



**BEND, OR**  
3052 NW Merchant Way, Suite 100  
Bend, OR 97703  
(503) 317-8429  
[www.aks-eng.com](http://www.aks-eng.com)

**KEIZER, OR**  
4300 Cherry Avenue NE  
Keizer, OR 97303  
(503) 400-6028

**TUALATIN, OR**  
12965 SW Herman Road, Suite 100  
Tualatin, OR 97062  
(503) 563-6151

**VANCOUVER, WA**  
9600 NE 126th Avenue, Suite 2520  
Vancouver, WA 98682  
(360) 882-0419

**Date:** 5/30/2018  
**To:** Ms. Denyse McGriff, Chair Oregon City Planning Commission  
**From:** Stacey Reed, PWS, Senior Wetland Scientist  
**Project:** City of Oregon City File No. PZ 15-01 and ZC 15-03  
**Subject:** Goal 5 ESEE Analysis – SFR and MUC Conflicting Uses

---

The applicant (Historic Properties) is proposing a zone change from “R-3.5, R-6, and R-10” Single-Family Dwelling District to “MUC-2” Mixed-Use Corridor 2, along with an amendment to the Oregon City Comprehensive Plan Map from Low and Medium Density Residential to Mixed Use Corridor.

City of Oregon City Planning Commission has conditions of approval prohibiting the following MUC-2 development types from the property: museums, libraries, postal services, repair shops, restaurants, retail trade, ancillary drive-in or drive through, and gas stations. Potential MUC-2 development that may occur on the site includes: single/detached residential, town center, parks, offices, services, child care, health and fitness clubs, banquet/conference center, medical or dental clinics, and other permitted uses listed under Chapter 17.29.020 of Oregon City code that are not restricted per the City’s Planning Commission conditions of approval.

LUBA document number 2016-045, January 25, 2017 requires substantial evidence that the possibility of land use development activities allowed under the proposed MUC-2 zoning will not result in a greater impact on the Goal 5 resources mapped on the site over the existing low and medium single-family housing zoning land use development activities.

Based on information provided in Exhibit 3 *Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy (ESEE) Phase 1 Analysis* of Metro’s April 2005 UGB Growth Management Functional Plan ordinance, the section below describes the potential conflicting uses associated with Single family residential with low and medium density zoning (SFR) and Mixed Use Center (MUC) zoning and an analysis of which conflicting use could have the greater potential to have an adverse effect on the functions and values of the Goal 5 resource mapped on the site (Newell Creek). Note the zoning themselves are not conflicting uses. It is the development activities and other disturbances permitted under the zoning that potentially conflicts with the functions and values associated with the Goal 5 resource. The City of Oregon City developed their Chapter 17.49 Title 13 regulations based on Metro’s UGB Management Function Plan. Therefore, the ESEE analysis provided below is consistent with Oregon City’s Goal 5 ordinance.

#### **Economic Consequences**

SFR – May provide increased adjacent property value. SFR developments typically retain more vegetation and tree cover than MUC development activities; however, does not provide an overall economic value to the community.

MUC – Enhances the potential for local economic development. According to Metro’s 2040 Growth Concept, only 3% of Title 13 lands are zoned MUC. Therefore, the zone change supports Metro’s Growth Concept Plan underlying goals to provide employment, income, and related tax benefits to local community.

Summary: While SFR may result in less vegetation removal, the MUC land use provides a greater economic benefit to the community through increased employment and educational opportunities and reduced

transportation facilities and utilities. MUC promotes more efficient use of land, minimizing urban sprawl. Therefore, the conflicting uses associated with MUC development activities provides a greater economic benefit, outweighing the SFR conflicting uses.

### **Social Consequences**

SFR – Abundance of low and medium density housing zoned in Metro’s UGB. Does not provide public educational or recreational opportunity. Potential to maintain scenic value.

MUC – According to Metro’s 2040 UGB Growth Concept Plan, only 3% of lands are zoned for MUC. Goal 5 resource provides natural stress relief to employment occupants. MUC land uses may also provide potential public educational and recreational benefit; however, there is a potential to reduce the scenic value.

Summary- Change in conflicting use zoning from SFR to MUC may provide an increased social benefit to Oregon City.

### **Environmental Consequences**

SFR –Impacts to Goal 5 resources and associated Impact Area (buffer) for SFR development may require: removal of native vegetation; non-native landscaping; pesticide and fertilizer use; and pets which tend to degrade habitat and water quality. Housing provides light and glare into the Goal 5 resource and buffer. Provides overall moderate on-site imperviousness, moderate infrastructure (roads, sidewalks, storm) requirements, and low to moderate overall natural landcover.

MUC – Larger building footprints than SFR, which may result in increased vegetation removal; however, MUC offers decreased VMT (vehicle miles traveled) which reduces overall water quality impacts in the local watershed. Minimal light and glare into Goal 5 resource and buffer. Provides overall moderate to high imperviousness, low infrastructure requirements, and low to moderate overall natural landcover.

Summary: Due to smaller development footprints, disturbance activities associated with SFR conflicting uses may provide a slightly lesser degree of impact to the Goal 5 resource and associated buffer than MUC conflicting use development activities. However, MUC requires lower infrastructure requirements and stricter water quality standards, providing potential for overall lesser amounts of impact to the local watershed.

### **Energy Consequences**

SFR - Tends to retain more trees than other zoning, reducing air quality and temperature impacts. However, tends to create more infrastructure (utilities and roads) and greater travel distances which can have a negative energy consequence.

MUC- Energy efficient zoning because it decreases VMT (vehicle miles traveled) and overall infrastructure requirements. Potential to reduces the amount of overall development through shared parking. Shared parking areas have vegetated islands reducing imperviousness and negative energy consequences associated with temperature regulation.

Summary: MUC conflicting use development activities for energy consequences may result in lesser impact on the Goal 5 resource and associated buffer over SFR development activities.

### **Overall Summary Conclusion**

In summary, the ESEE consequences that can occur within the proposed MUC zoning will not result in a greater conflict to the Goal 5 resource mapped on the site over the current SFR zoning. The change in zoning from SFR to MUC-2 may result in lesser amounts of environmental and energy consequences; however, MUC-2 has opportunity to provide increased economic and social benefits. Mixed use centers allow City residents to live

near their work, which tends to reduce vehicle use, which minimizes potential air, water and energy quality impacts.

The Goal 5 resource mapped on the site is protected under Chapter 17.49 Natural Resource Overlay District of the City's code of ordinances, regardless of site zoning. Chapter 17.49 of Oregon City code is compliant with Metro's Title 3 and 13 lands and the Statewide Planning Goal 5. Therefore, the potential for increased levels of impervious surfaces and vegetation loss associated with MUC-2 development activities will be protected and if necessary mitigated through local permitting compliant with Chapter 17.49.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding this memorandum.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Stacey Reed".

Stacey Reed, PWS  
Senior Wetland Scientist