

URBANIZATION

GOAL 14

1. Need to Plan Urban Development	14-3
1.1 Overview.....	14-3
1.2 Effect of Urban Development of Resource Lands.....	14-3
1.3 Effect of Urban Development of Service Costs.....	14-6
2. State Urbanization Planning Requirements	14-8
2.1 Overview.....	14-8
2.2 Definition of Urban Areas.....	14-8
2.3 Definition of Urbanizable Lands	14-9
2.4 Definition of Rural Lands.....	14-9
2.5 Purpose of the Urbanization Goal, Goal 14	14-10
2.6 Establishment of Urban Growth Boundaries Around Incorporated Communities	14-10
2.7 Changing the Location of an Acknowledged Urban Growth Boundary	14-11
2.8 Conversion of Urbanizable Land to Urban Land	14-11
2.9 Goal 3, Agricultural Lands, and Urbanization.....	14-12
2.10 Goal 4, Forest Lands, and Urbanization	14-12
2.11 Goal 9, Economy of the State, and Urbanization	14-13
2.12 Goal 10, Housing, and Urbanization	14-13
2.13 Goal 11, Public Services and Facilities, and Urbanization	14-15
2.14 Goal 17, Coastal Shorelands, and Urbanization	14-16
3. Urbanization Findings and Policies	14-16
3.1 Planning for Unincorporated Communities	14-16
3.2 Planning for the Unincorporated Communities of Neahkahnie and Twin Rocks/Barview in Accordance with the Urbanization Goal	14-17
3.3 Planning for the Unincorporated Communities of Netarts, Oceanside, Pacific City, and Nehalem in Accordance with the Urbanization Goal	14-19
3.4 Planning for the Unincorporated Communities that are not Rural as Defined by the Statewide Planning Goals and which are not Necessary, Suitable, or Intended for Urban Use.....	14-23
3.5 Planning for Rural Areas Outside of Communities.....	14-24
3.6 Establishing Urban Growth Boundaries to Separate Urban and Rural Uses	14-24
3.7 Establishing Urban Growth Boundaries Around Incorporated Communities.....	14-25

3.8	Establishing Community Growth Boundaries Around Unincorporated Boundaries	14-25
3.9	Procedure for Establishing Community Growth Boundaries Around Unincorporated Communities	14-26
3.10	Coordination of Community Growth Boundaries with Service Districts	14-26
3.11	Development Within Community Growth Boundaries	14-27
3.12	Changing Established Community Growth Boundaries for Unincorporated Communities	14-27
3.13	Review of Zoning Within Unincorporated Communities	14-28
3.14	Request for Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and Service District Comments on Planning Actions within Community Growth Boundaries of Unincorporated Communities	14-28
3.15	Zoning of Rural Areas Consistent with the Need to Protect Resource.....	14-29
3.16	Development in Rural Communities.....	14-29
3.17	Development in Non-Community Rural Areas	14-34
3.18	Creation and Expansion of Sewer and Water Districts Outside of Urban Growth Boundaries	14-37
3.19	Community Growth Boundary Findings	14-38

URBANIZATION

GOAL 14

1. NEED TO PLAN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

1.1 Overview

Unplanned development at urban densities can and has unnecessarily degraded resource values and has raised the cost of providing public services. It prematurely removes or limits the use of productive resource lands, reduces water quality, and results in costly unplanned extensions of sewer, water, and other services. The resulting pattern of development is relatively expensive to serve. These problems are ultimately reflected in the price that people have to pay for living in a community and the quality of community life.

1.2 Effect of Urban Development on Resource Lands

Unplanned urban development can and has unnecessarily degraded resource values by creating conflicts that make continued resource use difficult, using more land than is necessary to accommodate urban uses, overburdening inadequate sewage disposal facilities, and inadequately accommodate the effects of storm water runoff.

Sprawling or leapfrogging urban development in farm areas increased the conflicts between residences and farms over what would occur with a more compact urban form. Sprawling development leaves farm parcels surrounded or partially surrounded by residential development. This condition makes it difficult for the farmer to continue to farm because of the number of conflicts present. (See Agricultural Element for discussion of residential/agricultural conflicts.) Such farm parcels are likely to be sold to speculators who than only rent the land for farming. Under these conditions, few long-term investments will be made to keep the land in optimal production. The land may not be used at all and will just remain vacant. In Tillamook County a residential subdivision east of the City of Tillamook, Valley View and subsequent additions around Bluebird and Hummingbird Lanes, are examples of leapfrog development that have and will continue to create conflicts with surrounding farms.

Leapfrog and sprawl development takes more land out of production than a compact urban growth form. It over consumes land and leaves many small parcels of unmanaged land. Santa Clara County in California provides an example of the waste of land that results from sprawling and leapfrogging development. Whereas 200 square miles of valley bottom land was covered with urban uses in 1974, only 30 square miles would have been needed to accommodate development which occurred since 1947, tripling the population. Residential densities no greater than they are now would be needed to accommodate this population.¹

Unplanned urban development can lead to the overburdening of sewage disposal facilities and result in pollution of groundwater or surface water. Failure of septic systems on small platted lots can force the extension of sewer lines to alleviate health and water quality problems. If such additions to existing sewage treatment systems are not planned for, overloading of the treatment facility can result. This can result in insufficient sewage treatment or the need to bypass the treatment systems to handle excess flows.

1

Examples of these kinds of problems exist throughout Tillamook County. Several large subdivisions including Brighton Beach, Cape Meares, Tierra Del Mar and Nedonna, platted at densities which can not accommodate on site sewage disposal systems. In many cases this has meant that individual lots can not be built on and yet ownerships are so fragmented that it is difficult to accumulate a sufficient number to allow development on septic tanks. In the case of Nedonna Beach, small lots and high groundwater tables have contributed to contamination of the groundwater used for Rockaway's water supply. Sewering is necessary if water quality is to be protected. Urban development also affects the quantity and quality of storm water runoff. This in turn affects the seriousness of flooding, water quality in streams, rivers, lakes and bays, and habitat quality for fish and other animals.

The quantity of storm water runoff increases with intensity of development. Table 1 shows that at densities of ten or more dwelling units per acre up to twenty-five percent of the land is covered with impermeable surfaces and storm water runoff increases the mean annual flood by two or more times what exists on undeveloped land. It is unlikely that in Tillamook County, where urban development occupies a small portion of watershed areas, the course of major flood events will be altered by the additional runoff from urban development. However, this additional runoff creates a nuisance, contributes to soil erosion, pollutes streams and other water bodies, and can trigger landsliding.

The density of development dramatically increases erosion and sedimentation. Figure 1 shows the amount of sediment generated from the erosion of land under various uses. Land used for light development can produce 100 times the amount of sediment produced by woodland. As development density increases, so does sediment yield. This is shown in Table 1.

FIGURE 1

Insert Figure 1

Source: Joachim Tourbier, Water Resources Protection Measures in Development, p.

TABLE 1
IMPACTS OF LAND DEVELOPMENT

Land Use Intensity	Gross Percentage of Impermeable Cover (1)					Permeable Surfaces	Assumed Runoff Generation (Increase in Mean Annual Flood)						Assumed Sedi. Ylds t/sq. mi./yr.		Average Assumed Residential User Characteristics									
	Total (2)	Roofs	Roads	Parking	Other	% Perm. Surface Mowed Grass	% Perm. Surface Wood, Pasture or Abandoned	% of Area Served by Storm Sewers (3, 6)						During Construction (5)	After Construction (4)	Gross Lot Size (Acres)	Gross Land-Use Intensity (7)	Persons Per Gross Acre (8)	Sewage Generation Gal Per Day (9)	Water Usage GPD (10)	Length of Utility Lines per Acre	Length of Untility Lines per DU	Assumed Sewerage Assumed Water	
								0	20	40	60	80	100											
1	0-2½	< 1	< 2½	<1	-	<25	>75	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	400	400	>5	-	<1	<100	<125	200	1000	-	-
2	2½ - 5	1- 1½	1- 2½	½-1	-	25-50	50- 75	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	600	600	2-5	-	1-2	100- 200	125- 250	200	750	-	-
3	5-10	1½- 3½	2½- 5	1-1½	-	50-80	10- 50	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1000	750	1-2	-	2-4	200- 400	250- 500	200	300	-	X
4	10- 20	3½-7	5-10	1½-3	-	100	0	1.3	1.4	1.7	2.0	2.1	2.1	2500	1000	½-1	-	4-6	400- 800	500- 1000	200	150	-	X
5	20- 33	7-10	10- 16	3-7	-	100	0	1.4	1.8	2.0	2.4	2.5	2.5	5000	1250	¼-½	-	6-12	800- 1600	1000- 2000	145	55	X	X
6	33- 50	10-17	16- 23	7-10	-	100	0	1.5	2.2	2.4	2.7	2.8	3.0	10000	1500	1/8-¼	3.5	12- 24	1600- 3200	2000- 4000	145	30	X	X
7	50- 75	17-25	23- 25	10-20	0-5	100	0	1.8	2.5	3.0	3.8	4.0	4.2	20000	1750	1/8- 1/16	4.5	24- 40	3200- 6400	4000- 8000	140	15	X	X
8	70- 100	25	25	>20	5-15	100	0	2.5	3.0	4.2	5.0	5.4	6.0	50000	2000	<1/16	-	>40	>6400	>8000	140	<15	X	X

1. This includes collector roads, streets, etc.
2. This is a low estimation of % impermeable cover for lot sizes shown based on Leopold's references in Hydrologic Data for Land Planners, 1968, p.2.
3. Squares indicate most usual combination of % impermeable cover and % storm sewers. Data from Leopold, 1968.
4. Figures for the higher land uses are largely due to increased streambank erosion caused by increased runoff.
5. Figures estimated from references quoted by Leopold, 1968.
6. DRBC Compact report (April 1971) estimates increase for 20% cover and 20% storm sewer = 2, and increase due to 50% cover and 50% storm sewer = 5.
7. Land-Use Intensity Index as used by the Urban Land Institute in the Community Builders Handbook for a dwelling size of 1089 sq. ft.
8. Four persons per unit assumed for lower densities; 2.5 persons per unit for high densities.
9. Based on New Castle County (DE) Design Flow Standards.
10. Based on 125 gallons per day per person; Urban Land Institute, Community Builders Handbook.

Another interesting relationship between development and sedimentation is that sediment yields are the same during and after construction for lot sizes of more than two acres, but for smaller lots sediment yields are greater during construction than after. Construction sediment yields increase in comparison with post construction sediment yields as density increases. At lot sizes of an eight acre or less (5000 square feet), construction sediment yields are more than 10 times post construction yields. This is understandable since the proportion of land area that is disturbed during construction increases with increasing density.

Sedimentation is a problem because it results in the filling in of ditches, culverts, streams, river, bays, ponds and lakes. This filling in reduces the water carrying capacity of drainways and increases flooding. It can block roadside drainage ditches and clog culverts thus eliminating orderly storm drainage. Sediment can reduce the habitat value of water bodies for fish and other animals by covering spawning grounds, increasing turbidity and reducing light penetration.

Storm water runoff from urban developments can also carry other pollutants such as organic matter, fertilizers and pesticides into streams and other water bodies. Runoff from suburban lawns has been found to contain high nitrogen and orthophosphate counts. These pollutants can also ruin the habitat value of water bodies.

1.3 Effect of Urban Development on Service Costs

Unplanned urban development can and has unnecessarily raised service costs by creating unplanned costs and a pattern of development that is expensive to serve.

A low density sprawling or leapfrog development pattern costs more to service with sewer lines, water lines and other utilities than does a compact development pattern. This was the conclusion of a study done by the Real Estate Research Corporation, The Costs of Sprawl. This stands to reason since more miles of utility lines and streets are needed per swelling with low density development patterns. Figure 2 shows the relationship between population density and the per capita cost of streets.

FIGURE 2
RELATIONSHIP OF POPULATION DENSITY TO ANNUAL PER CAPITA
EXPENDITURES ON CITY STREETS

Insert Figure 2

Source: *Preston S. Pattie, Impacts of Urban Growth on Local Costs and Revenues, p. 19*

Likewise, the per capita cost of utilities increases with decreasing density. Table 1 shows the length of utility lines needed to serve developments of various densities. What this means in terms of the cost of electrical distribution lines, is shown in Table 2.

Table 2
COST OF ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION LINES FOR DIFFERENT CUSTOMER DENSITIES*

	Customers** Per Mile of Line		
	10	40	100
Average Distance between poles	300'	200'	120'
Cost of pole and wire per mile of line	\$4,806	\$12,714	\$20,592
Services per transformer	1	8	15
Cost of transformers per mile of line	\$2,890	\$2,895	\$5,845
Investment per mile of line	\$7,696	\$15,609	\$26,437
Investment per customer	\$770	\$390	\$264
Annual Cost per customer (20% of investment)	\$154	\$78	\$53

*Puget Sound Power and Light Company

**Customer is used in this study to mean a home or hookup to electrical service.

Since these expenditures are probably not part of a long-term expansion program there is less control over the borrowing of funds at the best rates or of making use of the best bond market conditions. In some cases these extensions may be difficult to intertie with existing facilities.

Greater service costs increase the cost of living in a community. Table 3 shows the impact of development density on the cost of municipal services per dwelling. As can be seen from this example, where street frontage is reduced by 28 percent from 86 feet to 61 feet, the costs per dwelling decrease by 19 percent. Similar reductions could logically be expected from a reduction of sprawl and leapfrog development.

TABLE 3
IMPACT OF HIGH DENSITY DEVELOPMENT IN JEFFERSON – HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE

Municipal Service	Expenditure per dwelling of present low density development	Expenditure per dwelling of hypothetical high density development	Difference
Streets	\$60	\$46	\$-14
Water	\$76	\$45	\$-31
Sewer	\$89	\$62	\$-27
Total	\$225	\$153	\$-72
Total of all municipal services	\$377	\$305	\$-72

Source: *Pattie, p. 20*

Many of the costs of services and roads are included in the price of the dwelling. Since these costs are paid for by the developer and then must be passed on to the consumer, they are magnified because the developer has to borrow money at relatively high interest rates.

Lack of planning can be particularly expensive for small communities that have to build their own sewage treatment system to alleviate health and water quality problems resulting from failing septic systems. This has been the experience of the communities of Oceanside, Netarts, Pacific City, and Woods. The high cost of sewer projects in these communities has caused economic and social problems. The elderly population has particularly felt financial hardships. Such problems have included difficulty in managing the systems given the voluntary nature of sewer board positions and the limited amount of time and expertise available. Sewer district residents are reluctant to approve rate increases to operate the

system because of high capital costs.

2. STATE URBANIZATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Overview

The State Planning Goals require that incorporated communities be planned for according to the Urbanization Goal (Goal 14). The purpose of this goal is to delineate where development will occur at urban densities and where services will be available to support that level of development. This is accomplished by establishing an urban growth boundary (UGB). This goal applies explicitly to incorporated areas but not to unincorporated communities that are functionally urban. The State Planning Goals are not clear on how to plan for these functionally urban unincorporated communities. The Urbanization Goal is integrally related to several other planning goals, including Agricultural Lands (Goal 3), Forest Lands (Goal 4), Housing (Goal 10), Services (Goal 11), and Coastal Shorelands (Goal 17). There are four key provisions in the Urbanization Goal. These govern the requirement for UGBs around urban areas, the method of establishing urban growth boundaries, the method of changing urban growth boundaries, and the process of converting land to urban uses within UGBs.

2.2 Definition of Urban Areas

Urban areas are defined by the Statewide Planning Goals as follows:

“Urban areas are those places which must have an incorporated city. Such areas may include lands adjacent to and outside the incorporated city and may also:

- (a) have concentrations of persons who generally reside and work in the area
- (b) have supporting public facilities and services.”¹

In Tillamook County urban areas include the incorporated cities of Bay City, Garibaldi, Manzanita, Nehalem, Rockaway, Tillamook, and Wheeler, as well as developed areas outside of these communities. The definition however is not clear on whether conditions (a) and (b) are mandatory if land adjacent to an incorporated city is to be considered as urban. It is only logical though that urban areas adjacent to cities are only as extensive as concentrated populations and urban services. Otherwise the whole county could be considered to be an urban area.

Assuming that urban areas adjacent to incorporated cities must have population concentrations and supporting public services and facilities unincorporated urban areas in the county include Neahkahnie, Necarney, Bayside Gardens, Nedonna Beach, Twin Rocks, Barview and some areas north and east of the City of Tillamook (See Figure 3).

1

FIGURE 3

Insert Figure 3

2.3 Definition of Urbanizable Lands

Urbanizable lands are defined by the Goals to be “lands within the urban growth boundary and which are identified and (a) Determined to be necessary and suitable for future urban areas (b) Can be served by urban services and facilities (c) Are needed for expansion of an urban area.”¹ Urbanizable lands then are essentially undeveloped or sparsely developed lands that surround incorporated cities and are necessary and suitable for urban development and can be serviced with urban services and facilities. They differ from rural lands in that they are inside an urban growth boundary although they may be physically no different.

According to this definition, urbanizable lands in Tillamook County include lands within the acknowledged urban growth boundaries of the cities of Bay City, Garibaldi, Manzanita, Nehalem, Rockaway, Tillamook, and Wheeler. They also include land within the separate urban growth boundaries of Neahkahnie and Twin Rocks/Barview. (More about separate urban growth boundaries for Neahkahnie and Twin Rocks/Barview in Section 3.2).

2.4 Definition of Rural Lands

“Rural land are those outside the urban growth boundary and are:

- (a) non-urban agricultural, forest or open space lands; or
- (b) Other lands suitable for sparse settlement, small farms or acreage homesites with no or hardly any public services, and which are not suitable, necessary or intended for urban use.”²

According to this definition, rural lands in Tillamook County include lands outside of the urban growth boundaries of Bay City, Garibaldi, Manzanita, Nehalem, Rockaway, Tillamook, Wheeler, Neahkahnie and twin Rocks/Barview that meet conditions (a) or (b). Since there is some land outside of UGBs which does not meet conditions (a) or (b), not all lands outside of UGBs are rural.

Condition (a) describes most of the area of the County since most land outside of urban growth boundaries is agricultural, forest or open space land.

Condition (b) describes most of the remaining land outside of urban growth boundaries. There are some areas outside of urban growth boundaries that do not meet this condition, however, because they are either not sparsely settled without public services or they are

¹
²

suitable, necessary or intended for urban use. The functionally urban unincorporated communities of Oceanside, Netarts, Cloverdale, Pacific City, and Neskowin can not be described as sparse settlement, small farms, or acreage homesites nor do these communities have no or hardly any urban services. In all physical respects, these communities are no different from the incorporated communities of the County.

Similarly, the semi-urban communities described in Section 3.4 do not fit this definition of rural lands very well although they are more rural than the functionally urban unincorporated communities. Whereas the fictionally urban unincorporated communities are “suitable, necessary, and intended for urban use,” these communities are not. These communities while not fitting the Goal definition of rural lands well, nevertheless do not fit a description of urban and better and problems would be created if they were planned for as urban areas.

2.5 Purpose of the Urbanization Goal, Goal 14

The purpose of the Urbanization Goal is “to provide an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use.” There are several aspects of an orderly and efficient transition of land uses. One is minimizing the loss of productive resource land by reducing sprawl and leapfrog development. Another is providing the most efficient and therefore least costly arrangement of public services. A third is planning the most efficient arrangement of residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Another is coordinating land development occurring outside city limits so that it is compatible with city standards when it is finally annexed.

The Urbanization Goal specifies that the urban growth boundary will be used to manage urban growth. The Goal also established the method for delineating an urban growth boundary and for changing the position of the boundary in the future. Finally, the Goal sets out criteria for controlling the phasing of development within an urban growth boundary.

2.6 Establishment of Urban Growth Boundaries Around Incorporated Communities

The Urbanization Goal requires that “Urban growth boundaries be established to identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land.”¹ These boundaries must be placed around incorporated communities and must be site specific. Land inside of these boundaries is considered to be urban and urbanizable while land outside is rural.

Establishing and changing an urban growth boundary is a cooperative process between the County and the cities. The County adopts a joint management agreement with each city which spells out the manner of administration of the area within the boundary but outside the city limits.

The Goal also requires that UGBs established prior to January 1, 1975 be reviewed according to the Goal requirement if undeveloped rural land is included within these boundaries.

The Goal sets out seven criteria which govern the location of the UGB.

These include the following:

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

1

- 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 as defined, 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.”¹

2.7 Changing the Location of an Acknowledged Urban Growth Boundary

According to the Goal, future changes in the location of an urban growth boundary must follow the “procedures and requirements as set forth in the Land Use Planning Goal (Goal 2) for goal exceptions.”² The procedural requirements of Goal 2 include notices for public hearing that “summarize the issues in an understandable and meaningful manner.”³ Justification of the boundary change must include compelling reasons and facts regarding the following:

- “(a) Why these other uses should be provided for;
- (b) What alternative locations within the area could be used for the proposed use;
- (c) What are the long term environmental, economic, social and energy consequences to the locality, the region or the state from not applying the goal or permitting the alternative use;
- (d) A finding that the proposed uses will be compatible with other adjacent uses.”⁴

In addition, the Urbanization Goal requires that changes of the UGB be based on the seven considerations for establishing a boundary mentioned before.

2.8 Conversion of Urbanizable Land to Urban Land

Although land in the UGB is to be considered available for urban use over time, the Goal specifies the manner in which urbanizable land, undeveloped or underdeveloped, within the UGB is to be used for urban developments. The purpose of this is to promote the orderly and efficient transition of land uses and the provision of services. Four considerations guide this transition of land uses.

- “1) Orderly, economic provision for public facilities and services;
- 2) Availability of sufficient land for the various uses to insure choices in the market place;

1
2
3
4

- 3) LCDC goals; and
- 4) Encouragement of development within urban areas before conversion of urbanizable areas.”¹

2.9 Goal 3, Agricultural Lands, and Urbanization

Goal 3 specifies conditions and procedures for including agricultural land, SCS Class I through IV land, in an urban growth boundary. To do so, the governing body “shall follow the procedures and requirements set forth in the Land Use Planning Goal (Goal 2) for goal exceptions.”² In addition, this conversion shall be based on the consideration of the following five factors:

- “1) Environmental, energy, social, and economic consequences;
- 2) Demonstrated need consistent with LCDC goals;
- 3) Unavailability of an alternative suitable location for the requested uses;
- 4) Compatibility of the proposed use with related agricultural land; and
- 5) The retention of Class I, II, III, and IV soils in farm use.”³

2.10 Goal 4, Forest Lands, and Urbanization

The Forest Lands Goal requires local jurisdictions to conserve forest lands for forest uses. The means for doing so differs for land within or without an urban growth boundary although not substantially. Forest lands inside and outside of urban growth boundaries must be inventoried. If forest land outside of an urban growth boundary is not zoned to protect forest uses, the process and requirements of Goal 2 for exceptions must be followed. Where forest lands occur within an urban growth boundary the exceptions process does not have to be followed but the requirements for establishing the urban growth boundary are “roughly equivalent to those required by the Exceptions Process.”⁴ The LCDC policy paper on Forest Lands Goal does state that “efforts should be made to protect existing forest uses.”⁵ The policy paper also suggest that the following actions may be taken to protect urban forest uses:

- “1) Designate and zone forest lands as forest lands, open space or park land;
- 2) Provide for the retention of vegetation in subdivision and planned unit development ordinances;
- 3) Require a permit to fall street or other trees;
- 4) Preserve forest lands along streambanks and in hazard areas;
- 5) Encourage wind breaks; and

1
2
3
4
5

- 6) Develop an urban forestry program.”¹

2.11 Goal 9, Economy of the State, and Urbanization

The Urbanization Goal has as one of its factors for consideration, the need for employment opportunities. Therefore, there is a need to consider Goal 9 when planning for urban areas. It can be expected that a large proportion of total employment will be provided within urban growth boundaries. The LCDC policy paper, “Common Questions on Urban Development” lists factors that should be considered when determining how much land is necessary for commercial and industrial uses. These include:

- a. Community attitudes
- b. Population and labor force projection
- c. Employment projection by economic sector
- d. Analysis of commercial and industrial activities:
 - 1) Types of existing activities and whether they are growing, stable or declining; projected employment in these existing activities;
 - 2) Types of new industries that must be introduced in order to meet any gap that may exist between projected total employment and employment in existing activities, including consideration of any resulting secondary impacts;
 - 3) Characteristics of land required for these areas and estimates of land needs based on employment density factors;
 - 4) Inventory of land currently being used for these purposes, and of vacant land suitable for development.
- e. Land use supply and demand considerations in your entire region, including the area not in your jurisdiction.”

2.12 Goal 10, Housing, and Urbanization

The Housing Goal requires local governments to inventory buildable lands within urban growth boundaries. Buildable lands are defined in the Goal as lands in urban and urbanizable areas that are suitable, available, and necessary for residential use . 1 Factors that should be considered in determining suitability and availability include:

- a) Topographic and soil conditions such as slope.
- b) Flood plain and hazard considerations such as erosion, flooding, ground movements, ground and surface water pollution and industrial pollution.
- c) Market suitability considerations such as land ownership (public or private), market availability, cost of providing services and facilities.

1

- d) Availability of public facilities and services.
- e) Conflicting land uses.”¹

The Housing Goal has been interpreted to mean that all housing needs are to be met within urban growth boundaries by the State Appeals Court and by the State Land Use Board of Appeals.² This interpretation results from the buildable lands inventory requirement of the Housing Goal. The following excerpt from the amicus brief of the Real Estate Loan Fund for the case of DLCD v. Tillamook County Board of Commissioner, LUBA No. 81-004, demonstrates that a broader interpretation of the applicability of the Housing Goal is both logical and consistent with past LCDC decisions.

“Goal 10 requires two things. The first is an inventory of ‘buildable lands.’ Since the goal defines ‘buildable lands’ as ‘lands in urban and urbanizable areas that are suitable, available, and necessary for residential use,’ this inventory requirement applies only within urban growth boundaries. This is certainly reasonable, since a large proportion of the land within urban growth boundaries will eventually be put to residential use, whereas, in any conceivable instance, only a relatively small portion of the land outside of urban growth boundaries will be used for residential purposes. Furthermore, the designation of land outside of urban growth boundaries for residential purposes will almost always (unless the land is non-resource land) require exceptions from Goals 3 and/or 4. The justification of such exceptions will itself require consideration of whether the areas are ‘suitable, available and necessary for residential use.’ Thus, it is unreasonable to conclude that, because Goal 10’s buildable lands inventory requirement applies only within urban growth boundaries, all housing needs must be satisfied within urban growth boundaries.

In addition, the second requirement of Goal 10, that ‘plans shall encourage the availability of adequate numbers of housing units and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density,’ is not limited by the goal to land within urban growth boundaries. LCDC, in reviewing County Comprehensive Plans for compliance with Goal 10, has frequently referred to whether or not the County has provided for its rural housing needs. See, e.g. LCDC, Deschutes County Continuance Order, Staff Report of March 26, 1980, page 33; LCDC, Wasco County Continuance Order, Staff Report of July 21, 1980, page 41. Also LCDC has acted specifically to delete from a hearings officer’s recommendation the statement that ‘Goal 10 does not apply to rural agricultural and forest lands.’ 1000 Friends of Oregon v. Multnomah County, LCDC No. 77-031, Final Order of February 25, 1980, page 3; Supplemental Recommendation Merits, revised September 28, 1979, page 27.

Thus, although certain provisions of Goal 10 and other goals (such as the resource protection provisions of Goals 3, 4, 5, 16 and 17; energy conservation provisions of Goal 13) can be said to encourage the provision of needed housing within urban growth boundaries, there is nothing in the goals requiring that all housing needs be satisfied within urban growth boundaries.”³

The more limited interpretation, saying that all housing needs will be met within urban growth boundaries, creates internal contradictions within the Goal. Within a rural county such as

1
2
3

Tillamook County, it is not possible “to provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state”¹ and simultaneously attempt to provide for those needs within urban growth boundaries. (Additional discussion on this point is included in Section 3.7).

The amount of land necessary for residential use is determined by the following factors:

- “a. population forecast or target that considers employment characteristics;
- b. income analysis to determine financial capability of households;
- c. household size determination;
- d. vacancy rate determination;
- e. existing housing in terms of type, condition and cost;
- f. determination of future housing needs - - by cost and type level - - i.e., the number of units that will be needed during the plan period, based on a-e above;
- g. determination of additional residential land requirements based upon density calculations of future housing needs from f above.
- h. assessment of jurisdiction’s role in meeting regional housing needs.”²

2.13 Goal 11, Public Services and Facilities, and Urbanization

Goal 11 is integrally related to the Urbanization Goal. First, the location of the urban growth boundary must be based on the consideration of “orderly and efficient provision of public facilities and services.”³ The purpose of Goal 11 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.”⁴ Goal 11 makes a distinction between the types and levels of public facilities and services that are appropriate for urban areas and rural areas. This Goal also requires that a plan for the provision of key services be included in the Comprehensive Plan. Service and facilities policies between development within and without.

Goal 11 requires “a provision of key facilities shall be included in each plan.”⁵ As defined by the Goals, key facilities are “basic facilities that are primarily planned for by local government but which also may be provided by private enterprise and are essential to the support of more intensive development, including public schools, transportation, water supply, sewage, and solid waste disposal.”⁶ According to the Urban Development policy paper, the provision for key facilities means a strategy which includes the type, location and delivery of public facilities and services. “Type refers to urban or rural facilities as defined by Goal 11. Location includes designating buildable areas where various services will be provided. Delivery includes when services are to be provided, how services are to be provided, and who will provide services.”⁷

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

The conversion of urbanizable land to urban land must be based on the considerations of “orderly, economic provision for public facilities and services.”¹ Services policies in the plan should therefore reinforce this transition of land uses.

2.14 Goal 17, Coastal Shorelands, and Urbanization

Goal 17 distinguishes between uses that are appropriate within urban and rural shorelands. Within urban growth boundaries, sites that are especially suited for water-dependent uses must be protected for those uses. Outside of urban growth boundaries, the uses which are allowed in the shorelands are listed below.

- “(a) Farm uses as provided in ORS Chapter 215;
- (b) Propagation and harvesting of forest products consistent with the Oregon Forest Practices Act;
- (c) Private and public water-dependent recreation developments;
- (d) Aquaculture;
- (e) Water-dependent commercial and industrial uses and water-related uses only upon a finding by the governing body of the County that such uses satisfy a need which cannot be accommodated on shorelands in urban and urbanizable areas;
- (f) Subdivision, major and minor partitions and other uses only upon a finding by the governing body of the County that such uses satisfy a need which cannot be accommodated at other upland locations or in urban or urbanizable areas and are compatible with the objectives of this goal to protect riparian vegetation and wildlife habitat; and;
- (g) A single family residence on existing lots, parcels or units of land when compatible with the objectives and implementation standards of this goal.”²

3. URBANIZATION FINDINGS AND POLICIES

3.1 Planning for Incorporated Communities According to the Urbanization Goal

Findings

The incorporated communities of Manzanita, Nehalem Wheeler, Rockaway, Garibaldi, Bay City and Tillamook and areas outside of these cities are urban as defined by the statewide planning goals. They therefore fall within the jurisdiction of the Urbanization Goal.

Policy

Tillamook County recognizes that incorporated communities are urban. The County will cooperate with those communities to plan for them in accordance with the Urbanization Goal (Goal 13.2 Planning for Unincorporated Communities

¹

²

3.2 Planning for Unincorporated Communities

3.2(A) Findings

(1) Unincorporated communities are an essential and valued part of life in Tillamook County. More than 25% of the county's citizens reside in these communities. They include some of the county's most livable places.

(2) On October 28, 1994, the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) adopted new administrative rules and goal amendments establishing planning and zoning requirements and opportunities for unincorporated communities. The new rules were amended by LCDC on January 30, 1997. These rules are contained in OAR 660, Division 22. The expressed purpose of the unincorporated community rule is

“to establish a statewide policy for the planning and zoning of unincorporated communities that recognizes the importance of communities in rural Oregon. It is intended to expedite the planning process for counties by reducing their need to take exceptions to statewide planning goals when planning and zoning unincorporated communities.”

(3) Prior to the adoption of these new rules and goal amendments, established unincorporated communities like Neahkahnie, Oceanside, Netarts, Pacific City and Neskowin existed only as “exceptions” or “nonconforming uses” in Oregon's land use system. They were neither “urban” (i.e., incorporated) nor “rural” (i.e., agricultural, forest or sparsely settled). This ambiguous status questioned the legitimacy and value of communities and complicated needed planning for them.

(4) The need for planning in unincorporated communities is indicated by citizens concerns about the quantity and quality of growth in these communities. In 1995 more residential development (94 residences) occurred within the five unincorporated coastal communities of Neahkahnie, Netarts, Oceanside, Pacific City and Neskowin than within the growth boundaries of the County's seven incorporated cities combined (92 residences). There was more residential development (35) in Pacific City than in any other city or community in the county.

(5) Public response to recent surveys in the unincorporated communities of Oceanside, Netarts, Pacific City and Neskowin indicate concern about the quantity and quality of the growth that is occurring in their communities. Proposed developments have received increased attention and objections from those who perceive that they will have adverse impacts on their community. This in turn creates uncertainty for those who are interested in purchasing and developing property as they face the prospect of lengthy hearings and extended appeals.

(6) The key to resolving concerns about and conflicts over growth is to involve citizens in a planning effort that helps assure that inevitable growth will occur in a manner that enhances livability rather than degrades it. The unincorporated communities rule requires citizen involvement in all phases of the planning process (OAR 660-22-060). Coordination with special districts and affected cities is also required.

(7) The unincorporated communities rule (OAR 660-22-010) distinguishes the following four types of unincorporated communities (emphasis added).

(a) A “Rural Community... consists primarily of permanent residential dwellings but also has at least two other land uses that provide commercial, industrial or public

uses...”

(b) A “Resort Community... established primarily for and continues to be used primarily for recreation or resort purposes; and includes residential and commercial uses...”

(c) A “Rural Service Center... consisting primarily of commercial or industrial uses providing goods and services to the surrounding rural area or to persons traveling through the area, but which also includes some permanent residential dwellings.”

(d) An “Urban Unincorporated Area... which... includes at least 150 permanent residential dwellings; contains a mixture of land uses, including three or more public, commercial or industrial land uses; (and) includes areas served by a community sewer system... and a community water system.”

(8) The rule requires that county comprehensive plans designate and identify unincorporated communities in accord with the above definitions. Such a community must have all of the following characteristics described in OAR 660-22-010(10):

(a) It is made up primarily of lands subject to an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 3, Goal 4 or both;

(b) It was either identified in a county’s acknowledged comprehensive plan as a “rural community,” “service center,” “rural center,” “resort community,” or similar term before this division was adopted (October 28, 1994), or it is listed in the Department of Land Conservation and Development’s January 30, 1997 “Survey of Oregon’s Unincorporated Communities;”

(c) It lies outside the urban growth boundary of any city;

(d) It is not incorporated as a city; and

(e) It met the definition of one of the four types of unincorporated communities and included the uses described in those definitions, prior to the adoption of this division (October 28, 1994).

(9) Tillamook County has 16 communities that have all of the required characteristics: Barview, Beaver, Cape Mearns, Cloverdale, Falcon Cove, Hebo, Idaville, Neahkahnie, Neskowin, Netarts, Oceanside, Pacific City/Woods, Siskeyville, Tierra Del Mar, Twin Rocks and Watseco.

(10) Counties must identify boundaries for unincorporated communities in order to distinguish them from adjacent exception areas, resource lands and other rural lands. The criteria for including land within an unincorporated community boundary is contained in OAR 660-22-020. There is a presumption that land is qualified for inclusion if it is within a site specific unincorporated community boundary that is shown on an acknowledged plan map on October 28, 1994, particularly if the land is not designated for farm or forest use.

(11) Individual plan and zone designations are to be adopted for all unincorporated communities, except rural service centers, in accord with OAR 660-22-030. Industrial and commercial development, including motels and hotels, is limited, depending upon the type of community and distance from incorporated cities.

(12) OAR 660-22-030(6) requires that county plans and land use regulations shall ensure that new uses authorized within unincorporated communities do not adversely affect agricultural or forestry uses.

(13) OAR 660-22-030(7) requires that county plans and land use regulations shall allow only those uses which are consistent with the identified function, capacity and level of service of transportation facilities serving the community, pursuant to OAR 660-12-069(1)(a) through (c).

(14) OAR 660-22-030(f) requires that zoning applied to lands within unincorporated communities shall ensure that the cumulative development will not result in public health hazards or adverse environmental impacts that violate state or federal water quality regulations and will not exceed the carrying capacity of the soil or of existing water supply resources or sewer services.

(15) OAR 660-22-040 provides for the adoption of plans and land uses for urban unincorporated communities and describes the circumstances under which the boundaries of these communities may be expanded.

(16) Community public facility plans are required in circumstances described in OAR 660-22-050.

3.2(B) Policies

(1) Tillamook County will plan for unincorporated communities in accordance with Statewide Planning Goal 14 (Urbanization) and the unincorporated communities rule (OAR 660, Division 22) as available resources permit. Such planning is a high priority given the importance of these communities to the county and citizen concerns about the quantity and quality of growth that is occurring within them.

(2) Tillamook County will provide for and encourage citizen involvement in all phases of the community planning process in accord with the requirements of OAR 660-22-060.

(3) Tillamook County will designate unincorporated communities in accord with OAR 660-22-010, establish boundaries for these communities in accord with OAR 660-22-030. Community public facility plans will be developed where required by OAR 660-22-050.

(4) Tillamook County will prioritize the need for planning for unincorporated communities, beginning with the five coastal communities that have been experiencing significant development pressure, and whose residents and property owners have expressed concern about the impact of development on the livability of their communities. These communities are Neahkahnie, Oceanside, Netarts, Pacific City/Woods and Neskowin. Tillamook County will proceed with planning for the other identified rural communities as resources permit.

3.3 Planning for the Unincorporated Communities of Netarts, Oceanside, Pacific City, and Neskowin in Accordance with the Urbanization Goal.

Findings

The unincorporated communities of Oceanside, Netarts, Cloverdale, Pacific City, and Neskowin are not urban as defined by the Goals because they are not incorporated nor are they adjacent to any incorporated communities. Neither do these communities fit the definition of rural lands in the Goals because they are not “non-urban agricultural, forest or open space lands” nor are they “other lands suitable for sparse settlement, small farms or

acreage homesites with no or hardly any public services.” Functionally, these communities are urban and they experience communities in the county face.

A general discussion follows which describes the characteristics of functionally urban communities and distinguished their planning problems from those of rural areas. Then a description of the urban characteristics of each community is included.

Although the term urban is relative, most people would probably agree that urban development is fairly dense and it typically includes clusters of commercial and industrial development. It is typified by communities, town, and cities. Rural development generally is sparse rather than dense and with few or no clusters of commercial or industrial development.

A functional definition for planning purposes should indicate a cutoff that recognizes where planning issues differ according to density of development.

The density of development has many impacts on the landscape and the community. Some of these impacts include water usage, storm water runoff, sewage generation, and road requirements and are shown in Table 1. The impacts of development are valid community concerns that justify community regulation because they extend beyond the boundaries of any individual property. Where densities are high and development is extensive community services and facilities are necessary for managing impacts in order to prevent unreasonable community burdens. Such service and facilities include sewage disposal, water, storm drainage and roads. In addition, some control over the siting of land uses is necessary to reduce conflicts between incompatible uses. The most critical public service needed for managing the impact of dense development is central sewer. This service also is important for defining functionally urban communities.

The availability of public sewer is the major determinant of development density. All individual sewage disposal systems are limited by the amount of land needed to accept effluent. With septic tanks and drainfields, a minimum lot area of approximately one acre is necessary if drinking water comes from a well. This assures adequate separation between the water supply and the septic tank drainfield. Where soils are of poorer quality for drainfields, a larger lot size is necessary. If central water is available, the minimum lot size that assures septic tank functioning and protection of surface and groundwater quality is approximately ½ acre. The availability of public sewers greatly decreases lot size requirements because individual lots no longer have to accept sewage effluent. With public sewer, densities much greater than two dwellings per acre are possible over a large area. Public sewer also allows concentrations of commerce and industry that would not be possible without it.

The availability of central sewer also sets limits on the minimum community size and the maximum lot size. Small communities are costly to serve with central sewer. In such cases, on-site sewage treatment with septic tanks and drainfields is more cost effective. (See Section 3.19) In addition, sewer fees and taxes make it difficult to maintain larger lot sizes for any length of time. Only in affluent communities can residents afford larger lots such as 20,000 square feet and central sewers.

Central sewers provide the primary criterion for determining whether an area is urban or rural. Where sewers are available, densities can be and typically will be greater than two dwelling units per acre and other urban planning problems will be present. Where sewers are not available, densities, population size and growth, and the presence of commercial or industrial centers which attract population growth may characterize an area as urban to justify the development of sewers.

There is a gray area that might be best described as semi-urban development where some urban problems exist but which are not likely to develop to an extent that require sewerage. Such areas include older platted subdivisions with lots too small to accommodate on-site sewage disposal (See Sections 3.4 and 3.19) and larger areas of development at densities of one to two dwellings per acre.

The communities of Oceanside, Netarts, Cloverdale, and Pacific City have public sewers. Development has occurred at high densities and further high density development is possible. These communities have relatively large populations for the County, and a limited central sewer but the community has grown substantially growth. Further information on each community follows.

Oceanside and Netarts are two unincorporated communities bound together under the common administration of one sewer district. They are separated by a distance of about one and one-half miles and are about 7 miles away from Tillamook City. These communities have a permanent population of approximately 1,050 and a seasonal population of 1,030. The population of the areas has grown by approximately 26 percent over the last decade. Residential densities range from 5 to 10 dwellings per acre.

Services available include sewage disposal, public water, street lighting and fire protection as well as a range of county-wide services. There is a fire hall and a post office in each community. There are a variety of commercial services in the communities, including grocery and general stores, gas stations, laundromat, restaurants and taverns.

Cloverdale is a small residential community and relatively important commercial center in the south central part of the County, 22 miles south of Tillamook City, the nearest incorporated place. Its 359 permanent residents live at urban densities of about 4 to 6 dwelling units per acre. A sewer system serves the area as does a water system. The Nestucca Rural Fire Protection District serves the area and a fire station is located in the community. There is also a high school and a post office. The community as a variety of commercial services making it a commercial center for the south central county. These services include a bank, hardware store, auto parts store, supermarket, feed store, pharmacy, clothes store, barber shop, beauty salon, gun shop, liquor store, gas station, restaurant and lounge.

Pacific City and Woods are two communities located in close proximity to one another along the Nestucca River 27 miles from Tillamook City. Over the last decade, the population of these communities grew by 41 percent to the current total of approximately 665 permanent residents and 935 seasonal residents. Residential densities range from 4 to 8 dwelling units per acre. This is a commercial fishing center. 325,548 pounds of Salmon worth \$640,806 were landed in Pacific City in 1979. This was more Salmon than was landed in Garibaldi during the same year.¹ This is also a tourist center oriented toward the ocean, adjacent state parks, Nestucca Bay, and the Nestucca River.

The commercial services available in the communities include several gas stations, restaurants, fish processors and markets, supermarkets, taverns, building supplies, laundromat, beauty and barber shops, marinas, motels, bank, construction companies, florist, auto repair, clothes store, and cabinet making. Public services include both central sewer and water. The communities are within the Nestucca Rural Fire Protection District with a fire station located there. A post office is also located in Pacific City.

1

Neskowin is a resort and residential community located in the south end of the County, 31 miles from Tillamook City and 13 miles north of Lincoln City. It is a community which has grown appreciably over the past decade, 47 percent, despite the limitations that soil has placed on the installation of septic drainfields. (The bulk of the community is unsewered.) The community has 367 permanent residents and 570 seasonal residents living mainly at densities of from 3 to 10 dwelling units per acre. Residential density in condominium units is considerably higher.

There are few commercial services in the community and most are oriented toward recreation. These services include a gas station, two golf courses, grocery stores, motels and restaurants.

Central water serves the community. A small private sewer serves a portion of the community. A sewer district has been formed and is applying for grants to build a sewer system to replace the existing one and to extend service other areas. The community is part of the Nestucca RFPD and there is a fire station in the community.

This community is likely to grow at a much faster rate than previously if a new sewer system is installed in the area. Soil conditions currently limit building. A growth rate that is more like the one occurring in Lincoln City, 7 to 8 percent per year, is likely if central sewer is provided. Neskowin has similar access from the Willamette Valley. Route 18 is 7 miles away from Neskowin compared to five miles away from Lincoln City.

Planning for these unincorporated communities does not fit well into the framework of the Goals. Although they are not defined as urban communities, development can not be planned for at rural densities given the existence of urban services and the need for urban housing. They do not have types and levels of services appropriate for rural areas as Goal 11 requires.

The Urbanization Goal is more appropriate means of planning for these communities than the exceptions process. Moreover, as the Common Questions on Urban Development paper states, the Urbanization goal roughly approximates the exceptions process.¹ This is especially true when the requirements of Goal 3 for UGBs are taken into account.² These communities could be planned for in accordance with the Urbanization Goal and still be more consistent with the character of planning problems presented. The Urbanization Goal along with Goal 3 urbanization requirements is less restrictive than the exceptions process in four ways: the exceptions process requires special notice; there is explicit mention of the consideration of alternatives; there is explicit mention of conflicts that would apply to forest and shoreland areas; and the exception process is considered when proposing the conversion of uncommitted forest or shorelands to urban use. If the planning for functionally urban unincorporated communities follows the Urbanization Goal along with these four requirements, then the requirements of the Goals will be met.

The Urbanization Goal is a more appropriate framework to use for planning these communities because it requires the consideration of services and facilities, the phasing of urban development, land use deficiency, housing and employment needs, and through the Housing Goal, a buildable lands inventory.

Policy

¹

²

Tillamook County recognizes that there are several communities in the County that are neither urban or rural as defined by the statewide planning goals and which are necessary, suitable and intended for urban development. The County will plan for these communities in accordance with the Urbanization Goal (Goal 14) because this goal best meets planning needs in these communities. The County will include procedural and substantive findings that fulfill the requirements of the exceptions process of Goal 2.

3.4 Planning for Unincorporated Communities That Are Not Rural as Defined by the Statewide Planning Goals and Which Are Not Necessary, Suitable or Intended for Urban Use.

Findings

The unincorporated communities of Falcon Cove, Idaville, Cape Meares, Beaver, Hebo and Tierra Del Mar are semi-urban in character. These communities do not fall within the definition of rural in the Goals because they are not characterized by sparse settlement, small farms, or acreage homesites. They do, however, more closely fit the definition of rural than to the functionally urban unincorporated communities. Because of existing public and commercial services and facilities, population size and densities and parcel sizes, these communities display some urban characteristics and urban problems. These problems are not great enough however to warrant planning for these areas in terms of the Urbanization Goal.

Falcon Cove together with adjacent Cove Beach in Clatsop County forms a community of approximately 175 people, most of whom are seasonal, living at densities of from one-half to 6 units per acre. There is a community water system serving the area. Fire protection is available from the Cannon Beach Rural Fire Protection District.

Idaville is a small residential community located just east of Bay City. The population of approximately 190 live at densities of 1 to 4 units per acre although much higher densities exist in the mobile home park.

The community has a convenience store and gas station. Water service is from the Kilchis Water District and fire protection is from the Tillamook Rural Fire Protection District.

Cape Meares is a residential community of approximately 360, many of whom are seasonal residents. The area is extensively platted and residential development is predominantly at densities of from 2 to 6 units per acre. There are no commercial services in the community. The Cape Meares Water Cooperative provides water to the community. There is no guaranteed fire protection service to the community since it is not part of any fire district. The Tillamook Rural Fire Protection District will respond to fire calls if it can.

The community of Beaver is a commercial and residential center with a population of approximately 250 permanent residents who live at densities of from less than 1 to over 4 dwelling units per acre although higher densities exist in the mobile home park. Commercial services in the community include grocery stores, two gas stations, and a nursery. A large construction company is headquartered in the community. The community has a grade school, a post office and a fire station. The Beaver Water District provides the community with water service.

The community of Hebo is also a commercial and residential center in the south central part of the County. The approximately 300 residents live at densities from under 1 to over 3 units per acre. Much higher densities exist in the two mobile home parks in the community. Hebo is also the headquarters of the Siuslaw National Forest in this area.

Commercial services include several restaurants, a grocery store, a combined grocery and hardware store, two gas stations, a tavern, and a sports shop. A grade school and a post office are also located in the community. A portion of Hebo is served with central water. The Nestucca Rural Fire Protection District provides fire protection but there is no fire station in the community.

Tierra Del Mar is a seasonal residential community with approximately 500 part-time residents living at densities of from 4 to 12 dwelling units per acre. The Tierra Del Mar Water Company provides water service to the community and the Nestucca Rural Fire Protection District provides fire protection. The nearest fire station is in Pacific City. Commercial services in the community are limited to souvenir sales.

Policy

Tillamook County recognizes the existence of a number of rural communities including Falcon Cove, Idaville, Cape Meares, Beaver, Hebo and Tierra Del Mar which are not rural as defined by the goals because they are not lands characterized by sparse settlement, small farms, or acreage homesites. These communities are also not functionally urban and are not necessary, suitable or intended for urban uses. Although the County recognizes the commitment to development in these communities, it will not plan for them in accordance with the Urbanization Goal (Goal 14).

3.5 Planning for Rural Areas Outside of Communities

Findings

Although most of the County is undeveloped and being managed as forest land or farm land there are a number of areas that are primarily in rural residential use. These areas do by and large fit the description of acreage homesites and sparse settlement. Although there are specific locations where development is fairly dense, these are small and do not take on a community character. Such areas are discussed and mapped in much more detail in; the Justification Section of the Goal 2 plan element. Many of these residential areas are served by public or private water systems and most are in fire districts. Densities are typically less than two dwelling units per acre. Commercial services in these areas are limited. Generally, these areas fit the Goal definition of rural.

Policy

Tillamook County recognizes that the majority of the land area of the County is rural as defined by the statewide planning goals. The County will plan these areas as rural lands defined by the goals.

3.6 Establishing Urban Growth Boundaries to Separate Urban and Rural Uses

Findings

A major purpose of the statewide planning goals is to clearly distinguish between areas that are intended for urban development and receive urban services. Where the distinction between urban and rural areas has not been made in the past, the public has incurred the costs of unplanned service extensions, underutilized land, and the loss of resource land.

The urban growth boundary acts as the dividing line between urban and rural areas. (See Sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3). Urban growth boundaries include enough land to meet urban

development needs for 20 years and indicate where urban services will be made available. Areas outside of these boundaries are not intended for either urban services or high density development.

Policy

Tillamook County will establish urban growth boundaries to separate urban and rural uses. Land within these boundaries will be available for urban use over time. Land outside of these boundaries will not be available for urban use.

3.7 Establishing Urban Growth Boundaries Around Incorporated Communities

Findings

The Urbanization Goal requires counties and incorporated cities to cooperate in establishing and changing urban growth boundaries. Establishment of a UGB is to be guided by the seven factors listed in Goal 14. Changing the location of an acknowledged UGB is to be guided by the procedures and requirements of the exceptions process included in Goal 2, as well as the seven factors of Goal 14. (See Sections 2.6 and 2.7).

Policy

Tillamook County will cooperate with incorporated cities in the County to establish urban growth boundaries in accordance with the Urbanization Goal (Goal 14). The County will manage unincorporated lands within those boundaries in conformance with comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances adopted in cooperation with the cities and in accordance with Goal 14. Future urban growth boundary changes will be made in accordance with the seven factors listed in the Urbanization Goal (Goal 14) and the procedures and requirements set forth in the Land Use Planning Goal (Goal 2) for goal exceptions. Appropriate citizen advisory committees and service districts will be involved in the urban growth boundary planning process.

3.8 Establishing Community Growth Boundaries Around Unincorporated Communities

Findings

Since the functionally urban unincorporated communities will be planned for according to the Urbanization Goal (See Section 3.2 and 3.3), community growth boundaries need to be established around them to separate urban and rural land uses. The burden for establishing these boundaries rests with the County. The residents of Neahkahnie and Twin Rocks/Barview wish to maintain identities separate from adjacent incorporated communities by having separate community growth boundaries.

Policy

Tillamook County will establish community growth boundaries around the functionally urban unincorporated communities of Neahkahnie, Twin Rocks/Barview, Oceanside/Netarts, Cloverdale, Pacific City/Woods, and Neskowin. The boundaries for the communities of Neahkahnie and Twin Rocks/Barview will be separate from those of adjacent incorporated communities.

3.9 Procedure for Establishing Community Growth Boundaries Around Unincorporated Communities

Findings

Community growth boundaries for the communities of Neahkahnie and Twin Rocks/Barview may be based on the consideration of the seven factors listed in the Urbanization Goal because these communities are defined as being urban by the goals. Community growth boundaries for the other functionally urban unincorporated communities, Oceanside/Netarts, Cloverdale, Pacific City/Woods, and Neskowin must be based on the procedures and requirements of the Goal 2 exceptions process because these communities are not defined as being urban by the goals.

The Urbanization findings requirements along with the Goal 3 findings requirements for conversion of rural agricultural land to urbanizable land, can with modification provide all the findings required by the exceptions process. The findings required by the Urbanization Goal for establishing a community growth boundary are roughly equivalent to those required by the exceptions process.¹ With respect to agricultural lands, the Goal 3 findings requirements for conversion of rural agricultural land to urbanizable land are more rigorous than the exceptions requirements. The Urbanization Goal is weaker with respect to forest lands and coastal shorelands. However, if alternatives and conflicts are considered when proposing forest lands or coastal shorelands for urban use in addition to the seven urbanization factors, all of the substantive exceptions requirements will be met.

The procedural requirements of the exceptions process, notification must also be met for approval of community growth boundaries around these functionally urban communities.

In establishing these community growth boundaries, it is important to involve County residents. Where these boundaries are adjacent to incorporated cities, as with Neahkahnie and Twin Rocks/Barview, it is also important to involve these cities.

Policy

Tillamook County will establish community growth boundaries around unincorporated communities in accordance with the seven factors listed in the Urbanization Goal (Goal 14) with the Agricultural Lands Goal (Goal 3) requirements, along with necessary modification in substance and process to fulfill the procedures and requirements of the Goal 2 exceptions process. Appropriate citizens advisory committees will be involved in the establishment and change of these boundaries. Tillamook County will coordinate the establishment and change of community growth boundaries around Neahkahnie with the City of Manzanita and around Twin rocks/Barview with the cities of Rockaway and Garibaldi.

3.10 Coordination of community Growth boundaries with Service Districts

Findings

One of the important functions of the community growth boundary is to indicate where services will be made available over the next 20 years. This tells the developer which areas can be assured of eventually receiving urban services. For the governing body, it indicates where the impacts of urban development will be limited to. It is important that this boundary be respected. Extending services beyond the boundary negates the purposes of the boundary by spreading the effects of urban development beyond where they are intended and reducing the efficiency of providing public services. Such considerations are especially important for functionally urban unincorporated communities since services are provided by

1

districts and not by the County. It is important for the County to coordinate its plans with service districts and use its powers to assure that actions by these districts do not circumvent the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy

Tillamook County will coordinate the establishment and change of community growth boundaries around unincorporated communities with affected service districts. The County will work with service districts to assure that all areas within the community growth boundaries will be serviced. Proposed annexations and disannexations to service districts will be reviewed by the County Planning Department to assure consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

3.11 Development Within Community Growth Boundaries

Findings

Community growth boundaries indicate where urban development is appropriate and where urban services will be made available over the next 20 years. Although all areas within the boundary are planned to eventually receive services, it may be a number of years before any specific property is serviced. Ideally, the most efficient sequence of service extensions and development within the boundary is stepwise outward from existing developed areas. Departure from such an ideal sequence may be necessary depending on terrain and the availability of land for development. The Urbanization Goal lists four criteria governing development within community growth boundaries (See Section 2.8).

Policy

The County will review land development actions and service district expansions according to the following four criteria listed in Goal 14:

- 1) Orderly, economic provision for public facilities and services;
- 2) Availability of sufficient land for the various uses to insure choices in the market place;
- 3) LCDC goals;
- 4) Encouragement of development within urban areas before conversion of urbanizable areas.

3.12 Changing Established Community Growth Boundaries for Unincorporated Communities

Findings

Community growth boundaries are not meant to be forever fixed. Changing conditions and community needs require changes in CGB location. In addition, the long term population projections which determine, in part, CGB location are only crude estimates of future population. Population projections are based on the continuation of past trends and are dependent on community values, the economy and other factors. With time, the projections will become increasingly inaccurate. It is important, therefore, to review and revise CGBs periodically.

The Urbanization Goal specifies that future changes in an acknowledged CGB must be

based on the seven factors listed in the Goal as well as the procedures and requirements set forth in the Land Use Planning Goal for goal exceptions (See Section 2.7).

Policy

Tillamook County will periodically review community growth boundaries, every 3 to 5 years, to see if they meet community needs. Boundary revisions will be made where necessary. Future community growth boundary changes will be made in accordance with the seven factors listed in the Urbanization Goal (Goal 14) and the procedures and requirements set forth in the Land Use Planning Goal (Goal 2) for goal exceptions.

3.13 Review of Zoning Within Unincorporated Communities

Findings

It is especially important that there be a review of zoning within the urban growth boundaries of unincorporated communities. None of these six communities have their own governing body to make planning recommendations and decision. These responsibilities have fallen on the citizen advisory committees, the County Planning Commission, and the County Board of Commissioners. Each of the five citizen advisory committees had one or more of these communities to plan for in addition to the non-community areas. Limited time precluded lengthy citizen meetings in these areas and only immediately identifiable needs and the requirements of the Statewide Planning Goals could be considered. Additional planning is necessary if the aspirations of community residents are to be met.

Policy

Upon adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, Tillamook County has as its first priority, review of the plan and zoning within the urban growth boundaries of unincorporated communities.

3.14 Request for Citizen Advisory committee (CAC) and Service District Comment on Planning Actions within community Growth Boundaries of Unincorporated Communities

Findings

Citizen advisory committees can continue to provide valuable advice to the County Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners after the Comprehensive Plan is adopted. These committees are an important source of information about local opinion and properties. They also have a greater knowledge about the decisions made during the comprehensive planning process.

Service districts should also be involved in planning decisions on a continuing basis. Service districts are inevitably affected by such decisions since property values and the demand for services is affected by their outcome.

Policy

Tillamook County will continue to involve appropriate citizen advisory committees and service districts in important planning decisions within the community growth boundaries of unincorporated communities.

3.15 Zoning of Rural Areas Consistent with the Need to Protect Resource

Findings

Just as it is important to recognize that land within urban growth boundaries is available over time for urban use, it is important to recognize that land outside is intended for rural use and primarily for the protection of resource land.

Policy

Tillamook County recognizes that lands outside of urban growth boundaries are rural. The County will zone those lands in a way that is consistent with rural needs and the need to protect resource lands.

3.16 Development in Rural Communities

Findings

Tillamook County recognizes the existence of a number of rural communities including Falcon Cove, Idaville, Cape Meares, Beaver, Hebo, and Tierra Del Mar which don't fit the Goal definition of rural and which are not well suited for urban development. (See Section 3.4.) These communities have a large supply of vacant lots that are a resource for accommodating residential development. However, because of small lot sizes and small populations, these communities face a dilemma. Parcel sizes are predominantly too small for on site sewage disposal and ownership patterns limit the use of several lots together. Sewering these communities could eliminate this problem but the costs are likely to exceed the local resources available to provide such a service.

A General Accounting Office study of nine small communities with populations of under 10,000 including Oceanside/Netarts and Pacific City/Woods found that sewerage small communities has several major drawbacks. These include high service costs, community conflicts, management problems, and problems of managing secondary impacts.¹

Central sewer systems are more costly than individual septic systems in large part because the cost of collection systems which comprise about two-thirds of total sewer system costs.² These costs create problems for lower income families and the elderly on fixed incomes.³ In some communities, families have had to sell their home or defer other necessary expenses because of sewer costs.⁴ Such costs can cause community conflicts with a substantial number of people refusing to pay required charges.⁵

It is difficult for small communities to operate a central sewage system because typically the volunteer board members do not have sufficient time or experience. It is difficult for them to adequately review the work of consulting engineers as has been the case with Oceanside/Netarts and Pacific City/Woods.⁶ Even greater management problems could result if the smaller rural communities received sewer service. Sewer service also may bring an increased growth which results in other community impacts. These secondary impacts are

¹ Comptroller General, U.S. General Accounting Office, "EPA Should Help Small Communities with Federal Pollution Control Requirements."

² Comptroller General, U.S. General Accounting Office, "Community Managed Septic Systems," 12

³ Comptroller General, U.S. General Accounting Office, "EPA Should Help Small Communities with Federal Pollution Control Requirements." 10

⁴ Comptroller General, U.S. General Accounting Office, "EPA Should Help Small Communities with Federal Pollution Control Requirements."

⁵ Comptroller General, U.S. General Accounting Office, "EPA Should Help Small Communities with Federal Pollution Control Requirements."

⁶ Comptroller General, U.S. General Accounting Office, "EPA Should Help Small Communities with Federal Pollution Control Requirements." 18-19

difficult for an unincorporated community to manage.

Individual waste disposal systems have advantages over central sewers. These systems treat sewage as well or better than central sewage treatment and are more cost effective over their life span.¹ They also replace groundwater.²

A number of existing sewage disposal problems in rural communities can be solved without resorting to central sewage systems.³ Some can be solved by repairing or replacing existing septic systems. Alternative systems such as sandfilters can replace other failing systems. Funds for repairs are available as a result of the Clean Water Act of 1977.⁴

Alternative individual sewage disposal systems can increase land utilization in rural communities. Some of these alternatives include sharing of septic systems or sand filters by several homes, using individual sand filters, using low pressure systems, and obtaining easements to secure drainfield placements on nearby property. A community maintenance program for individual sewage disposal systems would assure that properly installed systems will continue to function.⁵

The development of a sewer system may be advisable if the financial resources are available and a significant public health or water quality problem exists within an established rural community that cannot be resolved in a less expensive way. The provision of any such system shall be appropriate for but limited to the needs of the rural community.

Policy

Tillamook County recognizes the commitment to development in the communities of Falcon, Idaville, Cape Meares, Beaver, Hebo and Tierra Del Mar because of the existence of small lots in disjointed ownerships, services and roads, and structures. These areas are not urban, however, and Tillamook County discourages the establishment of urban services in these areas unless such services are needed to accommodate urban expansion which can not be accommodated through the expansion of nearby urban communities or to solve existing health and water quality problems that can not be solved in other ways. Tillamook County will respect the use of existing lots within sewage disposal limitations and will allow the development of unplatted land within these communities at the maximum density possible with public water systems and individual sewage disposal systems if such development is consistent with the requirements of Goal 7, hazards, and Goal 17, Coastal Shorelands. In rural communities such as Hebo where a sewer system is the only effective method of solving a public health or water quality problem, installation of such a system will be supported by the County so long as the system is appropriate for but limited to the needs of the rural community.

¹ Comptroller General, U.S. General Accounting Office, "Community Managed Septic Systems," 12

² Comptroller General, U.S. General Accounting Office, "EPA Should Help Small Communities with Federal Pollution Control Requirements." 5

³ Comptroller General, U.S. General Accounting Office, "EPA Should Help Small Communities with Federal Pollution Control Requirements." 15-22

⁴ Comptroller General, U.S. General Accounting Office, "Community Managed Septic Systems," 5

⁵ Comptroller General, U.S. General Accounting Office, "EPA Should Help Small Communities with Federal Pollution Control Requirements." 15, 22

FIGURE 3
TILLAMOOK COUNTY, OREGON DEVELOPMENT AREAS

Insert Figure 3

FIGURE 4
CHANCE ROAD DEVELOPMENT PATTERN
(Scale: 1" = 400')

Insert Figure 4

Source: Tillamook County Assessor's Office

FIGURE 5
BRICKYARD ROAD DEVELOPMENT PATTERN
(Scale: 1" = 200')

Insert Figure 5

Source: Tillamook County Assessor's Office

3.17 Development in Noncommunity Rural Areas

Findings

In noncommunity areas where there isn't commitment to small lot development, it is important that lot sizes are sufficient to assure that development minimizes impacts on roads, services and resources. In noncommunity areas, development on lots that are even as small as a half-acre can cause significant public problems. Tillamook County has large areas that are appropriate for rural residential development and is likely to have problems unless it has reasonable lot sizes to govern future development. There are four major areas of concern affected by rural lot sizes. These include traffic congestion, water quality, water availability, and impacts on resource lands.

The impacts of dense rural development are not felt immediately because development over small areas is buffered by the large amounts of resource land which surround them. In fact the rural characteristics that people seek by moving to rural areas may not be due to their property at all. Those who live on small lots are getting their rural benefits from surrounding undeveloped properties. But if all of the surrounding properties are developed with small lots, the area loses its rural characteristics because no one has provided the open space.

This problem is compounded by the desires of property owners to have the same development rights as their neighbors. The first developments at high densities may have little effect on the area because of the buffering provided by neighboring large undeveloped parcels surrounding. By the time that negative public impacts are felt, a lot size precedent has been formed which may be difficult to change. The owners of undeveloped property would think it unfair that they should have less development options than their neighbors had although continued development at the higher density will mean that the County will have to take other corrective action in order to alleviate problems.

The effect of uncoordinated development on roads is one area of concern. A common way of developing land in rural areas involves partitioning land off next to existing county and state roads with each lot having its own access onto these roads

The effect of access ways is even greater when left hand turns are involved. In addition, a greater impact would be noticed on the two lane roads which predominate in the County.

Small lot development allowed by existing zoning can significantly degrade traffic capacity of county and state roads. Conceivably 81 homes could line each side of a mile of county road in the current A-1 Zone (60 foot minimum lot width). For each home, we can expect cars to turn into or out of each driveway ten times a day.¹ Therefore, 1,620 cars would be turning into or out of driveways along this mile of road. Half of these would probably be making left hand turns. Traffic flows would be significantly impacted and road capacity would be degraded to a point where the road does not do the job as an arterial or an access road.

The problem is actually more complicated because roads in rural areas become pedestrian and bicycle routes since there are no sidewalks.

The streets can also become play areas for children. The highway that once was a blessing to rural residents because it afforded easy access to town, now becomes a nightmare because of the danger it presents to their children. Understandably, these residents will lobby the County or the State to reduce speed limits on these roads for increased safety. For

1

example, rural residents along McCormick Road and along Brickyard Road have expressed concern about the traffic along these roads. Of course, with lower speeds, the road becomes a less effective traffic arterial. In Pleasant Valley for example, the speed limit on Highway 101 drops from 55 MPH to 50 MPH because of development along the highway.¹ More development in this area may require further reductions in the speed limit.

Water quality is also a concern in rural areas. Under good soil conditions with central water available, the minimum lot size capable of on site sewage disposal is about one half-acre. Lots using well water need a lot size of at least an acre to provide the necessary setbacks between the septic tanks, drainfields and wells. If the zoning in a rural area allows development down to a half acre density outright, then lots will be created on poor quality soils which are too small for accommodating septic systems. However, the owners of such lots are not likely to simply accept their losses. Political pressure will be brought to bear on the County Sanitarian or the DEQ to approve septic systems on marginal or substandard lots. What should be an objective procedure for evaluating sites becomes subjective as a result of this pressure.

As a result, systems fail and pollute ground or surface waters. This is a minor problem if only a few systems are involved but with enough systems, the problem can be considerable. For example, pollution of Mill Creek has been traced to failing septic tanks in the Brickyard/Mill Creek Road area. Many of the lots in this area are too small to accommodate septic systems but meet the required lot size of the zoning.

Dune aquifers are especially prone to pollution from septic systems. Pollution can occur even if present DEQ rules are followed since those rules don't address contamination of dune aquifers.

Sand dune aquifers experience very high infiltration rates. They are especially susceptible to pollution. Fluid pollutants travel significant distances quickly in this sand medium. Because of this, all sand dune areas down stream or in close proximity to sources of pollutants may become polluted. those areas of particular concern include all deflation plains and their fringes, areas near lakes, streams and marshes, and near beach sites.²

Bacteria have been shown to travel 100 feet or more through dune sand. Sand is also incapable of removing chemical contaminants, including those used in most household detergents which can render water unfit for domestic purposes. Some such contaminants not only produce a potential health hazard, but may also threaten filtering out viruses. Outbreaks of Hepatitis in some counties may be linked to septic tank problems in areas of high water tables or ponding.³

Besides the naturally occurring sources of nitrate nitrogen (NO₃N), septic tank emissions and fertilizer used on pasture and croplands are significant sources in some areas. There are indications that excessive nitrate ingestion may cause methemoglobinemia (Blue babies). The U.S. Public Health Service prohibits the use of drinking water with greater than 10 mg/liter concentration of NO₃N. The U.S. Department of Environmental Quality has set a limit of 5 mg/liter in at least some sand aquifer areas on the Oregon Coast due to seasonal population peaks and associated septic tank discharges.⁴ Currently, the State of Oregon assumes no responsibility for drinking water quality and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency does not have adequate resources allocated to monitor and enforce the federal

1
2
3
4

regulations. The net result is that little or no sampling is being done and potential problems may be going undetected.

The seriousness of this problem depends on the density of development and where that development occurs in relation to groundwater resources.¹ A large lot size, at least permitted outright, will assure that workable septic systems can be accommodated and will provide some protection in dune areas.

A third development concern is with the adequacy of public water and groundwater supplies to support rural development. Individuals can supply their own water from surface or groundwater supplies. Community water systems can get water from wells, surface sources, or other water systems. All of these types of supply are represented in the County and each has its benefits and limitations.

Public systems are limited by their source, treatment capacity and water line sizes. Many rural water systems were designed and built when they only had to serve scattered homesites and farms. Their capacity may not be adequate to serve large areas of dense rural homesites. Some rural systems depend on surplus water from nearby cities for their supplies, as is the case with many systems around the City of Tillamook. These systems don't have their own water sources or treatment facilities or the management to run them. Since these systems buy surplus water, they don't have assurances that they will always have that water available or that water will be made available to handle growth in the area. For example, the Netarts Bay Water District buys surplus water from the Netarts Water District. The Netarts Water District has placed a moratorium on any water hookups in the Netarts Bay water District because their own supply of treatment water is limited.

The availability of groundwater for residential use is limited by the water holding capacity of the underlying geology. If the water demands of development exceed the rate of which the underground aquifers are replenished, the water table is drawn down at the expense of the quality or quantity of water supplies.

Some areas have abundant groundwater supplies including the Nehalem, Bayocean, and Nestucca sand spits and the area west of Sand Lake.²

The Tillamook lowlands are also very productive.³ Shallow depth groundwater can probably be obtained throughout the lower flood plains of the Nehalem and Nestucca Rivers.⁴ The Kilchis River provides groundwater for the Bay City regional water system.

Some groundwater supplies are available under more localized conditions because they are perched above relatively impermeable materials. For example, groundwater in volcanic flow braccia commonly remains perched above impermeable sedimentary interbeds. Limited yields of groundwater supplies are available in the marine sedimentary and volcanic rocks which underlie much of the county because they are largely impermeable.⁵ Also coastal marine terrace deposits consisting of relatively permeable, unconsolidated sand, silt and gravel could provide groundwater in some areas because they receive large quantities of water during the rainy season.⁶ One would expect that these water supplies have less certain quantities of water.

1
2
3
4
5
6

If the demands of residential development for groundwater exceed the supply available, the water table will be drawn down. This can happen seasonally or permanently. Typically water withdrawal creates a cone-shaped depression from where the water is extracted. Depending on the rate of water removal and the rate of groundwater replenishment, and the density of development, the water availability on neighboring properties can be affected.

New residents in an area can draw down the groundwater table below the wells of existing residents.

In coastal areas, over drawing on the aquifer can result in the reduction of lake levels, the draining of wetlands, and the loss of dune vegetation.¹ Overdrawing groundwater can also result in saltwater intrusion into the aquifer.

Rural development also affects resource lands. As the number of rural residents increase, so do the complaints about farm and forest practices. As density increases, the farmer has more neighbors along his fence lines; more dogs and more children. At the same time, there is less residential open space for play areas.

Several acres of open space land are needed for children to play field games such as football or baseball. In areas where the lot size is half-acre the only large open spaces may be on farmlands, because public playgrounds are not provided in rural areas. Conflicts are caused if farmlands are used for play areas. Such conflicts include gates left open, cut fences, littering (which fouls farm machinery), and liability problems for the farmer.

Estuaries and wetlands are also adversely affected by dense rural development. Sediment from residential lots washes into waters during and after construction. Domestic sewage and lawn and garden fertilizers also adversely affect nearby water bodies. (See Section 1.2).

Policy

Tillamook County recognizes that development densities in rural areas have significant impacts on roadways, sewage disposal, water quality and quantity and nearby resource lands. Tillamook County will set its minimum lot size requirement in rural non-community areas at two acres in order to prevent adverse impacts. Higher densities will be allowed on a conditional basis where the cumulative impact of greater densities is not significant.

3.18 Creation and Expansion of Sewer and Water Districts Outside of Urban Growth Boundaries

Findings

The creation and expansion of sewer and water service into resource areas provides incentives to convert those lands to non-resource use. In the past, federal agencies have encouraged and financed water and sewer systems

in rural areas without fully considering the impact that this would have on resource lands.

Where significant health and water quality problems exist which can not be corrected through replacement or rehabilitation of septic systems or the use of alternative septic systems, such extensions and their accompanying costs may be justified.

1

Water systems are more justifiable in rural areas. Their impact on the conversion of resource lands and on costs is less than that of sewer systems. Water systems may be necessary in order to permit development in foothill areas where groundwater is less available. In these areas water systems are desirable because such development reduces the pressure to develop agricultural lands.

Policy

Tillamook County discourages the extension of sewer service outside of urban growth boundaries unless there is a significant health and water quality problem and alternatives to central sewer such as repair and rehabilitation of septic systems is infeasible or if there are unusual circumstances in which uses requiring sewer can not be located in urban areas. In such cases, sewer expansion will be allowed only if guarantees limit connection to the specific area of concern. The County approves of water system creation or expansion only if such systems only meet the needs of development allowed by the Comprehensive Plan. Tillamook County jointly with the Clatsop-Tillamook Intergovernmental Council will actively pursue cooperative agreements with all water and sewer districts and will review cooperative agreements that have already been signed to assure consistency with this policy.

3.19 Community Growth Boundary Findings

Cloverdale (Refer to exception map 4S 10W #13)

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

The community growth boundary will accommodate the need for approximately 100 more housing units by the year 2000.

- 2) Need for housing, employment opportunities and livability:

The expansion of Cloverdale is limited by topography and surrounding agricultural and forestry uses. Although there is sufficient room to meet housing needs there is little room for commercial or industrial expansion. The community growth boundary will guide growth according to the existing pattern of development and will retain the community's existing level of livability.

- 3) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services:

Most of the southern half of the area has sewer and water service. The northern half has only water service. Unsewered areas could have this service fairly readily extended.

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

The community growth boundary encourages the maximum efficiency of land uses because it focuses growth on committed lands. This pattern creates a minimal increase in the amount of conflicts with surrounding resource uses.

- 5) Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences:

Environmental consequences are beneficial because development will occur on committed lands having limited potential for resource use.

Energy consequences are favorable because the community growth boundary maintains a compact urban growth form.

Economic consequences are favorable because growth is being accommodated in a way that doesn't take valuable resource land out of production and that creates a minimum of conflicts with surrounding resource uses.

Social consequences are favorable because the existing community pattern is retained.

- 6) Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority:

All areas within the community growth boundary are committed and have low agricultural value. The largest ownership is 20 acres and has Group 4 and 5 soils. It also has a very high level of surrounding development conflicts.

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

Agricultural lands border on the west and north. To the north, the Nestucca River and Highway 101 act as buffers. In addition there is already a high level of development and the effect of additional development would be marginal. To the west, Highway 101 and Krebs Mill Road act as buffers. Here also there is existing development.

Neahkahnie (Refer to Exception Map 3N 10W #2)

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

There will be a need for approximately 276 additional housing units by the year 2000. The community growth boundary can accommodate approximately 366 additional dwellings.

- 2) Need for housing, employment opportunities and livability:

Neahkahnie is a residential community primarily housing retired and seasonal populations. Because of this, employment needs are small and are met in surrounding communities. There is ample room in the community growth boundary to meet housing needs. The community growth boundary retains the same community character and retains the current level of livability. The extra room available for development assures that adequate open space can be maintained in areas that are most prone to geologic hazards.

- 3) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services:

The community growth boundary is included within water and sewer districts. Developed areas currently receive those services and undeveloped areas could receive those services in the future if capacities are upgraded to meet future growth needs.

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

Highway 101 forms the boundary defining the area which can be developed at urban

densities with maximum efficiency. All areas contained within have very limited resource use potential because they are either physically committed or economically and socially committed. These areas also have the potential of being served by sewer and water.

5) Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences:

Environmental consequences are beneficial because all lands included in the community growth boundary are committed to non-resource use and because sufficient land is included to allow retention of open space in hazardous areas.

Energy consequences are beneficial because a compact growth form is maintained.

Economic consequences are favorable because sufficient land that can be efficiently provided with public services is included within the boundary.

Social consequences are favorable because the existing community pattern is maintained.

6) Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority:

The limited areas having some agricultural potential are all committed to development.

7) Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities:

The area is not adjacent to any agricultural activities.

Neskowin (refer to exception maps 5S 10W & 11W #3, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9)

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

There is a need to accommodate approximately 420 additional homes by the year 2000. The community growth boundary can provide for approximately additional dwellings at urban densities.

2) Need for housing, employment opportunities and livability:

Neskowin is a residential community primarily housing retired and seasonal populations. Sufficient land is included within the boundary to meet future housing needs. There are few employment opportunities in the community and the future need will be small given the nature of the community. Future commercial needs can be met on the 14 acres of vacant commercial land located near the community's center. Livability is maintained by the wide variety of housing choices made available by this boundary.

3) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services:

Most of the area is included within sewer and water districts. Developed areas are currently served and undeveloped areas may be with water. Public sewers are currently available in the central Neskowin area.

- 4) Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area:
The community growth boundary area is well bounded by topographical and physical man-made features. It is well separated from the forest lands behind.
- 5) Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences:
Environmental consequences have some beneficial aspects. The agricultural land is of relatively low quality and important wetland areas have been placed in protective zones. Forest lands are separated by topography.
Beneficial energy impacts result from the provision of a large area attractive for second home developments within easy driving distance of the Salem metropolitan area.
Beneficial economic impacts would result from the stimulation of the housing industry in this area.
Beneficial social impacts would result from the use of this area as a seasonal and retirement retreat.
- 6) Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority:
Agricultural lands included within the community growth boundary have primarily Group 4 or 5 soils. Most of the Group 4 soils are wetland or used by a golf course. A small area of Group 2 soil is also occupied by a golf course. A 20 acre area of Group 1 soil is included because it is separated from the remainder of the farm ownership.
- 7) Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities:
The surrounding area has limited agricultural use and development will pose few conflicts in the future.

Netarts-Oceanside (refer to exceptions maps 1S 10 & 11W #12 & 13 and 2S 10W #1)

- 1) Demonstrated need to accommodate long range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals:
There is a need to accommodate approximately 1,150 additional housing units in the central coast area which includes the communities of Netarts and Oceanside. The community growth boundary can accommodate approximately 985 additional dwellings.
- 2) Need for housing, employment opportunities and livability:
These are primarily second home and retirement communities. Permanent residents find employment mainly in the Tillamook City area although some local employment is available. Sufficient land is included to meet the area's housing and vacant commercially zoned land and some use conversion is possible. The placement of the undeveloped area between the two communities is a planned development zone will assure that livability is maintained.

- 3) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services:

The entire area could be served with water and sewer. It is all part of a sewer district. Most of it is included in either of the water districts could be included at some future time.
- 4) Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area:

The area can be efficiently served and committed areas are used for development. Efficiency is achieved by using the undeveloped land between the two communities which are served by a common sewer system.
- 5) Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences:

Environmental consequences are beneficial because committed areas are included within the boundary and because urban development is not expanded southward along Netarts Bay.

Energy consequences are beneficial because development will occur when energy has been invested in capital facilities.

Economic consequences are beneficial because land which has services available will be used for development.

Social consequences are beneficial because existing community centers will retain their existing character.
- 6) Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority:

There is no agricultural land within the community growth boundary.
- 7) Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities:

There are no agricultural uses adjacent to the community growth boundary.

Pacific City (refer to maps 4S 10 & 11W #3, 4 & 5)

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

There is a need to accommodate approximately 670 additional housing units in the Pacific City area by the year 2000. The community growth boundary can accommodate approximately 530 additional housing units.
- 2) Need for housing, employment opportunities and livability:

The community growth boundary will meet housing needs for most of the period to the year 2000. Future plan updates will be able to reassess growth trends and include additional land if needed. Although the community has a very high proportion of seasonal and retirement households there is some local employment in fishing, services and construction. The community growth boundary provides 16 acres of vacant land for commercial expansion and additional acreage for residential to commercial conversion. The area will retain its existing sense of livability with

beach and bay views and defined community centers.

- 3) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services:

Most of the area is within sewer and water districts with the exception of the extension to the southeast. The area within the districts can be sewerred. Water and sewer lines about the northwest side of the area excluded from the districts.

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

Future growth of the area can be most efficiently accommodated along the south side of Brooten Mountain. This is a forest area that is isolated from other forest areas and has limited long term forest potential. Growth of the area to the north is limited by State and Federal land and other land in commercial, farm, forest or recreation use. To the south, Nestucca Bay and the Nestucca Spit limit development.

- 5) Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences:

Environmental consequences are beneficial because future expansion along the south side of Brooten Mountain will minimize the impact on forest or farm resources. The effects on Nestucca Bay will be minimized by the buffering land that is too narrow to develop.

Energy consequences are favorable because a fairly compact growth form is retained and the south facing slopes of Brooten Mountain favor solar development.

Economic consequences are favorable because development needs can be met in a pattern that can be efficiently served.

Economic consequences are favorable because development needs can be met in a pattern that can be efficiently served.

Social consequences are favorable because the existing community centers are maintained.

- 6) Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority:

The boundary does not include any productive uncommitted agricultural land.

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

Conflicts with agricultural uses are most likely to occur in the north. Most of this area however, is already developed with urban uses. The potential for additional conflicts will be moderated by topography.

Twin Rocks-Barview (refer to exception maps 1N 10W #1, 2 & 3)

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

There is a need to accommodate approximately 130 additional housing units by the year 2000. The community growth boundary will accommodate approximately 320

dwellings.

- 2) Need for housing, employment opportunities and livability:

The Twin Rocks-Barview area is primarily residential in nature with a high proportion of seasonal and retirement households. Sufficient land is included within the community growth boundary to meet housing needs. Employment needs for permanent residents have been primarily met in surrounding communities. Approximately 4 acres of vacant commercial land is included to meet the communities' commercial growth needs. Approximately 14 acres of vacant industrial land can meet future industrial needs in the North Central Coast area. A community growth boundary separate from that of the City of Rockaway has been developed so that Twin Rocks-Barview residents could retain their own sense of livability.

- 3) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services:

The entire area is included within sewer and water districts. Developed areas are currently served and undeveloped areas are in close proximity to existing lines.

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

Lands included within the community growth boundary are committed to development and can be easily served with sewer and water.

- 5) Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences:

Environmental consequences are beneficial because committed areas are used for development.

Energy consequences are favorable because development areas are fairly compact.

Economic consequences are favorable because sufficient land that can be easily served is included within the boundary.

Social consequences are favorable because existing community centers are retained.

- 6) Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority:

The boundary does not include any agricultural land.

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

No agricultural uses are adjacent to the community growth boundary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Department of Land conservation and Development, Letter from Wes Kvarsten, Director, to George Diel, Chairman, North Central County Citizens Advisory Committee, October 4, 1978.

Department of Land Conservation and Development, Letter form Wes Kvarsten, Director, to Kenneth O. Christenson, Mayor, City of Rockaway, October 25, 1978.

Downie, Leonard Jr., Mortgage on America: The Real Cost of Real Estate Speculation, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.

Land Conservation and Development Commission, "Common Questions on Urban Development Paper," Salem, OR, November 19, 1979.

Land Conservation and Development Commission, "Common Questions About the Forest Lands Goal, Statewide Goal 4", Salem, OR, Draft May 29, 1979.

Land Conservation and Development Commission, "Exceptions Process Paper", Salem, OR, Approved March 10, 1978, Amended May 3, 1979.

Land Use Board of Appeals, Rudd v. Malheur County, LUBA No. 80-056, Final Order of September 29, 1980, p. 8.

Metropolitan Service District, "Urban Growth Boundary Findings", November, 1979.

Mills, Edwin S., Urban Economics, Oakland: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1972.

Oregon Court of Appeals, Still v. Marion County Bd. Comm., 42 OR App 115, 122, 600 P2d 433 (1979).

Oregon Department of Transportation, Guidebook for Access Management, Salem, OR 97310, July 1979.

Oregon, Secretary of State, Oregon Blue Book 1981-1982, State Capitol, Salem, OR 97310, 11981.

Pattie, Preston S., Impacts of Urban Growth on Local Costs and Revenues, Special Report 423, Oregon State University Extension Service, Corvallis, OR, November 1974.

Ragatz, Richard L., A Survey of the Housing Situation in Tillamook County, Richard L. Ragatz Associates, Inc., 3660 Donald Street, Eugene, OR 97405, 1978.

Real Estate Loan Fund, Amicus Curiae, DLCD v. Tillamook County Bd. Comm., LUBA No. 81-004, brief filed by Edward J. Sullivan, 1727 NW Hoyt Street, Portland, OR 97209.

Real Estate Research Corporation, The Costs of Sprawl, Washington, D.C., U.S. Council on Environmental Quality, 1974.

Sargent, F. O., Rural Environmental Planning, University of Vermont, 1976.

Schlicker, Herbert G., Environmental Geology of the Coastal Region of Tillamook and Clatsop Counties, Oregon, Bulletin 74, State Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, 1069 State Office Building, Portland, OR 97201, July, 1972.