed designation/zone, any construction development of the adjacent property could have a negative impact on the wetlands if the construction is not properly done. Erosion of newly worked earth and resulting siltation could adversely impact the wetlands.

There are several construction methods which can be used to control such potential problems. Earth movement should be kept to a minimum and slopes should be kept as flat as possible. Erosion and sediment can be controlled by the installation of temporary silt fences during construction and by the use of slope erosion control fabrics along with slope revegetation on unprotected newly constructed slopes. Implementation of a general landscaping plan will also help to control erosion. The City has authorized, in its standards, the imposition of such measures upon the development of Area 1 and other properties adjacent to these wetlands.

Another potential adverse impact could be the disturbance of the natural outdoor recreation area due to trespass from an adjacent RV or mobile home park in Area 1, such as the use of motorized vehicles within the Lake and Wetlands area. The owners of the wetlands area have proposed in the past to construct and maintain some hiking and biking trails, etc., for access to the Elk Creek area as part of their proposed RV park. The construction of barricades, which allow for foot traffic but not motorized vehicle traffic, will control such trespass on these trails. Typically, such barricades include wooden posts or poles set into the ground at close intervals on a selected pattern. A requirement for installation of such barricades could be made a part of the development standards imposed by the City upon such a development.

AREA 2

This 2.3 acre area is proposed to be designated/zoned RAM. It is bordered on the north and east by UGB, on the west by another RAM

area and on the south by Area 1, which is proposed for MP designation/zoning.

Adequacy of Public Facilities and Services

As described for Area 1, an eight-inch sewer line, a six-inch water line and an empty electrical conduit run under elkland Drive and are stubbed out at its intersection with Silverpoint Avenue to within 150 feet of the southwest corner of Area 2, and capacity to provide these services is adequate. Telephone and cable T.V. lines are also readily accessible at this intersection. Road access to Area 2 has already been discussed in the Roads Section under Area 1 above. Fire protection and police protection can be provided by the Cannon Beach Volunteer Fire Department and Cannon Beach Police Department. Drainage from this area is to the north and east into the natural wetland and does not affect any adjoining properties. A storm drainage plan for the property can be prepared at the time development occurs.

Impacts on Adjacent Uses and Neighborhoods

At present, Area 2 is surrounded by undeveloped property. An area with an identical RAM designation/zone is adjacent to Area 2 to the west. Possible impacts of RV park development of the property to the south of Area 2 on Area 2 itself have been dealt with under Area 1. Development of mobile homes or other residential uses in Area 2 would not have adverse impacts on similar mobile home uses or on an RV park located to the south in Area 1. As described under Area 1 above, any such RV park would be buffered by earthen berms, vegetative screening, etc. to protect the adjacent residential areas.

Potential negative impacts on the adjacent LW wetlands area from development allowed by the proposed RAM designation/zone in Area 2 are similar to those previously discussed for Area 1 and may be minimized and controlled in a similar manner.

AREA 3

Area 3 is a 2.6 acre area proposed to be designated/zoned RAM. It is adjoined on the north and the east by the UGB, on the west by Area 1, which is proposed to be designated/zoned MP, and on the south by an RVL area. All of the ares adjoining Area 3 are presently undeveloped.

Adequacy of Public Facilities and Services

An eight-inch sewer line, six-inch water line and full electrical conduit run to the Elkland Sewage Lift Station and are stubbed out about 80 feet from the southwest corner of Area 3. As described under Area 1 above, these sewer, water and electrical facilities have the capacity to serve the development anticipated in Area 3. Telephone and cable T.V. lines are accessible from the existing terminal junction boxes opposite the southwest corner of Area 1. Road access to Area 3 could be provided from Elk Creek Road along the eastern boundary of the C2 area and then along the southern boundary of Area 1 to Area 3 or, what would probably be preferable, from Elk Creek Road through the current RVL area to Area 3. Although Area 3 does have an average slope of 20% (which limits potential residential development of this area to four dwelling units per acre), it has no identified geological hazards which would pose a problem for road building. Road access to Area 3 has already been discussed in the Roads section under Area 1 above. Fire and police protection can be provided to Area 3 by the Cannon Beach Volunteer Fire Department and Cannon Beach Police Department. Drainage from Area 3 is to the north and east into the natural wetlands and does not affect other adjacent properties.

Impacts on Adjacent Uses and Neighborhoods

Under the RAM designation/zone, development of Area 3 will be in the form of mobile homes or other residences. Compatibility between such residential uses and a potential RV park located in Area 1 to the west have been described under Area 1. It is very likely that the RVL area adjoining Area 3 to the south will eventually be given an identical RAM designation, pursuant to Midtown Policy 4. Nevertheless, in the mean time, under its present RVL designation/zone the only likely significant difference between development allowed in the RVL area and in Area 3 (considering the constraints the 20% slope imposes on density in Area 3) is that development of Area 3 may occur in the form of mobile homes, whereas mobile homes are prohibited in the RVL area. However, mobile home development of Area 3 would not have an adverse visual impact on the RVL area because the density of development allowed would not be greater than four units per acre and because modern mobile homes look very much like stick-built housing. Skirting is required to be used by the Department of Commerce, and so the wheels of the mobile home are obscured. Modern mobile homes also use aluminum woodgrain siding and may even

come with composition roof shingles, further eliminating the visual difference between them and conventional homes.

Potential negative impacts on the adjacent LW wetlands area from development allowed by the proposed RAM designation/zone in Area 3 are similar to those previously discussed for Area 1 and may be minimized and controlled in a similar manner.