

Hood River Westside Area Concept Plan

Technical Advisory Committee



Date: October 11, 2017

Time: 3:00 to 5:00 PM

Hood River Fire Station

Training Room
1785 Meyer Parkway

Agenda

- 3:00 p.m. **Welcome and Process for the Meeting**
- Welcome and self-introductions
 - Agenda overview and process for the meeting

Overall process note: For this last meeting of the Committee, staff is not asking the Committee to approve the content of the meeting packet materials. To do that in a fair and thorough manner, many more meetings would be required. Instead, the proposed process question is: “Is there consensus to move the package forward (inclusive of issues listed) for further work by the Planning Commission?” A “yes” means you think it is an acceptable starting point for further work, even if there are items with which you do not agree.

Kevin Liburdy, City of
Hood River

Joe Dills, Angelo
Planning Group

Please review the original meeting guidelines approved by the PAC in October, 2016 (attached). The TAC will use the same process. Notes will be taken throughout the meeting on issues to be forwarded as part of the package for the Planning Commission.

-
- 3:10 p.m. **Concept Plan Report – Introduction and Physical Framework Plans**
This agenda item will review the Introduction chapter and the Framework Plans chapter for: Neighborhoods and Districts; Streets; Pedestrian and Bicycle; Park and Open Space.
- Highlights by staff
 - Discussion and Committee feedback – listing of issues to be forwarded

Project Team

- 3:40 p.m. **Concept Plan Report – Land Use Framework Section**
This agenda item will review the Land Use Framework section.
- Highlights by staff
 - Discussion and Committee feedback – listing of issues to be forwarded
- Project Team

-
- 4:15 p.m. **Concept Plan Report – Implementation Chapter**
This agenda item will review the Implementation Chapter. Due to limited time, staff suggests that discussion focus on policy issues and direction; more detailed commentary or questions can be provided by email submittal.
- Highlights by staff, section by section
 - Discussion and Committee feedback – listing of issues to be forwarded
- Project Team

-
- 4:45 p.m. **Closure on the Package to be Forwarded to the Planning Commission**
This agenda poses the closure question: “Is there consensus to move the package forward (inclusive of issues listed) for further work by the Planning Commission?” A “yes” means you think it is an acceptable starting point for further work even if there are items with which you do not agree.

Per the adopted meeting guidelines, the process options are:

1. The Committees will seek to develop advice and recommendations by consensus. Consensus means a member either supports the proposal or can live with it in the interest of moving forward.
2. If consensus cannot be reached, the facilitator will ask for a vote. The vote will be captured in the meeting summary, along with the various points of view on the issue.
3. The facilitator may ask for straw polls during the course of discussion to gauge the level of support for various issues and help identify areas of compromise.

All

-
- 5:00 p.m. **Next Steps and Adjourn**

Meeting Guidelines – Approved by Project Advisory Committee, October, 2016

OVERVIEW

The following guidelines are suggested in order to facilitate productive meetings and a clear process for developing project recommendations.

PURPOSE AND ROLES OF THE COMMITTEES

The Project Advisory Committee (PAC) is a volunteer committee consisting of property owners in the study area, representatives of local advocacy groups, Columbia River Treaty tribes, the City of Hood River and other interested parties. It will meet five times during the course of the project to provide guidance to the project team (i.e. the staff team from the City, County, Oregon Department of Transportation and consultants).

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is made up of local and state agency representatives who will provide guidance on the project too, particularly in regard to legal requirements, planning and engineering analyses, inter-jurisdictional coordination and similar technical issues.

MEETING AND COMMITTEE GUIDELINES

General Guidelines

- a. Meetings will be facilitated by the project consultant.
- b. Discussions are generally intended to develop consensus and a common direction from the Committee, but consensus is not required to move forward.
- c. Meetings will begin and end on time. If an agenda item cannot be completed on time, the group will decide if the meeting should be extended or items continued to the next meeting.
- d. Committee members will strive to:
 - Share comment time so all can participate
 - Be respectful of a range of opinions
 - Focus on successfully completing the agenda
 - Voice concerns as needed at the meeting
 - Seek consensus where possible
- e. The public is welcome to attend PAC meetings, and time will be reserved for public comments.
- f. Committee members are encouraged to share the project's progress with their respective networks and constituencies.

Guidelines for Developing Advice and Recommendations

4. The Committees will seek to develop advice and recommendations by consensus. Consensus means a member either supports the proposal or can live with it in the interest of moving forward.
5. If consensus cannot be reached, the facilitator will ask for a vote. The vote will be captured in the meeting summary, along with the various points of view on the issue.
6. The facilitator may ask for straw polls during the course of discussion to gage the level of support for various issues and help identify areas of compromise.

For additional information, visit the project website at www.hrwestsideplan.com or contact Kevin Liburdy, City of Hood River, via info@hrwestsideplan.com .

Memorandum



8/23/2017

To: Project Advisory Committee
Cc: Project Management Team
From: Joe Dills, AICP and Andrew Parish, AICP, Angelo Planning Group
Re: **DRAFT** Summary of August 16, 2017 TAC Meeting

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum provides a summary of the August 16, 2017 meeting of the Hood River Westside Area Concept Plan Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), including meeting discussion, decisions made and next steps.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Date: August 16, 2017
Time: 6pm
Location: Hood River Fire Station
 1785 Meyer Pkwy, Hood River, OR

Members:

- Kevin Liburdy, City Planning Department
- John Roberts, Director, Hood River County Community Development Department
- Gail Curtis, ODOT
- Joel Madsen, Executive Director, Mid Columbia Housing Authority
- Sandra Buchanan, CFO, Hood River County School District
- Mark Hickok, Director, Hood River Valley Parks District
- Julie Stephens, Columbia Area Transit
- Mikel Diwan, County Public Works **(ABSENT)**
- Cindy Walbridge, Director, City Planning Department
- Jennifer Kaden, City Planning Department
- Leonard Damian, City Fire department
- Neal Holste, Chief, City Police Department
- Steve Wheeler, City Manager **(ABSENT)**
- Kim Travis, North Central Regional Solutions Team **(ABSENT)**
- Scot Edelman, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Schedule

Welcome from Kevin Liburdy, followed by a round of introductions.

Joe Dills provided an overview of the agenda, which will include continued discussion of the Land Use Framework and its updates, a Transportation Analysis update, and materials related to the Infrastructure Funding Plan. The last meeting for this committee is planned for the end of September or early October – date TBD. There are two additional pieces going through project team review – zoning code amendments and street cross sections. These will be available for email review.

At the next meeting, the team will present a draft concept plan, supporting policies, and development code language. This will be scheduled for September or October.

Agenda Item 2: Revised Land Use Framework

Joe Dills reminded the committee of the land use discussion at the July meeting. After feedback from community members and committee members, the team has created a land use plan with the following major updates, generally related to a rationale of transecting from urban to a rural/natural edge of the city:

- Item A. Retained the current R-1 designation in the southwest portion of the study area (minimum lot size of 7,000 sf).
- Item B. Retained existing R-2 zone (5,000 SF min lot size) in the southern portion of the study area
- Item C. Removed R-3 designation on a portion of the western side of the study area. The team received lots of feedback from TAC members and some PAC members that said R-3 was a priority and should be retained, but we think this one spot of change makes sense.
- Item D. Keep developed parcels that are not expected to be able to subdivide in their existing designation throughout the Westside Area.

These changes affect the overall land use capacity and expected housing mix. The previous land use plan had capacity for an estimated 1830 units, and this revised plan is down to about 1700.

Cindy Walbridge stated that R-3 is a very important component of this plan. The affordability of small houses and townhomes has changed rapidly in the city and are no longer an affordable product to the 80% AMI range. Only multifamily can meet this need.

Scot Edelman noted that a 20-year horizon is the minimum required by the State – jurisdictions can plan for longer periods.

Joel Madsen noted that almost all development lately has been single family detached. In the westside - there is one piece of property in public ownership. This property is the best chance of creating some affordable housing, we need to have that property in mind with all our framework plans.

John Roberts: Land banking is the County's preferred method of creating affordable housing.

The community conversation is about general topics such as "Do we want more people here?"

The HNA has a number of other assumptions that are proving false already – annexation of the UGB, short term rentals, etc. The need for more and affordable housing is greater than predicted even a couple of years ago.

Agenda Item 3: Transportation Analysis Update

John Bosket gave a presentation on the updated transportation analysis that was conducted to address these land use assumptions and revised PSU population projections. The analysis also assumed a level of transit service similar to the City of Sandy to account for some trips. The analysis has these key findings:

- New projects - lots of them are new streets.
- Improvements at interchange, Cascade/Mt Adams, Rand / May.

- Almost all of the improvements that were needed in this analysis are already identified in the Transportation System Plan. One change: intersection at May and Rand, either adding a traffic signal or mini-roundabout.
- The previous TSP only went to 2031, this analysis looks to 2040. The same transportation infrastructure is needed by 2040 whether you do the zone change or not.
- Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) - requires you to coordinate and have a reasonable plan for meeting the improvements. This will be part of the next agenda item – infrastructure financing.
- "Financially Constrained List" - some of our projects are on this list. Large interchange improvements also needed. Through conversations with ODOT, they have agreed to fund "interim improvements" to the exit 62 interchange - traffic signals at ramp terminals.
- Remaining projects include new streets, new intersection at Rand and May, and a portion of projects on Cascade Avenue. City will need to figure out how to fund them - a portion will be borne by developments.
- For TPR, the City doesn't need to find funding right now. They need to adopt a policy to explore funding for those.
- Just a note on bicycle and pedestrian improvements - like offroad trails - city will need to find funding, but there is no direct connection to the TPR.

Questions and comments:

What portion will be the developers' responsibility?

- Typically, the developer pays the "local street equivalent" and the City pays for the rest.

When thinking of roundabouts, ensure they are wide enough for transit vehicles to maneuver on and consider bus routes.

Did the change in population forecast affect the needed infrastructure?

- No, the same projects are needed. The projects are driven by urban development, not really the number of trips involved.

Agenda Item 4: Infrastructure Financing


Lorelei Juntunen presented the ECONorthwest memorandum on Infrastructure Funding.

- The Westside Area had large infrastructure needs before this planning process.
- This is a high-level conversation – details can be found in tables of the report.
- Hood river is not alone in the challenge of funding infrastructure. Just about all jurisdictions find themselves in this situation, and transportation is usually the largest unfunded infrastructure gap. Rarely do Service Development Charges (SDCs) cover infrastructure costs.
- How city pays for infrastructure now:
 - SDCs
 - Developer contributions
 - Grants (such as ODOT funds)
- SDC revenues estimates were presented. Currently, there is a citywide pool for SDCs and projects citywide are funded from there.
- Water and wastewater - Looks like funding is sufficient
- Stormwater - city is updating stormwater management plan. Likely need a SDC increase to fund needed infrastructure.
- Parks - could increase SDCs or apply the charge to employment uses, as employees use parks as well. Land donations/exactions may also be part of the funding plan.
- Transportation needs are much better understood now, through this planning process. There is a gap in funding, but this is helped by the "interim improvement" to Exit 62 agreed to by ODOT.
- SDC comparison – Hood River has SDCs much lower than some jurisdictions.

- SDC impact on housing affordability – increasing fees to developers get shifted to homebuyers. There are ways to waive the SDC for developers and have the city pay through the recently-adopted Construction Excise Tax (CET).

Discussion:

- For water/sewer/stormwater, City is currently in a “maintenance only” mode. We are far away from being able to fund that gap. Backlog of maintenance work and capital facilities plans.
- Parks SDCs have changed recently - can charge up to \$6,000. The current plan is to increase that cost gradually.
- Sidebar from Joe Dills – delivering parks comes down to money, location, and authority. The City can get land through pre-development acquisition. North Bethany maps properties directly (may not meet Nolan/Dolan legal requirements). Canby asks property owners to waive Nolan/Dolan rights as part of annexation. Rest of the cities surveyed said they figure it out as they go.
- SDCs are not collected until permitting, and parks needs the money beforehand to purchase land. Answer would be a citywide/SDC pool, using funds from somewhere else.
- Bonding is another tool. Urban renewal is possible but not recommended.
- Transit SDC - worth a conversation between the transit district and the city. Transit master plan projects serving the area
- Transportation: Just a note that Exit 62 rebuild is still needed in the long term. The interim fix is sufficient for the plan to move forward.
- There is community concern about school capacity. Can the district speak to this?
- Sandra: School district has banked property in this area. Grades/type of school is yet to be determined, will depend on future school demand. One of the things school boards do is assess needs as far as population growth, enrollments, etc. Just asked for a bond to address old buildings. Enrollment projections - newer projections are somewhat less. Boundary changes, bonds, are possible if things change. Hard to guess until development actually occurs. Growth is not harmful for the school district – declining enrollment is more difficult to address.
- Regarding the Housing Affordability memo - we've talked about affordability for everyone. Want to dig in a little bit to talk about specific funding measures for affordability (allowing SDC waivers or paying SDCs through grants, Construction Excise Tax).
- City passed construction excise tax on Monday. (1%? About 400k a year for affordable housing at 80% AMI and below.)
- Communicating school capacity is important, along with other public services (emergency services, police and fire).
- Fire: Fire department can't be proactive for growth by adding staff waiting for people to move in. This fire station is in a good location. We may need to add a facility further west, add more people, but that will be evaluated as development occurs. Westside fire district is rural, not far from city boundary. Unpredictable staffing there. We are in a position where we have people for today's needs.
- The 911 district is managed by the county sheriff's office. Every 911 center is understaffed and underpaid.
- Paying a sufficient wage for police and fire is a challenge in Hood River.
- Agencies should be prepared to write a letter responding to whether this planning effort affects their levels of service. What we are hearing today is that a change in the amount of growth of the Westside Area will need to be part of agency planning, but will not negatively affect schools, fire, or police.



CONCEPT PLAN REPORT

Vision, Concepts, and Issues for a Livable Westside Area

October 4, 2017

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| Purpose | 3 |
| Scope of this Report | 4 |
| Regulatory Role of the Concept Plan When Adopted | 5 |
| Vision and Guiding Principles | 6 |
| Overview of Hood River’s Westside Area | 8 |
| Summary of 2016-2017 Concept Planning Process | 10 |
| FRAMEWORK PLANS | 12 |
| Neighborhoods and Districts Framework | 13 |
| Streets Framework | 26 |
| Pedestrian and Bicycle Framework | 37 |
| Park and Open Space Framework | 40 |
| Land Use Framework | 42 |
| IMPLEMENTATION | 62 |
| How Will Housing Affordability Be Delivered? | 62 |
| Comprehensive Plan Policies | 66 |
| Comprehensive Plan/Zoning Map Updates | 68 |
| Transportation System Plan Updates | 68 |
| Urban Growth Area Management Agreement | 69 |
| Zoning Code Updates | 71 |
| Paying for Infrastructure – A Funding Plan for the Westside | 76 |
| Planning for Adequate Urban Services for the Westside Area | 84 |

Appendix

APPENDIX A: PROJECT PARTICIPANTS AND PROCESS

1. TAC/PAC Membership
2. Project Team membership
3. Summary of Public Comments (Will be updated to include October TAC/PAC Meetings)

APPENDIX B: INFRASTRUCTURE AND FUNDING

1. Roadway Cross Sections (New Material)
2. Transportation Analysis
3. Roundabout Coordination
4. July 6, 2017 letter from ODOT regarding Exit 62 (New Material)
5. 2010 Exit 62 Concept Plan and Gateway Illustrations
6. Water, Sewer, Stormwater
7. Technical Memorandum 6.1: Funding Review and Funding Toolkit
8. Park Lands Acquisition: Code Research and Case Studies (New Material)

APPENDIX C: HOUSING AND AFFORDABILITY

1. Memo: Questions about the Housing Needs Analysis (New Material)
2. Housing Basis Memo
3. Housing Implementation for the Westside Area Concept Plan

APPENDIX D: DRAFT CODE AMENDMENTS

1. Overview Memorandum for Public Review Draft 1
2. Chapter 17.01 – General Provisions
3. Chapter 17.03 – Land Use Zones
4. Chapter 17.04 – Supplementary Provisions
5. Chapter 17.16 – Site Plan Review
6. Chapter 17.19 – Townhouse Projects
7. Chapter 17.23 – Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

APPENDIX E: INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

1. Hood River Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) (New Material)

INTRODUCTION



PURPOSE

The purposes of this Hood River Westside Area Concept Plan (Concept Plan) report are to:

1. Describe **planning concepts** developed during the 2016-1017 planning process for the Concept Plan.
2. Provide **recommendations, ideas, options and issues** for use by the City as the Concept Plan is further reviewed and refined by the Planning Commission, City, County, and community.

Recommendations and opinions in this report are those of the Westside Area Concept Plan project team.¹ The specific intent of the Concept Plan is to:

- Establish the overall vision for a livable Westside Area;
- Define an integrated land use and transportation plan for the area, addressing land use, streets, bike ways, pedestrian paths, parks, open space, schools, and utilities;
- Support and facilitate the development of workforce and affordable housing;
- Serve as a guide for coordinating individual developments and public realm improvements into a cohesive Westside community that is an livable extension of Hood River; and
- Provide strategies for land use regulations, infrastructure funding and other key actions needed to implement the Plan.

¹ See Appendix A for a list of the project team and other project participants. A project management team guided the staff work and include project managers from Angelo Planning Group (primary authors of this report), City of Hood River, Hood River County, and the Oregon Department of Transportation.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report is an interim step in preparing an adoption-ready Westside Area Concept Plan. It is “interim” because the City intends to continue to discuss and shape the plan. The plan addresses the following topics:

- Neighborhoods and Districts
- Streets and Transit
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections
- Parks and Open Space
- Land Use
- Implementation, specifically:
 - *Provision of affordable housing*
 - *Comprehensive Plan policies and zoning code updates*
 - *Water, Sanitary Sewer, and Storm Water Plans*
 - *Infrastructure Funding Plan*
 - *Planning for adequate services for the Westside Area*

Four Framework Plans and Roadmap for Land Use

This Concept Plan addresses four key physical frameworks for the livability of the Westside Area: neighborhoods and districts; streets; pedestrian and bicycle connections; and, parks and open space. These frameworks are the high-level physical components of the plan, and are fundamental to implementing the vision and ensuring livability as the area develops.

In contrast to the physical frameworks listed above, which have mapped recommendations, land use is described in terms of policy choices, key issues raised during the process, citywide information about buildable lands, a roadmap of steps for completing the Land Use Framework, and recommendations from the project team. This approach is offered because:

- The Project Advisory Committee (PAC) concluded its work without consensus support for a recommended land use plan.
- The PAC also did not have broad agreement on how the City should implement its adopted housing policies and strategies in the Westside Area.²
- The draft land use framework drew many concerns and questions (and some misunderstandings) from the community.

In response to, and with respect for, the above perspectives, this plan presents land use information and options, including:

² Housing strategies recommended as part of the 2015 Housing Needs Analysis are found in the Hood River Housing Strategies Report.

- Additional data and observations about the city’s land supply and growth strategies, to help inform discussion of land use options and evaluation of how much growth should be planned for the Westside Area;
- A roadmap of suggested steps and issues to address to craft the Land Use Framework; and,
- Recommendations from the project team to use as a starting point.

REGULATORY ROLE OF THE CONCEPT PLAN WHEN ADOPTED

When complete and adopted, the Concept Plan will establish the basis for implementing Comprehensive Plan policies and zoning code standards. The City’s intent is to adopt the Concept Plan as a supporting document of the Comprehensive Plan. The specific approach and format for the regulations are currently under evaluation, however, the basic parts of the regulations is will include:

- Comprehensive plan policies;
- Updates to the Comprehensive Plan/Zoning map;
- Updates to the City’s Transportation System Plan;
- Updates to the City’s Public Facilities Plans for sewer, water, and storm water (as needed); and
- Updates to zoning code standards.

Regarding the code, the City is also discussing code updates that may apply citywide to address housing affordability and livability issues as addressed in the City’s 2015 Housing Strategy.³ The code work prepared for the Concept Plan can inform the citywide work, and vice versa. Following the completion of the Concept Plan, the City will finalize the code updates, bringing the Westside Area and citywide efforts together into a cohesive package.

³ See the discussion of affordability and livability within the “Land Use Framework” section of this report.

VISION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The following vision statement and guiding principles were derived from the PAC and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) discussions held on October 5, 2016, and subsequently approved by those committees.

Vision for the Westside Area

The vision statement approved by the PAC is:

The Westside Area will grow to become an interconnected community of great neighborhoods, an attractive gateway of commercial and mixed-use activity, and an affordable and diverse area of the City.

The Westside's hallmarks will be:

- *Housing options that provide choices for all income levels, life stages, and cultures within Hood River.*
- *Streets, trails, and paths that are walkable, connected, and green.*
- *Neighborhood design that celebrates the landforms, views, and magnificent landscape of Hood River.*
- *Open spaces and parks that support community gathering and a connection to nature.*

The Westside Area will be an integral part and extension of the larger Hood River community.

Guiding Principles

The following guiding principles are intended to implement the vision statement and provide clear touchstones to evaluate elements of the Concept Plan.

The Hood River Westside Area Concept Plan will:

- A. Create livable neighborhoods that make good use of the Westside's limited land supply.
- B. Create well-planned and commercially successfully mixed-use districts in the Westside gateway area.
- C. Create a plan that works for all ages and abilities of the community.
- D. Provide a range of densities and housing types by retaining existing affordable housing and increasing affordable housing choices in Hood River.
- E. Incorporate natural features and a sense of place into each neighborhood and district.
- F. Include open space and parks integrated in neighborhoods.
- G. Provide a connected transportation network with walkable, bike-friendly, and green streets.
- H. Promote active and healthy living through community design.
- I. Plan land uses and transportation facilities so the area may be served by fixed route transit in the future.
- J. Integrate Westside Elementary School and future new schools as key community places.
- K. Promote human-scaled building designs.
- L. Plan for efficient water, sewer, and stormwater infrastructure, utilizing green practices for stormwater management.
- M. Provide a realistic infrastructure funding strategy.

The planning process will:

- N. Be open and transparent.
- O. Embrace cultural and community diversity throughout the plan and planning process.

OVERVIEW OF HOOD RIVER'S WESTSIDE AREA

The project area is located on the west side of Hood River and extends south from Interstate 84 at Exit 62 into a historically low-density residential area that includes numerous vacant parcels. In summary:

- The Westside Area contains approximately 447 acres and consists of approximately 577 lots/parcels, including developed neighborhoods as well as vacant and partially vacant lands.
- Approximately one half of the Westside Area is vacant or partially vacant and located in Low Density Residential (R-1) or Standard Density Residential (R-2) zones.
- The Westside Area includes a total of approximately 60 developable acres zoned General Commercial (C-2) and Light Industrial (LI), located in the “Gateway” area along Cascade Avenue.
- The Westside Area includes a vacant 17-acre parcel owned by the Hood River County School District that is being considered for future facility needs.
- The westernmost 158 acres of the Westside Area is located outside the city limits but within the Urban Growth Boundary (see Figure 1 and Figure 2 below). An intergovernmental agreement between the City and the County addresses the County’s management of land use activities in this Urban Growth Area (“UGA”) consistent with City standards until such time that annexation occurs.

The Westside Area, and all of Hood River, enjoy one of the most beautiful landscapes of the Pacific Northwest. Positioned at the crossroads of the spectacular Columbia River Gorge and the magnificent Cascade Range, the City and the Westside Area are framed by the Gorge, the east and west hills of the Hood River Valley, Mt. Hood, and Mt. Adams. Throughout the project area, there are views of Mt. Hood, Mt. Adams, and the Columbia River. Proximity to these natural wonders fosters a strong connection by residents and visitors to the land, weather, recreational amenities, rural character, and small-community lifestyle of Hood River.

The Westside Area is well-connected to the rest of the city by key existing and planned east-west connector roads: Cascade Avenue, Sherman Avenue, May Street, and Belmont Drive. The north-south connector roads, which are less continuous but still provide a framework for good connectivity, include Rand Road, 30th Street, the planned Mt. Adams Avenue extension, and Frankton Road at the western edge of the Project Area. This framework of connections to and through the Westside Area is very important for circulation and supporting active transportation choices such as walking and biking. It is also important for designing new neighborhoods in the Westside that are a connected and integral part of Hood River as a whole.

Figure 1. Citywide Context




Figure 2. View of Project Area and Columbia River Gorge, looking East




SUMMARY OF 2016-2017 CONCEPT PLANNING PROCESS

The Concept Plan process was funded by a grant from Oregon’s Transportation and Growth Management Program. The process spanned over a year, from August 2016 to October 2017 (see Figure 3), and provided extensive opportunities for community involvement, including:

- Seven meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC)
- Two open house events coupled with two online non-scientific surveys to ensure those who could not attend the open house events were able to participate and provide feedback, and one informal open house prior to the sixth PAC meeting. These events were held at the City Fire Station and Westside Elementary School.
- Two joint city council/planning commission briefings/work sessions.
- Two briefings to the county planning commission and Board of Commissioners.
- Ongoing maintenance of the project website, which hosted all associated background documents, plans and other materials developed throughout the concept planning process, answers to Frequently Asked Questions, and all materials produced for from PAC and TAC meetings.
- Ongoing distribution of information and meeting notices through email and the local newspapers, and the project website. The project website allowed interested parties to contact staff with questions and comments, and to sign up for project alerts via email. Nearly 300 interested parties signed up for email alerts.
- Stakeholder meetings with developers and property owners, and review of input on various infrastructure projects in the area.
- Many individual meetings and communications with property owners and interested parties.

Figure 3. Project Timeline



FRAMEWORK PLANS



The Concept Plan is comprised of Framework Plans, which depict the plan's "layers." The term Framework Plan is intended to convey the conceptual and long-term guiding role of each layer. More detailed and site-specific implementation is assumed for each of the Framework Plans. The Framework Plans for the Westside Area Concept Plan are:

- Neighborhoods and Districts Framework
- Streets Framework
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections Framework
- Parks and Open Space Framework
- Land Use Framework

NEIGHBORHOODS AND DISTRICTS FRAMEWORK

Fitting the Urban Landscape to the Natural Landscape

The project area is characterized by three terraces sloping north toward the Columbia River. This condition allows for stunning views and the opportunity to define neighborhoods and districts based on local topography, natural features, and walkable areas within each topographic subarea. The terraced landscape also presents challenges for transportation connections, development in rocky and steep areas, and utilities.

The Neighborhoods and Districts Framework Plan utilizes the terraces of the project area to organize the physical aspects of the Concept Plan (see Figure 4). The districts and neighborhoods are:

- **West Cascade Avenue District.** This district is the commercial, residential, and mixed use area in the lower terrace along west Cascade Avenue. It is the gateway into Hood River from the west and Exit 62.
- **Country Club Road District.** This district includes the lands along Wine Country Avenue and Country Club Road that comprise the area's supply of largely undeveloped commercial and industrial lands.
- **Middle Terrace Neighborhood.** Located generally north of May Street, this neighborhood extends from roughly 370 feet to 490 feet in elevation and contains existing subdivisions as well as a significant amount of undeveloped land west of 30th Street.
- **Upper Terrace Neighborhood.** Located generally south of May Street and ranging from 500 to 580 feet in elevation, this neighborhood has several existing subdivisions, but is primarily composed of larger undeveloped parcels and commercial orchards. It is anchored on the south by Westside Elementary School.
- **West Neighborhood.** This neighborhood comprises the westernmost portion of the project area to Frankton Road.

The edges of these areas are conceptual and should be thought of as transition areas rather than hard-and-fast boundaries. The organization of land use and transportation within the natural topography of the Westside Area is an important "big move" to connect the livability of the neighborhoods to the powerful landscape of Hood River, and plan for walkable neighborhoods and districts.

Figure 4. Neighborhoods and Districts Framework





Figure 5. 3D-Model of Neighborhoods and Districts



Livable Neighborhoods By Design

The Neighborhoods and Districts are the largest scale of community design addressed in this plan. They are one of three scales of planning for livability in the Westside:

- Neighborhoods and Districts scale
- Block scale
- Building scale

The “Neighborhood and Districts scale” and block scale are discussed below. Building scale is discussed in the code implementation section, starting on page 62. Livable neighborhoods are referenced in several parts of the Westside Vision and Guiding Principles. Examples include:

- “...an interconnected community of great neighborhoods
-neighborhood design that celebrates the landforms, views, and magnificent landscape of Hood River
-create livable neighborhoods that make good use of the Westside’s limited land supply
-incorporate natural features and a sense of place into each neighborhood and district”⁴

⁴ The full vision statement and guiding principles are discussed in the previous section of this report.

As described above, the Neighborhood and Districts Framework defines three neighborhoods (Middle Terrace, Upper Terrace, and West) based on their natural character within the terraced topography of the Westside, and, their walkable size of approximately a quarter-mile from center to edge. Working from this framework, this section of the Concept Plan includes Neighborhood Design Guidelines that show how each neighborhood's streets, trails, tree groves, rock outcrops, future parks, future school (Middle Terrace Neighborhood), transitions from existing uses, and other features might knit together over time to achieve the goals of livable and walkable neighborhoods.

Why are Neighborhood Design Guidelines important? There are two main reasons. First, development in the Westside is likely to be very incremental. With subdivisions and planned developments occurring at 2, 5, or 10 acres at a time, there is a high potential for a very fragmented pattern of land use with indirect paths of travel, remnant open space, and other missed opportunities for physical cohesion. Second, public investments, such as the future school, Alignment D road, and neighborhood parks, are opportunities to enhance their surrounding neighborhood. Regulating incremental development to knit together into cohesive communities and capturing opportunities for great public investment can both be supported through design guidelines prepared at a neighborhood scale.

The Neighborhood Design Guidelines in Figure 6 through Figure 8 show how development could be guided and shaped to implement the vision and guiding principles. The livability issues identified on these graphics capture the following types of opportunities:

- Terrace edges and tree groves retained and integrated into site design
- Neighborhood parks in targeted areas and as opportunities for open space between new and existing development
- Direct and convenient walking routes to the future Community Park and Westside Trail
- Preserving views to Mt Hood and Mt Adams
- Transition areas adjacent to existing development
- Larger ownerships as opportunities for innovative design
- Mature trees preserved as part of site design
- Alignment of the extension of 30th to the east side of the existing trees and Westside trail
- Direct and convenient walking routes from the Fox Hollow neighborhood to the future school
- Henderson Creek as a connecting open space
- The future school as community gathering space

Figure 6 through Figure 8 are included in the Concept Plan report as illustrations of livable, neighborhood-scale design. Can they be adopted as regulations? Yes, with some clear structure to how they are treated in the code. The recommended structure for such a regulation is a “two-track” system, where Track 1 consists of clear and objective standards, and Track 2 is a set of more discretionary guidelines.

For Track 1, Oregon law requires that clear and objective standards be available for development review of “needed” housing types. The intent of the law is to ensure that there are clear rules for approving or denying development proposals, so that needed housing is not overtly or inadvertently prevented through subjective criteria. Clear and objective standards are achieved by having either measurable standards (e.g. slopes greater

than 25%) or very clearly defined terms. As applied to the Neighborhood Design Guidelines, standards will need to be added to Hood River code for topics such as steep slopes, Henderson Creek, tree protection, etc.

For Track 2, local governments have more flexibility to apply judgement. In Hood River, an example of Track 2 review is Planned Unit Developments. In Track 2 reviews, the Planning Commission or City Council can make judgements about issues such as compatibility, resource protection, and transition between uses. The key is that procedures in the code and state law are properly followed for notice and opportunity to participate, approvals based on code criteria, decisions made on the record, etc. As applied to the Neighborhood Design Guidelines, Figure 6 through Figure 8 could be adopted by the City and applicants required to show “consistency” with them, or how alternative proposals result in outcomes that meet the intent. In short, Track 2 provides flexibility.

Figure 6. Neighborhood Design Framework – Upper Terrace Neighborhood

Neighborhood Design Framework Diagram
Upper Terrace Neighborhood






Figure 7. Neighborhood Design Framework – Middle Terrace Neighborhood

Neighborhood Design Framework Diagram
Middle Terrace Neighborhood



Note: These diagrams are conceptual and for study purposes only


0' 300' 600'

Figure 8. Neighborhood Design Framework – West Neighborhood

Neighborhood Design Framework Diagram
West Neighborhood

LEGEND

-  EXISTING TREE COVER
-  EXISTING TRAIL
-  PROPOSED TRAIL
-  EXISTING BIKE ROUTE
-  PROPOSED BIKE ROUTE
-  ROAD CONNECTIONS
-  POTENTIAL PARK LOCATION (conceptual and illustrative only)




Note: These diagrams are conceptual and for study purposes only



Block Scale – Concepts for Promoting Walkability, Community, and Transitions Between Housing Types

Hood River's original town plan and plat is in large part a block plan. It was, in effect, the original Concept Plan for Hood River. The establishment of those blocks endures today as one of the reasons for Hood River's successful downtown and highly livable adjacent neighborhoods.

Figure 9. Original Plat of Hood River



As with downtown's historic blocks, a clear, connected and context-sensitive block pattern should be established for the Westside Area. Unlike the historic original plats of the City, the Westside's block pattern will not be platted and recorded in advance. Rather, it will be guided by this plan and implemented at property owners' requests over time, often involving relatively small parcels. And of course, the block pattern will be shaped by the realities of existing development, slopes and natural features such as streams and tree groves, and the site-specific issues that arise through development review.

The City has two existing tools in the zoning code that support a walkable block pattern. The first tool is the standards titled “Street Connectivity and Formation of Blocks Required”.⁵ These standards require “complete blocks” and establish maximum block lengths and perimeters. Flexibility is provided through an exception to larger blocks that provide “pathways that minimize out of direction travel by pedestrians...” The second tool is the City’s requirement for “Future Street Plans”.⁶ These standards “...provide a guide for transportation circulation to the developing site and in the immediate area”, and provide very clear direction toward accomplishing the goal of a connected block pattern.

Figure 10 and Figure 11 show conceptual and illustrative future street plans for the southern portion of the Upper Terrace Neighborhood. This area is largely under single ownership and is an opportunity for above-referenced block and Future Street Plan standards to create a highly walkable and livable neighborhood. These alternatives are illustrative and conceptual – they are not intended as a requirement.

⁵ HRMC, Section 16.12.020(I).

⁶ HRMC 16.12.020(J)

Figure 10. Upper Terrace Neighborhood Demonstration Plan 1



Note: These diagrams are conceptual and for study purposes only




Figure 11. Upper Terrace Neighborhood Demonstration Plan 2



Transitions Between Different Building Forms

Like other areas within Hood River, the Westside Area will have blocks where different building forms and housing types – single family homes, cottages, townhomes, apartments, and non-residential buildings – are adjacent to each other. During the Concept plan process participants expressed an interest in design standards to improve compatibility between housing types and between uses. Compatibility can be guided through regulations and the development review process. Some guidelines are simply good site planning and do not necessarily add cost to development. Regulations, which must be clear and objective for needed housing, can be adopted to add features to buildings at a cost that is relatively low compared to the community benefits they are intended to provide.

The following guidelines are suggested:

- Like uses and building forms should face each other across streets.

- Along streets, there should not be a mix of front facades and side or rear facades. There should be a continuity to the placement of the fronts of dwellings. Homes on corner lots should be carefully designed, as there are effectively two front facades.
- Building form transition – single family form to townhomes to apartments, or non-residential buildings, in any combination – should generally occur at the center of blocks, across rear lot lines or rear alleys.
- Step-downs in height should be used for transitions between taller buildings and shorter buildings across lot lines or alleys.
- Open space should be provided between groups of townhomes. For this guideline, open space is not just the minimum required side setback; side setbacks should be increased between groups of townhomes. Pedestrian connections can be provided within these setbacks.
- Landscaping, particularly trees, should be used to soften transitions between different building forms.

In addition to the block-oriented guidelines above, compatibility and transition will be furthered by building design standards. Design standards typically address orientation of front entries to streets, garage locations, location of parking to the sides or rears of buildings, compatibility of height, bulk and scale of buildings, required architectural features, and the location of storage and mechanical equipment. Flexibility should be provided along higher volume streets with access limitation; continuous rear yards and fences should be avoided where possible.

STREETS FRAMEWORK

Streets as Public Places

The Streets Framework (Figure 12) is intended to implement the vision to create an interconnected community that includes streets, trails, and paths that are “walkable, connected, and green.” The streets of the Westside Area will comprise the largest component of the public realm. They will not only serve as transportation corridors for all users, but also as community gathering places, view corridors, utilities corridors, and other similar uses. A highly-connected street system is essential to creating a cohesive community.

Building on Hood River’s Transportation System Plan

The Streets Framework depicts the hierarchy of street types for the Westside Area, consistent with the street classifications used in Hood River’s Transportation System Plan (TSP): Minor Arterials, Collectors, and Local Streets (see Figure 13). To supplement this adopted hierarchy, the Streets Framework also depicts “Neighborhood Connector” Streets. The Neighborhood Connectors are selected local streets that are intended to be continuous through neighborhoods, providing direct and convenient connectivity. They are graphically shown as straight lines, but do not need to be rigidly straight alignments. They may be curved or shaped to natural features of the land provided that they still create a direct and convenient local street connection. Neighborhood Connectors are local streets by definition; they will have the same cross-section, design, and standards as all other local streets.

The Hood River TSP was the starting point for creating the Streets Framework. Updates to the TSP roadway and functional classifications for several streets in the Westside Area have been identified. The primary update is the relocation of a future North-South Minor Arterial street between Wine Country Avenue and May Street previously designated in the TSP. As the city grows, this street is expected to be a critical connectivity improvement in western Hood River that alleviates a significant amount of traffic from other corridors such as Cascade Avenue, Rand Road, and even 13th Street. Three alternatives were evaluated for this key route (see Appendix B for a detailed evaluation). The recommended route (“Alignment D”) runs from Wine Country Avenue to May Street in the transition area between the West Neighborhood and the Middle Terrace Neighborhood. The rationale for this alignment is that it:

- Can be designed to be less steep than other alternatives;
- Has less overall impact on developable properties;
- Avoids placement of a Minor Arterial at the front of the future school; and
- Has less disruption of neighborhood connectivity than other alternatives.

The transportation analysis for the Concept Plan validated the need for the transportation projects listed in the adopted TSP (see Appendix B for analysis). It identified several updates to streets and projects, including:

- Relocation of the “Mt. Adams Extension” Minor Arterial to Alignment D, as described above
- Relocation of the signals previously sited at Mt Adams/Wine Country and 30th/May to Alignment D/Wine Country and Alignment D/May (shifting the signals west).
- A signal or mini-roundabout at the Rand/27th/May intersection.⁷

⁷ Note: this improvement is only required if the Land Use Framework totaling 1,713 new dwellings is adopted. If the Land Use Framework is revised to achieve a lesser number of new housing units, the Rand/27th/May signal may not be needed to meet the City’s standards through the year 2040. For context, it is not required for the new growth associated with existing zoning (roughly 1,100 new dwellings).

Figure 12. Streets Framework





Figure 13 below depicts the City’s adopted TSP Functional Classification Map, with annotations indicating “Potential Local Street Connections.” The TSP will need to be amended in order to combine recommendations from the Westside Area Streets Framework, including local street connections, with existing TSP recommendations.

Figure 13. City of Hood River Roadway Functional Classification – 2011 Transportation System Plan



Specific Street Recommendations and Issues


Alignment D’s Design

The future Minor Arterial street connection from Wine Country Avenue to May Street, known as “Alignment D,” requires special consideration so that it is designed as a context-sensitive street that balances the multiple needs of active transportation, north-south mobility, neighborhood impacts, street connectivity, physical constraints, and cost. It will serve the function of a Minor Arterial, but must be the most “people-friendly” Minor Arterial that can be implemented. With that goal in mind, the project team recommends following elements for the design of Alignment D:

- **Center turn lane:** Not continuous; turn pockets where needed. Result is a 2-lane street instead of the typical 3-lane street.
- **Auto lane widths:** 11 feet instead of the typical 12 feet.
- **Buffered bike lanes:** A striped 2-foot buffer and 6-foot bike lane is recommended
- **Design speeds and curve radii:** Consider designing to accommodate slower speeds.
- **Storm water:** Incorporate low-impact designs.

A special cross-section for Alignment D is recommended – see Figure 14 and Appendix B..

Figure 14. Cross-section for Alignment D



MINOR ARTERIAL ALIGNMENT D - WITHOUT TURN LANE

CROSS-SECTION


30th Avenue Traffic Calming North of May Street

From a network and traffic impact perspective, the relocation of the Mt Adams extension to Alignment D will reduce future traffic on 30th Street and near the future school, as compared to future conditions under the currently-adopted TSP. However, it is important that 30th Street, once extended north, does not exceed its

local street function because it is a relatively direct route to Mt Adams and the Cascade Avenue corridor. To prevent this, the project team has several recommendations:

- The intersection of Sherman Avenue and 30th Street should be stop-controlled.
- The future intersection north of Sherman Avenue and an extended 30th Street should be stop-controlled.
- The five block section of 30th Street, between May and Sherman, should be traffic calmed. Options include stop signs (1-2) and chicanes.⁸ Speed bumps are generally not used in Hood River.
- When new connections are added to the curved section of Mt Adams and Wine Country (as shown on the Street Framework), turning movements should be restricted with a raised curb barrier to prohibit left turn movements across traffic. See Figure 15.

Figure 15. 30th Avenue Connections and Traffic Calming



⁸ Chicanes are curb extensions that are placed to slow traffic flow. They sometimes double as pedestrian refuges or storm water facilities.

30th Avenue Parking South of May Street

The City has received requests to eliminate existing bike lanes on 30th Street south of May Street in favor of on-street parking. This is due in part to limited on-street parking in a Planned Unit Development with narrow streets located at the southwestern corner of 30th & May. As 30th is extended south over time, it will be important to have bike lanes because the street is designated as a Minor Arterial south of May Street. Future development reviews should take this into consideration, with a goal of retaining the bike lanes on 30th. Providing connected block patterns and orienting new local streets with an east-west orientation, as well as providing parking bays for denser land uses will help prevent future conflicts.

Post Canyon Drive and 30th Street Right-of-Way Phasing

The current TSP and the Streets Framework show the “Belmont Avenue Post Canyon Drive Extension” and 30th Street (south of May Street) Minor Arterial connections, with alignments abutting the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). According to the TSP, the ultimate right-of-way widths for these streets is 70 feet. Obtaining right-of-way will be done primarily through the development review process, and there are legal limitations on exactions for right-of-way dedication and street improvements. Therefore, it is recommended that the City work with property owners and developers to obtain at least half of the needed right-of-way (i.e. minimum 35-foot-wide) for an interim level of improvements. In the future, if it is determined that the abutting property that is currently located outside of the UGB should be urbanized, remaining right-of-way and street improvements should be obtained to complete the full width of these streets to meet requirements for Minor Arterials.

Street Cross Sections

The following cross sections apply to development in the Westside Area. Some are in the City’s current TSP, and others were developed specifically for the Westside area. New cross sections are intended to supersede standard adopted cross-sections, where applicable. Cross-sections are considered typical and subject to modification as determined by the City Engineer. (See Appendix B for the full list of cross sections). Further, it is recommended that the standards for private streets are updated so as not to be more restrictive than standards for shared private driveways.

Highways and Arterials


- Historic Columbia River Highway – US 30 I-84 Eastbound to Mt. Adams Avenue)
- Historic Columbia River Highway – US 30 Mt. Adams Avenue to 13th Street/OR 281)
- Minor Arterial
- Minor Arterial Alignment D – With Turn Lane **(NEW)**
- Minor Arterial Alignment D – Without Turn Lane **(NEW)**

Collectors

- Commercial/Residential Collector
- Neighborhood Collector


Local Streets

- Neighborhood Connector Street **(NEW)**
- Local Option A
- Local Option B
- Local Option C
- Alley
- Path
- Industrial Street
- Private Street
- Six Home Private Street



NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTOR STREET

CROSS-SECTION



HOOD RIVER TSP LOCAL STREET

CROSS-SECTION

The Future of Transit in Hood River and the Westside

One of the guiding principles for this plan is to “plan land uses and transportation facilities so the area may be served by fixed route transit in the future.” In order to achieve this, the plan area must have good major connections to the rest of the city, an internal multi-modal circulation network that allows residents to access transit facilities, and sufficient residential density to support transit service.

Parallel to the Concept Plan work, Columbia Area Transit has been preparing a Transit Master Plan for Hood River County, which includes future transit service to the Westside Area. At this time, the basic concepts in the medium- and long-term plans anticipate an "out and back" route from Cascade Avenue south on Mt. Adams Avenue to May Street, west on May Street to Frankton Road, and south on Frankton Road to Post Canyon Drive. The working maps are shown in Figure 16 and Figure 17 below.

Figure 16. Medium-Term Potential Transit Route through the Westside Area



| Columbia Area Transit Fixed Routes | Frequency | Span | Service Days | Notes |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Hood River Seasonal | 20 minutes | 12 p.m. to 10 p.m. | Friday - Sunday | Seasonal service, Friday - Sunday, May - September |
| Upper Valley | 2 hours | 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. | Monday - Friday | Service model TBD |
| Hood River - Government Camp | 6 trips per day | 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. | Daily | |
| Hood River - The Dalles | 3 round trips per day | 6 a.m., 12 p.m., and 5 p.m. trip | Monday - Friday | Local Hood River portion of route eliminated -- passengers would transfer to a local fixed-route. |
| Columbia Gorge Express | 6 trips per day | 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. | Daily | |
| Portland - Hood River - The Dalles | 1 round trip per day | | TBD day | Only one day per week provided, Columbia Gorge Express to provide daily service to Portland. |
| Hood River Local N/S | 45 minutes | 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. | Monday - Friday | Deviated fixed-route service |
| Hood River Local E/W | 45 minutes | 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. | Monday - Friday | Deviated fixed-route service |

Other Existing/Planned Routes

- Sandy - Government Camp - Timberline Lodge
- Government Camp - Warm Springs
- TriMet Routes (Portland Metro Area)
- Community Boundary
- Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area
- Mt. Hood National Forest

Figure 17. Long-Term Potential Transit Route through the Westside Area



| Columbia Area Transit Fixed Routes | Frequency | Span | Service Days | Notes |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| Hood River Seasonal | 20 minutes | 12 p.m. to 10 p.m. | Friday - Sunday | Seasonal service, Friday - Sunday, May - September |
| Upper Valley | 1 hour | 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. | Monday - Saturday | Service model TBD |
| Hood River - Government Camp | 6 trips per day | 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. | Daily | |
| Hood River - The Dalles | 3 round trips per day | 6 a.m., 12 p.m., and 5 p.m. trip | Monday - Saturday | Local Hood River portion of route eliminated -- passengers would transfer to a local fixed-route. |
| Columbia Gorge Express | 6 trips per day | 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. | Daily | |
| Portland - Hood River - The Dalles | 1 round trip per day | | TBD day | Only one day per week provided, Columbia Gorge Express to provide daily service to Portland. |
| Hood River Local N/S | 30 minutes | 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. | Monday - Saturday | Fixed-route service (deviation removed) |
| Hood River Local E/W | 30 minutes | 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. | Monday - Saturday | Fixed-route service (deviation removed) |

Other Existing/Planned Routes

- Sandy - Government Camp - Timberline Lodge
- Government Camp - Warm Springs
- TriMet Routes (Portland Metro Area)
- Community Boundary
- Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area
- Mt. Hood National Forest

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FRAMEWORK

The Vision

The Westside Area is envisioned as an extremely walkable and bikeable part of the City, with on-street and off-street paths connecting neighborhoods to green spaces and services within Hood River and the surrounding area. The Westside Area is at the intersection of the Historic Columbia River Highway, the Westside Trail, and a popular route to the Post Canyon area west of the City.

Existing Plans

Planning for bicycle and pedestrian access in the Westside Area has to date been addressed in the Transportation System Plan, which includes “Modal Plans” for the pedestrian system and the bicycle system. These plans identify a number of bicycle and pedestrian projects within the Westside Area, largely limited to sidewalks and bike lanes on May St. and Rand Road, and the Westside Trail.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Framework

Pedestrian and bicycle routes are a key component of the Concept Plan. In the November 2016 online open house, connecting neighborhoods with bicycle lanes was the highest-ranked transportation issue, with nearly two-thirds of respondents rating the issue as “Very Important.” Off-street walking paths and a connected system of sidewalks also received high scores, with over half of respondents rating the issue as “Very Important.”


The Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections Framework (Figure 18) depicts a connected network of pedestrian paths, bike routes, and trails that go “to and through” each neighborhood and district of the Westside Area. The goal is to provide many options for active transportation and reduced reliance on vehicle travel. The plan builds on designated and existing routes, including the Historic Columbia River Highway State Trail, the Westside Trail, and routes in the adopted TSP. Other connections have been added to connect activity centers such as the planned parks and schools.

Each of the trail and path segments have been evaluated and classified. The tables following the Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections Framework describe the type, intended users, width, and surface type for each segment. The width and surface types are preliminary and subject to refinement during design.

Three Key Trails for the Westside

Three key trails are envisioned through the Westside Area, as shown in Figure 18. The Westside Trail, which currently connects from the Westside Elementary School to Sherman Avenue, will remain and be improved. A new trail along Henderson Creek is also proposed, which will provide access to nature and an opportunity to improve the condition of the creek. A third major trail along the ridgeline through groves of retained trees is also included.

Figure 18. Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections



EXISTING BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

| Trail Segment | Type | Users | Approximate Width | Surface * |
|---------------|---|-------|-------------------|---|
| A | Westside Community Trail, between May & Sherman, then along Henderson Creek | | ~4' | Gravel, Natural Surface |
| B | Westside Community Trail, along Sherman | | 5' | Concrete Sidewalk |
| C | Fox Hollow Pedestrian Path | | ~4' | Asphalt |
| D | Westside Community Trail, on Rocky Road | | ~6' | Shared with Asphalt Road |
| E | Westside Community Trail, between Rocky Road & Fairview | | ~3' | Gravel |
| F | Westside Community Trail, west of Rocky Road | | ~4' | Gravel, Natural Surface |
| G | Belmont Rd/Fairview Bike Lanes | | 5' | Asphalt† |
| H | Westside Community Trail, north of Sherman | | ~4' | Concrete Sidewalk, Shared with Asphalt Road |
| I | Cascade Ave/Mt. Adams Ave Bike Lanes | | ~4' | Asphalt† |

† These existing routes are high-stress for cyclists and should be upgraded to a wider and more clearly-marked or physically separated bike lane. See "Bicycle Routes by Stress Conditions" map.

* Wherever Westside Community Trail exists as gravel or natural surface, it should be upgraded to a firm and stable surface for improved accessibility.

PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FRAMEWORK

| Trail Segment | Type | Users | Approximate Width† | Surface* |
|---------------|---|-------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Historic Columbia River Hwy Trail | | 8' | Asphalt |
| 2 | Historic Columbia River Hwy Trail (design varies by segment; see map) | | 12' | Asphalt or Concrete |
| 3 | Westcliff Dr pedestrian path | | 6' | Concrete Sidewalk or other Firm & Stable Surface |
| 4 | Henderson Creek Trail | | 6' | Firm & Stable Surface |
| 5 | Westside Community Trail extension to Cascade Ave | | ~4' | Firm & Stable Surface |
| 6 | Westside Community Trail extension east and north to waterfront | | ~4' | Firm & Stable Surface |
| 7 | Bike Boulevards on Montello Ave, 17th St, 18th St, and 20th St | | N/A (Shared Lane Markings) | Shared Asphalt Road |
| 8 | Rand Rd Bike Lanes | | 6' | Asphalt Bike Lane |
| 9 | May St Bike Lanes | | 6' | Asphalt Bike Lane |
| 10 | Upper Terrace Neighborhood Trail: May St to Fairview St | | ~10' Off-Street Path | Asphalt/Wide Sidewalk |
| 11 | Post Canyon bike lanes and off-street multi-use path | | 6' Bike Lane, 10' Off-Street Path | Asphalt or Concrete |
| 12 | Completion of Westside Community Trail connection west to Frankton Rd | | ~4' | Firm & Stable Surface |
| 13 | Sherman Ave Bike Route | | N/A (Shared Lane Markings) | Shared Asphalt Road |
| 14 | Trail from Sherman Rd to Frankton Rd | | ~4' | Firm & Stable Surface |
| 15 | Frankton Rd Bike Lanes | | 6' | Asphalt Bike Lane |
| 16 | Country Club Rd Bike Lanes | | 6' | Asphalt Bike Lane |
| 17 | Future Minor Arterial Bike Lanes | | 6' | Asphalt Bike Lane |
| 18 | Ridgeline Trail north of Sherman | | 6' | Firm & Stable Surface |

† Preliminary. Final cross-sections to be determined during design.

* Preliminary. Final surface materials to be determined during design.

PARK AND OPEN SPACE FRAMEWORK

The Vision

The Westside Area's parks and open spaces are envisioned to form a connected system of natural areas (tree groves, ridgelines, and Henderson Creek), parks (three neighborhood parks), and community destinations (Westside Elementary School and the future school). This network of public and private open spaces will weave through the Westside Area community, resulting in greenspaces a short distance from every home.

Park Needs

The Westside Area Vision Statement calls for "open spaces and parks that support community gathering and a connection to nature." The overall parks and open space concept is that a connected system of open space be created through coordinated planning of the following elements:

- Up to three new neighborhood parks to serve the Westside Area.
- Possibly a new community park, with the location to be determined in a future update of the Park and Recreation District's Master Plan.
- A riparian corridor and off-street path adjacent to Henderson Creek, preliminarily sized at 25 feet on either side of the creek.
- The Westside Trail corridor and Ridgeline Trail corridor.
- Retention of tree groves throughout the project area as much as practical.
- Limited development of terraced areas that are 25% slope and greater, except where needed for street connections and pedestrian connections, resulting in a network of public and private open spaces that can benefit birds and wildlife.
- Open space tracts and community gathering spaces that are designed as part of Planned Unit Developments, and higher density and mixed-use projects.

The precise locations of parks have yet to be determined, but the concept is that one neighborhood park should be located within each of the three residential neighborhoods, with the possibility of a community park of 20-30 acres that may or may not replace a neighborhood park within the Westside Area. Based on a preliminary evaluation of neighborhood park need for the Westside Area, the Land Use Framework will require approximately 11 acres for neighborhood parks.⁹ The needed acreage calculated in this Concept Plan is preliminary; the plan assumes and recommends that it be officially determined as part of an update of the Park and Recreation District's Master Plan for the area.


⁹ This analysis used the range provided in the 1996 National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) guidelines. Neighborhood park need was estimated at two acres per thousand residents, with an estimated 2.39 residents per housing units.

The Park and Open Space Framework identifies “target areas” for neighborhood parks (see Figure 19). These areas are based on a preliminary evaluation by the project team of the following criteria:

- Available buildable land (no existing development or environmental constraints);
- Proximity to natural features that could be incorporated into the park;
- Central location within the neighborhood; and
- Accessible by future pedestrian connections.

The neighborhood park target areas are preferred locations, but they are not intended as mandatory locations. Flexibility will be needed to acquire parks through a variety of means: advance acquisition, dedication during development review, gifting, etc. The Park and Open Space Framework is intended to be flexibly applied, and to help inform future efforts by the Hood River Valley Parks and Recreation District to develop an updated Parks Master Plan.

Figure 19. Park and Open Space Framework



LAND USE FRAMEWORK

This section of the report includes information, key issues, and recommendations for the Land Use Framework for the Westside Area, focusing primarily on housing. The intent here is to inform and guide the discussion by the City that will finalize the Land Use Framework. Recommendations from the project team are also provided. The following topics are addressed:

- Housing needs and strategies for Hood River and the Westside Area
- Housing issues and perspectives raised during the process
- Buildable land in Hood River– where and how might Hood River fulfill its housing needs?
- How might the housing strategies in the HNA be implemented?
- A Roadmap for Defining Westside Area Land Use – Steps, Options, and Recommendations
- Scenarios for the Westside Area Land Use Framework

Housing Needs and Strategies for Hood River and the Westside Area

The foundation of planning for housing in the Westside Area is Hood River’s Housing Needs Analysis (HNA), adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan in 2015. The HNA examined trends in the population, housing inventory, and buildable land of Hood River, and found that “Hood River’s supply of land for residential development is very tight. While Hood River has sufficient land to accommodate expected growth over the 2015 to 2035 period, Hood River does not have much land beyond what is needed to accommodate this growth.”¹⁰

The HNA also noted of several key caveats and recommendations related to its land and housing capacity findings, which have implications for housing policy citywide and the planning for the Westside Area specifically:

- Due to the surrounding Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area and active farmland, Hood River has limited opportunities for future expansion of the UGB.
- The City has a very limited supply of residential land for multifamily development. The HNA recommends that the City consider identifying vacant land in single-family zones (in R-1 and R-2 designations) for multifamily uses. In the absence of adding multifamily land as part of the HNA adoption, the report assumed that about 42% of new multifamily development would be accommodated on general commercial (C-2) land.¹¹
- There is an existing deficit of affordable housing in Hood River, both for low-income and workforce housing. As noted on Page 49: “...the median home value was 6.4 times median income in 2013, up from

¹⁰ City of Hood River Housing Needs Analysis, page 47.

¹¹ Table 5 of the HNA describes the allocation of needed housing by type and zoning designation through 2035. A total of 694 multifamily dwelling units are expected to be developed in the R-2, U-R-2, R-3 and C-2 zone. Of this number, 297 units, or 42 percent of the citywide need, is accommodated within the General Commercial (C-2) zone. Since adoption of the HNA, the City has approved or is reviewing a combined total of about 50 housing units in C-2 lands, located outside the Westside Area.

4.5 in 2000. More than a third of Hood River households are unable to afford the fair market rent (\$845) on a two-bedroom rental in Hood River. In addition, half of the workers at businesses in Hood River live outside of the city or in nearby communities.”

- Much of the buildable residentially-designated land in the Urban Growth Area is in agricultural use - about 20% according to Table 2 of the HNA. The timing of development of these properties (subject to the desires of individual property owners and other market factors) may impact the availability of residential units for the City.

The findings of the HNA, including the factors described above, inform the strategies and recommended actions of the Hood River Housing Strategy. There are three key strategies, summarized below and discussed on page 49 of this report:

- **Strategy 1:** Increase the efficiency of use of land within the Hood River UGB
- **Strategy 2:** Regulate and manage secondary and short-term rental housing
- **Strategy 3:** Develop affordable housing

Housing Issues and Perspectives Raised During the Process

How to address Hood River’s housing needs and adopted strategies, especially Strategy 1 regarding land use efficiency, was one of the more hotly debated issues during the concept planning process. The issues and perspectives raised are summarized below.

Diversifying the housing mix and capacity in the Westside Area

The project team prepared an initial “Land Use Program”¹² and subsequent Plan alternatives that emphasized increasing the housing mix and capacity in the Westside Area (i.e. increasing efficiency, per Strategy 1), by implementing specific actions identified in the Hood River Housing Strategy:¹³

Several land use alternatives were mapped and reviewed with the project committees and community. The resulting Draft Land Use Framework significantly increased estimated housing capacity from roughly 1,100 new dwellings under base zoning, with an estimated housing mix of about 14% multifamily, 9% single-family attached, and 78% single-family detached dwellings, to roughly 1,700 dwellings with an estimated housing mix of about 45% multifamily, 20% single-family attached, and 35% single-family detached dwellings.¹⁴ The land use mapping was prepared alongside the other framework plans for neighborhoods and districts, streets, pedestrian and bicycle connections, and parks and open space.

¹² ECONorthwest: Hood River Westside Area Concept Plan: Draft Land Use Program, January 12, 2017.

¹³ A detailed summary of how the Westside Area Concept Plan process addressed specific items from the Housing Strategy can be found in Appendix C.

¹⁴ The City’s target mix, adopted in the HNA, is 35% multifamily, 10% single family attached, and 55% single family detached for new residential growth overall.

The draft Land Use Framework described above sparked a lively debate. In summary, perspectives on these recommendations included:

- PAC members – The PAC did not have agreement on the direction for the Land Use Framework. Some members felt strongly that this was too much emphasis on changes to the Westside Area, and that further citywide or even countywide planning for affordable housing is needed. Some PAC members stated that existing zoning is their preferred plan. Other members felt the policy approach and map were appropriate to address the significant need for more affordable housing choices.
- TAC members – The TAC was strongly supportive of approach and map, emphasizing the importance of increasing the amount of multi-family housing opportunities in Hood River.
- Community members – Although community members who responded to Concept Plan surveys and spoke at public meetings were generally supportive of efforts to provide a broader mix of housing types, many existing homeowners said they oppose recommendations for rezoning. In summary, the key viewpoints were: (a) existing zoning was their preferred choice; (b) a much more modest increase in the mix and amount of housing in the Westside Area would be more compatible with existing housing; or (c) affordable housing should be located elsewhere (see discussion below about multi-family housing within the C-2 zone). Existing residents also raised many implementation questions (see summary of public comments in Appendix A).

Assurances for the provision of affordable housing

During the process, the PAC discussed several key questions related to affordable housing: How will workforce and affordable housing objectives be implemented by the Concept Plan; and how can the City assure that workforce and affordable housing will be built, not merely allowed by the updated zoning?

The Project Team prepared a memorandum addressing these questions (see Appendix C). The memo documents nine land use and transportation-related strategies¹⁵ that allow, support, and enable (but do not assure) workforce and affordable housing. The memo also provides information about inclusionary zoning, which is the primary zoning tool for assuring that development yields housing at particular affordable price points. The memo concludes by describing the importance of non-zoning approaches, such as land trusts and construction excise taxes, and suggests that the combined approach of land use/transportation strategies, working with project partners on specific projects, and proactive non-zoning strategies should be considered by the City. This approach was captured in draft policies and implementation strategies for the Comprehensive Plan. Please see the Implementation chapter of this report for further information.

The TAC supported the “combined approach” noted above. The PAC did not reach closure, but was generally supportive of the approach and policies while not specifically endorsing the Land Use Framework map. The PAC received testimony from community members that expressed concern that the approach would induce development and associated impacts without providing affordable housing choices.

¹⁵ Examples include: additional multi-family and “missing middle” housing, planning for transit.

Multi-Family Housing in the General Commercial (C-2) Zone

As noted above, the HNA made the assumption that about half of the future multifamily housing need (about 300 units) would be accommodated in the C-2 zone. Since adoption of the HNA, the City has reviewed development applications for about 50 units of multi-family housing in commercial zones. During stakeholder interviews for the Concept Plan, developers expressed doubt about the financial feasibility of multi-family and mixed-use development on commercial land. The project team prepared a high-level analysis of feasibility, concluding that vertical mixed-use development did not appear feasible in today's market. Another aspect of this issue relates to the commercial land base – the City's 2010 Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) identified a surplus of C-2 land within the City. Based on this information, the project team promoted the Westside Area concept that multi-family and mixed use development is desirable and appropriate on the C-2 properties of the Westside Area, but that the City should not rely exclusively on commercial land for the provision of workforce and affordable housing.

The PAC received comments from community members that C-2 properties and mixed use were the preferred location for multifamily housing, and therefore additional multifamily was not needed in neighborhoods of the Westside Area.

Housing affordability trends

Several TAC members noted that since adoption of the HNA, the need for workforce and affordable housing has grown. They noted there has been a starker rise in housing prices for single family detached and townhome dwellings than anticipated by the HNA. The importance of multifamily housing as the most affordable housing type has increased, according to the City's planning director and others on the TAC.

Short-term rentals and secondary housing

The HNA touches on this type of housing but notes that second homes are not part of the overall forecasted need. The HNA offers a few scenarios for citywide housing needs based on the amount of new housing that could be used for short-term rentals or second homes. In the most aggressive scenario provided, 20% of new homes are assumed to be this type of housing, which would result in an overall deficit of residential land in all zones. The report states: *"The addition of more than about 220 to 250 additional short-term rentals and secondary housing units would consume Hood River's "surplus" residential land. We recommend that the City monitor changes in the number of short-term rentals and secondary housing units, both existing units and newly built units, to assess the impact on the city's residential land base."*¹⁶ Anecdotally, secondary homes are increasingly prevalent within Hood River, but recently adopted Short Term Rental regulations may have an impact on this dynamic.¹⁷

¹⁶ Hood River Housing Needs Analysis, page 48.

¹⁷ Since adoption of Short-Term Rental regulations in October of 2016, 29 new homes have been occupied and none of them are licensed for use as STRs. However, only 12 of these have a mailing address that matches the site address. It's unclear how many are occupied full time or second homes.

Several PAC members noted that short-term rentals and second homes were another dynamic in Hood River's housing market that elevates the need for workforce and affordable housing choices to be provided as part of the Westside Area Concept Plan.

Population forecasts

Oregon's statewide planning program requires cities and counties to use coordinated long-term population forecasts for comprehensive planning. Since adoption of the HNA, the Oregon legislature has designated the Portland State University Population Research Center as the official preparer of the forecasts to be used by local governments and the state. The HNA used a population forecast that projected 2% annual average growth through 2035. PSU's most recent forecast for Hood River is a slower rate: 1.4% annual average growth through 2035. The project team noted the following implications of the revised rate:

- It may take longer for the land within Hood River's UGB to be fully "built-out". The HNA found that the City has "just enough" land to accommodate expected growth through 2035 at the higher rate, so a lower rate would mean a modest surplus through that date.
- Some PAC and community members expressed the idea that if the rate of growth is slower than projected in the HNA, then the need for a diversified mix and increased capacity in the Westside Area is lessened. The project team's opinion is that the revised rate does not change the need for workforce and affordable housing, or the strategies the City should use to meet that need (See the ECONorthwest memorandum in Appendix C for detailed information).
- Automobile trips generated by development in the Westside Area and citywide, within the specific 20-year planning horizon, can be assumed to be slightly lower. The Concept Plan's transportation analysis was updated to incorporate the PSU forecast, and while overall trips were lower, it did not change the list of transportation improvements needed over the long term.

Public development of affordable housing

Hood River County owns a two-acre parcel in the study area that was purchased with the intent of developing subsidized affordable housing. The specific design and programming of this site will be addressed at a later date, but its role in providing housing affordable to lower income levels has been paramount throughout the planning process, consistent with Housing Strategy 3. This use of publicly-owned property was not controversial among the advisory committees or community members.

Buildable Land in Hood River– Where Might Hood River Fulfill its Housing Needs?

Figure 20. *Buildable Lands in Hood River (from 2015 Buildable Lands Inventory)*




Figure 20 shows the results of the Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI) conducted as part of the HNA. The purpose of this inventory is to examine how much capacity for future development the City of Hood River has within its Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), and where this capacity is located.

The BLI classifies each residentially-zoned parcel within the UGB in the following ways:

- *Vacant*: Land with no structures, or containing buildings with little improvement value (below \$10,000)
- *Partially Vacant*: Land occupied by a use but contain enough land to be subdivided and developed
- *Undevelopable*: Land that is constrained, owned by a homeowners association, inaccessible, or too small to be turned into a lot.
- *Public Land*: Land in public or semi-public ownership (federal, state, county, or City).
- *Developed*: Land developed at densities consistent with the zoning designation, and is unlikely to redevelop.


Figure 20 is annotated to characterize the areas of the City that have vacant or partially vacant lands within the BLI. The five areas annotated are described below.

1. These are large parcels along Westcliffe Dr. They are categorized as “partially vacant” because houses sit on large lots that are theoretically able to subdivide. However, a bluff limits development potential and there is no sanitary sewer serving the area between Cascade Ave. and Windswept Place, so it seems unlikely to experience much additional development or infill.
2. This area is a combination of R-1 and R-2 zoning and is currently being developed with 98 lots for single-family homes and a limited number of duplexes or townhouses.
3. Roughly 10-acres north of the golf course at Broken Tee Drive and Rachel Way appears to have some development capacity, but may be hindered by topography, wetlands and the Indian Creek floodplain.
4. South and East of Westside Elementary School, there are several parcels zoned R-1 that appear to have capacity for some new residential development and infill.
5. This is the Westside Area, the largest concentration of developable residentially-zoned land within the Hood River UGB.

In addition to the five areas described above, there are some scattered individual parcels throughout the city that fall into “Vacant” or “Partially Vacant” classifications. Also, accessory dwelling units provide an additional opportunity for new housing, helping to fulfil the affordable housing need if they are not short-term rental units. The potential impacts of additional ADUs on citywide housing supply in Hood River has not been analyzed in detail, but in general are only a small contributor to housing overall. Since 2007, the City has permitted about 29 ADUs.

Figure 21 from the Economic Opportunities Analysis shows vacant and partially-vacant non-residential parcels (from 2010). Large commercially-zoned parcels and smaller parcels in the 1-5 acre range that are zoned C-2 could be developed with multifamily uses, if economically feasible.

Figure 21. 2010 Economic Opportunities Analysis of Commercial and Industrial Parcels



In sum, the project team concludes:

- The opportunities for new housing are limited outside of the Westside Area. Opportunities in much of the rest of the city are limited primarily to smaller infill projects.
- The opportunities to implement the HNA's Strategy 1 (increase housing efficiency), appear to be fairly robust in the Westside Area and relatively limited elsewhere in the City.
- Working from the premise that the commercial corridors of the City are appropriate areas for mixed use and multifamily housing, the city should evaluate ways to incentivize such development, but should not rely on those lands to provide needed multifamily housing, especially in the short term.

How might the housing strategies in the HNA be implemented?

The Hood River Housing Strategy presents a comprehensive set of actions providing a variety of opportunities to meet the housing needs of Hood River's residents at all income levels. The elements of the Hood River Housing Strategy are discussed below.

Strategy 1. Increase efficiency of land use within the Hood River.

- The goal of Strategy 1 is to manage Hood River's residential lands efficiently to meet current and future housing development within the UGB and to meet the requirements of Statewide Planning Goal 10, while maintaining the character and quality of life in Hood River.

- The recommended actions under this strategy include identifying land to rezone to allow more moderate- and high-density single-family detached and multifamily development, reducing minimum lot sizes in residential zones, and allowing townhomes and cottage developments in more areas of the city.
- Broadly speaking, there are two complementary ways to accomplish this strategy – by developing more compactly on greenfield areas (such as the Westside Area) and by using infill development elsewhere to increase the efficiency of existing neighborhoods.
- Implementing this strategy was one of the foundational premises during the Westside Area concept planning process. As the area within the urban growth boundary with the largest supply of vacant and partially vacant land, the Westside Area has the most spatial options for implementing this strategy of anywhere in Hood River.
- There are select locations elsewhere in Hood River that may be worth considering for changes in zoning designation as part of specific infill development proposals. The fact that these parcels are small and dispersed throughout the City means there is less opportunity for concept planning in the creation of new neighborhoods. Rather, zone changes in those locations would be done in the context of complementing (and managing impacts to) existing neighborhoods.
- Encouraging development of multifamily housing on C-2 zoned land is worth considering, and re-zoning commercial land to R-3 land may be possible to ensure multifamily development in strategic locations. However, the city has a limited supply of vacant commercial and industrial lands, and must ensure adequate lands are available for future employment growth.
- Other parts of Strategy 1 (such as incentivizing ADU's) can be applied to residential land citywide.

Strategy 2. Regulate short-term rental housing.

- The City of Hood River adopted citywide regulations for short-term rental housing. These regulations apply in the Westside Area and throughout the city.

Strategy 3. Develop affordable housing.

- This strategy recommends that the City encourage development of housing affordable for low-income and moderate-income households to provide housing options to all residents of Hood River, including providing opportunities for workers at businesses in Hood River to live in the city.
- The Westside Area contains a 2-acre parcel owned by Hood River County and intended to be developed for affordable housing. There may be other portions of the Westside Area that are also suitable for public land acquisition or land-banking in order to support affordable housing.

A Roadmap for Defining Westside Area Land Use

Steps, Options, and Recommendations

The City of Hood River has examined its land use needs thoroughly in recent years. The analyses have established strategies and actions adopted in the Housing Needs Analysis. The concept planning process evaluated application of these strategies and actions in the context of an Westside Area Concept Plan, however, that evaluation did not result in consensus by the PAC on the policy approach or how it would be mapped in a Land Use Framework. To help move the process forward, this section provides a roadmap for how the policy approach and a revised Westside Area Land Use Framework should be discussed and decided by the Planning Commission and City Council. Recommendations from the project team are included.

Roadmap recommendation: the City should review its options for the Westside Area land use in three steps:

1. **Articulate the overall housing policy direction that will guide the finalization of the Westside Area Concept Plan.** Specifically, the Planning Commission and City Council should affirm whether Housing Strategy 1, Action 1.1. will be implemented as part of finalizing the Westside Area Concept Plan. Action 1.1 states: *“Identify land to rezone to allow additional moderate-and high-density single family detached and multifamily development.”*

Project team recommendation: Action 1.1 should be affirmed and implemented. Increasing the supply of land for moderate and high density housing is fundamental to creating more workforce and affordable housing choices. It is not the only action needed, and is not easy, but it is a necessary and fundamental action for addressing Hood River’s housing needs. Whether or not Action 1.1 will be implemented in the Westside Area is also a city choice, and is addressed in the next step.

2. **Review options citywide, then determine the conceptual role of the Westside Area for providing workforce and affordable housing.**¹⁸ This step will first evaluate and determine the realistic opportunities for implementing Action 1.1 outside of the Westside Area. The questions are practical: To what degree, if at all, should the city rely on the development within the C-2 zone (or other mixed use zones) to deliver multi-family housing? What are there realistic opportunities to redesignate low-density residential (R-1 or R-2) lands to higher densities outside of the Westside Area? For any code changes that will facilitate moderate and high density housing, which are appropriate to apply outside of the Westside Area, and how effective will they be in actually delivering new housing? After answering these and related questions from a citywide perspective, the City will then be in a position to articulate the conceptual role of the Westside Area in implementing Action 1.1.

Project team recommendations: (a) The City should continue to allow and encourage multifamily housing in C-2 and other mixed use zones. However, it should not rely on commercial land to meet much of its multi-family housing need in the short term (1-5 years) based on expected land

¹⁸ Step 2 of the roadmap assumes affirmation of the housing policy in step 1.

development economics. (b) If appropriate areas outside of the Westside Area can be identified for redesignation for higher densities, the City should consider those so as to increase its overall opportunities and potentially reduce the need for moderate and high density housing in the Westside Area; (c) Based on the BLI, the Westside Area is the City's best opportunity to implement Action 1.1 to any significant degree. The opportunities for moderate and high density housing should be increased in the Westside Area, carefully and with continued community input, through redesignation of some existing R-1 and R-2 lands to R-2.5 and R-3. The map changes should be combined with policies and framework plans and code changes directed at regulating new development to produce livable neighborhoods.

3. **Determine the Land Use Framework for the Westside Area.** Using the foundation of policy and spatial guidance from the above steps, the City should then finalize the Land Use Framework for the Westside Area. The draft Land Use Framework prepared during the concept plan process provides a starting point that utilizes the following key concepts:

- Retain existing zoning on parcels that are developed and not expected to further infill or divide.
- Retain the existing R-1 zoning in the southwest area of the plan, based on transect planning principles.
- Redesignate selected undeveloped R-2 lands to a new R-2.5 designation that has a 4,000 square foot minimum lot size.¹⁹
- Re-designate selected areas to R-3 in relatively small acreages and in several strategic locations in order to increase the amount of land planned for moderate and high density housing in locations near services, transportation corridors, and parks.
- Increase the mix of housing types throughout the plan area.
- Do all of the above in the context of adopting code updates to achieve minimum densities, while adding design standards, cottage- and cluster housing provisions, and by preserving open space, and incorporating other livability-related provisions.
- Do all of the above in the context of implementing the other physical framework plans for neighborhoods and districts, streets, pedestrian and bicycle connections, and parks and open space.

If the City determines that the Westside Area is a good location to enact these types of changes to some degree, the tangible questions are: how much change from existing zoning is appropriate, and where? From a physical planning viewpoint, the land use pattern shown on the draft Land Use Framework is fairly flexible. It can be "dialed up" and "dialed down" to achieve desired outcomes, including how much moderate and high density housing is the right amount to locate in any given part of the Westside Area. Regardless of the amount of any particular land use, the Concept Plan is

¹⁹ Per Strategy 1 of the HNA

designed to “knit together” into a highly livable community - provided the physical frameworks and code updates are part of the package and are implemented over time.

From a housing count and mix perspective, the R-3 lands on the plan have the greatest influence. That is, a relatively small acreage change to the R-3 areas has a relatively large influence on the overall housing count and mix. Figure 22 through Figure 24 show several scenarios for revisions to R-3.

Project team recommendation: Adopt a Land Use Framework that implements the key concepts listed above and is supported by the other framework plans and draft code updates. Three “scenarios” are described below, and recommended as a starting point. They scenarios include the draft Land Use Framework and two variations that focus on different amounts of R-3 in the Westside Area. Regarding R-2.5, the team believes the pattern on the draft Land Use Framework is generally correct and that R-2.5 is a good choice for the vacant and partially vacant properties shown. Some site specific adjustments may of course be identified as the map is finalized. The team believes all three of these scenarios are reasonable choices that will implement the Westside Area vision and guiding principles, and deliver some measure of implementation of Action 1.1.

Scenarios for the Westside Area Land Use Framework

Each of the scenarios below have these attributes in common:

- **Housing Needs Analysis.** The HNA was the basis for the projected development densities and housing mix within the various zones of Hood River. The ultimate density and mix of development will depend on a variety of market factors and policy choices.
- **Buildable Lands Inventory.** The analysis is based on a buildable lands inventory conducted for the citywide 2015 HNA. This inventory took into account natural resource constraints such as steep slopes, existing development, and large parcels with existing homes that may have capacity for additional units in the future. The inventory has been updated to include a 25-foot riparian buffer setback area around Henderson Creek, which runs through the study area.
- **Existing Homes.** Based on tax lot data and aerial photography, there are an estimated 535 existing homes in the study area. These are assumed to remain, though large lots with the ability to add additional homes are assumed to do so over the planning period.
- **Parks.** These scenarios assume one three-acre neighborhood park in each of the three neighborhoods. (See the Parks and Open Space Framework for additional information about parks.)
- **School Property.** The school district’s property is planned for one or more future schools, and has a central role in the design of the Westside Area in all scenarios.
- **County Property for Affordable Housing.** The County’s two-acre parcel located north of the intersection of 30th Street and Sherman Avenue is assumed to be used for an affordable housing project.
- **Industrial and Commercial Land.** The Land Use Framework retains the existing land use designations within the West Cascade Avenue and Country Club Road Districts. These lands are important to fulfilling the city’s need for commercial and industrial land as documented in the City’s Economic

Opportunities Analysis. Mixed-use and additional housing in the West Cascade Avenue District is a desired goal, but not a mandate.

- **Neighborhood Commercial.** The Draft Land Use Framework includes a two-acre node to provide locally-serving commercial services such as coffee shops, day care centers, and small retail shops (see Figure 22) located in the northwest corner of the intersection of May Street and 30th Street. This site is centrally located for serving the Middle and Upper Terrace Neighborhoods. It will be within a quarter mile of roughly 1,000 units of housing (including existing homes).
- **Comprehensive Plan Nomenclature.** Each Land Use Framework scenario uses the nomenclature of Hood River's Comprehensive Plan designations, which are:
 - R-3 Urban High Density Residential
 - R-2.5 Urban Moderate Density Residential
 - R-2 Urban Standard Density Residential
 - R-1 Urban Low Density Residential
 - NC Neighborhood Commercial
 - C-2 General Commercial
 - L-1 Light Industrial

Scenario A

This scenario was presented to the TAC and PAC during the August 16 meetings.

Figure 22. Land Use Scenario A




Table 1. Estimated Development Capacity of Scenario A

| | R-1 | R-2 | R-2.5 | R-3 |
|---|------|------|-------|-------|
| Assumed Density (Units/Acre) | 5.3 | 7.7 | 8.4 | 20.3 |
| Developable Acreage (subtracting assumed parks) | 41.8 | 37.0 | 51.1 | 38.9 |
| New Dwelling Units (including approved developments) | 206 | 288 | 429 | 790 |
| | | | | |
| Total New Units | | | | 1,713 |
| Existing Units in Westside Area | | | | 535 |
| New Units + Existing Units | | | | 2,248 |

The table below provides an estimate of the housing mix for Scenario A. Housing mix assumptions are extrapolated from data in Table 5 of the HNA.²⁰ For comparison, the Base Case scenario under existing zoning anticipates development at 78% Single Family Detached (879 units), 9% Single Family Attached (100 units), and 14% Multifamily units (154 units).

Table 2. Estimated Mix of New Housing Units – Scenario A

| | R-1 | R-2 | R-2A | R-3 | Total | |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Single Family Detached | 206 | 158 | 227 | 0 | 591 | 35% |
| Single Family Attached | 0 | 75 | 116 | 158 | 349 | 20% |
| Multifamily | 0 | 55 | 86 | 632 | 773 | 45% |
| Total | 203 | 288 | 429 | 790 | 1,713 | 100% |

²⁰ City of Hood River Housing Needs Analysis, Chapter 4, page 33.

- Land with R-1 zoning is assumed to develop as single-family detached housing.
- R-2 and R-2.5 land is assumed to develop as a mix of single-family detached (including cottage cluster development), single-family attached (such as townhomes), and multifamily (duplexes/triplexes) housing.
- R-3 land is assumed to develop primarily as a mix of single-family attached (such as townhomes), and multifamily (apartments or condominiums).

Scenario B

This scenario is similar to Scenario A, but has two fewer nodes of R-3 land (a reduction of 7 acres of R-3 compared to Scenario A) within the Westside.

Figure 23. Land Use Scenario B




Table 3. Estimated Development Capacity of Scenario B

| | R-1 | R-2 | R-2A | R-3 |
|---|------|------|------|-------|
| Assumed Density (Units/Acre) | 5.3 | 7.7 | 8.4 | 20.3 |
| Developable Acreage (subtracting assumed parks) | 41.8 | 41.0 | 54.0 | 31.9 |
| New Dwelling Units (including approved developments) | 206 | 319 | 454 | 648 |
| | | | | |
| Total New Units | | | | 1,626 |
| Existing Units in Westside Area | | | | 535 |
| New Units + Existing Units | | | | 2,161 |

The table below provides an estimate of the housing mix for the Preferred Land Use Framework. Housing mix assumptions are the same as described above for Scenario A. For comparison, the Base Case scenario under existing zoning anticipates development at 78% Single Family Detached (879 units), 9% Single Family Attached (100 units), and 14% Multifamily units (154 units).

Table 4. Estimated Mix of New Housing Units – Scenario B

| | R-1 | R-2 | R-2A | R-3 | Total | |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Single Family Detached | 206 | 175 | 241 | 0 | 621 | 38% |
| Single Family Attached | 0 | 83 | 1123 | 130 | 335 | 21% |
| Multifamily | 0 | 60 | 91 | 518 | 670 | 41% |
| Total | 203 | 319 | 454 | 648 | 1,626 | 100% |

Scenario C

This scenario is similar to Scenario B, but has one fewer nodes of R-3 land (a reduction of 11 acres of R-3 compared to Scenario A) within the Westside.

Figure 24. Land Use Scenario C




Table 5. Estimated Development Capacity of Scenario C

| | R-1 | R-2 | R-2A | R-3 |
|---|------|------|------|-------|
| Assumed Density (Units/Acre) | 5.3 | 7.7 | 8.4 | 20.3 |
| Developable Acreage (subtracting assumed parks) | 41.8 | 41.0 | 58.0 | 27.9 |
| New Dwelling Units (including approved developments) | 206 | 319 | 488 | 567 |
| | | | | |
| Total New Units | | | | 1,579 |
| Existing Units in Westside Area | | | | 535 |
| New Units + Existing Units | | | | 2,114 |

The table below provides an estimate of the housing mix for the Preferred Land Use Framework. Housing mix assumptions are the same as described above for Scenario A. For comparison, the Base Case scenario under existing zoning anticipates development at 78% Single Family Detached (879 units), 9% Single Family Attached (100 units), and 14% Multifamily units (154 units).

Table 6. Estimated Mix of New Housing Units – Scenario C

| | R-1 | R-2 | R-2A | R-3 | Total | |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Single Family Detached | 206 | 175 | 258 | 0 | 639 | 40% |
| Single Family Attached | 0 | 83 | 132 | 113 | 328 | 21% |
| Multifamily | 0 | 61 | 98 | 454 | 612 | 39% |
| Total | 206 | 319 | 488 | 567 | 1,579 | 100% |

Commercial and Industrial Land

In each of the above scenarios, the Land Use Framework retains the existing land use designations within the West Cascade Avenue and Country Club Road Districts. These lands are important to fulfilling the city's need for commercial and industrial land as documented in the City's Economic Opportunities Analysis.

The Country Club Road district is comprised primarily of large commercial and industrial parcels, and may be suitable for large commercial and industrial uses. The West Cascade Avenue district lends itself to a more finely-grained and walkable commercial character, and the plan envisions a pedestrian-oriented urban form with limited auto-oriented land uses. Mixed-use development and additional housing in the West Cascade Avenue District are possible within the C-2 zone and may be developed in this area, depending on the financial feasibility of this type of development and landowner interest.

Neighborhood Commercial

The Land Use Framework includes one new site intended to provide locally-serving commercial services such as a coffee shop, day care center, and/or a small retail shop. The site is located in the northwest corner of the intersection of May Street and 30th Street. This site is centrally located for serving the Middle and Upper Terrace Neighborhoods, and will be within walking distance (roughly a quarter mile) of approximately 1,000 units of housing (including existing homes). This neighborhood commercial node is implemented by a new "Neighborhood Commercial" zone, described in the Implementation section of this report.

IMPLEMENTATION



HOW WILL HOUSING AFFORDABILITY BE DELIVERED?

The Vision

The Vision Statement for the Westside Area specifically reference housing affordability: “The Westside’s hallmarks will be: Housing options that provide choices for all income levels, life stages, and cultures within Hood River.”

In addition, two of the Guiding Principles address housing affordability directly:

- A. Create livable neighborhoods that make good use of the Westside’s limited land supply.
- D. Provide a range of densities and housing types, increasing affordable housing choices in Hood River.

Overall, the vision is intentionally ambitious, comprehensive, and places a priority on workforce and affordable housing.

Strategies to Deliver Affordable Housing

The Concept Plan includes the following land use and transportation strategies that will influence the cost and affordability of housing in the Westside Area:

- **Increasing overall housing capacity.** Under the Westside Area’s existing zoning and with a continuation of historical development patterns (the “Base Case”), the Westside Area is expected to accommodate about

1,130 new dwellings. The Land Use Framework (Scenario A), if adopted, has an estimated capacity of approximately 1,730 new dwellings, or increase of 51 percent over the Base Case.

- **Increasing the amount of “missing middle” housing specifically.**²¹ This “middle” covers a range of multi-unit or clustered housing types compatible in scale with single-family homes that help meet the growing demand for walkable urban living. Under the Base Case, the Westside Area is expected to develop predominantly as single-family detached housing. The Land Use Framework scenarios are expected to provide significantly more attached and multifamily housing types, as described in the previous section.
- **Diversifying the mix of housing in each of the three planned neighborhoods.** The extent of the mix is to be determined. The Land Use Framework (Scenario A) has R-3 zoned lands increased and distributed to each of the Middle Terrace, Upper Terrace, and West Neighborhoods with the intent of creating three varied and walkable neighborhoods with their own diversity of housing types and open space amenities.
- **Inclusion of a Neighborhood Commercial node, integration of land uses with planned transit, and emphasis on pedestrian and bicycle connections** to help reduce reliance on auto travel.
- **Reduction in cost per unit for infrastructure.** This is a potentially significant cost-saving strategy for land development. For water, sewer, and storm water utilities, the cost of infrastructure to serve the Westside area is relatively fixed, but the number of dwellings generating infrastructure funding revenue is substantially increased.
- **Supporting development** of the County-owned 2-acre parcel for affordable housing.
- **Potential housing bonuses** for a guarantee of workforce and affordable housing (sometimes called “voluntary inclusionary zoning”).
- **Recommended code changes**, such as minimum density requirements and lot size averaging.

These strategies focus on housing capacity, land development efficiency and flexibility, removing barriers, and providing incentives. It is implicit in the above strategies that the City will continue to work with partners such as Mid-Columbia Housing Authority, Aging in the Gorge Alliance, Oregon Housing and Community Services, and Oregon Regional Solutions in order to meet affordable housing needs.

Zoning and Affordable Housing

What can Hood River’s land use regulations do to deliver workforce and affordable housing in the Westside Area, consistent with the vision for the Concept Plan?

The answer to the above question begins with the City stating its goals for the Westside, and how the City views such implementation from a city-wide perspective. If the goal is to ensure that all or part of the Westside’s housing is built at price points that meet workforce and affordability targets in Hood River, the primary tool is called **inclusionary zoning**. As stated in a recent report by the City of Portland, where inclusionary zoning has been adopted as a tool in the zoning code, statutory authority for inclusionary zoning is relatively new to Oregon:

“In March 2016, the Oregon State Legislature passed Senate Bill 1533 which permits cities and counties to adopt land use regulations or impose conditions for approval of permits to require affordable housing of up to

²¹ Based on assumptions by zone in the Hood River Housing Needs Analysis, Table 5

20 percent of units in multi-family structures in exchange for one or more developer incentives that are identified in SB 1533. In addition to the inclusion rate cap of 20 percent of units in a project, SB 1533 creates a project size threshold of 20 or more multi-family units and income level restrictions of a mandatory inclusionary housing program for 80 percent or higher Median Family Income (MFI).”²²

So, the practical questions are: is the City’s goal to assure workforce and affordable housing through zoning, and if so, does it want to determine how inclusionary zoning would be adopted in Hood River? This is clearly a big question for City policy makers and the community to discuss. Development of such a program is beyond the scope of the Westside Area Concept Plan, but could be pursued if the community wishes to evaluate it. The City of Portland needed approximately one year to develop an inclusionary housing program, informed by a panel of housing experts.

If the goal is to support and encourage that workforce and affordable housing is built in the Westside area, then the tools are the draft strategies listed above. These strategies are examples of zoning amendments that are within the scope of the Westside Area Concept Plan project.

As part of the Concept Plan process, Angelo Planning Group provided some case studies of other Oregon communities who have recently evaluated policies and strategies related to housing affordability. This memorandum is included as Appendix C.

Recommendation from Project Team

A key point is that the two goals discussed above are not mutually exclusive. Rather, they are two points along a continuum of policy approaches where multiple complementary tools could be employed by the City. A hybrid policy approach is listed below, and recommended by the project team:

- a. Adopt Comprehensive Plan policies and zoning code updates that support and encourage workforce and affordable housing for the Westside (or the city as a whole), through the strategies listed above.
- b. Work with project partners to assure delivery of affordable housing on project-specific basis (e.g. the 2-acre parcel owned by Hood River County).
- c. Work proactively to identify and acquire additional parcels for workforce and affordable housing development (land banking).
- d. Consider participating in other proactive programs, incentives and advocacy efforts, such as:²³
 - Construction Excise Tax for affordable housing development (in place as of September, 2017)
 - Community land trust for affordable, owner-occupied housing

²² Inclusionary Housing Zoning Code Project, City of Portland, page 1, <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/590320>

²³ Source: Mid-Columbia Housing Authority and Columbia Cascade Housing Corporation, edited for clarity. Some actions may be by entities other than the City. Feasibility research has not been conducted as part of this work.

- Advocacy for government (federal, state, local) subsidies for affordable housing
- System Development Charge waivers or significant reductions (example: 75% reduction)
- Defer payment of System Development Charges to date of occupancy
- System Development Charge financing options
- Property tax exemption for low-income housing²⁴
- Property tax exemption for non-profit corporation, low-income housing
- Property tax exemption for multi-unit housing
- Property tax exemption for housing in distressed areas
- Property tax freezes on rehabilitated housing
- Affirmatively furthering fair housing²⁵
- Partnerships with employers to create housing solutions for workers in Hood River
- A streamlined process, with dedicated staff time, for affordable housing construction

²⁴ See also Hood River Housing Strategy #3, regarding Multiple Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program, and Appendix B which notes the Vertical Housing Tax Abatement for mixed use.

²⁵ Additional information available at:
https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/AFFH_Final_Rule_Executive_Summary.pdf

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICIES

Overview

The proposed text amendments to implement the Westside Area Concept Plan add two new subsections under Goal 2: Land Use Planning. The first subsection, Concept Plans and Master Plans, provides “enabling” policies to define Concept Plans and Master Plans, establishes authority to use them, and requires a public process to create them. The second new subsection is specific to the Westside Area Concept Plan, stating its vision, guiding principles, and implementation strategies.

Proposed Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments

Concept Plan and Master Plans - Policies

1. A Concept Plan is a plan for a sub-area of the city that addresses relevant planning issues in an integrated and comprehensive way. Concept Plans typically address housing, land use, transportation, natural resources, parks, and infrastructure, however, the topics addressed may be unique and tailored to each Concept Plan. Concept Plans set the stage for long term growth and development that achieves the community’s goals and vision.
2. A Master Plan is a Concept Plan that more detailed and site-specific. A Master Plan may include details such as urban design and architectural recommendations. As with a Concept Plan, the topics addressed may be unique and tailored to each Master Plan.
3. The City may use Concept Plans and/or Master Plans to refine the Comprehensive Plan and/or the zoning ordinance in order to further implement Comprehensive Plan policies and/or a vision for the area. Implementing regulations may include an Overlay Zone for the Concept Plan or Master Plan area.
4. A Concept Plan or Master Plan is developed through a public process that relies upon the contributions of citizens and stakeholders.

Westside Area Concept Plan - Policies

1. The Hood River Westside Area Concept Plan is a supporting document of the Comprehensive Plan. It should be used for context and guidance whenever “consistency with the Comprehensive Plan” is evaluated for the Westside Area.
2. The Hood River Westside Area Concept Plan is implemented through the Westside Overlay Zone, in combination with relevant policies of the Comprehensive Plan, the City’s Public Facilities Plans, and zoning code.
3. The vision for the Westside Area is:

“The Westside Area will grow to become an interconnected community of great neighborhoods, an attractive gateway of commercial and mixed use activity, and an affordable and diverse area of the City. The Westside’s hallmarks will be:

- a. *Housing options that provide choices for all income levels, life stages, and cultures within Hood River*

- b. Streets, trails, and paths that are walkable, connected, and green*
- c. Neighborhood design that celebrates the landforms, views, and magnificent landscape of Hood River*
- d. Open spaces and parks that support community gathering and a connection to nature*

The Westside Area will be an integral part and extension of the larger Hood River community.”

4. The Guiding Principles for the Westside Area are to:
 - a. Create livable neighborhoods that make good use of the Westside’s limited land supply.
 - b. Create well-planned and commercially successfully mixed use districts in the Westside gateway area.
 - c. Create a plan that works for all ages and abilities of the community.
 - d. Provide a range of densities and housing types, increasing affordable housing choices in Hood River.
 - e. Incorporate natural features and a sense of place into each neighborhood and district.
 - f. Include open space and parks integrated into neighborhoods.
 - g. Provide a connected transportation network with walkable, bike-friendly, and green streets.
 - h. Promote active and healthy living through community design.
 - i. Plan land uses and transportation facilities so the area may be served by fixed route transit.
 - j. Integrate the Westside Elementary School and future new schools as key community places.
 - k. Promote human-scaled building designs.
 - l. Plan for efficient water, sewer, and storm water infrastructure, utilizing green practices for storm water management.
 - m. Implement the Westside Area Concept Plan’s infrastructure funding strategy.

Westside Area Concept Plan – Implementation Strategies

1. The City will support and facilitate the development of workforce and affordable housing projects and programs in the Westside Area, including development of housing on the publicly-owned parcels. Banking land for workforce and affordable housing projects is a priority strategy.
2. The City will evaluate policies to ensure there is no net loss of existing workforce and affordable housing in the Westside Area.
3. To complement land use and zoning strategies to support for workforce and affordable housing in the Westside Area, the City will explore additional programs and actions outside the land use framework, such as:
 - Land banking
 - Construction Excise Tax for affordable housing development
 - Community land trust for affordable, owner-occupied housing
 - Advocacy for government (federal, state, local) subsidies for affordable housing
 - System Development Charge (SDC) waivers or significant reductions (example: 75% reduction)
 - Defer payment of SDCs to date of occupancy
 - SDC financing

- Property tax exemptions (examples: for low-income housing²⁶; for non-profits serving low-income housing; for multi-unit housing; for housing in distressed areas)
 - Property tax freezes on rehabilitated housing
 - “Affirmatively furthering fair housing”²⁷
 - Partnerships with employers to create housing solutions for workers in Hood River
 - A streamlined process, with dedicated staff time, for affordable housing construction
4. The City will explore establishing a setback from Henderson Creek in order to provide a continuous open space that follows the creek and a trail corridor.
 5. The City will work with the Hood River Park and Recreation District to implement the park and trail recommendations in the Westside Area Concept Plan.
 6. The City will work with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to determine the funding and timing for the Exit 62 interchange improvements and refinements to the Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP).
 7. The City will work with ODOT to implement the Historic Columbia River Highway Trail.
 8. The City shall amend its Public Facility Plans to implement the water, sewer, and storm water recommendations in the Concept Plan.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN/ZONING MAP UPDATES

After the City finalizes the Land Use Framework for the Concept Plan, it should then prepare Comprehensive Plan/Zoning Map²⁸ amendments to implement the Land Use Framework. Map amendments will be needed for both city zoning and county zoning within the study area.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATES

The City’s Transportation System Plan will required the following types of updates:

- Updates to the project list
- Updates to the Motor Vehicle System Plan to be consistent with the Streets Framework
- Updates to the Pedestrian System Plan and Bicycle System Plan to be consistent with Pedestrian and Bicycle Framework
- Updates to cross-sections for graphic changes and two new cross-sections: Alignment D and the Neighborhood Connector street
- Text edits as needed to incorporate specific issues such as traffic calming on 30th Street north of May Street

²⁶ See also Hood River Housing Strategy #3, regarding Multiple Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program, and Appendix B which notes the Vertical Housing Tax Abatement for mixed use.

²⁷ Additional information available at:

https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/AFFH_Final_Rule_Executive_Summary.pdf

²⁸ The City has a one-map system of a combined comprehensive plan and zoning designations.

Draft amendments will be included in the package of materials transmitted to the Planning Commission. A review of the Hood River County TSP should be conducted to determine if amendments to that plan are required for consistency.

URBAN GROWTH AREA MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT

As required by state law, the City of Hood River and Hood River County have Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA). The agreement is included as Appendix E. The agreement was originally adopted in 1997 and updated 2003. The intent statements of the UGAMA reflect its main topics and content:

B. INTENT OF AGREEMENT

- 1. To establish standards and procedures for review and action on comprehensive plan amendments, ordinance amendments, proposed land actions and related matters noted within this agreement pertaining to implementation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Zoning Regulations as adopted by the City and County for the UGA;*
- 2. To recognize that the County shall have authority and jurisdiction over current planning activities and land use decisions within the UGA. This agreement, including the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Zoning Regulations agreed to by the City and the County, constitute the provisions, standards and procedures for land use review and decision making by the County within the UGA.*
- 3. To provide assistance to the public in the UGA by processing land use applications in a timely and consistent manner;*
- 4. To benefit the public through reduction of governmental processes;*
- 5. To provide governmental processes necessary for development of lands in the UGA that are clear and readily accessible to the public.*
- 6. To jointly develop and adopt a set of land use regulations and plan and zoning map designations by the City and County for land use administration within the UGA.*

This important agreement has several implications for the finalization of the Concept Plan, including:

- The County must continue to be involved in the planning process for the Westside Area. As one example, the County should be a participant in the City's Planning Commission work sessions prior to hearings.
- Both the City and County will need to update their respective Comprehensive Plan and zoning ordinance provisions to implement the Concept Plan.
- The UGAMA provides for the option of joint hearings for legislative amendments to the City and County Comprehensive Plans. Once the package of amendments is completed in draft form, the City and County could schedule a joint public hearing that would have the common elements of: notice;

record; opportunity to testify; and, deliberations in public session on requested changes to the amendments. Following deliberations, the City and County could convene individually to adopt their respective ordinances, completing the process. Note: this is just one scenario for how a joint or coordinated process could work.

- The City and County may wish to explore amendments to the UGAMA.

ZONING CODE UPDATES

Updates to the Hood River Zoning Code are essential to the successful implementation of the Concept Plan. The following section summarizes proposed updates to the code, which are part of Appendix D of this report. This list below is intended for consideration in the Westside Area, with the understanding the City will determine, prior to adoption, whether any of them should instead be considered for citywide application.

Residential Zones and Development

Maximum and Minimum Density for Land Divisions

Purpose and intent:

Provide a method to calculate the maximum number of lots that can be created through a land division that is more predictable (easier to estimate before a detailed layout is complete) and offers some flexibility on the size of individual lots within a subdivision without changing the total number of lots permitted (“lot size averaging”). Additionally, establish a minimum number of lots that can be created through a land division to ensure efficient use of residential land. Minimum density standards should allow for larger parcels to be divided incrementally, with shadow platting.

Public Review Draft 1 Summary:

- Calculate the maximum and minimum number of lots in a way that allows, but does not require, density transfers from significant natural resource areas and other constrained land by including constrained land when calculating maximum, but not minimum, density and allowing smaller lot sizes when constrained land is preserved in its own tract.
- Encourage right-of-way dedication in order to provide a connected local street network (which may require more land for right-of-way than a less-connected street layout).
- For land divisions (except for townhouse projects, which have their own density standards), regulate the number of lots/parcels that can be created rather than dwelling units so that new regulations don’t interfere with existing standards allowing duplexes and townhomes.
- Set maximum density for each zone based on current minimum lot size standards.

Lot Size Standards

Purpose and intent:

Reduce the minimum lot size for certain housing types in certain zones to enable more efficient use of residential land

Public Review Draft 1 Summary:

- Allow a small amount of lot size flexibility for single family detached housing in the R-1 and R-2 zones without changing the overall density
- Create a new R-2.5 zone for use in the Westside Concept Plan area with a lower minimum lot size of 4,000 square feet (vs. 5,000 square feet for R-2) for a single family home, duplex, or townhome building (with two attached units)
- Reduce the minimum lot size for single family detached housing in the R-3 zone to allow small-lot detached housing. (Minimum density requirements apply.)

- Slightly reduce the minimum lot size for duplexes, triplexes, multifamily and townhomes in the R-3 zone

Affordable Housing Incentives

Purpose and intent:

Provide affordable housing incentives in the form of modified development standards that make it easier to build affordable housing (including projects consisting of all affordable housing units as well as mixed income projects).

Public Review Draft 1 Summary:

- Make incentives available to projects that provide a certain level of affordability (housing costs are no more than 30% of the annual household income for a household making less than 60-80% of the county median income).
- Require that projects that take advantage of the incentives enter into legal agreements with the City that ensure that affordability is delivered and maintained over a certain period of time (e.g. 20-50 years).
- Offer a density bonus that increases with the number of affordable units up to some maximum (e.g. up to 25-50% above the maximum for the zone – the amount of the bonus is a policy judgement).
- Offer reduced parking requirements for affordable housing units.


Flexibility and Innovative Housing Types

Purpose and intent:

Ensure that cohousing, cluster housing, cottage housing and other innovative housing types are clearly permitted by the code without the need to go through a Planned Development process (which can be time-consuming, expensive and requires a public hearing).

- Cluster subdivisions are intended to allow reduced lot sizes for developments that will preserve an on-site natural feature, without changing overall density of the development.
- Cottage court housing standards are intended to enable small detached homes in clusters around a common green as an alternative to standard subdivisions.
- Cohousing standards are intended to provide flexibility for cohousing developments to arrange various types of units on a common lot, to include a common house and shared open space in lieu of private yards, and to cluster parking rather than provide individual driveways.

Public Review Draft 1 Summary:



- Allow cluster subdivisions in the R-1, R-2, and R-2.5 zones
- Allow Cottage Court developments in the R-1, R-2, and R-2.5 zones
- Allow Co-housing in the R-2.5 and R-3 zones

Housing Mix

Purpose and intent:

Ensure a mix of housing occurs in larger projects in the R-2.5 and R-3 zones in the Westside area where both detached and attached housing is allowed

Public Review Draft 1 Summary:

- Require that housing types other than single family detached occupy a certain minimum percentage of the land area in subdivisions over 10 acres in the R-2.5 and R-3 zones in the Westside area. The threshold size of 10 acres is intended to allow enough acreage and planned homes to make it workable to provide mix of housing types in the same project.

Residential Design Standards

Purpose and intent:

Establish simple, clear and objective design standards for single family homes in the Westside Overlay Zone that:

- Enhance public safety by ensuring views of the street from inside the residence;
- Provide for a pleasant pedestrian environment by preventing garages and vehicle areas from dominating the views of the neighborhood from the sidewalk; and
- Support the creation of architecturally varied homes, blocks and neighborhoods that enhance the character of the development.

Public Review Draft 1 Summary:

- Require windows facing the street
- Require main entrances to be facing the street or open onto a porch, and not to be recessed too deeply from the front of the house
- Limit the width of garage entrances facing the street and require them to be recessed slightly from the front of the house
- Require use of architectural details that create visual interest (e.g. dormers, eaves, balconies, bay windows, etc.), with options to pick from a list
- Don't allow houses next to each other or across the street to use the same street-facing elevation, in order to ensure some variety in home designs

Parking Requirements

Purpose and intent:

Ensure that parking requirements are not so high that they make higher density and more affordable housing impractical

Public Review Draft 1 Summary:

- Allow on-street parking abutting a property to count toward parking requirements up to one space per unit within the Westside Overlay Zone.
- Reduce required parking for multifamily development in the R-3 zone within the Westside Overlay Zone to one space per dwelling unit.

Protecting Natural Features

Steep Slopes

Purpose and intent:

Support retention of the terrace edges in the Westside area as open space.

Public Review Draft 1 Summary:

- Require that development avoid impacts to areas with slopes greater than 25% within the Westside Overlay Zone (except for required roads and utilities).

Henderson Creek

Purpose and intent:

Require a setback from Henderson Creek for open space and trail opportunities.

Public Review Draft 1 Summary:

- Require a setback (50 feet) from the centerline of Henderson Creek

- Allow density to transfer from the setback area through lot size flexibility standards and cluster subdivision provisions.

Streets, Trails, and Parks

Purpose and intent:

Ensure that the streets, bicycle and pedestrian connections, and neighborhood parks identified in the Westside Concept Plan frameworks are implemented through development

Public Review Draft 1 Summary:

- Require development within the Westside Overlay Zone to provide streets and bicycle/pedestrian connections consistent with the Transportation System Plan and Westside Area Concept Plan Streets Framework and Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections Framework
- Amendments to the Transportation System Plan and/or subdivision standards (Article 16) may be needed to implement the connectivity, street, and bicycle/pedestrian connection concepts developed through the Concept Plan.
- Provide general direction and methods for establishment of neighborhood parks

Commercial Development and Design Standards

Purpose and intent:

Ensure that new commercial development is pedestrian-oriented, attractive, and creates interesting streetscapes.

Public Review Draft 1 Summary:

- Apply existing standards for commercial buildings in the C-2 zone that address entrances from the street, maximum setbacks, landscaping, and building design more broadly (e.g. to all commercial development in the Westside Overlay zone, rather than only development with buildings between 25,000 and 50,000 square feet).
- Prohibit new drive-up and drive-through uses and facilities within the Westside Overlay Zone and limit expansion of existing facilities
- Prohibit other uses which are auto-oriented and do not contribute to an active pedestrian environment (e.g. car washes, new gas stations). (Existing uses would be grandfathered.)
- Create a new Neighborhood Commercial zone for a 2-acre site northwest of 30th and May.

Draft Zoning Code

Appendix D includes draft zoning code updates for further evaluation in conjunction with or following adoption of the concept plan.

PAYING FOR INFRASTRUCTURE – A FUNDING PLAN FOR THE WESTSIDE

An analysis of infrastructure funding for the Westside Area was prepared as part of the Concept Plan. It is attached in Appendix B. The analysis provides revenue estimates, infrastructure costs, comparison of costs and revenues, cost sharing ideas and specific tools for future consideration. Where project costs exceed revenues, the “gap” is identified and funding strategies are suggested. The analysis is a first-ever review of costs and revenues for Westside Area projects. Typically, the City approaches funding from a city-wide perspective. What costs and revenues are attributable to the Westside Area, and therefore what “gap” there is, is solely reflective of the assumptions stated in the analysis.

The following sections summarize key findings from the infrastructure funding analysis and presents recommendations and issues for implementation.

Overall Revenue Estimate

System development charges (SDCs) are one-time impact fees assessed on new development for various types of infrastructure. They are intended to fund the capital costs incurred by a municipality or utility resulting from the infrastructure or other needs associated with new development.

Table 7 summarizes estimated SDC revenue generated in the Westside Area for each infrastructure type. The land use assumed is 80% of the Scenario A Concept Plan.²⁹ Combined SDC revenue totals almost \$12.9 million. For a detailed breakdown of SDC revenue by infrastructure type, see Appendix B. This total revenue estimate compares to \$9.56 million³⁰ that is estimated for future development that would occur under the base zoning that exists today.

Table 7. SDC Revenue (2017\$), Westside Area

| | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| City SDCs | |
| Water | \$3,182,629 |
| Wastewater | \$1,431,486 |
| Stormwater | \$941,112 |
| Transportation | \$3,408,317 |
| Total | \$8,963,544 |
| Parks and Recreation SDC | \$3,901,134 |
| Total SDC Revenue | \$12,864,678 |

Source: Angelo Planning Group, City of Hood River, Hood River Parks and Recreation. Calculated by ECONorthwest.

²⁹ The 80% level of build-out accounts for “under-build”, and provides a more conservative revenue estimate than 100% of land use capacity.

³⁰ See “Technical Memo 6: Funding Review and Funding Toolkit”, page 4, ECONorthwest, February 3, 2017

Water, Sanitary Sewer and Storm Water

Cost versus Revenue Analysis

Table 8 provides a comparison of costs and revenues for water, sewer and storm water, with parks and transportation shown as well. The columns are defined as follows:

- **Column A:** Total project costs
- **Column B:** Infrastructure costs attributable to Westside Area development. Column A with the following netted out:
 - Portions of projects that are intended to improve a city-wide infrastructure system rather than to support added development capacity in the Westside Area.
 - Portion of costs funded by developers or other non-City sources
- **Column C:** Portion of Column B that is or should be funded by SDCs
- **Column D:** SDC Revenue that is generated by development in the Westside Area
- **Column E:** The funding gap, which compares the assumptions stated.

Table 8. Summary: Total Westside Area Infrastructure Cost-Revenue Comparison

| | A. Total Cost | B. Cost attributable to Westside | C. Portion of Westside Costs (B) that are SDC funded | D. Westside SDC Revenue | E. SDC funding gap (minus D) |
|----------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Water | \$6,148,100 | \$1,599,993 | \$1,599,993 | \$3,182,629 | \$0 |
| Stormwater | \$9,096,300 | \$2,334,875 | \$2,334,875 | \$941,112 | \$1,393,763 |
| Sewer | \$7,074,200 | \$536,040 | \$536,040 | \$1,431,486 | \$0 |
| Parks | \$5.6M to \$7.5M** | \$5.6M to \$7.5M** | \$5.6M to \$7.5M** | \$3,901,134 | \$1.7M to \$3.6M |
| Transportation | \$64,047,225 | \$12,397,837 | \$5.2M to \$6.7M* | \$3,408,317 | \$1.8M to \$3.3M |
| Total | \$92M - \$93.8M | \$24.1M to \$26.0M | \$15.2M to \$18.7M | \$12.9M | \$4.9M to \$8.3M |

*See section on transportation for detail regarding assumptions

**See section on parks for detail regarding assumptions

Source: APG, DEA, City of Hood River. Calculated by ECONorthwest. Note: 2017 dollars

Funding Plan Strategies and Issues – Water, Sewer, and Storm Water

The City's current practice is to require that developers pay for water, sewer and storm water costs for development. The City issues SDC credits, or contributes funds, for "oversizing" of lines and infrastructure as needed to meet system needs. This is at the discretion of the City and is done on a case-by-case basis. Depending on the application of SDC credits in exchange for the provision of infrastructure (which will play out over time as development occurs), the Westside Area may be a net positive contributor to the City SDC pool for water and wastewater.

For storm water, there is an estimated gap of \$1.39 million, about 15% of total costs. A "base case" of existing storm water costs does not exist, so it unknown how this gap compares existing conditions. The City is currently updating its Storm Water Management Plan and should assess the adequacy of city-wide storm water SDCs to cover city-wide costs during or after that process. For individual projects, developers are responsible for storm water infrastructure. As noted above, the City's participation for oversizing in on a case by case basis.

Parks

Cost versus Revenue Analysis

The Westside Area Concept Plan projects that, based on the potential population under Land Use “Scenario A”, 10.7 acres of neighborhood parks will be needed and should be implemented as the Westside develops. The plan cites the need for a community park to serve the area. Land acquisition cost is assumed to be \$350,000 per acre for neighborhood parks;³¹ and the cost of park improvement is assumed at \$4-8 per square foot.³² These assumptions are preliminary, and more detailed design, engineering, and pricing analysis would be needed to understand the cost of providing parks in the Westside Area. Table 9 provides a comparison of costs and revenues.

Table 9. Neighborhood Parks Cost-Revenue Comparison

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| Improvement Cost | \$1,864,368 - \$3,728,736 |
| Land Cost | \$3,745,000 |
| Total: | \$5,609,368 - \$7,473,736 |
| SDC Revenue | \$3,901,134 |
| Gap | \$1,706,234 - \$3,572,602 |

Source: Angelo Planning Group, City of Hood River, Hood River Parks and Recreation. Calculated by ECONorthwest. Note: All cost and revenue estimates are presented in 2017 dollars.

Funding Plan Strategies and Issues

As noted in the table above, it is likely that the City will need funds beyond current SDCs to support the parks vision for the Westside Area. Assuming the lower end of improvements costs (\$4 per square foot), the estimated gap is approximately 30% of total costs. Put another way, two of the three recommended neighborhood parks can be funded by SDCs over time, with more funding needed to acquire and develop the third park.

The City and Parks District will need to be proactive to implement the neighborhood parks plan for the Westside Area. The following actions and strategies are recommended:

- The City and District should work together to:
 - Add the Westside Area neighborhood parks to the District’s Master Plan and SDC Methodology. The SDC Methodology Report currently has 3 neighborhood parks identified for the “UGB Area”, which is a city-wide reference (i.e. not site specific). The acreages and costs

³¹ ECONorthwest arrived at the price estimate of \$350,000 per acre by surveying properties currently listed for sale, as well as looking at land sales that had occurred within the past two years to determine a likely average price for undeveloped land within the study area.

³² Assumption provided by APG, based on review of parks costs in Wilsonville and Washington County, built to a relatively high standard. The \$4/sq foot end of the range represents a more modest improvement standard. The estimate will need to be updated as more is known about park location, amenity, and other variables.

are somewhat dated and will need to be updated to align with Westside Area assumptions and concepts.

- Determine whether (and when) a higher SDC than is currently charged should be considered to fund Westside Area parks. The currently adopted SDCs are below the “maximum defensible SDC” described in the Park Districts SDC methodology. This is an intentional strategy by the District to increase SDCs gradually.³³
- Determine whether the City or the District will own and maintain the Westside Area neighborhood parks
- The City should consider requiring annexation agreements, at time of annexation, to provide the authority for the City and District to acquire park land at fair market value as part of the development review process.

The City should also explore the following options:

- Seek land donations or exactions from developers. A parkland dedication could reduce the City’s expenditures on land, but may affect overall Parks SDC revenues due to the issuance of SDC waivers in exchange for dedicated land.
- Seek financial management strategies that reduce or phase in costs. For example, seek opportunities to acquire park land earlier, and hold it for later park development and new housing units are constructed. Given the increase in land costs, this approach could keep costs down.
- Lower costs per acre for improvements. Estimates in this memorandum are preliminary, and may be higher than actual costs for development in Hood River, especially as more is known about the types of park amenity that will best serve the community.
- Seek grants from the State or Oregon or other sources
- Consider applying parks SDCs to commercial and industrial uses as well as residential uses. This would require finding a nexus between development of commercial and industrial uses and the need for park development, given that employees use parks.

This funding strategy is limited to neighborhood parks. It does not address the Community Park, and the trails, that the Concept Plan also recommends. The Community Park is assumed to be implemented by the District, and likely not on land within the UGB. The new trails recommended by the plan will require a separate funding analysis.

Transportation

Overview

The city plans for transportation improvements and funding through the Transportation System Plan (TSP). The TSP identifies a set of projects called “financially constrained” projects. These are priority projects

³³ Mythology Report, page 10.

necessary for adequate system function and to meet requirements of Oregon’s Transportation Planning Rule (TPR, OAR 660-12). The financially constrained list is also used as the project list in the City’s Transportation SDC methodology. There are many other TSP-identified projects that are not on the financially constrained list and SDC methodology. Those projects are either funded by revenues other than SDCs (e.g. grants or reimbursement districts), or, will be added to the financially constrained list in future updates of the TSP and SDC methodology.

The Concept Plan’s transportation analysis verified the need for all of the projects in the TSP, whether on the financially constrained list or not. The analysis also identified the need for one additional project: a signal or mini-roundabout at the Rand-27th-May intersection. A key new project within the existing TSP, the “Mt Adams Extension” is recommended to be shifted to the west in a location known as “Alignment D”. In addition, the transportation analysis identified a much needed interim improvements solution to Exit 62. The interim improvements is estimated at \$5 million, far less than the full \$27 million interchange upgrade that is noted in the adopted TSP. ODOT has stated it will commit to funding the \$5 million interim improvements within the planning period (by 2040). ODOT’s funding commitment is conditioned on the City adopting “reasonably likely” funding measures and policies for all of Westside Area’s transportation facilities identified in the TSP.³⁴

Cost versus Revenue Analysis

The approach to evaluating the funding gap in transportation used the following steps:

1. Inventory transportation projects in two categories: streets and pedestrian bicycle facilities. In the TSP, streets are called Motor Vehicle facilities (identified with project names beginning with “MV”) and are “complete streets” in that they include sidewalks and, where needed, bike paths.
2. Estimate total costs for projects that are located in the Westside Area, by individual transportation project. DKS completed this work, and identified \$11.7 million for streets and \$2.3 million for pedestrian-bicycle facilities.³⁵
3. For each project, determine the portion of total project cost that is attributable to Westside Area development. This is the portion of project cost that is rightly compared to SDC revenues that are generated in the Westside Area to estimate a gap. To do this, for each project based on input from with DKS, APG, and City staff, we identified: (1) whether the project is currently on or should be considered for the City’s financially constrained list in the future; (2) whether it is or should be SDC eligible and at what percentage; and (3) what portion of the project’s costs should be shared by other sources (ODOT, the County, or broader City-wide SDCs or other funding sources). These assumptions are provided in detail in appendix of the funding analysis. Depending on which financially constrained

³⁴ As of the writing of this report, the specifics of ODOTs and the City’s obligations are under discussion.

³⁵ DKS Consulting, see Appendix B. This work is preliminary and subject to change.

scenario the City opts to use as the model for cost estimates, the range of costs for Westside Area transportation projects that are SDC eligible is \$5.2 million to \$6.7 million³⁶.

4. Based on a comparison of available SDC revenue generated in the Westside Area to the result of the steps described above, estimate the SDC funding gap for financially constrained Westside Area projects, as well as the total funding gap.

Given the estimated SDC funds of approximately \$3.4 million, the remaining SDC funding gap range is \$1.8 million to \$3.3 million. If all SDC revenues were used for streets, the SDC funding gap for streets would be \$1.6 million to \$3.1 million. The strategies discussed below focus on filling the gap for financially constrained projects, as these are the projects that are most critical to the system and to allowing new Westside Area development to occur.

Funding Plan Strategies

The analysis identifies the need for additional funds for transportation. This need is not attributable to the addition of new street improvement projects recommended by the Concept Plan. In fact, only one new street project has been identified: the signal or mini-roundabout at the Rand/May/27th Street intersection. Rather, the analysis recommends that additional funds be identified so that more of the planned transportation system has a strategy for funding and implementation than under the current TSP and list of financially-constrained projects.

Finding additional revenues will be a challenge, and will require additional analysis, decision-making, and public process. The City should explore the following options for additional funding; some of these tools are likely to be used in combination:

- **Increase Citywide SDC rates over time.** Many of the Westside Area projects will benefit the entire City, and development of the Westside Area also benefits the City through increasing tax base and providing needed housing. This approach would occur as an official update to the City's SDC methodology for transportation; which would be conducted in compliance with state law governing SDCs.
- **Apply a sole source SDC in the Westside.** Sole source SDCs are charged inside of a particular geographic area and are used to fund investments in that area only (as opposed to the City-wide allocation system currently used). The City of Hood River has not used sole-source SDCs in the past. A rough estimate of the SDC increase that would be needed in the Westside Area to fill the gap is about \$1,200.³⁷ A sole source

³⁶ The financially constrained project costs are preliminary and require additional review. They were determined by developing two development scenarios. A full explanation of all the projects included in each scenario is included in Appendix B.

³⁷ To estimate this, we began with the estimate of the portion of SDC revenue that comes from residential development: roughly 60%. We therefore divided 60% of transportation SDC funding gap by the number of units anticipated in the Westside Area for this order-of-magnitude estimate.

SDC should be discussed with stakeholders, compared to a City-wide approach, and considered in combination with other potential strategies.

- **Local improvement district, reimbursement district, or other kinds of public private partnership.** This category of tools generally leverage private funding sources for infrastructure investments. There are a range of creative possibilities in this category that can be explored. They generally work best when a developer or property owner would be highly motivated to construct a particular segment of infrastructure, for example, when one segment of infrastructure serves a large development parcel or parcels, and that infrastructure is necessary to allow development to occur. Alignment D from Wine County Road to Sherman may be one example of this situation.³⁸
 - Local improvement districts (LIDs) are special assessment districts in which property owners are assessed a fee to pay for capital improvements, such as streetscape enhancements, underground utilities, or shared open space. LIDs must be supported by a majority of affected property owners. LIDs spread the costs of infrastructure over a number of properties, and are usually levied over time. In some cases, municipalities may choose to borrow against that revenue stream to create up-front funding sources.
 - Developer-build approaches. Developers can generally build infrastructure to a lower cost than the public sector. Partnerships with developers can leverage existing public funding sources to bring in additional private funds and lower costs. The City has experience with these types of mechanisms in the past, specifically to fund the Country Club Road realignment investment. The City used a pool of public money from ODOT and the City to fund the road, but a developer designed and constructed the road to City standards. The developer agreed to use his own money to fill any funding gaps beyond the pool of resources available to him from the City and ODOT. This approach reduced costs and brought additional private dollars to the project. Reimbursement districts also fall into this category, allowing developers to construct the infrastructure in exchange for reimbursements through SDC credits or other funding sources.
- **Financial management approach.** While this approach does not reduce costs or increase revenues, the City will seek ways to be more efficient with the resource available as the infrastructure is invested. For example, the City may seek to acquire right-of-way up front and hold it until it is time to construct the facility. As land prices are likely to rise in the future, this can help to manage costs. There may also be opportunities to phase infrastructure investments over time to reduce the costs that are needed up front. For example, construction of Alignment D from Wine Country to a westerly extension of Sherman Avenue is a logical first phase, while the steeper section of Alignment D that connects to May Street could be a longer-term project.

³⁸ Cost estimates included in the Appendix in detail already show a substantial developer investment in this particular project. Total cost burden to the developer would need to be considered.

- **Find opportunities to reduce infrastructure costs.** One option for doing this is to reduce mobility standards to bring project costs down. Another is to seek opportunities for value engineering as project are more fully designed for implementation.
- **General fund contributions.** The City may choose to directly contribute to infrastructure development from its general fund through the typical budgeting and prioritization process. The City may also choose to bond against the general fund (general obligation bond) to increase the amount of funding available up-front to cover infrastructure costs, and then re-pay the bonds over time with general fund dollars. A general obligation bond increases the tax rates on residents and requires a vote of the public. As such, it is typically only used for significant projects that benefit the City as a whole.
- **State or grant funding.** This funding source may be most appropriate for bike/ped projects, and trail projects, but could potentially be used for other types of projects as well.

Timing of Funding for Infrastructure

An idea raised during PAC discussions was to “generate an infrastructure funding profile which ties needs to land use and rezoning such that funding does not lag development”. The goal of assuring that infrastructure (and whatever funding is needed for it) is provided concurrent with development is an important one. The City should implement this goal through its SDC updates, capital improvement planning, development reviews and other relevant processes.

PLANNING FOR ADEQUATE URBAN SERVICES FOR THE WESTSIDE AREA

Policies and Regulations that Address Infrastructure

The City has Comprehensive Plan policies, City-County agreements and code provisions that are intended to assure adequate infrastructure is in place, or will be in place, concurrent with development. These requirements are an important backdrop to development of the Westside Area, regardless what land uses are being developed. Assuring that infrastructure does not lag behind development was a recurrent issue raised during the concept plan process. Applicable provisions are summarized below:

Comprehensive Plan

Goal 2, Plan Review and Revisions Policy D1d – “It must be demonstrated that public facilities will be used effectively, and that no unnecessary tax burden will be placed upon the general public or adjacent land owners.” (this policy applies to Comprehensive Plan changes, including application of City zones to annexed property).

Goal 6, Water Implementation Strategies Policy 5 – ‘New development and improvement projects will provide storm and sanitary sewers.’”

Goal 8, Policy 6 – “As parcels of land are annexed from the UGA into the City, some land will be designated Open Space/Public Land for the development of new parks and public facilities, including access ways, to serve the recreational needs of the community”

Goal 11, Public Facilities and Services Goal – “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 in the City and Urban Growth Area.”

Goal 11, Policy 2 – “Discourage urban development in the UGA that lacks adequate

public facilities and services, or is not planned for urban services.”

Goal 11, Policy 6 – “Ensure that water mains are installed or upgraded to adequate size for fire-fighting and supply purposes.”

Goal 11, Policy 7 – “Ensure that public facilities and services of adequate size are constructed to serve planned urban uses as urban growth occurs consistent with the zoning.”

Goal 12, Transportation Goal 3, Policy 4 – “Establish rights-of-way at the time of site development and where appropriate officially secure them by dedication of property.”

Goal 14, Implementation Strategy 3 – “City sewer and water services will be provided to property only after the area has been annexed to the City, or a “consent to annex” has been put forth.

Goal 14, Implementation Strategy 4 – Only areas contiguous to the City will be considered for annexation. All annexations will be done in accordance with the Annexation policy adopted by City Council in May, 1982.

Urban Growth Area Management Agreement

Section I. City Services:

1. Extension of City water or sewer services within the Urban Growth Area may be permitted when approved by the City and if consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and with any adopted public facility plan. Extension of City water and sewer services shall be subject to approval of the City engineer.
2. As available, City services such as water, sewer, storm drainage, police, fire, parks and street maintenance within the UGA may be provided to the owner of the property upon signing and recording a "Consent to Annex", "Waiver of One Year" and "Waiver of Remonstrance."
3. All services within the UGA shall be developed and maintained to City standards and under the supervision of the City or the City's designee.
4. The City shall be responsible for public facilities planning within the UGA.

Municipal Code

Hood River's Annexation Policy is adopted as Chapter 17.15 of the municipal code. It includes criteria for review of annexations that address infrastructure, fiscal impact, and urban service capabilities. The overall policy is:

17.15.010 Introduction. It is the policy of the City of Hood River to promote orderly, efficient, and fiscally responsible annexation of territories in conjunction with urban growth or expected or desired urban growth within the urban growth area. Accordingly, the City shall annex property where:

The proposed annexation represents the natural extension of the existing City boundary consistent with urban growth;

- 1. The proposed annexation would not, when developed or as developed, unreasonably limit the ability of the City to provide a level of services to City residents consistent with community needs and the financial capabilities of the City, as determined by the City;*
- 2. The proposed annexation would not cause the City to pledge extension of services beyond its resources so as to result in a deficit operation of the service;*
- 3. The proposed annexation would serve the interests of the entire community and not solely the interests or convenience of those within the territory proposed to be annexed.*

Transportation Analysis and Planned Improvements for the Westside Area

The Westside Area Concept Plan is what is sometimes referred to as an "integrated land use and transportation plan", because the land uses and transportation needs have been developed as one combined effort. A transportation analysis was prepared for the concept plan, using the City's transportation model and land uses that are described in this report as the Scenario A Land Use Framework. That analysis is attached as Appendix B. In brief, the analysis:

- Evaluated the transportation impacts of the plan and identifies mitigation needed to ensure adequate transportation facilities will be in place to support planned growth, considering the legal parameters established in Oregon's Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-12-0060).
- Verified the need for the transportation projects listed in the adopted TSP. The specific improvements and/or location of some TSP projects were updated to align with the concept plan recommendations (e.g. Alignment D).
- Added one new project: a signal or mini roundabout at the Rand/May/27th Street intersection.
- Identifies an interim solution for Exit 62 interchange improvements (cost estimate of \$5 million) in lieu of the full set of interchange improvements included in the TSP (cost estimate of \$35 million). ODOT has committed to funding the interim improvements by 2040, on the condition that the City establish funding in the same timeframe for the balance of TSP-identified projects in the Westside Area, which are listed in the memo.
- Found that, with the proposed transportation improvements and funding commitments, the land uses and transportation improvement in the Concept Plan will meet TPR requirements. If the City chooses a land use scenario that has less land use than Scenario A, the conclusion is still valid. If the City chooses to intensify land use elsewhere in the City to meeting housing needs somewhere other than the Westside, additional transportation analysis will be needed to determine TPR compliance.

A second transportation analysis was prepared to evaluate a potential roundabout at the Cascade Avenue/Mt Adams intersection. Please see Appendix B. The PAC reviewed the options and favored the roundabout option over the signalized option. Further discussion and coordination with ODOT, including discussion of funding, is required before the roundabout can be included in the Hood River TSP. Until that time, the signalized improvement is the planned project in the TSP.

Water, Sewer, and Storm Water Plans for the Westside Area

Planning level water, sewer and storm water plans and cost estimates were prepared for the Concept Plan and are attached in Appendix B. These will provide the guidance for more refined engineering at a site specific level.

Parks Implementation – How will Park Land be Acquired and Improved?

The Open Space and Parks Framework describes the vision and planning concepts for parks to serve the Westside Area. The funding analysis for park implementation compares costs and revenues, identifies the need for additional funding, and recommends funding strategies.

How will park land actually get acquired and improved? How can new parks move from colors on a map to reality in the Westside Area?

There are no easy answers to these questions. Park implementation is a challenge for most cities, and particularly challenging in small cities with limited resources. However, there are tools and strategies that can be learned from other jurisdictions. Research for the City of Gresham regarding how that city might


strengthen its acquisition of park land in two concept plan areas is attached in Appendix B. Four park implementation strategies from the memo are summarized below.

Acquisition during development review. Acquisition through exactions in the development review process is subject to legal requirements. The “Nollan/Dolan” tests apply, requiring that the exaction be based on: (1) a “rational nexus” between the park land exacted and the impact of the development; and, (2) “rough proportionality” between the size of the exaction and the impact created by the development. These tests are relatively easily demonstrated for residential development because future residents will clearly be park users, and, level of service standards for parks are commonly accepted as a means to establish impact and proportionality. However, the amount of park land that can be justified solely through exaction is relatively small for most developments: a 10-acre subdivision may only justify about .4 acres of park land exaction.³⁹

Supplemental purchase. If the proportional exaction is smaller than the park that is needed, then the City or Park District could offer to purchase the remaining land at fair market value (see Figure 25). Any compensation would likely need to be paid in cash rather than an SDC credit, because it would be over and above the amount of the Parks SDC, which is proportional to the impact of the development. The City is also free to offer “carrots” to incentivize the supplemental purchase, e.g. waiver of all or part of the SDCs for the proportional exaction, or other regulatory or financial incentives.

³⁹ Park acreage estimated using the “rule of thumb” of 2 acres per 1,000 residents and typical densities in the R-2 designation.

Figure 25. Illustration of Example Park Land Acquisition Scenario



Proactive acquisition. The Bend Park and Recreation District and Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD) both have extensive experience with park land acquisition and development. Both reported that proactive acquisition, i.e. buying land in advance of development, is their primary means of acquiring park land, particularly for neighborhood parks. Both of these districts have the financial resources and staff to support an acquisition program. Within the THPRD in Washington County, North Bethany is unique concept plan area where specific parks are required, with purchase by THPRD, as part of development review. Please see Appendix __ for additional information.

Annexation agreements. Annexation may offer a strategic approach to land acquisition that will supplement and support the above-mentioned tools of proactive purchase and development review. Two Oregon cities, Canby and Bend, have regulations for annexation agreements that enable the waiver of Nollan/Dolan criteria.⁴⁰ Further research and legal consultation is needed to determine if such agreements might be useful for Hood River. Bend representatives noted that annexation agreements have not been a tool for park acquisitions to date.

⁴⁰ The City of Canby has codified this waiver be required in annexation or development agreements. See Canby Municipal Code, Division VI, Chapter 16.84.040. Available at <http://canbyoregon.gov/Chap16/16.84ANNEXATIONS.pdf>

See provision number 8 in this example annexation agreement from the City of Bend:
http://bend.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=5&clip_id=299&meta_id=6602

Fee-in-lieu programs. The City of Sandy has adopted a park land dedication ordinance that has been in place since the 1990s. The regulations are located within the City’s general development regulations.⁴¹ The code requires land to be dedicated to the City or a fee paid in-lieu of land dedication. The City’s parks SDCs do not include the cost of land acquisition—they are limited to the cost of development and capital improvements—therefore, this park land dedication requirement functions as a fee to recover this portion of the cost of parks. The code applies to all subdivisions, partitions, Planned Developments, and multi-family developments. The amount of the land, or the fee-in-lieu, is based on a population factor determined by the Parks Master Plan (number of acres of parks per person). The City has the authority to either accept the land or the fee-in-lieu, depending on the proposed development. If the City decides to accept a fee-in-lieu, the amount of the fee is calculated based on a standardized rate (dollar value per acre) that applies to all land in the city. City staff report that the program is a necessary and effective means to acquire parks, and is generally received favorably by developers and property owners.

Hood River should explore all of the above-listed tools and establish a strategy for the Westside Area. Proactive acquisition is clearly an approach that should be pursued. There are several large property owners that may be amenable to an acquisition or purchase option in advance of development. Another opportunity is to include park acreage in a land acquisition for an affordable housing project. As a first step, implementation roles should be clarified. The practical question is: “Who is in the lead for neighborhood park acquisition – the City or the Hood River County Park and Recreation District”? Community members have expressed concern that there are multiple jurisdictions that provide parks, and that clarity is needed.

Schools

Schools are a key component of any neighborhood, and planning for schools has been an important part of this concept planning process. During the discussions of the draft Concept Plan, community members asked if school facilities had been considered and whether they were adequate for the planned growth for the Westside Area. The Hood River County School District owns a 17-acre site at an important location within the Westside Area, west of 30th Avenue in the Middle Terrace Neighborhood. The TAC membership included both Sandra Buchanan, CFO for the Hood River County School District, and Don Benefield, Operations Director for the District, or alternates from the District. The District has provided feedback about multimodal access to the site and the role of schools as centerpieces of their respective neighborhoods.

Per the school district, long-term school facility planning is complex and responds to the demographic makeup of households, and in particular young families. Wide swings in the community’s growth rate make school facility planning more challenging as compared to more steady growth. As Hood River grows and economic and demographic shifts occur nationwide, the Hood River County School District will continue to plan and adapt in order to provide for the needs of those it serves. The District has not yet finalized plans for its property in the Westside or how it fits into the overall district’s plan, but stated the property is in a good

⁴¹ City of Sandy Municipal Code, Chapter 17.86, Parkland and Open Space.

position to serve the Westside and broader community with one or more new school facilities at this location, and the Concept Plan has been designed to support this.

Emergency Services

The City of Hood River is committed to providing a high level of emergency services for the community. Police chief Neal Holste and fire chief Leonard Damian, or their alternates from the police and fire departments, participated in the Concept Plan process as members of the TAC. They provided valuable input on issues of roadway design and access to accommodate emergency vehicles, as well as urban design to create safe neighborhoods.

Adequacy of police and fire services was a topic of discussion at the August 16th, 2017 TAC meeting. Fire Chief Leonard Damian remarked that the location of the new fire station on Meyer Parkway is well-suited to serve the Westside Area as it develops. He also noted that the fire department cannot proactively add staff in preparation for growth – adequacy of service and potentially adding new staff and facilities will be evaluated as development occurs.

As stated on the Fire Department's website, the department is funded through property taxes and a fee based ambulance service. Funding to increase fire services will increase along with property tax revenue from new development throughout the city, and if funding is deemed to be insufficient then the rates of taxation can be revisited by the City.

The same dynamic holds true for the police department. One of the most pressing issues for both police and fire, also discussed at the August 16th TAC meeting, is the ability of their staff to find affordable housing within Hood River. Currently, the lack of affordable housing in Hood River is a challenge for the recruitment and retention of emergency services personnel.

Appendix A: Project Participants and Process

Items in bold are included in the October 11th, 2017 committee Packets. Full draft appendix is available on the project website at www.hrwestsideplan.com

1. TAC/PAC Membership
2. Project Team membership
3. **Summary of Public Comments (Will be updated to include October TAC/PAC Meetings)**

Memorandum



10/2/2017

To: Project Advisory Committee
Cc: Project Management Team
From: Joe Dills, Andrew Parish, and Kyra Schneider, Angelo Planning Group
Re: **DRAFT** Summary of Public Comments

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum is a summary of public comments received by the Hood River Westside Area Concept Plan project team, as requested by the Project Advisory Committee. Included in this summary are descriptions of:

- Stakeholder interviews (September 28th and 29th, 2016)
- Comments received during Technical Advisory Committee meetings (informally)
- Comments received during Project Advisory Committee meetings as part of specific Public Comment periods.
- Input received during the two project open houses (November 17, 2016 and March 9, 2017)
- Input received as part of online surveys for this process.
- Correspondence received by planning staff
- Articles and letters submitted to local newspapers regarding the plan

Stakeholder Interviews

Angelo Planning Group conducted a series of interviews with property owners and stakeholders on August 30, 2016 at Hood River City Hall, plus 2 telephone interviews on September 28 and 29. Key themes are summarized below, and detailed comments can be found in Attachment A: Task 1.4 Stakeholder Interview Summary memorandum.

- Interviewees were generally very interested in **transportation connections** and looking at **alternatives**, both in terms of overall connections and the **Mt. Adams extension and the Mt. Adams / Cascade intersection** specifically. There was general support for the Mt Adams connection, but concern regarding its alignment and impact on properties and existing streets.
- There was strong support for a **high level of connectivity** overall, and for **safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian connections**.
- Stakeholders expressed an interest in **safe and livable neighborhoods**, in terms of traffic safety and having a tight-knit community of neighbors. **Diversity of people and diversity of housing** were mentioned multiple times as a means to achieve a vibrant neighborhood.
- Maintaining and building upon the **existing, unique character of Hood River** was mentioned several times.
- The portion of the study area near Cascade was suggested by stakeholders as being more appropriate for mixed use/multifamily development and attached housing, primarily because of proximity to transportation facilities and other services.

- The **need for more housing** within the city was clear to stakeholders.
- **Communication by email and through existing groups** such as the Hood River Valley Residents Committee were suggested as good approaches for public involvement.
- Stakeholders had mixed opinions about whether a locally-serving commercial node was appropriate for the area.

Technical Advisory Committee and Public Advisory Committee Meetings

- Community perception of affordable housing is important - Commenter was on a low income housing board. Applied for a project with 40 houses, neighbors did not want it. Reduced to 30, killed affordability of the project.
- How can we assure affordability? Workforce housing/caregiver housing models that can be incentivized.
- There is a desire for cohousing. One of the incentives could be requiring only one parking space per household.
- Want to move into town as I age. Easier to address need for denser housing now, rather than trying to infill in 20 years.
- Guiding principles won't be part of someone's development application.
- When developers come in to develop a high-density area, they're not going to building government-subsidized affordable housing, they're going to build market value housing, which will appeal more to second home buyers, etc. Concern that this aggressive stance on density will shape the children's futures in this town and change it to different community.
- Concern about the way that rezoning will affect the future of her property, and the rural character and natural feel of the area. Does not support commercial uses in neighborhoods.
- Concern about changes to the livability and rural feel of the community, feeling that this project has been moving too quickly and paved the way for too much housing in the Westside Area.
- Doesn't feel that it is necessary to make lots smaller because you can still accomplish affordable housing on large lots. The biggest concern is 30th street becoming an arterial right and impacting those existing homes.
- People who live in this community moved here to have more green space.
- Desire to explore ADUs as a solution to affordability.
- Regarding the comments that density shouldn't be focused in one place, these are issues that you should bring to your City Councilors because they ultimately make those decisions.
- 30th St has many driveways, it is an existing neighborhood that would not support the type of traffic that is projected.
- Concern about the worsening flooding of Henderson Creek.
- Parking is an issue of concern, because for most residents of Hood River garages are full of outdoor gear so you have to park your car somewhere else.
- Has already experienced what this process does to communities in previous home in a nice suburb of Seattle that was developed, the neighborhood changed, and people moved out. Doesn't want to see the same thing happen in the Westside Area.
- Existing zoning is sufficient for the Westside area.
- It is unfair to homeowners to change the zoning.
- Infrastructure is already too taxed to support growth.
- Utilize commercial lands for more mixed use projects, and consider multifamily housing on the waterfront.
- Consider natural corridors and natural habitat in the plan.

Open House #1

Project staff had discussions with community members in individual and small group settings at the event. The following is a partial list of topics and interests discussed:

- Employers having difficulty finding housing for even well-paid employees in Hood River
- A group who are actively looking for land to site a co-housing project in the Westside Area. Staff recommended remaining engaged throughout any legislative process to amend or adopt standards that may be useful in development of co-housing projects such as an update of the Planned Development ordinance.
- Interest in a local neighborhood commercial node within walking distance of the cohousing project.
- Need for “missing middle” housing
- Comment on the west end of Sherman Avenue: the area experiences flooding during peak rain events. A design for the road will need to provide proper drainage.
- Advocacy for Morrison Park to remain a park, and the potential for a trail network from Morrison Park to The Hook and other parts of the City, including the Westside Area. Concern that the scope of the Westside Area Concept Plan is focused too narrowly on the study area rather than connecting to the broader city.
- When will development happen in the Westside?
- The need for a community park in the Westside Area. There was advocacy for the 20-acre site that was the subject of study by the PSU students working with the community.
- Interest in the size, location and number of neighborhood parks
- How many existing residents are there in the Westside Area? (follow-up item)
- Extensive transit planning has been happening in the Gorge – the Westside Area Concept Plan should tap into and build on this work
- Interest in capping growth in Hood River, and discussion of how the Statewide land use program seeks to coordinate and accommodate growth in each community
- Can agriculture continue within the UGB? Yes. Can it be a mandated part of the Plan? No, urban land is designated for urban uses, even if that may not happen for many years.
- Question asked about the feasibility of installing roundabouts at key street intersections.
- Question asked about the adequacy of public infrastructure such as sewer and water lines to serve a larger number of homes on the Westside under Scenarios B or C. Also, who will pay for needed infrastructure to serve new neighborhoods?
- Concern regarding extension of 30th Street north and south, and impacts on existing neighborhoods due to increased vehicle traffic. However, appreciation for a potentially more direct route to I-84 via Exit 62.
- Concern regarding this effort to plan for new neighborhoods with parks, trails, sidewalks and bike lanes when taxpayers in many existing neighborhoods don’t have these amenities.
- Question asked if new homes will need to be designed in a manner that reflects existing homes on neighboring properties.
- Question asked about the extent of wetlands and other environmental features in the study area.

Online Open House #1

The survey was available through the Hood River Westside Area Concept Plan project website (www.hrwestsideplan.com) from November 17th through December 9th. The survey addressed respondents’

priorities with regards to transportation, components of the draft vision statement, housing strategies, and proposed land use programs. A detailed summary of the online survey is attached to this memorandum.

Open House #2

Project staff had discussions with community members in individual and small group settings at the event. The following is a partial list of topics and interests discussed:

- Safety concerns with various intersections in and near the study area
- Compatibility of smaller lots with existing residences in the area
- A desire for the City to better communicate the process
- Background of the planning process (Housing needs analysis, economic opportunities analysis)
- Membership and interests that makeup the advisory committees
- Pros and cons of the land use alternatives

Online Open House #2

The survey was available through the Hood River Westside Area Concept Plan project website (www.hrwestsideplan.com) from March 14, 2017 through April 5th, 2017.¹ The survey gathered input on draft frameworks including the pedestrian and bicycle network, parks and open space, the location of a locally-serving commercial area, the Wests Cascade gateway area, and land use strategies. A detailed summary is attached to this memorandum.

Public Comment and News Articles

- **“Westside Plan”, Hood River News, November 3rd, 2016.**
 - About 60 people attended an open house at the Hood River Fire Station on November 17th, 2017 for the Westside Area Concept Plan. The goal of the Plan is to develop an integrated land use and transportation plan for the 450-acre project area, addressing land use, affordable housing, streets, bike ways, pedestrian paths, parks, schools, utilities, and infra-structure funding.
- **“City presents Westside plan”, Hood River News, February 11th, 2017.**
 - The Westside Area Concept Plan is attempting to assess the long-term choices, issues, and opportunities for the Westside Area" of Hood River. The plan envisions that the Westside Area will grow to become an interconnected community of great neighborhoods, an attractive gateway of commercial and mixed-use activity; and an affordable and diverse area of the City.
- **“Westside Area Plan”, Hood River News, March 4th, 2017.**
 - The City of Hood River is engaged in a year-long planning process for the area of town where the most growth will occur in coming years (west of Rand Road and south of Country Club Road). The plan will address transportation and utilities, parks, housing, and other issues.
- **“Our Readers Write: Losing small-town feel”, Hood River News, April 19th, 2017**

¹ The original close date was March 28th, however several requests to keep the survey open were received from residents who were traveling for Spring Break during late March. The City opted to keep the survey open to allow additional opportunity for public input.

- The City has proposed the building of 2,300-plus new units (apartments, single family homes, townhouses, etc.) as part of their Westside Area Concept Plan on the 'undeveloped' west side of Hood River, which will bring roughly 6,000 new residents and add 5,000 additional cars to our roadways.
- With current funding levels, none of the proposed parks and paths as part of the plan are likely to be built as advertised without a new funding ballot measure.
- **“Our Readers Write: Mixed use housing”, Hood River News, May 2nd, 2017.**
 - The City of Hood River is looking at rezoning the westside area from 7,000 square foot lots to smaller 4,000 square foot lots with multifamily housing densities.
 - The City should consider looking at mixed use housing in existing commercial/retail neighborhoods as an alternative. The city council should postpone their decision on the Westside Area Plan until a further study on mixed use housing development has been completed.
- **“Westside Plan Meeting, Forum to happen two nights this week”, Hood River News, August 17, 2017.**
 - Notice of a Hood River Valley Residents Committee forum on August 15th followed by the concept plan meeting on August 16th.
- **“Another Voice: Hood River Planning – don’t leave folks on the other side of the gate,” Hood River News, July 15, 2017.**
 - Opinion column calling for a focus on housing affordability and consideration of future residents.
- **Email correspondence**
 - Questions and concerns about the intersection of Belmont and Fairview and the possibility of improvements.
 - The City has put considerable resources into defining the housing needs, yet there is not much detail about housing in the Westside Area Concept Plan documents online. The city of Hood River has an immense need for affordable housing both for people who meet HUD federal poverty levels, and for those who are lower income but not low enough for HUD assistance.
 - Zoning concepts that had been focused on the Westside are now suggested as being applicable to the rest of the city, which goes beyond the funded scope and published intent of this project. City residents who live outside the Westside have had no notice that this project could have direct effect on their neighborhoods. References to citywide application should be removed.
 - Parts of the draft appear to deliberately limit or preclude public participation in important aspects of proposed neighborhood development, which violates comprehensive plan principles supporting meaningful public participation in important decision-making.
 - Concern about challenges for transportation facilities and stormwater runoff due to topography and increased impermeable surface coverage, and evacuation bottlenecks in the event of fire or other natural disasters.
 - The Housing Needs Analysis of 2015, which assumed an annual projected population increase of 2%, found that adequate land exists under current zoning to accommodate growth if appropriate multifamily development in C-2 zones is maximized.
 - These proposal for significant density increases comes before proper evaluation of these risks and before needed roads, schools, parks, and other critical infrastructure are properly funded, planned, or in place.

- The 2011 Transportation System Plan (TSP) envisions a north/south connector in the Westside area to carry through-traffic and trucks.
- The City should review the TSP north/south road assumptions to verify both the need, and desire for more road capacity, as well as consider new assumptions, which might lead to alternative scenarios more consistent with the goals of the Concept Plan.
- A compromise might be to create an improved north/south connection by stemming-off Frankton south of the Covenant Church (before the steep grade) traversing east across the hillside over to either 30th or May in a design that mitigates the slope.
- The proposed zoning is not sufficient to ensure diverse housing types and sufficient housing supply at all income levels to meet the current and future needs identified in Hood River's Housing Needs Analysis.
- Some people have said that the HNA shows that Hood River could accommodate all of its growth for the next twenty years without changing zoning at all. If so, why is this rezone necessary?
- The quality of life in Hood River has been deteriorating since about 1982.
- This concept like this will only put money in developers' pockets and leave the residents with overcrowded streets and schools, overloaded utilities and water facilities, and poor parks and recreation facilities.
- The 2015 Housing Strategy Report identified the need for more multifamily units and affordable options, and the Westside Concept Plan addresses that need creatively, mixing it intentionally with planning for transportation, parks, natural resources, infrastructure, and financing.
- Newcomers and new wealth displacing long-time residents has been happening for some time, but has been accelerating recently. Young college-educated people with emerging leadership and so much value to offer are moving away because they can't afford to live here.
- We must make Hood River an inclusive and more welcoming, affordable place for everyone already here, and plan realistically for the fact that population growth is inevitable.
- How can we assure that we end up with diverse housing types at all income levels?
- Undergrounding power lines is desired.
- Off-street parking is important.
- The plan should include more background information to educate readers about Oregon planning, the grant process, etc.
- The plan should be more flexible by recommending an overall number of park acres, rather than the number of parks.
- If the plan includes typical (suburban-sized) roads, then the cars will prevail and we will not have supported the guiding principles of the plan.
- I think the document needs a Parking Section to address a broad philosophy and a few specific details. Examples of topics include, street parking (or not) on all streets, parking lots (or not) by parks, allowing apartment builders to use street parking to meet their parking requirements.
- At the end of the day, below-market priced housing will require a funding source. That said, there are many who argue that zoning changes to increase the supply of a variety of housing types is extremely beneficial.
- Raising height limits in commercial zones would make mixed-use development in these areas easier.

- Concern that the responses to the survey were 90% white, while the county as a whole is 1/3 Hispanic.
- Support for the location of a neighborhood-serving commercial node.
- How can the zoning require multifamily buildings, rather than just allowing them?

Appendix B: Infrastructure and Funding

Items in bold are included in the October 11th, 2017 committee Packets. Full draft appendix is available on the project website at www.hrwestsideplan.com

1. **Roadway Cross Sections (New Material)**
2. Transportation Analysis
3. Roundabout Coordination
4. **July 6, 2017 letter from ODOT regarding Exit 62 (New Material)**
5. 2010 Exit 62 Concept Plan and Gateway Illustrations
6. Water, Sewer, Stormwater
7. Technical Memorandum 6.1: Funding Review and Funding Toolkit
8. **Park Lands Acquisition: Code Research and Case Studies (New Material)**

Memorandum



10/4/17


To: Project Management Team
Cc: Project Team
From: Joe Dills and Andrew Parish, Angelo Planning Group, and Walker Macy
Re: Draft Street Cross-Sections

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum describes the existing street cross-sections in the City of Hood River Transportation System Plan (TSP) and introduces new cross sections for roads in the Westside Area. The project team is asked to review the existing cross-sections in the context of the vision and goals of the Westside Area and evaluate whether additional cross sections are needed to implement the Westside Area Concept Plan. The draft Streets Framework Diagram is included at the end of this memorandum for reference.


CROSS-SECTIONS IN THE CURRENT TSP

The following cross sections are in the current TSP.




* Prior to construction of the outer westbound travel lane, the City of Hood River and ODOT will demonstrate the need for the lane based on updated traffic projections and will present the findings to the Historic Columbia River Highway Advisory Committee.


Historic Columbia River Highway - US 30 (Mt. Adams Avenue to 13th Street/OR 281)




Minor Arterial




Commercial/Residential Collector




Neighborhood Collector




Local - Option A




Local - Option B




Local - Option C







- * Recommend 16-feet of paving with 2-foot-wide gravel shoulder on each side, except where alley abuts existing or proposed hard surfacing (e.g. driveway or other parking area). Where alley abuts existing or proposed hard surfacing, alley pavement should tie into abutting hard surfacing (eliminating gravel shoulder).
- ** On-Street Parking prohibited.



- * In constrained areas, vertical clearance may be reduced to a minimum of 8 feet.
- ** Where path abuts existing or proposed hard surface, shoulders shall be paved to tie into the hard surface.
- *** Where not required by City code, can be hard-packed gravel surface.




Six Home Private Street ¹



1. 20 foot private street may be used for up to 6 homes.

Private Street ^{2, 3}




- 2. Cross-Section applies to PUD streets that serve more than 6 homes. An additional 0.50 parking spaces shall be added for each additional unit beyond 6 homes.
- 3. Parking shall be staged to allow room for passing vehicles.

* Recommend 2-foot-wide gravel shoulder on each side, except where private road abuts existing or proposed hard surfacing (e.g. driveway or other parking area).

NEW CROSS-SECTIONS FOR THE WESTSIDE AREA



Included below are three cross sections specifically for the Westside Area. These supersede standard adopted cross-sections. These are considered typical and subject to modification as determined by the City Engineer. For any cross-sections not shown below, the adopted TSP cross sections apply.



MINOR ARTERIAL ALIGNMENT D - WITH TURN LANE

CROSS-SECTION


- This diagram shows the layout of the north-south connector ("Alignment D") in areas where a center left-turn lane is required.



MINOR ARTERIAL ALIGNMENT D - WITHOUT TURN LANE

CROSS-SECTION


- This diagram shows the alignment of the north-south connector (“Alignment D”) during segments where a left-turn lane is not required, allowing for a smaller overall right-of-way.



NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTOR STREET

CROSS-SECTION

- This diagram shows a cross section for the “Neighborhood Connector” shown on the street framework plan. Sidewalks are buffered from the street by a planter/stormwater feature, and bicycle travel is accommodated in 10’ travel lanes with sharrows. The City Engineer would have authority to modify this cross-section for inclusion of bioswales.




HOOD RIVER TSP LOCAL STREET

CROSS-SECTION

- This cross section is consistent with the existing local street diagram “Option A” in the TSP, but it shows on-street parking in the image rather than as a footnote. On-street parking provides a buffer between pedestrians and moving traffic. The City Engineer would have authority to modify this cross-section for inclusion of bioswales.

STREETS FRAMEWORK
10.4.2017
HOOD RIVER WESTSIDE AREA CONCEPT PLAN

-  MINOR ARTERIAL (existing/proposed)
-  COLLECTOR (existing/proposed)
-  NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTOR (proposed)
-  EXISTING STREET
-  PROJECT AREA BOUNDARY
-  CITY BOUNDARY
-  URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY





Kate Brown, Governor

Department of Transportation

Region 1 Headquarters
123 NW Flanders Street
Portland, Oregon 97209
(503) 731.8200
FAX (503) 731.8531

July 6, 2017

MEMORANDUM

To: Steve Wheeler, Cindy Wallbridge, Kevin Liburdy, City of Hood River

From: Gail Curtis, Senior Planner, ODOT

Subject: Westside Area Concept Plan TPR compliance at time of comprehensive plan amendment

The purpose of this memo is to identify the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) provision that will enable compliance with the TPR at the time of adoption of the Westside Area Concept Plan.

The TPR allows that a local government may request a “reasonably likely [funding]” letter from ODOT in situations where a land use amendment will have a significant effect on the state transportation system. The letter indicates that the needed improvements will be provided by the end of the planning period, which is 2040 in this case.

To exercise this TPR provision, I recommend that the city establish an understanding with ODOT regarding the “reasonably likely” funding for Exit 62 improvements. Based on that understanding the city should submit a formal request for ODOT to provide a “reasonably likely [funding]” letter in advance of the adoption process.

Explanation of TPR Provision:

TPR test: If an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation (including a zoning map) would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, then the local government must mitigate that effect as provided in the TPR 660-012-0060(1).

One of the TPR mitigation options, from **660-012-0060(4)(c)**, applies when there is an Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP). In this case, it has been determined that the Westside Area Concept Plan would have a significant effect on the I-84 interchange at Exit 62 which has an adopted IAMP. In accordance with this provision, the City may rely on the improvements identified in the IAMP and the City of Hood River TSP if ODOT provides a “reasonably likely” letter stating that improvements needed to mitigate the effect are reasonably likely to be in place by the end of the planning period.

Further, ODOT's understanding is that the other TSP transportation needs associated with the Westside Area Concept Plan will be addressed through development, redevelopment, funds the city has or is able to obtain, or, possibly, county funds. This includes investments on Cascade Avenue.

Attachment: TPR 660-012-0060

ATTACHMENT

660-012-0060

Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments

(1) If an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation (including a zoning map) would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, then the local government must put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule, unless the amendment is allowed under section (3), (9) or (10) of this rule. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:

(a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);

(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or

(c) Result in any of the effects listed in paragraphs (A) through (C) of this subsection based on projected conditions measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted TSP. As part of evaluating projected conditions, the amount of traffic projected to be generated within the area of the amendment may be reduced if the amendment includes an enforceable, ongoing requirement that would demonstrably limit traffic generation, including, but not limited to, transportation demand management. This reduction may diminish or completely eliminate the significant effect of the amendment.

(A) Types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;

(B) Degrade the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility such that it would not meet the performance standards identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or

(C) Degrade the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to not meet the performance standards identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.

(2) If a local government determines that there would be a significant effect, then the local government must ensure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards of the facility measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted TSP through one or a combination of the remedies listed in (a) through (e) below, unless the amendment meets the balancing test in subsection (2)(e) of this section or qualifies for partial mitigation in section (11) of this rule. A local government using subsection (2)(e), section (3), section (10) or section (11) to approve an amendment

recognizes that additional motor vehicle traffic congestion may result and that other facility providers would not be expected to provide additional capacity for motor vehicles in response to this congestion.

(a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility.

(b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of this division; such amendments shall include a funding plan or mechanism consistent with section (4) or include an amendment to the transportation finance plan so that the facility, improvement, or service will be provided by the end of the planning period.

(c) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.

(d) Providing other measures as a condition of development or through a development agreement or similar funding method, including, but not limited to, transportation system management measures or minor transportation improvements. Local governments shall, as part of the amendment, specify when measures or improvements provided pursuant to this subsection will be provided.

(e) Providing improvements that would benefit modes other than the significantly affected mode, improvements to facilities other than the significantly affected facility, or improvements at other locations, if:

(A) The provider of the significantly affected facility provides a written statement that the system-wide benefits are sufficient to balance the significant effect, even though the improvements would not result in consistency for all performance standards;

(B) The providers of facilities being improved at other locations provide written statements of approval; and

(C) The local jurisdictions where facilities are being improved provide written statements of approval.

(3) Notwithstanding sections (1) and (2) of this rule, a local government may approve an amendment that would significantly affect an existing transportation facility without assuring that the allowed land uses are consistent with the function, capacity and performance standards of the facility where:

(a) In the absence of the amendment, planned transportation facilities, improvements and services as set forth in section (4) of this rule would not be adequate to achieve consistency with the identified function, capacity or performance standard for that facility by the end of the planning period identified in the adopted TSP;

(b) Development resulting from the amendment will, at a minimum, mitigate the impacts of the amendment in a manner that avoids further degradation to the performance of the facility by the time of the development through one or a combination of transportation improvements or measures;

(c) The amendment does not involve property located in an interchange area as defined in paragraph (4)(d)(C); and

(d) For affected state highways, ODOT provides a written statement that the proposed funding and timing for the identified mitigation improvements or measures are, at a minimum, sufficient to avoid further degradation to the performance of the affected state highway. However, if a local government provides the appropriate ODOT regional office with written notice of a proposed amendment in a manner that provides ODOT reasonable opportunity to submit a written statement into the record of the local government proceeding, and ODOT does not provide a written statement, then the local government may proceed with applying subsections (a) through (c) of this section.

(4) Determinations under sections (1)–(3) of this rule shall be coordinated with affected transportation facility and service providers and other affected local governments.

(a) In determining whether an amendment has a significant effect on an existing or planned transportation facility under subsection (1)(c) of this rule, local governments shall rely on existing transportation facilities and services and on the planned transportation facilities, improvements and services set forth in subsections (b) and (c) below.

(b) Outside of interstate interchange areas, the following are considered planned facilities, improvements and services:

(A) Transportation facilities, improvements or services that are funded for construction or implementation in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program or a locally or regionally adopted transportation improvement program or capital improvement plan or program of a transportation service provider.

(B) Transportation facilities, improvements or services that are authorized in a local transportation system plan and for which a funding plan or mechanism is in place or approved. These include, but are not limited to, transportation facilities, improvements or services for which: transportation systems development charge revenues are being collected; a local improvement district or reimbursement district has been established or will be established prior to development; a development agreement has been adopted; or conditions of approval to fund the improvement have been adopted.

(C) Transportation facilities, improvements or services in a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) area that are part of the area's federally-approved, financially constrained regional transportation system plan.

(D) Improvements to state highways that are included as planned improvements in a regional or local transportation system plan or comprehensive plan when ODOT provides a written statement that the improvements are reasonably likely to be provided by the end of the planning period.

(E) Improvements to regional and local roads, streets or other transportation facilities or services that are included as planned improvements in a regional or local transportation system plan or comprehensive plan when the local government(s) or transportation service provider(s)

responsible for the facility, improvement or service provides a written statement that the facility, improvement or service is reasonably likely to be provided by the end of the planning period.

(c) **Within interstate interchange areas,** the improvements included in (b)(A)–(C) are considered planned facilities, improvements and services, except where:

(A) ODOT provides a written statement that the proposed funding and timing of mitigation measures are sufficient to avoid a significant adverse impact on the Interstate Highway system, then local governments may also rely on the improvements identified in paragraphs (b)(D) and (E) of this section; **or**

(B) **There is an adopted interchange area management plan, then local governments may also rely on the improvements identified in that plan** and which are also identified in paragraphs (b)(D) and (E) of this section.

(d) As used in this section and section (3):

(A) Planned interchange means new interchanges and relocation of existing interchanges that are authorized in an adopted transportation system plan or comprehensive plan;

(B) **Interstate highway means Interstates 5, 82, 84,** 105, 205 and 405; and

(C) Interstate interchange area means:

(i) Property within one-quarter mile of the ramp terminal intersection of an existing or planned interchange on an Interstate Highway; or

(ii) The interchange area as defined in the Interchange Area Management Plan adopted as an amendment to the Oregon Highway Plan.

(e) For purposes of this section, a written statement provided pursuant to paragraphs (b)(D), (b)(E) or (c)(A) provided by ODOT, a local government or transportation facility provider, as appropriate, shall be conclusive in determining whether a transportation facility, improvement or service is a planned transportation facility, improvement or service. In the absence of a written statement, a local government can only rely upon planned transportation facilities, improvements and services identified in paragraphs (b)(A)–(C) to determine whether there is a significant effect that requires application of the remedies in section (2).



MEMORANDUM**Park Lands Acquisition: Code Research and Case Studies**
City of Gresham

DATE August 1, 2017
TO Ken Koblitz and Michelle Kimble, City of Gresham
FROM Jamin Kimmell, Angelo Planning Group
Joe Dills, Angelo Planning Group
Cathy Corliss, Angelo Planning Group

The purpose of this memo is to document the research performed by Angelo Planning Group (APG) on approaches to acquiring land for parks through the development review or annexation process for the City of Gresham. The memo is organized into five sections:

1. Background information on the issue and purpose of the research;
2. Legal considerations/questions;
3. Precedent examples of from other jurisdictions;
4. Findings of three case studies of jurisdictions in Oregon; and
5. Preliminary recommendations

NOTE: APG is not a law firm and therefore cannot provide legal advice. This memorandum is intended for general information. The City should discuss these issues with its legal counsel.

1. BACKGROUND

The purpose of this research memo is to assess options for establishing a more clear and objective procedure for acquiring land for parks through the development review or annexation process. The City of Gresham does not currently require that lands designated for parks be dedicated or acquired by the City during either the annexation or development review process. Currently, the City asks for the cooperation of developers and property owners to voluntarily sell land that is planned for parks to the City either prior to development or during development review. This process is undefined, administratively complex, and does not ensure that land will be preserved for parks in the locations designated by local plans. The City desires a more clear and objective procedure that is integrated with the annexation or development review process.

City staff have discussed the possibility of establishing a regulatory procedure to address this issue in the past. In 2007, staff considered options for requiring land be preserved for parks within the

Pleasant Valley area, where development had been proposed. Staff determined that the Pleasant Valley Plan District and Master Plan provisions were not intended to require that park land be dedicated to the City. The Plan District and the Master Plan provisions encouraged that the locations of parks be identified in future Master Plans for new development, but did not stipulate that those lands must be dedicated to or acquired by the City. In response, planning staff proposed options for establishing this requirement, including amending the Development Code or the annexation policies in the Comprehensive Plan. Legal staff considered the potential amendments and recommended that any requirements be based on objective standards, such as a formula that calculates the amount of required land based on the number of dwelling units proposed in the development. An objective standard would be more consistent with established legal standards that govern development exactions. The City did not move forward with adopting any code or policy amendments at the time.

2. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS/QUESTIONS

Requiring dedication or acquisition of park land

The legal basis for requiring park lands to be dedicated or acquired by the City is one of the primary questions related to such regulations. APG conducted research on national cases and best practices to identify case law or statutes that directly prohibit local governments from requiring that land be dedicated or acquired for parks. No cases or statutes were found to directly prohibit this requirement; however, the requirement appears to fall under the general legal framework associated with “takings”. The Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution guarantees that in no case will “private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.” If a property is appropriated by the government without just compensation, it is considered a takings and a violation of the Constitution.

It is our understanding that the City proposes to compensate property owners for the fair market value of any land acquired for parks and avoid takings claims. In most cases, the City desires to cooperate and negotiate with property owners to engage in a voluntary agreement to acquire land. The purpose of this research is to lay out some of the procedures and limitations that might apply should the property owner be unwilling to sell the land for a public park. There are three types of government actions that, in some circumstances, could be considered a taking if the local government does not proceed within the applicable limitations:

- **Direct condemnation.** A direct condemnation occurs when a government directly requires a property owner to sell land. If the land is acquired for a legitimate public use and the property owner is paid just compensation, then it is not a taking. In Oregon, condemnation of land for use as a park is considered a legitimate public use and permitted by statute.¹

¹ See ORS 226.320 Authority to acquire land for certain purposes

- **Regulatory taking.** A land use regulation that completely eliminates or greatly lowers the value of land, without just compensation, could be considered a regulatory taking. For example, if the City were to adopt a requirement that all park lands be acquired by the City at the time of development, and a planned park constituted all or the great majority of a property owner's land, the property owner could argue that the regulation effectively eliminates the value of the land for development, and thus is a regulatory taking. In this case, the City may be obligated to compensate the land owner at the point when the regulation went into effect, as it was the regulation itself that eliminated or greatly reduced the value of the land. The determination of whether the regulation constitutes a taking is complex and depends on a number of factors. The City should closely evaluate the potential for any park land acquisition requirement to be construed as a regulatory taking for some property owners in specific circumstances. There may be methods of drafting the code language to reduce this risk.
- **Exaction.** An exaction is a fee or cost imposed on a developer or property owner intended to offset or mitigate the impacts of a proposed development. The City currently collects System Development Charges (SDCs) for parks, which are a form of development exaction. Exactions may be considered takings if they violate two criteria established in the "Nollan/Dolan" cases that were decided by the U.S. Supreme Court.²
 - **Nexus:** There must be a "rational nexus" between the exaction and the impact of the development. In other terms, the exaction must be related to an impact that is clearly attributable to the development. In the case of park land acquisition, this criteria is relatively easy to demonstrate, as the land for the park will be located in close proximity and clearly serve the residents of a proposed development.
 - **Proportionality:** The exaction must be "roughly proportional" to the impact created by the development. Proportionality should be demonstrated by objective measures and standards to the greatest extent possible. For parks, proportionality is usually operationalized as a "level of service" standard that is measured as a number of acres of parkland needed per dwelling unit. The City's SDCs are calculated based on a proportional, level of service standard.

Implications for park land acquisition

The City seeks to achieve acquisition of park lands while minimizing or eliminating the possibility of a takings claim, and in the spirit of a fair and transparent process. The City has the authority to acquire land for parks, but the procedure for doing so depends on the situation.

In the case of a development review, the process could potentially proceed as follows:


1. **Proportional exaction.** The City would require, based on adopted code, that the developer dedicate or allow the City to purchase an amount of land that is proportional to the impact

² *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission*, 483 U.S. 825 (1987) and *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, 512 U.S. 374 (1994)

of the development. Proportionality would be based on a level of service standard, ideally consistent with or equal to the standard used to calculate the portion of Parks SDCs that covers the costs of land acquisitions. Proportional exactions do not require dedication; the land could be purchased by the City. However, if a developer dedicates the land, they could be credited the value of the dedication. If the developer requests the City purchase the land, then no SDC credits would be applied. If the proportional exaction of land is sufficient to cover the amount of land that is needed for the park and owned by the developer, then the acquisition is complete.

2. **Supplemental purchase.** If the proportional exaction is insufficient based on the amount of land owned by the developer in relation to the identified park boundaries, then the City could offer to purchase the remaining land at fair market value (see Figure 1). Any compensation would likely need to be paid in cash rather than an SDC credit, because it would be over and above the amount of the Parks SDC, which is proportional to the impact of the development. If the City were to adopt a regulation that requires the land be dedicated or acquired by the City, then having that adopted requirement could be considered a regulatory taking in some circumstances. The City is also free to offer “carrots” to incentivize the supplemental purchase, e.g. waiver of all or part of the SDCs for the proportional exaction, or other regulatory or financial incentives.

Figure 1. Illustration of Example Park Land Acquisition Scenario



3. **Condemnation (if necessary).** If the developer does not agree to comply with the supplemental purchase, the City could acquire the land through a condemnation procedure. The developer would still be compensated fair market value. This process would need to conform with the general procedures for condemnation prescribed by state statute.³ The developer could still proceed with development of the surrounding area.

Annexation agreements

It may be possible for the City to require more land to be dedicated or acquired than what is proportional to the impact of the development if the transaction is included as part of an annexation agreement. If the developer or property owner has not yet annexed to the City, and sees significant value in doing so, then they may be willing to agree to dedicate or sell the land if it enables annexation. As a “voluntary” contract between two parties, annexation agreements may not be subject to the limitations on exactions required by Nollan/Dolan. If the property owner did not want to sign the agreement, they could always elect to not annex into the City.

In contractual agreements between two parties, one party may waive its constitutional rights when voluntarily entering into the contract. This waiver would be included as a term of the agreement.⁴ Therefore, the proportionality criterion that limits exactions would not be applicable. The only limitation is the voluntary cooperation of the developer or property owner in entering the contract. The City would need to consider how any requirements to dedicate or sell land for parks would affect the overall negotiation with the property owner and weigh the costs and benefits of the requirement.

Development agreements

Development agreements may be another method for requiring more land be dedicated or acquired than what is proportional to the development; however, it is unclear if the limitations on exactions apply to development agreements. LUBA has ruled that development agreements made pursuant to ORS 94.504 are land use decisions and subject to LUBA’s jurisdiction.⁵ It is not clear whether the implication of this ruling is that development agreements, as land use decisions, may include waivers of Nollan/Dolan rights as a term of the agreement. We recommend the City seek legal counsel on this question.

3. PRECEDENT EXAMPLES

APG collected examples of jurisdictions across the country and in the state of Oregon that have adopted park land dedication ordinances. The following examples are relevant and potentially

³ See ORS Chapter 35.

⁴ The City of Canby has codified this authority. See Canby Municipal Code, Division VI, Chapter 16.84.040. Available at <http://canbyoregon.gov/Chap16/16.84ANNEXATIONS.pdf>

⁵ LUBA No 2007-265. Available at: <http://www.oregon.gov/LUBA/docs/opinions/2008/07-08/07256.pdf>

useful as references for guidelines and best practices when drafting policy or code amendments to address this issue:

- Three large cities were found to have adopted specific park land dedication requirements: Lakewood, Colorado; Austin, Texas; and St. Paul, Minnesota.⁶
- The State of Pennsylvania has adopted state law that enables local jurisdictions to require park land dedications. The Pennsylvania Land Trust publishes guidelines for jurisdictions to implement this requirement.⁷
- The Tennessee Parks and Recreation Association has organized conference sessions on this topic that include useful guidance for drafting clear and defensible code provisions.⁸

Within the state of Oregon, we identified the following jurisdictions with adopted park land dedication or acquisition requirements: Bend, Washington County (North Bethany Subarea), Sandy, Veneta, Canby, and Pendleton. Other than Washington County, we did not identify any other jurisdictions in the Portland Metro area that have adopted park land dedication requirements. The City of Tualatin requires public land acquisition for greenways and natural areas, which often include trails; however, these lands are usually located in riparian corridors that are not developable. The City of Oregon City acquires park land as a condition of approval of an annexation in some cases, but the amount of land required or the location of parks is not specified in code or policies. Several cities require open space in Planned Unit Developments but the open space is not required to be in public ownership as it can be owned and maintained by a homeowners association. Many cities achieve the majority or all park land acquisition through proactive negotiations with property owners prior to a proposed development or rely on voluntary cooperation of developers or property owners when development is proposed.

4. CASE STUDIES

This section of the memo summarizes the findings for three case studies of jurisdictions in Oregon that have adopted park land acquisition or dedication requirements: the City of Bend, Washington County, and the City of Sandy. In addition to reviewing relevant code provisions and planning documents, phone interviews with staff from each jurisdiction were conducted to assess the effectiveness of the requirements and guidelines for implementation.

City of Bend

Steve Jorgenson, Parks Planner, Bend Parks and Recreation District
Phone interview on May 25, 2017

⁶ See the following links for the code provisions: [Lakewood](#), [Austin](#), and [St. Paul](#)

⁷ [Pennsylvania Public Land Trust: Public Dedication of Land and Fees-in-Lieu for Parks and Recreation.](#)

⁸ [Park Land Dedication Ordinances, Tennessee Parks and Recreation Conference, November 2015.](#)

The City of Bend requires that land designated for parks be transferred (with compensation) to the Bend Parks and Recreation District wherever the proposed development meets certain criteria. The code provision is part of the City's Public Improvement Standards.⁹ The requirement applies citywide, but is only intended to require land acquisition for neighborhood parks (it does not apply to community or regional parks). In order to meet the criteria, the proposed development must be in a park service area with an identified park need in an adopted plan, be at least 10 acres in size, and include land that is suitable for a public park. The Bend Parks and Recreation Master Plan indicates park service areas—areas with a need for a neighborhood park—and in some cases identifies the specific location of parks (Figure 1). The code provides that the City can determine the specific location and size of land for the park. The price of the land is based on its appraised value under the base zoning requirements, prior to development approval. The code includes a reference to the Nollan/Dolan principles: the City must demonstrate that the required dedication is consistent with regulations that govern all conditions of approval, which stipulate that the conditions must be related to and roughly proportional to the impact of the development.


The City of Bend has not acquired a significant amount of land for parks by applying these code requirements. Most land needed for parks has been acquired through proactive negotiation with property owners prior to a proposed development. However, staff did note that the existence of the code requirement may incentivize property owners to engage in negotiations as they may be required to dedicate the land prior to approval of any future development. The City applies similar code provisions for trails, however, which are used widely and successfully to acquire lands for trails through development review.

One strength of Bend's code is that it requires the appraisal of the land value—which is used to determine the purchase price for acquisition—to occur prior to approval of the development. If the appraisal occurred after approval, it is possible that the appraisal may be based on the value of the land as if it were subdivided and entitled for development, which increases the value and thus the cost to the public agency.

There are some limitations to Bend's approach, however. The requirement cannot be applied to land needed for community parks, because there is no specific plan for community parks that designates their location, establishes a service area, or defines a level of service (LOS) standard that could be used to calculate the amount of land needed for parks as a result of any particular development. Additionally, the code does not address whether a development would be eligible for System Development Charge (SDC) credits if land is dedicated to or acquired by a public agency.

⁹ Bend Development Code, Chapter 3.4, Section 3.4.300 Public Use Areas.

Figure 2. Bend Neighborhood Parks Plan



Washington County

Jeannine Rustad, Parks Planner, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District

Phone interview on May 22, 2017

Washington County, in coordination with the Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District (THPRD), requires that land designated for parks in the North Bethany Subarea be transferred to public ownership under THPRD. The requirement is included in the County's Public Facility and Service Requirements.¹⁰ It only applies in the North Bethany Subarea and is limited to neighborhood parks, trails, or other off-street pedestrian routes. North Bethany is a 700-acre Urban Growth Boundary expansion area that is similar to Pleasant Valley in that it has a Concept Plan and an adopted Community Plan. Most of the neighborhood parks are identified in a fixed location in the North Bethany Subarea Plan, but some parks are designated for a more general area (Figure 2). The location of the park is determined—or adjusted if already determined by the subarea plan—if the location meets certain criteria defined in the code. Intent for the land to be acquired by THPRD must be documented prior to development approval; however, the purchase price and other terms of the agreement may be specified at a later date.


County staff generally perceive the code provisions specific to the North Bethany subarea as having allowed the County and THPRD to acquire more land for parks than in other subareas where the requirement does not apply. However, the requirement can be complex to administer, primarily because the parks plan for the area does not specify the location of all parks and the code does not define all of the procedures by which the land will be acquired. THPRD staff have needed to dedicate a significant amount of time to negotiating with developers about the location of parks and the purchase price for the land.

Because the code does not specify the assumptions underlying the appraisal of land value, THPRD and developers must agree to a fair and reasonable valuation of the land. Generally, THPRD believes the land value should be based on the development capacity of the base zone with no improvements and no entitlements (subdivision or development approval). The developers and property owners have argued that the appraisal should include the value of the land if it were entitled for development.

A second challenge with Washington County's approach is that the timing of acquisition related to collecting SDCs can create cash flow issues. The County's parks and recreation SDCs are formulated to include the cost of land acquisition. Therefore, if a developer conveys land to THPRD for a park, the developer does not receive a credit on their SDCs for the cost of the land because the developer has already been compensated for that cost. The County recovers the cost of acquiring the land, or a portion of the cost, when it receives the SDC payment from the developer upon approval of building permits. Thus, the County must make an outlay of cash to acquire the land prior to collecting the revenue from SDCs that is intended to cover that cost.

¹⁰ Washington County Community Development Code, Article V, Chapter 501, Section 501-10 Standards for Development Within the North Bethany Subarea Plan Area

Figure 2. North Bethany Subarea Parks Plan



The City of Sandy

Kelly O'Neill, Community Development Director, Bend Parks and Recreation District

Phone interview on June 4, 2017

The City of Sandy has adopted a park land dedication ordinance that has been in place since the 1990s. The regulations are located within the City's general development regulations.¹¹ The code requires land to be dedicated to the City or a fee paid in-lieu of land dedication. The City's parks SDGs do not include the cost of land acquisition—they are limited to the cost of development and capital improvements—therefore, this park land dedication requirement functions as a fee to recover this portion of the cost of parks. The code applies to all subdivisions, partitions, Planned Developments, or multi-family developments. The amount of the land, or the fee-in-lieu, is based on a population factor determined by the Parks Master Plan (number of acres of parks per person). The City has the authority to either accept the land or the fee-in-lieu, depending on the proposed development. If the City decides to accept a fee-in-lieu, the amount of the fee is calculated based on a standardized rate (dollar value per acre) that applies to all land in the city.

Overall, staff report that the park land dedication code is a necessary and effective means for the City to ensure implementation of the Parks Master Plan. The fee-in-lieu option is used extensively—significantly more often than the land dedication requirement—as the City is relatively selective about the lands they will accept for parks uses. If land is accepted, the land is almost always identified for park use on the Parks Master Plan.

The system is generally received favorably by developers and property owners. On occasion, a developer will attempt to dedicate land to the City that is not suitable for a park use, and thus the City must require that the developer pay the fee-in-lieu despite having proposed a land dedication. The City finds the procedure to be relatively simple to administer. The amount of land is based on a standardized formula and the determination of whether land is suitable for a park is usually directly linked to the Parks Master Plan. The land need formula includes both neighborhood parks and community parks.

The amount of the fee-in-lieu is also relatively straightforward to determine as it is based on a standardized rate rather than an appraisal specific to a tract of land. However, one challenge associated with the standardized rate is that it must be increased over time and may not keep pace with the actual cost of the land. The code also includes a provision that allows a developer to split the fee into two payments, before and after final plat approval. This allows the developer to generate some revenue after final plat—but before building permits are issued—to pay for the cost of the fee. This provision has been well-received by developers.

¹¹ City of Sandy Municipal Code, Chapter 17.86, Parkland and Open Space.

6. PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

This section of the memo presents preliminary recommended strategies for the City to consider to acquire land for parks. As detailed below, we recommend an overall strategy of pursuing proactive acquisition of land prior to annexation or development. If the property owner is unwilling to sell, then the City may pursue acquisition as a part of a broader annexation agreement or as a code requirement to be addressed in a development application.

Proactive acquisition

A key finding of this research is that no jurisdictions we contacted or interviewed use the development review process as the primary method of acquiring park land. All jurisdictions we spoke with sought to acquire land for parks through proactive contacts and negotiations with property owners prior to annexation or development. The advantage of this approach is that land may be acquired prior to it being marketable for development, when developers may be attempting to purchase the land or the property owners may be interested in developing it themselves. This approach, of course, relies on the property owner being willing to sell and the City being able to provide an attractive offer. Proactive acquisition is worth pursuing in all cases, given some of the limitations and complexities of acquiring land through annexation or development review.

Acquisition through annexation agreements

If proactive acquisition is not feasible, we recommend strategies for land acquisition be integrated into both the annexation and development review processes. A key concept to consider regarding this overall approach is the proportionality of the requirement related to the impact or size of the development. As noted above, the proportionality limits related to exactions may not apply to the annexation process. Thus, the City could utilize annexation agreements to acquire lands needed to completely implement park plans, even if the acquisition may not meet a strict test of proportionality.

Annexation may offer a more flexible and strategic approach to land acquisition than what can be accomplished through the development review process. The City Attorney and legal staff should be consulted to clearly define the legal requirements applicable to annexation. This initial research found that the Nollan/Dolan principles may not be applicable to annexation agreements when Nollan/Dolan criteria are waived within the agreements; however, legal counsel is needed to confirm this finding. We identified two examples of other cities in Oregon that use annexation agreements that require the waiver of Nollan/Dolan criteria.¹²

¹² The City of Canby has codified this waiver be required in annexation or development agreements. See Canby Municipal Code, Division VI, Chapter 16.84.040. Available at <http://canbyoregon.gov/Chap16/16.84ANNEXATIONS.pdf>

See provision number 8 in this example annexation agreement from the City of Bend: http://bend.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=5&clip_id=299&meta_id=6602

If legal counsel agrees with this interpretation, the City should consider the following approach to annexation:

- 1. Update annexation policies and procedures.** The City should review and revise annexation policies and procedures to ensure that they sufficiently establish the City's authority to require that land for parks be dedicated or acquired, and that annexation may be conditioned on the assurance that land for parks will be conveyed to the City. The policy should describe the importance of complete implementation of community plans and provision of the full range of services, including parks and associated recreation facilities. The policy should also state that the amount and location of the land will be based on adopted plans, but may be revised to account for a change in circumstances. The policy may also establish that annexation agreements include time limits to ensure that the proposed development occurs in a reasonable timeframe. The City may also consider including provisions that SDC credits will be made available toward future development in exchange for land dedications.
- 2. Leverage annexation agreements to assure acquisition of park lands.** The City should utilize the flexible and voluntary nature of annexation agreements to assure that sufficient land will be conveyed to the City for parks. The terms of the annexation agreement should specify the amount and approximate location of land to be acquired. The final boundaries of the park may be platted at the development review stage. Satisfying the terms of the annexation agreement will be a condition of approval for any proposed development.

Acquisition through development review

Some planned parks are located on lands already annexed into the City of Gresham; thus, absent a friendly sale, parks would need to be acquired through the development review process. As outlined above, the legal context for a regulatory requirement that land be acquired for parks during development review is subject to more scrutiny related to takings claims than an annexation agreement. The Development Code should specify the criteria, standards, and process that will govern the land acquisition. The following is an outline of the general code concepts that need to be addressed and discussion of potential options for how to structure the regulations.

- 1. Authority and Purpose.** The code will need to establish that the City has the authority to require dedication or acquisition, with compensation, pursuant to the provisions of the code section. This section may also establish the general purpose of the code provision to ensure the implementation of the parks plan and create complete communities.
- 2. Relationship to Parks SDCs.**
 - *Purpose in Conjunction with SDCs.* The code should explain the relationship of this requirement to the parks SDCs. An initial recommendation is to describe that the parks SDCs provide a revenue source to pay for the cost of land acquisition but do not ensure that specific locations are preserved for park uses. This code provision, as part of the City's land use regulations, ensures that lands designated for parks are used for parks.

- *SDC Credits.* A developer may receive a credit on the parks SDC for the cost of land if the land is dedicated to the City. If the developer is compensated for the land then they will not be eligible for a SDC credit, except if making park-related improvements.
- 3. Applicability.** The code should specify the applicability of this regulation to both the park locations and the types of development.
- *Park locations.* The Gresham Parks Master Plan does not include a map of planned parks. However, the parks SDC Methodology includes a specific list and map of planned park projects. Parks are also identified in the Pleasant Valley Plan District. The code should specify the planned park locations that will be the primary basis for determining lands that need to be acquired for parks. Additionally, the City may elect to include a discretionary criterion that allows for the location of the park to be adjusted or a new park location determined in order to meet an identified need in the Parks Master Plan, or other City requirement, such as conditions of approval of a development agreement.
 - *Types of development.* The code should specify the types and sizes of development that will be subject to this requirement. A minimum size of the subdivision may be established, for example. The City should consider if the requirement should be applicable to Planned Developments or multi-family developments. The code may also address how this provision applies to phased developments.
- 4. Proportional Dedication.** This section could establish that the City will require a dedication of land that is proportional to the impact of the development, based on a level of service standard. If the land is dedicated to the City (not purchased), then the developer would be eligible for a SDC credit for the value of the dedication. If the land is purchased, then the developer has been compensated and they are still obligated to contribute SDCs. As noted above, the City has options for how to set the level-of-service standard that will apply:
- *Single Citywide Standard.* The City may adopt a single citywide standard for how much park land is required based on the size of the development (number of dwelling units). The City has adopted LOS standards in both the Parks Master Plan and the SDC Methodology. Either standard may be used, but legal counsel should advise on the legal basis of the standard. In some cases, the amount of land owned and proposed for development in an area designated for a park may be greater than the amount of land that can be required of the developer under a proportional calculation.
 - *District Standards.* As defined by the City's SDC methodology, the City may define multiple standards based on the location of the development. The SDC methodology defines standards for the City generally, the Pleasant Valley area, and the Springwater area. The advantage of this approach is that the City can ensure that the amount of land dedicated is sufficient to meet the specific park needs of different areas of the City.
- 5. Supplemental Purchase.** This section could establish that, in some circumstances, the City will offer to purchase additional land to be used for the park. The City could consider language that states that the acquisition of land is required in order to approve the development; however, legal counsel should advise as to whether the adoption of such a

requirement (in conjunction with a map identifying specific properties) in itself could be argued to represent an action that requires compensation (regulatory taking). As noted above, in the case of an unwilling seller, the City has an option to consider condemnation.

6. Procedures. The code should establish the procedures by which the land will be dedicated or acquired, including the following.

- *Documentation.* The code should define the legal documentation necessary to convey the land and when it must be finalized relative to approval of the development.
- *Land valuation.* The City has options for how to determine the market value of the land for the purposes of public acquisition, or in the case of dedication, SDC credits.
 - The valuation could be based on a standardized rate applied citywide or based on a subarea of the city. This may be the same rate used in the SDC Methodology. The advantage of this approach is that it is simple to administer. The disadvantages include that it may not be sufficient to cover the actual cost of land if the rate is not representative of the cost in areas where parks are needed, or that the rate does not keep up with the cost of land as it increases over time.
 - The valuation could be based on an appraisal of the land. The code should specify some terms of the appraisal, including when it occurs relative to development approval and what assumptions are made about the status of the land and capacity for development. The City may consider consulting a land appraiser when drafting this section.
- *Status of land.* The code may specify standards for the status of the land at the time it is acquired. An environmental assessment may be required prior to acquisition. The City may require that the developer clear, fill, and/or grade the land, or even install frontage improvements.

Appendix C: Housing and Affordability

Items in bold are included in the October 11th, 2017 committee Packets. Full draft appendix is available on the project website at www.hrwestsideplan.com

1. Memo: Questions about the Housing Needs Analysis (**New Material**)
2. Housing Basis Memo
3. Housing Implementation for the Westside Area Concept Plan



DATE: September 28, 2017
TO: Joe Dills
FROM: Beth Goodman
SUBJECT: HOOD RIVER: QUESTIONS ABOUT THE HOUSING NEEDS ANALYSIS

The Hood River Westside Area Concept Plan project is developing the framework for development of an area within Hood River. The project includes plans for infrastructure development and changes to Hood River's zoning code. The starting point for the Westside Area Concept Plan is the Hood River Housing Needs Analysis, completed by ECONorthwest in 2015.

One of the questions that has come up during the public discussions of the Westside Area Concept Plan is whether the City should revisit the Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) because new population forecasts for the city show slower population growth than the population forecast used in the HNA.

This memorandum addresses this question and describes the results of the HNA as they apply to planning in the Westside Area Concept Plan process.

Context for discussion

Before discussing the findings of the HNA and their implications for future planning in Hood River, it is useful to consider the requirements of Goal 10 and the changes to the population forecast for Hood River.

Requirements of Goal 10

Hood River's HNA was developed to meet the requirements of Goal 10.¹ The key requirements of Goal 10 are that cities: (1) provide appropriate types and amounts of land within their urban growth boundary to accommodate growth of needed housing types² and (2) that cities provide opportunities for development of housing that meets the needs of household of all income levels. As we discuss in the memorandum below, Hood River's residential land base was insufficient to accommodate expected residential growth (requiring assumptions about growth

¹ The requirements of Goal 10 are described in Oregon Administrative Rule 660-008, ORS 197.295 to 197.314, and ORS 197.475 to 197.490.

² Goal 10 defines needed housing types as "housing types determined to meet the need shown for housing within an urban growth boundary at particular price ranges and rent levels." ORS 197.303 defines needed housing types as:

- (a) Housing that includes, but is not limited to, attached and detached single-family housing and multifamily housing for both owner and renter occupancy;
- (b) Government-assisted housing;
- (c) Mobile home or manufactured dwelling parks as provided in ORS 197.475 to 197.490; and
- (d) Manufactured homes on individual lots planned and zoned for single-family residential use that are in addition to lots within designated manufactured dwelling subdivisions.

of multifamily housing in commercial zones) and did not provide sufficient opportunities for development of housing to meet all income levels. The Hood River Housing Strategy, completed as part of the HNA project, described potential actions to address these issues, such as allowing a wider-range of housing types in single-family zones, re-zoning land to provide opportunities for multifamily development, and policies to increase development of affordable housing.

New population forecasts

The HNA is based on the forecast that was the City's official forecast at the time the HNA was adopted. It showed that the Hood River Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) would grow from 9,317 people in 2015 to 13,845 people in 2035. This is an increase of 4,528 people at an average annual growth rate of 2.0%.

In the time since the HNA was adopted, Portland State University's Population Research Center developed a new, official population forecast for the Hood River UGB. This forecast shows that the Hood River UGB will grow from 9,675 people in 2016 to 12,576 people in 2035. Adjusting the forecast to a 20-year period³ shows that Hood River's UGB will have 12,725 new people by 2036. This is an increase of 3,050 people at an average annual growth rate of 1.4%.

The difference in population increase between the forecast used in the HNA and in the new forecast is 1,478, with less growth in the new forecast.

The HNA shows that the increase of 4,528 people will result in demand for 1,985 new dwelling units. Using the same methodology and assumptions to convert between growth of people and dwelling units, the new population forecast shows growth of 1,337 new dwelling units, about 648 fewer dwelling units than the HNA.

³ This adjustment was done consistent with the methodology specified in the following file (from the PSU PRC's Oregon Population Forecast Program website):
http://www.pdx.edu/prc/sites/www.pdx.edu/prc/files/Population_Interpolation_Template.xlsx

Potential impact of the new forecast on Hood River's housing needs

The question at hand is whether assuming a 1.4% average annual growth rate "changes everything" from the population growth rate of 2.0% in the HNA. Should the City re-evaluate housing needs before undertaking completion of the Concept Plan or implementing actions such as re-zoning?

As discussed above, growth of 1.4% annually over a 20-year period results in about 1,500 fewer people and about 650 fewer new households than the HNA assumes. Using the assumptions used to model housing growth and residential land sufficiency in the HNA, this slower rate of population growth results in a larger surplus of all residential land (described below) but a slower growth rate does not address the fundamental problems with Hood River's housing market in the short-term or in the long-term. These problems are:

- **Insufficient housing to meet current needs.** There is currently not enough housing to meet the needs of people currently living in Hood River now or people who would like to live in Hood River. Some dimensions of this need include:
 - Hood River has a deficit of affordable housing for existing residents.
 - About 32% of households in Hood River are cost burdened, including 40% of renters.⁴
 - Housing costs in Hood River have increased substantially since 2000, making it more difficult to find affordable rental and ownership housing opportunities.⁵
 - Hood River has a deficit of housing affordable to people who earn less than \$25,000 (about 200 units) and a deficit for people earning \$35,000 to \$100,000 (about 550 units).⁶ Housing for people in these income groupings will include relatively dense housing types such as: smaller single-family houses, cottages, townhouses, market-rate apartments, and government-subsidized apartments. These needs are for people who already live in Hood River but cannot afford their current housing (are cost burdened).
 - Anecdotal information from employers and employees in Hood River indicates that finding housing, much less affordable housing, is difficult and sometimes impossible. A number of large employers testified during the HNA hearings about the difficulty that professionals in Hood River (such as teachers, nurses,

⁴ Hood River Housing Needs Analysis, Figure B-25.

⁵ Hood River Housing Needs Analysis, pages B-47 through B-50.

⁶ Hood River Housing Needs Analysis, Table B-14.

tech workers, and others) have in finding housing, much less housing that they can afford within their salaries. People from the farmworker community testified that finding lower- and moderate-income housing in Hood River is all but impossible. These accounts fit with the finds in the data analysis that Hood River does not have enough housing to meet the needs of current residents and workers at businesses in Hood River.

- **Growth in population will increase the need for denser housing types.** The description above does not begin to address the housing needs of future residents, who are part of the people who would move to Hood River in either forecast scenario (between 3,000 to 4,500 new people) over the next 20 years. It is very likely that the housing needs of these households will be similar to housing needs of existing households. These new residents will also need housing that is relatively dense, such as: smaller single-family houses, cottages, townhouses, market-rate apartments, and government-subsidized apartments. These types of housing are underrepresented in Hood River.
 - The HNA shows that 69% of new residents in Hood River will have income below 120% of Hood River County's Median Family Income (\$76,800 in 2015). These households range from very low income (and can afford only very inexpensive housing) to middle income households (and can afford higher-cost rentals or lower-cost houses as homeowners).⁷
 - Assuming that 69% of new residents have income below 120% of the Median Family Income, between 2,100 new residents (1.4% forecast) and 3,100 new residents (2% forecast) will need these denser housing types.
- **Growth of second homes may continue to consume residential land.** The PSU forecast does not account for growth of second homes. While the City has new rules to limit growth of second homes, additional growth of second homes will require new land, consuming land that would otherwise be available for primary homes.

Another consideration in the implementation of the recommendations from the HNA, such as the Westside Area Concept Plan, are the character of Hood River's vacant land inventory and potential constraints on future expansion of the City's UGB.

- **Most vacant residential land is concentrated on the western side of Hood River.** The majority of vacant residential land is located on Hood River's western side, with much of that land within the Westside Concept Plan Area. The HNA showed 318 acres of vacant and partially vacant residential land. The Westside Area includes 60% of the City's vacant/partially vacant land (189 acres).⁸

⁷ Hood River Housing Needs Analysis, Table 7.

⁸ Hood River Housing Needs Analysis, Chapter 2, Residential Buildable Lands Inventory

-
- **Timing of development of land in Hood River.** The land within the Westside Concept Plan Area may be more likely to develop over the next 5 to 10 years than other larger areas within Hood River.
 - One of the other larger areas for development is 66 acres in farm deferrals. While we are not aware of the landowners' current plans for their lands, a concern during the HNA was development of this land and whether the landowners would choose to develop this area over the 20-year planning period. By State law, we considered this land buildable.
 - Planning for infrastructure in the Westside Concept Plan Area is further along than it is for many other larger areas within Hood River, such as the areas in farm deferral.
 - The current and future need for housing underline the importance of the Westside Concept Plan Area for providing development opportunities in Hood River over the near-term (next 5 years) and long-term (10-20 years). The Westside Area provides the largest area with development potential (vacant land) and planning for infrastructure to support new development.
 - **Hood River already has a deficit of land for multifamily development, no matter which growth rate is used.** While the HNA found that Hood River had sufficient land to accommodate growth, it also identified a deficit of land for multifamily land. It addressed this deficit by assuming: (1) more residential development would occur in commercial zones, (2) the City would allow a wider range of housing (from smaller single-family lots to townhouses to multifamily housing), and (3) the City would identify opportunities for development of multifamily housing through policy changes and re-zoning land. These actions are described in the Hood River Housing Strategy.
 - The HNA shows that Hood River is already (in 2015) unable to accommodate its need for high density housing on R-3 land (of which there is only 18 acres vacant).
 - The HNA makes an automatic land-use efficiency assumption that 12 acres of C-2 land would develop at densities higher than densities in R-3 to accommodate the need for multifamily housing.
 - Even at a lower growth rate (1.4%), Hood River would need to accommodate some of its multifamily need (93 dwelling units) on C-2 land. Even at this growth rate, the City will need to continue to adjust policies to accommodate multifamily housing.
 - **Hood River could consider opportunities to increase infill and redevelopment to meet these needs.** Another way to accommodate growth of some of these housing types (such as smaller-single-family units, townhouses, or apartments) is through infill or redevelopment. Infill is additional development on lots with existing housing, such as building more housing on underutilized land (e.g., a one-acre lot with one house on it). Redevelopment is demolition of existing housing and building new, denser housing

(e.g., on a lot zoned for medium and high density, demolition of a single-family house and development of a multifamily structure).

Infill and redevelopment were considered as a way to meet the city's housing needs during the HNA process. They were not pursued as policy recommendation because of potential disruption to existing neighborhoods.

Another important consideration in implementation of the recommendations of the HNA and the Housing Strategy is the long-term availability of land in Hood River. Most cities can expand their UGB as they grow and need more land. Hood River, however, is surrounded by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area and by farmland. Expansion in either of these areas will be extremely complicated and difficult.

- Expanding into the National Scenic Area will require coordination with the Columbia River Gorge Commission, an agency with representatives from Oregon, Washington, each of the six counties within the National Scenic Area, and the U.S. Forest Service. Expansion into the National Scenic Area may require federal legislation to authorize an expansion of urban uses into the Area.
- State law discourages expansion onto farmlands and requires that all other alternatives, such as increasing development capacity within the existing UGB or expansion onto non-farmlands, be exhausted or found infeasible before expansion onto farmlands. Expansion onto farmlands will require coordination with local and regional stakeholders, some of whom strongly oppose expansion onto farmlands.
- Given the complexities of any UGB expansion and the added complexities of expanding Hood River's UGB, the HNA recommends strongly that the City consider policies to use land within Hood River's UGB efficiently. The policies proposed in the Westside Concept Plan are exactly the types of policies recommended in the HNA.
- If the City grows faster than the PSU forecast,⁹ then the City will need to begin planning for a UGB expansion in 5 to 7 years. Waiting to plan for UGB expansion for 10 to 15 would be unwise because it is possible (and perhaps probable) that the process for obtaining a UGB expansion will take a decade or more. If, instead the City grows at 1.4%, the City would have longer before it would need a UGB expansion.
 - The HNA shows that Hood River has capacity for 2,460 new dwelling units on its vacant residential land, including development of multifamily housing on 12 acres of C-2 land.
 - At an average annual growth rate of 2%, all of Hood River's residential capacity would be consumed in 25 years.

⁹ Hood River's population growth rate between 1990-2013 and between 2000-2013 was about 2%. The City's growth since 1990 has been remarkably consistent, maintaining an average of 2% per year.

-
- At an average annual growth rate of 1.4%, Hood River's residential capacity would be consumed in 37 years.

Conclusions

The discussion above describes why it is important for Hood River to plan for a different type of housing than the City has had in the past. Planning for these types of housing will require the City to take the actions recommended in the HNA and the Housing Strategy, regardless of which of the two population projections are used. Many of these recommendations are present in the Westside Concept Plan, such as allowing a wider-variety of housing types in residential zones and rezoning lower density land to allow medium and high-density development.

As the author of Hood River's HNA and dozens of other HNAs for cities of all sizes across the state, I am confident that revisions to the HNA with the 1.4% growth rate will not change the key conclusions of the HNA. Those conclusions are:

- While Hood River has enough land to accommodate growth at the expected growth rate (whether 1.4% or 2%), the City has unmet housing needs.
- Current residents are unable to find affordable housing and employers report that availability of housing is a barrier (even for recruiting people with middle- and high-wages). Future residents are likely to have the same problems.
- Hood River has a deficit of land for multifamily housing, which the HNA addresses through assuming that about half of multifamily development will occur in C-2. Even with the lower forecast, about 90 multifamily units would need to be located in C-2 because of the small amount of vacant R-3 land.
- The City should consider land-use efficiency policies to address these unmet needs to: (1) provide opportunities for development of a wider range of housing affordable to lower-, moderate-, and middle-income households, (2) provide opportunity for multifamily housing, and (3) delay the need to expand the UGB. The City should take the additional actions described in the Housing Strategy.

Appendix D: Draft Code Amendments

Code materials were distributed on September 14th, 2017. Full draft appendix is available on the project website at www.hrwestsidepeplan.com.

1. Overview Memorandum for Public Review Draft 1
2. Chapter 17.01 – General Provisions
3. Chapter 17.03 – Land Use Zones
4. Chapter 17.04 – Supplementary Provisions
5. Chapter 17.16 – Site Plan Review
6. Chapter 17.19 – Townhouse Projects
7. Chapter 17.23 – Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

Appendix E: Interagency Coordination

Items in bold are included in the October 11th, 2017 committee Packets. Full draft appendix is available on the project website at www.hrwestsideplan.com

1. Hood River Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA)
(New Material)

Urban Growth Area Management Agreement

This agreement is entered into by the City of Hood River, an incorporated municipality of the State of Oregon, hereby referred to as the "City" and Hood River County, a political subdivision of the State of Oregon, hereby referred to as the "County."

A. RECITALS

WHEREAS, the City of Hood River and the Hood River County are authorized pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 190 to enter into an Intergovernmental Management Agreement for performance of functions which either government unit has the authority to perform; and

WHEREAS, the Management Agreement also constitutes a cooperative agreement under ORS 195; and

WHEREAS, Goal 14 – Urbanization requires that the City and the County establish an urban growth boundary to identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land and that the establishment and change of urban growth boundaries shall be through a cooperative process between the City and County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to provisions in Goal 2, Land Use Planning, the City and County are required to have a coordinated and consistent comprehensive plan which establishes an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and a plan for the Urban Growth Area (UGA) within the boundary;

WHEREAS, the City and County pursuant to Goal 2, are required to maintain consistent and coordinated comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances for the Urban Growth Area and the Urban Growth Boundary when amending their respective comprehensive plans; and

WHEREAS, the City and County share a common concern regarding the accommodation of population growth and utilization of lands within the UGB; and

WHEREAS, the City and County consider it mutually advantageous to establish this Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA) for the purpose of facilitating the orderly transition from rural to urban land uses within the City's UGA.

NOW, THEREFORE THE CITY OF HOOD RIVER AND HOOD RIVER COUNTY MUTUALLY AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

B. INTENT OF AGREEMENT

1. To establish standards and procedures for review and action on comprehensive plan amendments, ordinance amendments, proposed land actions and related matters noted within this agreement pertaining to implementation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Zoning Regulations as adopted by the City and County for the UGA;
2. To recognize that the County shall have authority and jurisdiction over current planning activities and land use decisions within the UGA. This agreement, including the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Zoning Regulations agreed to by the City and the County, constitute the provisions, standards and procedures for land use review and decision making by the County within the UGA.
3. To provide assistance to the public in the UGA by processing land use applications in a timely and consistent manner;
4. To benefit the public through reduction of governmental processes;

5. To provide governmental processes necessary for development of lands in the UGA that are clear and readily accessible to the public.
6. To jointly develop and adopt a set of land use regulations and plan and zoning map designations by the City and County for land use administration within the UGA.

C. DEFINITIONS: For the purpose of this agreement, the following definitions shall apply:

1. Board: the Hood River County Board of Commissioners.
2. City: the City of Hood River.
3. Council: the Hood River City Council.
4. County: Hood River County.
5. Land Use Decision: A Land Use Decision is defined by ORS 197.015 and involves a decision by the County after applying, through a land use application, standards of the UGA zoning or subdivision ordinances or other elements of the comprehensive plan to a particular property, or properties within the UGA. Land Use Decisions are made regarding at least the following land use applications: conditional use permits, Planned Unit Developments (PUD), subdivisions, major and minor partitions, expedited land divisions, property line adjustments, variances, road naming, road dedications and vacations, flood-plain and geological hazard permits, and use permits for commercial, industrial, or multi-family uses, quasi-judicial or legislative plan amendments, public improvement projects, major Public Works projects for transportation facility extension or improvements, establishment or major improvements to parks or recreation areas, public facility construction and public facility plans.
6. Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Urban Growth Area (UGA Plan): the comprehensive Plan and its elements adopted by both the City and the County for planning purposes and administration of land use applications and building permits within the Hood River Urban Growth Area (UGA). Elements of the Comprehensive Plan shall include the Plan Designation and Zoning Designation Maps; the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances; the Policy and Background Documents and the Exceptions Document.
7. Urban Growth Area (UGA): the area between the Hood River City Limits and the Hood River Urban Growth Boundary, as designated on the City's and County's Comprehensive Plan Maps, and shall be referred to as the "UGA."
8. Urban Growth Boundary (UGB): the boundary line which separates lands to be urbanized and eventually incorporated into the City of Hood River from the surrounding rural lands under the County's jurisdiction.
9. Urban Growth Area Management Agreement (UGAMA): this Intergovernmental Agreement between the City and County that coordinates the management of land use development within the City of Hood River's UGA.

D. PROCESS FOR ADOPTION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN FOR THE URBAN GROWTH AREA:

1. Hood River County shall adopt and maintain Comprehensive Plan map and zoning ordinance provisions within the Urban Growth Area as proposed by the City and agreed to by the County which are consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and zoning ordinance.
2. It is intended that the UGA Plan shall comprehensively cover all aspects of development within the UGA.

E. UGA ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. The County shall retain responsibility for administration and decision-making authority regarding all land use applications and building permits within the UGA until the land-base is annexed by the City. However, for delayed annexations, the City is responsible for enforcement of City building codes and land use ordinances and the conditions of the Delayed Annexation Agreement.
2. The County is responsible for regulating land use development within the UGA to avoid conflicts with the adopted UGA Plan.
3. Since the City is responsible for some urban services for lands within the UGA, it must review land use applications and building permits prior to final decision-making by the County.
4. The County shall send land use referrals and coordinate with other applicable special districts that have jurisdiction within the UGA. The County shall also coordinate with applicable special districts regarding building permits.

F. REVIEW PROCESS FOR LAND USE APPLICATIONS AND BUILDING PERMITS WITHIN THE UGA.

The review process within this section applies to land use applications and building permit applications proposed within the UGA. Applications for Legislative Amendments shall be processed pursuant to provisions in Section G of this agreement.

Land Use Applications:

1. Land use applications within the UGA shall be processed through the County Planning Department.
2. The County shall invite the City to participate in the County's pre-application process.
3. The County shall forward all land use applications to the City and other applicable special service districts for review and comment prior to final decision-making by the County.
4. The City Planning Department shall review land use applications and respond to the County within 20 days of the date the notice is received by the City.
5. The County shall grant the City on request a reasonable time extension to properly respond to land use applications.
6. If the City Planning Department fails to respond, it shall mean the City has no written comment regarding the application.
7. In making its decision, the County shall consider all comments made by the City with regard to land use applications.
8. The County Planning Department shall notify the City Planning Department in writing of all land use decisions within the UGA.
9. The City shall have standing to appeal the County's land-use decisions if the City has submitted written comments.

Building Permits:

10. Building permit applications within the UGA shall be processed through the County Planning and Building Departments.
11. The County shall invite the City to participate in the County's pre-application process.
12. The following is the process for building permits within the UGA:
 - a. Applicant obtains building permit application from County.
 - b. Applicant takes completed application to City for review and if necessary, collection of applicable service connection fees and system development charges.
 - c. After City has approved the permit, applicant takes the permit to applicable special service district for review.
 - d. Applicant returns building permit to County for final review and decision.
13. In making its decision, the County shall consider all comments made by the City.
14. The City shall have standing to appeal the County's land use decisions if the City has submitted written comments.

G. REVIEW PROCESS FOR LEGISLATIVE AMENDMENTS TO THE UGA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

1. Nothing within this agreement precludes either the City Council and Board of Commissioners or the City and County Planning Commissions from conducting joint meetings or hearings. It is the intention of the County and City Planning Commissions to conduct joint meetings whenever appropriate.
2. Amendments to the UGA Plan, including land use regulations and plan and zoning maps may be initiated by the City or County or property owner.
3. An application to amend the UGA Plan shall be filed with the City Planning Department. The City shall forward a copy of the application to the County Planning Department within five working days of the date the application was filed.
4. The City Planning Department shall notify the County Planning Department at least 30 days before the City Planning Commission's first hearing.
5. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing regarding the application. In making its decision, the City Planning Commission shall consider and respond to all comments submitted by the County.
6. The recommendation of the City Planning Commission shall be forwarded to the County Planning Department within five working days of the date the City Planning Commission recommendation is signed by the Chair.
7. The City Planning Department shall notify the County Planning Department at least 30 days before the Council's first hearing on the proposed application. All written comments received from the County prior to the scheduled hearing date shall be provided to the Council prior to the Council's hearing.

8. The decision of the City Council shall be forwarded to the County Planning Department within five working days of the date the City Council recommendation is signed by the Mayor. The decision of the City, along with a copy of the findings and record to support that decision, shall be forwarded to the County Planning Department.
9. Within 90 days of the receipt of the City's decision, the County Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment and make a decision. The City shall be notified of the Planning Commission hearing at least 30 days prior to the hearing. The Planning Commission shall consider and respond to all comments provided by the City. The Commission's decision shall be forwarded to the Board.
10. Notice of the Planning Commission's decision shall be forwarded to the City Planning Department within five working days of the date the Planning Commission makes its final written recommendations.
11. The decision of the County Planning Commission, including the record, shall be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners for scheduling of a hearing. Within 90 days of the Commission decision, the Board shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment and make a decision.
12. The County Planning Department shall notify the City Planning Department at least 30 days before the Board of Commissioners hearing. The Board shall conduct a public hearing and make a final decision.
13. The County shall notify the City of the Board's final decision within five working days of the date the ordinance is signed by the Board.
14. If either the City or County do not respond within the above notice periods, it is assumed by both jurisdictions that there are no comments regarding the proposals.
15. Both the City and County may request reasonable time extensions to the notice periods.
16. Failure of the City and County to respond within the notice periods precludes appeal.
17. If the City and County disagree with the proposed amendments, a joint meeting of the City Council and board of County Commissioners may be held to attempt to resolve the differences. Both jurisdictions may also request a dispute resolution process to resolve the differences as outlined in Section Q - Dispute Resolution Process.
18. Both the City and County may also appeal the respective jurisdiction's decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) pursuant to the applicable City or County ordinances, state statutes or administrative rule.
19. Neither the City nor County shall unilaterally amend nor take any action that effectively amends any provisions of the UGA Plan. The UGA Plan may be amended only if the decisions of the County and the City are the same.

H. ANNEXATION TO THE CITY OF HOOD RIVER:

1. Owners of property contiguous to the City may apply to the City for annexation or the City may seek annexation on its own initiative.
2. Annexation shall be processed according to Chapter 17.15 – Annexation Policy of the Hood River Municipal Code.

3. At least 30 days prior to any hearing regarding annexation, the City shall notify the County of the proposed annexation. The County's comments regarding a proposed annexation shall be submitted to the City at least 10 days prior to the first scheduled hearing on the annexation.
4. A proposal for annexation to the City for an area outside the UGA shall be considered a proposal for, and processed as, an amendment to the Urban Growth Boundary.
5. The City and County may enter into an intergovernmental agreement for contractual annexations according to ORS 222.115 and Chapter 17.15 – Annexation Policy of the Hood River Municipal Code which provides for urban development of lands prior to annexation into the City of Hood River.

I. CITY SERVICES:

1. Extension of City water or sewer services within the Urban Growth Area may be permitted when approved by the City and if consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and with any adopted public facility plan. Extension of City water and sewer services shall be subject to approval of the City engineer.
2. As available, City services such as water, sewer, storm drainage, police, fire, parks and street maintenance within the UGA may be provided to the owner of the property upon signing and recording a "Consent to Annex", "Waiver of One Year" and "Waiver of Remonstrance."
3. All services within the UGA shall be developed and maintained to City standards and under the supervision of the City or the City's designee.
4. The City shall be responsible for public facilities planning within the UGA.

J. AMENDMENTS TO THE URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY: The City is the lead agency for an UGB amendment. However, an UGB amendment should be viewed as a collective effort between all involved parties. Therefore, a pre-application conference between the City, County, applicable special service districts and affected property owners should be held by the City to determine the advisability of proceeding with the proposed UGB amendment.

1. Any proposed amendment to the Urban Growth Boundary shall be initiated by the City of Hood River or by the County Board of Commissioners only.
2. The initiating body shall submit the proposed Urban Growth Boundary revision to the City and County Planning Commissions.
3. The City and County Planning Commissions shall hold a joint public hearing within 60 days of the date the initiating body submitted the proposed revision.
4. Within 90 days of the joint hearing by the City and County Planning Commissions, the following shall occur:
 - a. A copy of the record of the hearing shall be submitted to both the Board and the Council.
 - b. If the City and County Planning Commissions agree to the boundary revision, they shall submit a joint recommendation to the Board and Council.
 - c. If the two Planning Commissions are unable to agree as to a recommendation, a recommendation of each Planning Commission shall be submitted to the Board and Council.

5. The Board and Council shall then hold a joint meeting to render a decision on the proposed Urban Growth Boundary revision.
 6. If both the Board and Council are able to reach a mutually acceptable decision, the Council and Board shall proceed with the amendment of their respective Comprehensive Plans and zoning ordinances.
 7. If the City and County disagree with the proposed amendment, a joint meeting of the City Council and Board of County Commissioners may be held to attempt to resolve the differences. Both jurisdictions may also request a conflict resolution process to resolve the differences.
 8. If the government bodies are not able to come to mutual agreement, there shall be no change to the Urban Growth Boundary.
 9. If the request is denied, the same or substantially the same request shall not be heard for a period of one (1) year.
- K. OTHER LAND USE ACTIVITIES: The City and County shall use the following process for review and action on public improvement projects and similar programs, projects or proposals that apply to the UGA.
1. The County shall seek a recommendation from the City with regard to the following items which are within, adjacent to, or directly impact the UGA.
 - a. Capital improvement programs.
 - b. Major public works projects sponsored by the County for transportation, facility extensions or improvement; establishment, development or major improvements to a park or recreation area; public facility construction or improvement; acquisition of property; or other similar activity.
 - c. Functional plans or amendments thereto, for utilities, drainage, solid waste, transportation, recreation, or similar activity.
 - d. Plans, or amendments thereto, for economic development or industrial development.
 - e. Neighborhood or sub-area development plans.
 - f. Proposals for formation of, or changes of boundary or functions of special services districts, as these terms are defined in ORS 198.705 and ORS 198.710, except as provided in ORS 199.410 and ORS 199.512.
 - g. Recommendations for designation of an area as a health hazard.
 - h. Other plans or proposals similar to the above.
 2. The City shall seek a recommendation from the County with regard to the following items which will affect the UGA for which the City has ultimate decision-making capacity:
 - a. Proposals for annexation to the City.
 - b. Capital improvement programs.
 - c. Functional plans or amendments thereto, for utilities, drainage, recreation, transportation, or other similar activity.

- d. Plans or amendments, thereto, for economic development or industrial development.
 - e. Proposals for the extraterritorial extension of any City service, utility, or facility, or the service area for any of the above.
 - f. Plans for the implementation of system development changes (SDC's).
 - g. Other plans or proposals similar to the above.
3. The initiating jurisdiction shall allow the responding jurisdiction 45 days to review and submit recommendations with regard to the items listed in Sections 1 & 2 above. Additional time may be provided at the request of the responding jurisdiction and with the concurrence of the initiating jurisdiction.
 4. The initiating jurisdiction shall consider, and is obligated to respond to as appropriate, the recommendations of the responding jurisdiction in making its decision. No response by the responding jurisdiction to the request within the timeline outlined above shall be presumed to mean no comment on the proposal.

L. PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS

1. All new streets shall be built to City standards at the initial land division where a street is required.
2. Streets in subdivisions and PUD's shall be initially developed to the City's improvement standards.
3. In all cases, right-of-ways in compliance with the City standards shall be required.
4. All newly created utility easements in the UGA shall be dedicated to the public.

M. SPECIAL DISTRICT COORDINATION

1. When a special district (water, parks, sewer, etc.) situated fully or partially within the UGA has entered into an intergovernmental coordination agreement with the County and/or the City, it shall be given the opportunity to review and comment on the land use actions and activities as specified in this agreement.
2. If such an agreement is entered into, the special districts shall give the City and County the opportunity to review and consider comments on the following activities which will apply to the UGA:
 - a. Major public works projects to be provided by the district.
 - b. Plans for establishment, improvement or extension of facilities provided by the district.
 - c. Capital improvement programs which are being developed by the district.

N. FEES

1. Applications for land use and building permits, including all land use appeals within the UGA, shall be accompanied by a fee set by the County.

2. The City, other County Departments and other special districts may require applicants to pay for utility or other services. However, these special districts will not duplicate the Land Use application fee requirements of the County Planning Department.
 3. Applications for Comprehensive Plan Amendments within the UGA shall be accompanied by a fee set by the City. To avoid duplication of fees for the applicant, the County shall not require a Comprehensive Plan Amendment fee because the County is collecting land use application, building permit, and appeal fees.
- O. ENFORCEMENT: The County shall be responsible for enforcement of the UGA plan and other applicable zoning and subdivision ordinances that have been adopted and building regulations within the UGA. Enforcement actions shall be taken in accordance with the County ordinances and the Uniform Building Code. For delayed annexation, the City is responsible for the enforcement of City Building Codes and Land Use Ordinances and Conditions of the Delayed Annexation Agreement.
- P. SEVERABILITY: The provisions within this agreement are severable. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this agreement is adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, said shall not impair or affect the validity of the remaining portions of the agreement.
- Q. DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCESS:
1. Parties to this agreement shall take all actions necessary to resolve any issue or issues through the pre-application or application processes or during the administrative, quasi-judicial or legislative decision-making processes.
 2. If the parties to this agreement still disagree, a joint meeting of the City council and Board of County Commissioners may be held to attempt to resolve the differences.
 3. However, when the parties to this agreement reach an impasse over any issue or issues, they shall hire a mediator to assist the City and County resolving the issue or issues through the Alternative Dispute Resolution Process as outlined by the Oregon Dispute Resolution Commission (ODRC).
- R. REVIEW, AMENDMENT AND TERMINATION:
1. This agreement supersedes the Hood River Urban Growth Area Management Agreement dated August 15, 1983.
 2. This agreement may be reviewed and amended at any time by mutual agreement of both parties, after public hearing by the City Council and the Board of County Commissioners.
 3. This agreement shall be reviewed, and may be amended at the time established for Periodic Review of each jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan.
 4. Any modifications in this agreement shall be consistent with the City and County Comprehensive Plans.
 5. This agreement may be terminated by either party under the following procedure:
 - a. A public hearing shall be called by the party considering termination. That party shall give the other party at least 45 days prior notice of the scheduled hearing date. The 45 days period shall be used by both parties to seek a resolution of differences. Both parties shall also request a collaborative conflict resolution process to resolve differences that remain.

- b. Public notice of the hearing shall be in accordance with applicable statewide and local goals and statutes.
- c. An established date for the termination of the agreement shall be at least 90 days after the public hearing in order to provide ample time for resolution of differences.

Adopted 21 July 1997

And signed by Paul Cummings (Mayor), Chair, Board of Commissioners, City Recorder, Acting Hood River County Planning Director.

Dated this 28 July of 2003.

CITY OF HOOD RIVER, OREGON




Mayor, City of Hood River

HOOD RIVER COUNTY, OREGON



Chair, Board of County Commissioners

ATTEST:



City Recorder