



Seaside Oregon

Urban Growth Boundary Amendment

Review of ORS 197.298 and Goal 14 Locational
Factors

Planning Commission

Draft 9/1/2015

Submitted to:
City of Seaside
Kevin Cupples
989 Broadway Street
Seaside, OR 97138

Prepared by:
Otak, Inc.
808 SW 3rd Ave
Portland, OR 97204



Otak Project #15012
August 27, 2015

Introduction

The following memorandum describes the land suitability analysis for adding lands to an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) as required by State of Oregon law and administrative rule.

Prior to this analysis the City of Seaside administered a Goal 9 land needs analysis considering existing growth capacity, a housing and jobs forecast to determine land needs, by use type for accommodation of a 20-year growth horizon for the city of Seaside. The conclusion from the Goal 9 and 10 processes resulted in an identified need of approximately 200 acres of land for addition to the City of Seaside's UGB.

The identified mix and quantity of land use types is as follows:

Table 1

Land Use Type	Gross Acreage Needed
High Density Residential	61.3
Medium Density Residential	54.5
Low Density Residential	38.8
Subtotal Residential	154.6
Industrial	16.1
Institutional	19.5
Employment	35.6
Parks	10.6
Total Need	200.8

This memo therefore describes the process used for selecting said lands for inclusion in the City's UGB following the guidance of ORS 197.298 (Priority Lands) and Goal 14: urbanization (OAR 660-015-0000(14)); the evaluation considers:

- Priority land factors - goal 3, 4 land 5 protections, soil site-class suitability for timber production
- Locational factors - efficient accommodation of identified land needs, orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services, comparative environmental, energy, economic and social consequences and compatibility with nearby farm/forest activities.

The conclusion of this Priority Lands and Locational Factors analysis will include a comparison of potential expansion areas and a recommended location for the approximately 200 acre UGB expansion. A subsequent effort and memorandum chronicle the planning process for identifying potential comprehensive plan designations and approximate infrastructure locations needed to guide and accommodate future growth. Ultimately land will be zoned and annexed into the city incrementally at the time land owners so choose.

ORS 197.298 Priority of land to be included within urban growth boundary

The purpose of this section within Oregon's Revised Statutes is to guide UGB amendments in a manner that discourages the inclusion of highly productive farm and forest lands unless no reasonable alternatives exist. UGB expansion, following the statute should take place as follows:

1. Urban Reserves – these are areas that have been pre-determined (and analyzed) as suitable for future UGB expansion.
2. Adjacent, Non-Resource Lands – these lands are both adjacent (can abut, or be in relatively close proximity) to the existing UGB and, known as “exception lands” are already in smaller rural lots and often contain housing or rural commercial activities.
3. Resource Lands – these areas support valuable farm and forest commercial activity. These lands are generally in large lot sizes (80 to 160 acres) and rarely contain housing or commercial activities.

Following is a description of how these priorities were analyzed.

Urban Reserves

Urban reserve areas can be designated as future locations for UGB expansion. The UGB is intended to contain the land needed to accommodate two-decade's worth of expected growth. Reserves are intended to provide the room for the following thirty years, and to be brought into the UGB periodically as land supply is deemed insufficient. Few cities in Oregon have established Urban Reserves. The City of Seaside does not have Urban Reserves, accordingly the first step in this process can be bypassed, moving on to Adjacent Non-Resource Lands.

Adjacent, Non-Resource Lands

This category of lands contains two distinct components. Non-resources lands are generally defined as lands for which no exception has been taken from the protective requirements of Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands), 4 (Forest Lands) or 5 (Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces). Goal 3 and 4 lands are generally protected from development in order to facilitate the economic use for farming and forestry on them or their neighboring lands. Others such as Goal 5 (Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces) and Goal 7 (Areas Subject to Natural Hazards) are intended to prevent loss of important habitat, scenery, other natural resources or human health, safety and welfare.

Three areas of non-resource land are present within the study area adjacent to the City of Seaside's UGB. They can be seen on the map below. They are designated Rural Lands by the County Comprehensive Plan and zoned RA-5 and RA-2.


Area 1: There is one Rural Lands parcel (Tax Map: 61010A0001100) that measure 5.95 acres in size. It is located within one mile of the City of Seaside's UGB, but is completely surrounded by resources lands (Goals 4 and 5).

Area 2: There is just one lot directly adjacent to the City's UGB. It is 3.08 acres in size (property is located at 420 10th Ave, Seaside, OR, Tax Map 61028AC00800). It's western edge connects to the UGB, but the south and eastern edges border Goal 5 lands identified as Conservation and Other Resource Uses in the comprehensive plan, and zoned LW.

There are two other areas that while not directly proximate, are located nearby.

Area 3: Just over one mile south of the existing UGB, east of HWY 101 and along Beerman Creek Ln there is a collection of Rural Lands zoned RA-2 and RA-5. Together these properties add up to just over 130 acres. The lands to the west of HWY 101 are protected from development by the North Coast Land Conservancy. These lands are sufficiently removed from the UGB that provision of public services would be impracticable.

Clatsop County Comprehensive Plan: Non-Resource Lands



Without sufficient adjacent, non-resource lands available to accommodate forecasted growth, the City of Seaside has no choice but to look at Resource Lands.

Resource Lands

Beyond the above described non-resource lands, all the remaining lands adjacent to the Seaside UGB are resource lands. In Clatsop County, and within our study area, the Resource lands fall into three categories from the Comprehensive Plan: Conservation Forest Lands, Rural Agricultural Lands and Conservation Other Resources.


Resource Lands within our study area include:

Goal 3 Resource Lands include an isolated parcel designated by the comprehensive plan as Rural Agriculture Lands. This land is zoned EFU

Goal 4 Resource lands, designated by the comprehensive plan as Conservation Forest Lands have been zoned AF (Ag / Forest at a smaller scale with lots generally smaller than 40 acres) and F-80 (Forestry with 76 acre minimum lots)

Goal 5 Resource lands, designated as Conservation and Other Resources are assigned the LW (Lake and Wetlands) zoning designation.


Clatsop County Comprehensive Plan: Resource Lands



The next step in examining land suitability is to prioritize lands for inclusion as those with the lowest potential productivity. On forest lands productivity is measured by soil site-class suitability. This measure describes the potential annual yield, listed as the number of cubic-feet of timber per acre.

Cubic Foot Productivity Classes	
Code	Potential Yield-Mean Annual Increment
1	225 or more cuft/ac/yr
2	165 to 224 cuft/ac/yr
3	120 to 164 cuft/ac/yr
4	85 to 119 cuft/ac/yr
5	50 to 84 cuft/ac/yr

The Natural Resources Conservation Services provides an online tool for viewing the productivity class for most lands within the State, and the US as a whole. The map below shows the information attained from this online too <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>



Map: Soil productivity (Cubic feet per acre, per year average)

As shown above, the majority of resource lands near or adjacent to the UGB fall within Productivity Class 2 (Between 165 and 224 cubic feet per acre per year). Some data near the UGB (predominately to the south) is not available. However, the soil typologies are similar and therefore expected to also fall within Class 2.

Conclusion: 197.298 Analyses

The City has no established Urban Reserves (first priority) and insufficient adjacent non-resource lands for accommodating expected future growth. The analysis of resource lands shows that there are no substantial differences among the resource lands near Seaside's UGB. As a result, all adjacent lands are available for consideration by application of the "locational factors" of OAR 660-015-0000(14)

Locational Factors Evaluation

Goal 14 lists a series of four (4) factors for determining the best location/s for UGB expansion. They are often referred to as locational factors. They are: (1) Efficient accommodation of identified land needs; (2) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services; (3) Comparative environmental, energy, economic and social consequences; and (4) Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural and forest activities occurring on farm and forest land outside the UGB.

The following analysis considers topographical constraints to examine development capacity for Factor 1. Access to existing street and infrastructure connections is mapped in regard to factor 2. Proximity to public services such as the Hospital, Schools, and the Tsunami Assembly areas, solar aspect are measured to consider factor 3. Factor 4 is analyzed by looking an ownership maps through Clatsop County's GIS servers.

For this analysis the location factors are divided into two categories:


- Positive Conditions – conditions which favor a site or location for urbanization
- Negative Conditions – conditions that limit the urbanization value of a site or location

Positive Conditions

These conditions are related to several of the location factors. GIS mapping allows them to be examined and combined to find the highest coincidence of conditions that support urbanization.

The map below shows the overlapping occurrences of these positive conditions:

- Connections to existing streets
- Distances to
 - Parks
 - The hospital
 - Tsunami assembly areas
 - Schools
- Proximity to Sewer and Water (including potential locations for storage)



Map: Positive Conditions


As can be seen many locations have good access to tsunami assembly areas. Access to water and sewer infrastructure is also similar for many locations. The southeastern edge of the City's UGB rises slightly above other areas in terms of access to existing roadway connections, the hospital and the school.

Negative Conditions

These conditions are related to several of the location factors as well. GIS mapping allows them to be examined and combined to find the highest coincidence of conditions that inhibit urbanization. The presence of a negative condition does not preclude development. Rather, this mapping has been done to collectively examine elements that may limit development potential or hinder provision of public infrastructure including safety.

The map below shows the overlapping occurrences of these positive conditions:

- Steep Slopes. Slopes equal to or greater than 25% are typically considered unbuildable when determining growth capacity. The map below shows two ranges of slopes, 20%-30% and slopes greater than 30% as an illustration of topography that is easier to read than topographic map layers. The combination of these two ranges was considered in the locational factors evaluation; when a preferred boundary amendment is developed, capacity will be calculated based on the 25% standard)Streams, with 50 foot riparian buffers
- Wetlands from the Oregon Spatial Data Library (includes NWI plus a compilation of other local data)
- Tsunami Inundation Area (SB 379 mapping)




Map: Negative Conditions

The most pronounced negative condition is the wetland areas identified by the County Comprehensive Plan as Conservation Other Resources and from the Oregon Spatial Data Library,

followed closely by topography. The wetlands, combined with the SB379 tsunami inundation line limit the ability of the southern and southeastern most areas in regards to safe and sustainable urbanization. The steep sloping lands to the northeast also limit the ability for urbanization, both in terms of capacity and safety.

Based on the combination of positive and negative conditions four locations were selected for further study.



Map of study areas

With these four areas established, the guiding forces behind the four locational factors were analyzed for each site – developing a comparative ranking for each. The four sites are:

Site A – East Hills

The site is approximately 265 acres in size and is situated directly east of and upslope from an existing subdivision within the city limits. The subdivision is accessed from Cooper Street which connects to Wahanna Road. The study area also extends north above the existing elementary school site and also to the south side of the subdivision with a narrow frontage on Wahanna Road.

- **Proximity to existing utilities.** The site does have access to existing water and sewer lines in Wahanna Road as well as in the existing subdivision to the west that could be extended. Sewer system upgrades would be required (pump station upgrades). A future water tank set at elevation 400 above the study area will ultimately be required to serve the upper portions of the study area. The future water tank is an identified objective for the overall city water system.
- **Vehicular access.** Vehicular access to the study area is somewhat limited. Three options exist. The northern portion of the site could be accessed by an extension of Spruce Drive, but this route would have to go through the elementary school site, potentially disrupting the school's parking and circulation routes for school busses. This route may be appropriate for

any future school facilities that may expand from the existing school uphill to the east. The central portion of the site has an access stub from the existing subdivision that is a narrow tract and would be limited to pedestrians and emergency vehicles only. It's also shown as a potential Tsunami evacuation route. The southern portion of the study area is shown with frontage on Wahanna Road where access could be extended east in alignment with Avenue S.

- **Site constraints.** The study area does contain steep slopes that are primarily along four existing drainage corridors that traverse the area from east to west. These drainage areas also contain smaller drainage fingers that reduce any potential development areas in the future. These drainage corridors and steep slopes would need to be protected in resource areas in the future with open space/resource protection area overlay mapping.
- **Logical Growth Pattern.** The East Hills area is a logical growth area for Seaside. It is next to existing residential development and existing utility services. It also has multiple access options.

The east hills site yields approximately 116 acres of land that is non-constrained by physical conditions for future urban development.

Site B – South Hills

The south Hills study area is approximately 165 acres in size and is situated just south of the East Hills site. It straddles Wahanna Road and is currently developed with 16 homes that are on larger land parcels. The study area does not contain steep slopes and is traversed by only one existing drainage way that flows from east to west through the center of the site. There is also one drainage finger along the southern edge of this study area.

- **Proximity to existing utilities.** The site is proximate to water service in Wahanna Road. There is actually an existing water district that serves the 16 current residential units in the study area. This district is currently supplied by City of Seaside water and pays for the service on a monthly basis. This water system would be upgraded and expanded to serve the balance of the South Hills study area. The water system would also be enhanced by the future water tank at elevation 400 feet. Sewer system upgrades would include extending a main line south in Wahanna Road and pumping it north into the existing city system.
- **Vehicular access.** The area can be served from Wahanna Road. Improvements would include upgrades to Wahanna Road and a series of local loop roads to provide access to the future development areas to the east and west of Wahanna.
- **Site constraints.** Constraints are limited given the absence of steep slopes. The one drainage corridor that traverses the site would need to be protected with adequate buffering in a resource overlay.
- **Logical growth pattern.** The South Hills area is a logical growth area for the city. It is proximate to existing services and extends an existing road, (Wahanna), for easy access to and from the city's major arterial.

The South Hills study area contains 141 acres of non-constrained land for future urban area development.

Site C – North Hills.

The North Hills area is approximately 69 acres in size and is located at a higher elevation and east of Shore Terrace Road. Although directly east of the city limits and current UGB, it has no access points or potential utility connection points. It is characterized by steep slopes. There are 3 severely sloped “ledges” that traverse the site from north to south.

- **Proximity to existing utilities.** There are existing water and sewer systems in two subdivisions to the west of the study area but there are no access easements in place to extend the services uphill to the study area. This site is also somewhat remote from where a future elevation 400 foot water tank would logically be installed.
- **Vehicular access.** The site does not have access to any public roads that could be expanded in a feasible manner to serve the area. The one potential access point on Shore Terrace in the northwest corner of the study area would require significant impact to an existing wooded wetland area.
- **Site constraints.** The existing severe topography greatly limits any future site development. The location of the 3 ledges and their configuration negate the ability to create an on-site street system to serve future development. Also there is no ability to provide a secondary access point for emergency vehicles.
- **Logical growth pattern.** Site C is not a logical growth pattern for the city given its lack of access and severe slopes which should be protected.

The North hills site contains 25 acres of unconstrained land. It is important to note that while this area is measured at 25 acres, the pattern of the 3 ledges divide the site into separate land areas that are not feasible for future development.

Site D – Lewis and Clark Hills.

The Lewis and Clark Hills area is approximately 57 acres in size and is located along the northern side of Lewis and Clark Road near the northeast corner of Seaside’s city limits. A portion of the site along Lewis and Clark Road is owned by Clatsop County and was once used as a refuse transfer station. The site is characterized by steep slopes, in particular on the northern and eastern portions of the site area.

- **Proximity to existing utilities.** The site is directly east of an existing city water tank but well above its service level elevation. A pump station would be required to serve the site. Sewer service also exists in an existing subdivision to the west of the site. A utility access easement and upgrades to the existing sewer system west of the connection point would be required to provide the needed capacity for the Lewis and Clark Site.
- **Vehicular Access.** The site does have frontage on Lewis and Clark Road with access potential along the southeast portion of the study area. The access point options are somewhat limited by three large curves on Lewis and Clark Road that restrict visibility for motorists. Safety improvements would be advisable on Lewis and Clark Road that would provide motorists advanced warning of a proposed intersection. These improvements may also include an eastbound left turn lane into the site from Lewis and Clark Road. There are also traffic safety concerns at the bottom of the hill at the Highway 101 intersection. Improvements are proposed in the TSP; however, they are medium and very long timeframe improvements.

- **Site Constraints.** The eastern and northern portions of the study area do contain steep slopes that restrict development and should be preserved. There is also an existing drainage along the eastern and northern edges of the site that will require protective buffers. Potential development area is limited to the southern portion of the site closest to the potential access along Lewis and Clark Road.
- **Logical Growth Pattern.** The site is not a logical growth pattern for the city. It is somewhat remote and limited in land area size due to both on and off site physical constraints. There is a lack of connectivity with the city, but it might be suitable for a small planned development in the future.

The Lewis and Clark site contains 23 acres of unconstrained land. The pattern of severe topography limits the site to approximately 15 acres that can be developed in a feasible manner near Lewis and Clark Road.

Table 2

Site	A- East Hills	B- South Hills	C- North Hills	D- Lewis & Clark Hills
Total Acres	265	165.9	69.3	57.4
Slope 0-10% (Acres)	55.9	92.9	8.2	13.7
Percent of Total Acreage	21.1%	56%	11.8%	23.9%
Slope 10-20% (Acres)	86.9	57.7	17.7	12
Percent of Total Acreage	32.8%	34.8%	25.5%	20.9%
Slope 20-30% (Acres)	58.8	12.1	17.2	9.2
Percent of Total Acreage	22.2%	7.3%	24.8%	16%
Slope 30 & greater (Acres)	63.4	3.2	26.2	22.5
Percent of Total Acreage	23.9%	1.9%	37.8%	39.2%
Constrained land Area (Acres)*	148.7	24.8	43.4	33.7
Percent of Total Acreage	56.1%	14.9%	62.6%	58.7%
Non-Constrained land Area (Acres)**	116.3	141.1	25.9	23.7

*Constrained land area includes slopes 20% and greater, stream/drainage corridors, and wetlands.



**Non-constrained land area is the leftover acreage after constrained land area is excluded.

The Location Factors

(1) Efficient accommodation of identified land needs: The first of the Goal 14 factors relates to the site's ability to efficiently accommodate needed growth. The analysis considers this factor through the following considerations:


Comparing the housing yield to the amount of land required describes the overall efficiency of the area. Each area was modeled to develop at 6 units per **net** residential acre. (6 units per net acre is considered standard for cities with fewer than 8,000 population)

Of the three areas, site B is the least constrained and therefore retains the highest percentage (84%) of land to accommodate housing and jobs. Site D comes in second with retention of 48% of its land, followed by site A with 44% and site C last with just of 37% of its land available to accommodate growth.




Examined another way, looking at the theoretical units per gross acre tells a similar story, using more conventional metrics. All of the sites were modeled with the same net densities (6 per net acre).

The map below shows that much of the land lost to constraints is a result of the steep nature of the forest land. The southern sites (A and B) fair the best in this analysis




Map: Environmental and topographical considerations

(2) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services: This factor relates to the efficiency of providing public services. The most commonly associated include roads, water and sewer, but it also includes needed infrastructure such as schools, parks, and public safety.



The map showing the relationship to these various services has been overlaid with the study area boundaries. Site B stands out with the largest confluence of these services and facilities. Site A, is a close second behind as it is slightly farther from the hospital, park and school sites. Site C is similarly situated close to these same services and D lags due to being the farthest from the confluence of services.

(3) Comparative environmental, energy, economic and social consequences: This factor guides the City to weigh a range of issues from environmental protection to conservation, energy conservation, community character and even human health impacts.



Comparing the potential housing yield with amount of land that is suitable reveals the amount of land that would be brought into the boundary for each theoretical unit. The best, B – South Hills brings in very little constrained land per unit, while site C, brings in more than one-quarter of an acre of constrained lands for each house that could be accommodated.




Growth Trends:

Examining aerial photographs from 2000 through 2014 one can assess the places where larger scale development has taken place. The circles on this aerial map are to show locations where such development has been observed. The trend appears to include some growth at nearly every location where land appears suitable. A pattern of growth in the east and south east shows that most of the studies areas appear to support the recent development trends. Sites B and C appear closest to recent growth areas. Developing new lands near recent growth areas can help to ensure compatibility of growth with the existing development because they will have been developed within a similar time frame and likely utilize similar design features

(4) *Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural and forest activities occurring on farm and forest land outside the UGB:* When UGBs are amended, care is taken to minimize, or eliminate conflicts with ongoing farm and forestry operations. Clatsop County's tax lot maps show the distribution of property owners within and nearby the four study areas. Beyond these study areas there are only seven (7) land owners whose commercial activities might be affected. They are:

Number	Owner
1	Lewis & Clark Oregon Timber LLC
2	City of Gearhart
3	Clatsop county
5	PDP LLC
6	Diane Dillard
7	Weyerhaeuser Real Estate Development Co.
19	Marjorie Stevens




Of the four study areas the South Hills (Site A) is adjacent to 1 primary owner - Lewis and Clark LLC, who has expressed supportive for future development, plus one smaller AF parcel owned by Marjorie Stevens. The East Hills (Site B) is adjacent to 1 primary owner - Lewis and Clark LLC, the same who has expressed supportive for future development. The North Hills Site C lands are adjacent to three owners. Two of which own land on both sides of the study boundary so would be able to control the nearby lands, minimizing conflict. The Lewis and Clark hills (Site D) has three adjacent owners, with Lewis and Clark LLC in the majority – who is supportive of future development. Based on the ownership pattern in the area the East Hills are alone in certainty of compatibility with nearby activities. The other sites however are all bordered by very few owners and thus it is unlikely that any site would be encumbered by concerns over compatibility with nearby forestry uses.

Site by Site Summary


With the overall analysis considered, each site is evaluated below based on the above locational factors.

Site A – East Hills




Site/Factor	A – East Hills
Efficient Accommodation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largest area (265acres) allows for the widest range of potential housing types • Second best in terms of units per gross acre.
Orderly, efficient provision of services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple roadway access locations • Gravity sewer capable • Uniquely situated for service by new reservoir to supply fresh water and fire suppression • Located above and near Tsunami gathering spot on Huckleberry
Environment, energy, economic and social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gravity sewer minimizes need pumping • Southwest exposure provides optimal solar access • Multiple connections to roadway and trail network reduces trip length and supports walking and biking • Elevation above tsunami zone preserves life • Continues with recent city growth direction
Compatibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent forest owner, Lewis & Clark LLC is supportive of urban development within the site.

Site B – South Hills




Site/Factor	B – South Hills
Efficient Accommodation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second largest gross area, with the most usable land (141) net acres) allows for the widest range of potential uses The only site to accommodate both jobs and housing Highest yield in terms of potential units per gross acre.
Orderly, efficient provision of services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple roadway access locations Gravity sewer capable Uniquely situated for service by new reservoir to supply fresh water and fire suppression Located above and near Tsunami gathering spot on Huckleberry
Environment, energy, economic and social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gravity sewer minimizes need pumping West exposure provides adequate solar access Multiple connections to roadway and trail network reduces trip length and supports walking an biking Elevation above tsunami zone preserves life Continues with recent city growth direction toward SW
Compatibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent forest owner, Lewis & Clark LLC is supportive of urban development within the site.

Site C - North Hills



Site/Factor	C – South Hills
Efficient Accommodation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smaller site (69.3 acres) may provide some mixed housing types, but the range would be relatively narrow Can accommodate housing, but not likely suitable for jobs. Lowest yield in terms of potential units per gross acre (2.2 units)
Orderly, efficient provision of services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single access location potentially compromised by wetlands, second access would need to go outside of UGB Gravity sewer capable Hookup to existing infrastructure to supply fresh water Located above Skyline Drive Tsunami gathering location Steep terrain may require additional infrastructure expense Most constrained acres per unit (0.28)
Environment, energy, economic and social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gravity sewer minimizes need pumping West and Northwest exposure provides minimal solar access Limited connections to roadway and trail network could lengthen trip length and limit walking and biking Elevation above tsunami zone preserves life
Compatibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three different adjacent forest owners could require additional coordination. Recently logged, minimal conflict

Site D Lewis and Clark Hills



Site/Factor	D – Lewis & Clark Hills
Efficient Accommodation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smallest site (57.4acres) may provide some mixed housing types, but the range would be relatively narrow • Can accommodate housing, but not likely suitable for jobs. • Second lowest yield in terms of potential units per gross acre (2.5 units)
Orderly, efficient provision of services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access locations would be outside of UGB • Gravity sewer capable • Hookup to existing infrastructure to supply fresh water for homes and fire suppression • Contains Tsunami gathering location on Royal View. • 58% of land environmentally constrained
Environment, energy, economic and social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gravity sewer minimizes need pumping • Large portion of site with southern exposure for solar access • Limited connections to roadway and trail network could lengthen trip length and limit walking and biking • Elevation above tsunami zone preserves life • 58% of land environmentally constrained
Compatibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two different adjacent forest owners could require additional coordination. Lewis & Clark and City of Gearhart

The following table provides an at-a-glance summary of the comparison between the sites.


Site/Factor	A – East Hills	B – South Hills	C – North Hills	D – Lewis & Clark Hills
Efficient Accommodation	Good	Best	Fair	Fair
Orderly, efficient provision of services	Better	Best	Poor	Fair
Environment, energy, economic	Good	Best	Fair	Fair
Compatibility	Best	Best	Good	Good

Refinement of Study Areas

The four site study areas were reviewed in detail with the Seaside Planning Director and Public Works Director. The study areas were also presented and discussed with both the Seaside Planning Commission and City Council at briefings/work sessions. The following summarizes direction from those meetings:

- Eliminate the North Hills study area due to site constraints
- Combine the South and East Hills study areas into one Southeast Hills area and continue to evaluate. Also, continue to evaluate the Lewis and Clark site
- Determine the best 200 plus acres of land to bring into the urban growth boundary

South and East Hills Study Areas



The following describes potential performance of the combined area.:

- **Land need.** Combining the two areas means that there are more than 430 acres of land from which to select locations for future UGB inclusion. With an established land need of roughly 200 acres (detailed below), there is adequate land within the area for identifying the best lands for inclusion.

Table 3

Land Use Type	Gross Acreage Needed
Residential	154.6
Employment	35.6
Parks	10.6
Total Need	200.8

After selecting the needed 200.8 acres, the remaining lands would stay outside of the UGB with continuation of their Goal 4 and 5 protections through Clatsop County's comprehensive plan.

- **Access/circulation.** Primary access could be provided by an extension and improvement of Wahanna Road south of Avenue S. This expansion would also likely entail reconstructing the Avenue S intersection at Wahanna to improve safety. Three emergency vehicle access (EVA) points are in proximity. One is located directly east of Cooper Street and will also serve as a pedestrian link. Two are located uphill and connect to the existing mainline tree farm road.

- **Open space/natural resource areas.** Seaside's Parks Master Plan was based on a 2003 population estimate of 6,040 people. The 2032 population forecasted in by the Goal 10 analysis is 8,215. To serve a population of 8,215 people at a Level of Service of 3 acres of developed park per 1,000 residents, the City of Seaside would need 24.65 acres of developed parks. Subtracting the current inventory of 14.05 acres of park, this leaves a 20-year need for 10.6 acres of new parks. There is ample room within the area to accommodate some or all of this need.

The Seaside comprehensive plan states that "All rivers and streams with a perennial flow are considered to be sensitive fish habitat areas. The most important species that these rivers and streams support are: Coho and Chinook salmon, Steelhead, sea-run Cutthroat and Rainbow trout." The combined Southeast Hills area is encumbered by perennial streams. Several options exist for treatment of these resources, two are:

- a. To minimize UGB expansion, the final boundary of the amendment area could exclude these streams to the extent practicable. They would therefore remain as Conservation Forest Lands within Clatsop County's comprehensive plan and be subject to existing regulations for protection and facilitation of forestry practices.
- b. Stream areas could be included in the UGB amendment with the expectation that they be protected from development by the City of Seaside. The City has a designation of OPR that could be assigned for protection. The Goal 5 safe harbor specifies a 50 buffer from the centerline of streams for consideration as non-buildable, accordingly an OPR, or similar designation could be applied to this geography, or another protection method put in place.

Wetlands are also present in the study area. To the extent feasible, these areas should not be included in the boundary amendment so as to prevent urbanization. If wetlands are included in the boundary amendment the City may need to expand its Goal 5 mapping through site research. If it is deemed necessary to include lands in the amendment area for which no urban development is desired, the City could apply any of a number of tools, such as code provisions that would preclude any subsequent actions that would allow development on said lands.

- **Provision of infrastructure.** Development of land within the selected study area will require extending and widening Wahanna road, improving the Wahanna/ Avenue S intersection, constructing a new water tank and other facility upgrades and also installing a sewer pump station and sewer main lines. The city will prepare a strategy and policy that establishes a "Pay as you go" program for incremental development of the southeast hills area. The intent of this policy is to avoid an inordinate burden on the balance of Seaside for the infrastructure costs associated with the Southeast Hills development.

The summary response to the locational factors for the joint South and East Hills study area is summarized in the table on the following page.

Site/Factor	Proposed UGB Amendment Area
Efficient Accommodation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfies complete need for housing, jobs and recreation within one site • Allows for a range of housing types to serve diverse needs of residents • Respectable yield in terms of potential units per gross acre
Orderly, efficient provision of services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple roadway access locations • Gravity sewer capable • Uniquely situated for service by new reservoir to supply fresh water and fire suppression • Located above and near Tsunami gathering spot on Huckleberry
Environment, energy, economic and social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gravity sewer minimizes need pumping • South and West exposure provides good solar access • Multiple connections to roadway and trail network reduces trip length and supports walking and biking • Elevation above tsunami zone preserves life • Continues with recent city growth direction toward SW
Compatibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent forest owner, Lewis & Clark LLC is supportive of urban development within the site.

Next Steps

The Southeast Hills study area should undergo refinement planning. This planning should:

- Identify appropriate lands for the identified housing and job needs
- Designate said lands into residential density categories (high, medium, and low) and employment categories (industrial and institutional)
- Identify a location, or locations of needed park infrastructure to serve the additional community needs
- Develop a strategy for addressing natural habitat areas either through exclusion from the amendment or protection via Seaside's comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances
- Identify the smallest expansion area that satisfies the need for land and efficient provision of infrastructure

To date, two draft proposals for the UGB expansion have been discussed by the City of Seaside's Planning Commission. During this process revisions to the map are being considered to better address comments from DLCD, consultation with 1,000 Friends of Oregon and concerns related to tsunami inundation mapping and overall community character.

The UGB and Comprehensive Plan amendments will continue to progress through the public hearing process and then need to be adopted by the City Council, and acknowledged by the Land Conservation and Development Commission. City of Seaside annexations/ zoning would occur incrementally as land owners opt to develop their lands.