

City of St. Helens
ORDINANCE NO. 3204

AN ORDINANCE TO ANNEX AND DESIGNATE THE ZONE OF CERTAIN
PROPERTY AT 35092 PITTSBURG ROAD

WHEREAS, applicant James Julian has requested to annex to the City of St. Helens certain property at 35092 Pittsburg Road. This property is also described per **Exhibit A** and depicted per **Exhibit B**; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has consented in writing to the proposed annexation; and

WHEREAS, the applicant constitutes 1) all the owners of the property to be annexed, and 2) more than half of the owners of the property to be annexed own more than half of such property representing more than half of the assessed value pursuant to ORS 222.170(1); and

WHEREAS, the City Council must recommend the property for annexation to the voters; and

WHEREAS, the City Council must determine the incorporated Comprehensive Plan Map designation and the Zone Map designation; and

WHEREAS, appropriate notice has been given and a public hearing was held February 3, 2016 on the annexation proposal; and

WHEREAS, the Council has considered findings of compliance with criteria and law applicable to the proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF ST. HELENS DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The above recitations are true and correct and are incorporated herein by this reference.

Section 2. The property described **Exhibit A** and depicted in **Exhibit B** is hereby accepted for annexation to the City of St. Helens.

Section 3. The St. Helens Zoning Ordinance Map is hereby amended to reflect that the property described herein shall be zoned Moderate Residential, R7.

Section 4. The St. Helens Comprehensive Plan Map is hereby amended to reflect that the property described herein shall be designated as Suburban Residential, SR.

Section 5. The land is classified as "Developing" in accordance with Chapter 17.112 of the St. Helens Community Development Code (SHMC Title 17) and OAR 660-08-0005.

Section 6. In support of the above annexation and zoning, the Council hereby adopts the A.1.14 Annexation and Zone Map Amendment Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law dated February 17, 2016.

Section 7. The City Council does hereby refer the final decision to annex this property to

the voters of the City of St. Helens.

Section 8. The effective date of this Ordinance shall be the date of the successful approval by the voters of the City of St. Helens, in accordance with the City Charter and other applicable laws.

Read the first time: February 17, 2016

APPROVED AND ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY this 17th day of February, 2016 by the following vote:

Ayes: Locke, Carlson, Conn, Peterson

Nays: None



Randy Peterson, Mayor

ATTEST:



Kathy Payne, City Recorder

ORD No. 3204 Exhibit A

Legal Description

Beginning at the Northwest corner of Partition Plat No. 1991-14, Columbia County, Oregon;

Thence South $22^{\circ}38'00''$ E 10.27 feet to the **True Point of Beginning**;

Thence South $22^{\circ}38'00''$ E 799.51 feet;

Thence South $67^{\circ}22'00''$ W 106.6 feet;

Thence North $22^{\circ}38'00''$ W 777.01 feet to the south side of the Pittsburg—St. Helens Road (County Road No. 94) right-of-way;

Thence North $53^{\circ}19'49''$ E along said Southerly right-of-way line 109.5 feet to the **True Point of Beginning**.

**CITY OF ST. HELENS PLANNING DEPARTMENT
FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
Annexation A.1.14**

APPLICANT: James Julian
OWNER: James Julian & Sandra Horan

ZONING: Columbia County's Single-Family Residential, R-10
LOCATION: 4N1W-5BC-7600; 35092 Pittsburg Rd.
PROPOSAL: The property owner filed consent to annex to allow connection to the City's sanitary sewer system

The 120-day rule (ORS 227.178) for final action for this land use decision is n/a [Clark v. City of Albany, 142 Or App 207, 921 P2d 406 (1996)].

SITE INFORMATION / BACKGROUND

The subject property lies on the south side of Pittsburg Rd. between N. Vernonia Rd. and Oak Ridge St. The site is about 1.8 acres, developed with a detached single family dwelling and a detached garage built around 1935. It has street access to Pittsburg Rd. on the north and frontage along Helens Way to the south.

On Pittsburg Rd, the property lacks right-of-way frontage improvements such as sidewalk, curb and streetscape. On Helens Way, both the street and the street frontage are only partially developed, with about 25 to 30 feet of undeveloped Helens Way right-of-way and only a curb along part of the subject property. There is also a Bonneville Power Administration easement for a transmission line through the southern portion of the property.

PUBLIC HEARING & NOTICE

Hearing dates are as follows: January 12, 2016 before the Planning Commission and February 3, 2016 before the City Council.

Notice of this proposal was sent to surrounding property owners within 300 feet of the subject property(ies) on December 23, 2015 via first class mail. Notice was sent to agencies by mail or e-mail on the same date. Notice was published in the The Chronicle on December 30, 2015. Notice was sent to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on December 8, 2015 via e-mail.

APPLICABLE CRITERIA, ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

SHMC 17.08.040 (1) – Quasi-judicial amendment and standards criteria

- (a) A recommendation or a decision to approve, approve with conditions, or to deny an application for a quasi-judicial amendment shall be based on all of the following standards:
 - (i) The applicable comprehensive plan policies and map designation; and that the change will not adversely affect the health, safety, and welfare of the community; and

- (ii) The applicable Oregon Statewide Planning Goals adopted under ORS Chapter 197, until acknowledgment of the comprehensive plan and ordinances; and
 - (iii) The standards applicable of any provision of this code or other applicable implementing ordinance.
- (b) Consideration may also be given to:
- (i) Any applicable evidence of change in the neighborhood or community or a mistake or inconsistency in the comprehensive plan or zoning map as it relates to the property which is the subject of the development application.

Discussion: (a)(i) The Comprehensive Plan designation for the subject property is Rural Suburban Unincorporated Residential, RSUR. Applicable designation and zoning district for annexation are discussed later.

There is no known conflict with the general Comprehensive Plan policies identified in Chapter 19.08 SHMC. Note that SHMC 19.08.030 discusses public services and facilities and includes utility provisions (e.g., water and sewer) as well as services such as police and library. In sum, all services are intertwined; the consent to annexation allows connection to City sewer to support existing and future development on the subject property, and, once annexed, all other City services/facilities. By this process, the proposal complies with this aspect of the Comprehensive Plan.

There is no known conflict with the specific Comprehensive Plan policies identified in Chapter 19.12 SHMC.

There is no known conflict with the addendums to the Comprehensive Plan which includes Economic Opportunities Analysis (Ord. No. 3101), Waterfront Prioritization Plan (Ord. No. 3148), the Transportation Systems Plan (Ord. No. 3150), the Corridor Master Plan (Ord. No. 3181), and the Parks & Trails Master Plan (Ord. No. 3191).

Finally, there is no evidence that this proposal will be contrary to the health, safety and welfare of the community.

(a)(ii) The City's Comprehensive Plan has been adopted by the State, thus, the applicable Oregon Statewide Planning Goals adopted under ORS Chapter 197 do not need to be analyzed per this section.

(a)(iii) Other provisions applicable to this proposal are discussed elsewhere herein. In addition, Section 3 of the City's Charter states that "annexation, delayed or otherwise, to the City of St. Helens, may only be approved by a prior majority vote among the electorate."

(b) There is no evidence of a change in neighborhood, or mistake or inconstancy in the Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Map.

Finding: The quasi-judicial amendment and standards criteria are met.

SHMC 17.08.060 – Transportation planning rule compliance

- (1) Review of Applications for Effect on Transportation Facilities. A proposed comprehensive plan amendment, zone change or land use regulation change, whether initiated by the city or by a private interest, shall be reviewed to determine whether it significantly affects a transportation facility, in accordance with OAR 660-012-0060 (the Transportation Planning Rule (“TPR”). “Significant” means the proposal 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) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:
 - (i) Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;
 - (ii) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP; or
 - (iii) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.
- (2) Amendments That Affect Transportation Facilities. Comprehensive plan amendments, zone changes or land use regulations that significantly affect a transportation facility shall ensure that allowed land uses are consistent with the function, capacity, and level of service of the facility identified in the TSP. This shall be accomplished by one or a combination of the following:
 - (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 OAR 660-012-0060.
 - (c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for vehicle travel and meet travel needs through other modes of transportation.
 - (d) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.
- (3) Traffic Impact Analysis. A traffic impact analysis shall be submitted with a plan amendment or zone change application, as applicable, pursuant to Chapter [17.156](#) SHMC.

Discussion: This section reflects State law regarding the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR): Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), OAR 660, Division 12. The TPR requires that where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards of the facility. *Current zoning of the property is Columbia County’s R-10 and the City zoning options given annexation is R7 or R10. Both zoning districts are residential and allow some non residential uses (e.g., churches/religious assembly).*

Generally, when comparing potential land use impact on transportation facilities, the *reasonable worst case scenario* for the existing and proposed designation/zone are considered. The potential land uses are very similar for both the City and County; the City’s zoning is comparable with the County’s with regards to the possible intensity of uses allowed and potential vehicular trips generated. Thus, this proposal will not affect an existing or planned transportation facility.

Finding: No transportation facility will be significantly affected by this proposal. No traffic impact analysis is warranted.

SHMC 17.28.030 (1) – Annexation criteria

- (a) Adequate public facilities are available to the area and have sufficient capacity to provide service for the proposed annexation area; and
- (b) Comply with comprehensive plan amendment standards and zoning ordinance amendment standards and not be in conflict with applicable comprehensive plan policies and implementing ordinances; and
- (c) Complies with state laws; and
- (d) Abutting roads must meet city standards or property owner will be required to sign and record an irrevocable consent to local improvement district; and
- (e) Property exceeding 10 acres in gross size must show a need on the part of the city for such land if it is designated residential (e.g., less than five years' supply of like designated lands in current city limits).

Discussion: **(a)** Currently, the site is not connected to either City water or McNulty PUD water. The City's water system is within the Pittsburg Road right-of-way, adjacent to the subject property. City law states "all water users in the city whose closest property line is within 160 feet of a city water main shall be connected to the city water system." In this case, the property is well within 160 feet of a water main.

The City's current water capacity is 6 million gallons/day and the peak flow, usually in the summer, is 3 to 4 million gallons/day. Additionally, the City has the capacity of approximately 10 million gallons to meet future demands. Any additional uses that occur on the subject property can be accommodated by the City's municipal water system as infrastructure has substantial capacity available.

Connection to the City's sanitary sewer is the catalyst for this annexation. In early February 2014, the applicant paid all necessary connection fees to connect to the City's sewer system. By late February 2014, Columbia County certified that the property had decommissioned the existing septic tank.

With regards to capacity, the City's waste water treatment plant currently has the capacity (physically and as permitted by DEQ) to handle 50,000 pounds of Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD), which is the "loading" or potency of the wastewater received by the plant. The average daily BOD is well below this at only 1,500 pounds. Thus, any potential uses that occur on the subject property can be accommodated by the City's sanitary sewer system as infrastructure is in place or can be upgraded and there is substantial capacity available.

As described above, this proposal poses no significant affect on a transportation facility. Adequate public facilities are available to the area and have sufficient capacity to provide service for the proposed annexation area.

(b) The existing land use of the subject property is a detached single-family dwelling. This land use would be permitted in the city zoning district (R10 or R7) that takes effect once annexation is completed.

There is no known conflict with the Comprehensive Plan and implementing ordinances.

(c) With regards to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS), city annexations of territory must be undertaken consistent with ORS 222.111 to 222.183.

Pursuant to ORS 222.111(1), a City may only annex territory that is not within another City, and the territory must either be contiguous to the annexing City or be separated from the City only by a body of water or public right-of-way. The subject property is not within another City's jurisdiction and City of St. Helens corporate limits lies on three sides of the subject property.

Although undertaking an annexation is authorized by state law, the manner in which a city proceeds with annexation is also dictated in the city charter. ORS 222.111(1) references a city's charter as well as other ORS. St. Helens' Charter requirements pertaining to annexations are noted above.

Per ORS 222.111(2) an annexation may be initiated by the owner of real property or the city council. This annexation request was initiated by the property owners.

Further, ORS 222.125 requires that that all property owners of the subject property to be annexed and at least half of the electors residing on the property consent in writing to the annexation. These documents were submitted with the annexation application.

ORS 197.175(1) suggests that all annexations are subject to the statewide planning goals. The statewide planning goals that could technically apply or relate to this proposal are Goals 1, 2, 11 and 12.

- ***Statewide Planning Goal 1: Citizen Involvement.***

Goal 1 requires the development of a citizen involvement program that is widespread, allows two-way communication, provides for citizen involvement through all planning phases, and is understandable, responsive, and funded.

Generally, Goal 1 is satisfied when a local government follows the public involvement procedures set out in the statutes and in its acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use regulations.

The City's Development Code is consistent with State law with regards to notification requirements. Pursuant to SHMC 17.20.080 at least one public hearing before the Planning Commission and City Council is required. Legal notice in a newspaper of general circulation is also required. The City has met these requirements and notified DLCD of the proposal.

- ***Statewide Planning Goal 2: Land Use Planning.***

This goal requires that a land use planning process and policy framework be established as a basis for all decisions and actions relating to the use of land. All local governments and state agencies involved in the land use action must coordinate with each other. City, county, state and federal agency and special districts plans and actions related to land

use must be consistent with the comprehensive plans of cities and counties and regional plans adopted under Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 268.

Generally, Goal 2 requires that actions related to land use be consistent with acknowledged Comprehensive Plans and coordination with affected governments and agencies and be based on an adequate factual base. The City has an adopted Comprehensive Plan, compliance of this proposal which is addressed herein. Moreover, explanation and proof of coordination with affected agencies and factual base are described herein, as well, including inventory, needs, etc.

- ***Statewide Planning Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services.***

Goal 11 requires cities and counties 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. The goal requires that urban and rural development be "guided and supported by types and levels of urban and rural public facilities and services appropriate for, but limited to, the needs and requirements of the urban, urbanizable and rural areas to be served."

City water and sewer capacities are adequate to serve the subject property. This is explained above. Moreover, there is no evidence that adequate infrastructure cannot be made available to serve the annexed area if redeveloped. The existing development is adequately served.

- ***Statewide Planning Goal 12: Transportation.***

Goal 12 requires cities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations, and ODOT to provide and encourage a "safe, convenient and economic transportation system." This is accomplished through development of Transportation System Plans based on inventories of local, regional and state transportation needs. Goal 12 is implemented through OAR 660, Division 12, also known as the Transportation Planning Rule ("TPR"). The TPR contains numerous requirements governing transportation planning and project development.

Traffic impacts and the City's provisions that address the TPR are explained above. This proposal will not significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility.

(d) The subject property abuts two streets: Pittsburg Road and St. Helens Way. Pittsburg Road is improved (asphalt) but lacks frontage improvements such as sidewalk and curb along the subject property's frontage. City standards require such improvements.

The Helens Way right-of-way adjacent to the subject property is only partially improved. There is about 25 to 30 feet of unimproved right-of-way with a vehicle blockade between the two developed portions of Helens Way. The Helens Way street frontage is also only partially developed, with only a curb along part of the property. City standards require such improvements.

However, this property is not the subject of a current development land use review, which provides the legal nexus and proportionality to require such improvements. As such, the only option is for the property owner to be required to sign and record an irrevocable consent to local improvement district, though, the applicant could improve the frontages if desired.

The City's Transportation Systems Plan designates Pittsburg Road as a Minor Arterial and if improved, would be subject to Minor Arterial standards. The existing right-of-way width is about 30 feet from centerline and is sufficient for this classification of street, thus, if the property is improved or divided, right-of-way dedication would not be necessary for Pittsburg Road. Helens Way is designated as a Local Street and is subject to Local Street standards. The existing right-of-way width varies, with the narrowest width at only approximately 32 feet wide. Thus, if the property is improved or divided, right-of-way dedication would likely be required to meet the 50 foot minimum width standard for Local Streets.

(e) The subject property is designated residential but is only approximately 1.8 acres in size. Thus a needs analysis is not necessary.

Finding: The annexation approval criteria are met for this proposal.

SHMC 17.28.030 (2) – Annexation criteria

The plan designation and the zoning designation placed on the property shall be the city's zoning district which most closely implements the city's comprehensive plan map designation.

Discussion: The Comprehensive Plan designation is currently Rural Suburban Unincorporated Residential, RSUR. Upon annexation, the Comprehensive Plan designation would thus be (incorporated) Suburban Residential, SR. Given the subject property's size (<2 ac.), there are two zoning options:

- 1) Suburban Residential, R10
- 2) Moderate Residential, R7

Finding: The subject property shall be designated Suburban Residential, SR and zoned Suburban Residential, R10 or Moderate Residential, R7 upon annexation depending on the determinations of the Commission and Council.

The Planning Commission recommends R7. At the Commission's public hearing the applicant stated that they would prefer R7. The Council agrees with the R7 choice.

SHMC 17.112.020 – Established & Developed Area Classification criteria

- (1) Established Area.
 - (a) An "established area" is an area where the land is not classified as buildable land under OAR 660-08-0005;
 - (b) An established area may include some small tracts of vacant land (tracts less than an acre in size) provided the tracts are surrounded by land which is not classified as buildable land; and
 - (c) An area shown on a zone map or overlay map as an established area.
- (2) Developing Area. A "developing area" is an area which is included in the city's buildable land inventory under the provisions of OAR except as provided by subsection (1)(b) of this section.

Discussion: OAR 660-008-0005 generally defines “Buildable Land” as vacant residential property not constrained by natural hazards or resources, and typically not publicly owned. There are no inventoried or known natural hazards on the subject property. It is also privately owned and underdeveloped (i.e., a greater density is possible). As such, the subject property can be classified as a “developing area.”

Finding: The subject property should be designated as “developing” in accordance with SHMC 17.112.


CONCLUSION & DECISION

Based upon the facts and findings herein, the City Council approves of this annexation and that upon annexation, the subject property have a Comprehensive Plan designation of Suburban Residential, SR, and be zoned Moderate Residential (R7) and designated as “developing.”

****This annexation will also be subject to voter approval subsequent to this land use process pursuant to the City’s Charter.****



Randy Peterson, Mayor



Date