

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECOMMENDING ) RESOLUTION NO. 81-287  
A CONTINUANCE OF THE CITY OF )  
HILLSBORO'S REQUEST FOR ) Introduced by the Regional  
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH ) Development Committee  
LCDC GOALS )

WHEREAS, Metro is the designated planning coordination body under ORS 260.385; and

WHEREAS, Under ORS 197.255 the Council is required to advise LCDC and local jurisdictions preparing comprehensive plans whether or not such plans are in conformity with the Statewide Planning Goals; and

WHEREAS, The city of Hillsboro is now requesting that LCDC acknowledge its Comprehensive Plan as complying with the Statewide Planning Goals; and

WHEREAS, LCDC Goal No. 2 requires that local land use plans be consistent with regional plans; and

WHEREAS, Hillsboro's Comprehensive Plan has been evaluated for compliance with LCDC goals and regional plans adopted by CRAG or Metro prior to June, 1980, in accordance with the criteria and procedures contained in the "Metro Plan Review Manual" as summarized in the Staff Reports attached as Exhibit "A" and "B"; and

WHEREAS, Metro finds that Hillsboro's Comprehensive Plan does not comply with LCDC Goal Nos. 2, 10, 11 and 14; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council recommends to LCDC that Hillsboro's Comprehensive Plan be continued to allow the City and Washington County to correct identified deficiencies in Goal Nos. 2, 10, 11 and 14.

2. That the Executive Officer forward copies of this Resolution and Staff Report attached hereto as Exhibits "A" and "B" to LCDC, city of Hillsboro and to the appropriate agencies.

3. That, subsequent to adoption by the Council of any goals and objectives or functional plans after November 1, 1981, the Council will again review Hillsboro's plan for consistency with regional plans and notify the city of Hillsboro of any changes that may be needed at that time.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 1981.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Officer

JH:gl  
4463B/283  
11/10/81

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT REVIEW

## CITY OF HILLSBORO

Goal No. 1: Citizen Involvement

No regional acknowledgment issues identified.

Goal No. 2: Land Use Planning

The City and county must sign an Urban Planning Area Agreement (UPAA) providing for consistent, cooperative land use planning for the City's planning area in order to meet regional expectations for Goal No. 2 compliance.

Goal No. 3: Agricultural Lands

Not applicable.

Goal Nos. 4 - 9: Forest Lands, Natural Resources, Air, Water and Land Quality, Natural Hazards, Recreation, Economy

The City appears to have done an effective and comprehensive job in addressing these elements. No regional acknowledgment issues have been identified.

Goal No. 10: Housing

The City has done a thorough analysis of its residential land needs and provided for a variety of creative housing opportunities to meet identified needs.

A technical memorandum updating the City's buildable lands inventory by plan designation shows that the City is providing the opportunity for an overall density of 10.7 units an acre and a 40/60 housing split, more than adequate to meet regional density expectations.

Although the City provides for mobile homes as an outright use only in one portion of its Immediate Urban area, Metro is satisfied that moderate priced housing needs are adequately met by this and other provisions, e.g., allowing up to 20 percent duplexes in single family zones.

Although Metro staff had expressed some concern about the discretion provided on subdivision approvals, a November 5 memorandum from Planning Director David Lawrence has provided Metro with sufficient assurance that the subdivision approval standards are not intended and may not be used to arbitrarily deny or attach conditions to proposed subdivisions.

The regional acknowledgment issues identified which Metro recommends be corrected prior to acknowledgment are as follows:

1. Upzoning: Much of the land in the City has not been upzoned to be consistent with local plan designations. Although the plan includes clear and objective standards for upzoning to achieve consistency with plan designations, plan policy and ordinance provisions allow for the imposition of conditions at the time of the zone change subject to only vague and discretionary criteria.

The City should amend plans and ordinance provisions to provide clear and objective standards for attaching conditions at the time of upzoning.

2. Regional Density Expectations for Future Urban Area: The City has designated a large area in its planning area for future urban use. The precise plan designations will be determined as provided by plan policy. Plan policy provides for the land to be designated in such a way as to meet regional density expectations, but relies on obsolete numbers (65/35 mix overall).

The City should amend its plan policy to provide that the Future Urban area will be assigned plan designation adequate to achieve an overall density of 10 units an acre and a 50/50 split on new construction.

With these changes, along with those recommended under Goal No. 14, Metro is satisfied that Hillsboro's Future Urban designation will be administered in a manner that minimizes negative impacts on the housing market and is consistent with current LCDC policy as expressed in an April 23, 1981, memo to LCDC from Wes Kvarsten regarding Housing Policy Discussion.

#### Goal No. 11: Public Facilities and Services

The City has carefully evaluated and planned for its public facility and service needs.

The City has adopted language agreeing to cooperate with and assist Metro in solid waste planning but should explicitly accept Metro's procedures for siting a sanitary landfill prior to acknowledgment.

#### Goal No. 12: Transportation

No regional acknowledgment issues identified.

#### Goal No. 13: Energy

No regional acknowledgement issues identified.

#### Goal No. 14: Urbanization

Three regional acknowledgment issues have been identified:

1. Timing for Conversion of Future Urban Lands: The City's Immediate Urban area includes a sufficient supply of land to meet housing needs for at least 10 years. However, future conversions will be subject to plan policy that provides that need should be evaluated for a three to five year time frame. Particularly because of the length of the plan amendment process and the potential of litigation subsequent to a decision, planning for a longer time frame will assure the adequate availability of land to accommodate a market choice on an ongoing basis.

Prior to acknowledgment the City should revise its policies to provide that it will provide a six to ten year supply of Immediate Urban land.

2. Protecting Redevelopment Potential: Although sewer connections are not allowed in the Future Urban area, land can be partitioned into lots as small as one acre under County zoning in the City's planning area. This does not adequately protect future redevelopment opportunities.

The City should not be acknowledged until Washington County has implemented by Ordinance its current growth management policies, or other policies that adequately protect future redevelopment opportunities.

3. Urban Growth Boundary: The City has not yet amended its plan to reflect the precise location of the UGB amendment southwest of the City, recently approved by Metro.

The City should amend its plan to show UGB is consistent with Metro's.

Goal No. 15: Willamette Greenway

Not applicable.

JH/gl  
4558B/274

# Metropolitan Service District

527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

## Memorandum

**Date:** March 10, 1980  
**To:** David Lawrence, Planning Director, City of Hillsboro  
**From:** Kenneth Lerner, Metro Plan Review *KL*  
**Subject:** Draft Review of the Public Facilities Element of the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan

We have completed our review of the Public Facilities Element and find the City staff has once again developed an excellent and thorough report. The Public Facilities report addresses most of the evaluation criteria on the plan review checklists and therefore we do not foresee any major difficulties with the plan element.

If you have any comments or questions please do not hesitate to contact us at the Metro office.

Listed below is a summary of recommended additions; Numbers referring to criteria on the Metro Plan Review Manual checklist worksheets.

(11.1.1) While there are identified problems with sewer service, the Unified Sewerage Agency (USA) is responsible for treatment. Therefore, it is advisable that a written statement, or agreement, (as per. 2.2.2.1b), from the service provider be submitted with the plan. Generally, the agreement should state that the USA has reviewed Hillsboro's comprehensive plan and is willing and able to provide services commensurate with the plan.

(11.1.1.5) and (11.2.2.3) The plan lacks the necessary regional sample language that recognizes Metro's role in '208', air quality and solid waste planning. The required regional language can be included in your proposed air, water and land quality element which has not yet been submitted. The recognition of Metro's role in these activities is important for plan acknowledgment. Adopting the sample language found in Section III J of the Plan Review Manual would be sufficient for compliance.

(11.1.5) The Public Facilities Element should also include a brief discussion of solid waste disposal needs. This discussion could be based upon the information in Metro's "Disposal Siting Alternatives," a copy of the relevant portions of which are attached.

David Lawrence - Memo  
Page 2  
March 10, 1980

(11.3.1) The implementation measures identified in the plan are good. Upon their submittal, Metro will review these documents to insure that the plan policies are adequately implemented and that development is permitted consistent with the City's ability to provide services.

As a final note, the Public Facilities Element included two items that were previously identified as plan deficiencies during the review of your Transportation Element (i.e., air transportation and the transportation disadvantaged). Both of these issues are adequately addressed in the Public Facilities Element.

KL:lz

Attachment

cc: Donna Stuhr, Metro Councilor  
Linda Macpherson, DLCD Field Representative  
Sue Klobertanz, Metro Coordinator  
Art Schlack, Washington County Coordinator

---

# Metropolitan Service District

527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

## Memorandum

---

**Date:** February 5, 1980  
**To:** David Lawrence, Planning Director, City of Hillsboro  
**From:** Ken Lerner, Metro Plan Review  
**Subject:** Draft Transportation Element of the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan

The Metro staff has reviewed Hillsboro's Transportation Element. It is an excellent report and Hillsboro should be commended. The report includes good inventories and discussions of transportation systems including a recognition of the Westside transit corridor and a high degree of emphasis on mass transit.

There are three concerns which should be mentioned: The need for some additional analysis and inclusion of data in certain areas, some functional classification inconsistencies between the Hillsboro plan and the ITP, and apparent disparities in the year 2000 traffic assignment volumes between Hillsboro and the Discussion Draft of the Regional Transportation Plan or RTP.

The following items have not been addressed either by disclaimer (that the item is not applicable) or inventory and policy: rail (12.1.1.3), air (12.1.1.4), water (12.1.1.5), pipeline (12.1.1.8) and for the transportation disadvantaged (12.2.1.1.a). In addition there was policy and planning on bikeways but there was no indication of existing conditions. Pedestrian walkways were included as sidewalks in street standards but existing conditions and plans were unclear. We suggest you contact DLCD to find out if and how they expect these items to be addressed. We do urge you to address the needs of transportation disadvantaged somewhere in the plan. A needs analysis based on demographic data, discussion of and policy on any current or planned local programs and policy language coordinating with Metro and Tri-Met plans would fully satisfy this requirement.

The other two issues, functional classification inconsistencies and traffic assignment volume disparities, are discussed in detail on the attached copy of a memorandum from the Metro Transportation Division. While neither of these problems need to be resolved prior to acknowledgment, we do urge you to seek resolution through the process for review and comment on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), as any inconsistencies



Memo - Hillsboro  
Page 2  
February 5, 1980

which remain after adoption may require that Hillsboro's plan be "re-opened" for amendment. We might add that for functional street classifications differences in terminology alone need not entail an inconsistency.

Finally, while Metro appreciates and supports the proposal to serve every resident by mass transit within two or three blocks, this recommendation is not consistent with Tri-Met policy. If the City wishes to include this proposal as policy, the inconsistency with Tri-Met should be clearly indicated. The plan should show how the City intends to provide for the proposed service by lobbying Tri-Met for change, or providing for their own alternative service.

In summary, we do not feel that any of the concerns expressed would affect a Metro recommendation or compliance acknowledgment, but we do urge you to: (1) include material on transportation disadvantaged somewhere in the plan, (2) discuss other inventory and policy deficiencies with DLCD and Tri-Met staff to determine what additional work in those areas, if any, they feel is needed for compliance, and (3) participate in the process for review and comment on the RTP.

KL:lz

Attachment

cc: Sue Klobertanz  
Linda Macpherson

---

# Metropolitan Service District

527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

## Memorandum

---

**Date:** February 6, 1980  
**To:** Ken Lerner  
**From:** Mike Saba, Gary Spanovich  
**Subject:** Metro Staff Review of the Transportation Element of the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan

The Transportation Element of the city of Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan was developed under contract by a private consultant. The result is a thorough and sophisticated transportation plan which addresses most areas of concern to Metro staff. However, two issues have emerged which should be discussed further with Hillsboro. These issues deal with functional classification inconsistencies and disparities between the year 2000 traffic volume projections found in the Hillsboro plan and the work currently being conducted by Metro.

### Functional Classification Issue

The Hillsboro plan identifies six levels of roadway functional class: (1) Freeway, (2) Expressway, (3) Arterial Street, (4) Collector Street, (5) Local Street, and (6) Cul-de-Sac Street. This compares with four basic classifications defined in the Interim Transportation Plan (ITP). These are: (1) Freeway/Expressway, (2) Principal Arterial, (3) Minor Arterial, and (4) Collector.

The greater number of distinctions within the lower order of classifications found in the Hillsboro Plan reflects the appropriate concern with localized circulation patterns by Hillsboro planners; whereas, the Metro classification system focuses on facilities of regional importance (i.e., the arterial classification).

Although collectors, as defined by Hillsboro, appear similar to ITP minor arterials in terms of function and volume capacity, it is probably more valuable to equate Hillsboro collectors with their ITP namesake and assume that Hillsboro arterials are equivalent to ITP principal and minor arterials. Based on this reasoning, Table 1 gives the recommended equivalencies.

TABLE 1

Functional Classification Equivalencies Between The  
 Hillsboro Transportation Plan and the ITP.

<u>HIERARCHY</u>	<u>HILLSBORO</u>	<u>ITP</u>
1.	Freeway/Expressway	Freeway/Expressway
2.	Arterial	Principal Arterial
3.	Arterial	Minor Arterial
4.	Collector St./Residential Collector St./Local Residential St./Cul-de-Sac St.	Collector

Using the above equivalencies, Table 2 lists the inconsistencies extent between the Hillsboro Plan and the ITP.

TABLE 2

Functional Classification Inconsistencies Between  
 The Hillsboro Transportation Plan and the ITP.

<u>FACILITY</u>	<u>HILLSBORO</u>	<u>ITP</u>
Evergreen Rd.	Arterial	Collector
Washington St. (east of 9th Ave.)	Arterial	Not Designated
Washington St. (west of 9th Ave.)	Collector	Not Designated
Oak St.	Arterial	Not Designated
Ninth Ave. (part of one-way couplet with 10th)	Arterial	Not Designated
Recommended South By-pass along RR Right-of-Way	Arterial	Not Designated
Jackson Rd. (North of Evergreen Rd.)	Arterial	Collector

Shute Rd. (North of Evergreen Rd.)	Arterial	Not Designated
Main St. (West of Ninth Avenue)	Collector	Arterial

Except for those facilities listed above, streets designated as collectors in the Hillsboro plan are either in agreement with ITP designations or are not designated at all in the ITP. Hillsboro collectors which are not designated in the ITP are probably not of regional significance.

Those facilities recommended for arterial standards by Hillsboro but designated as collectors, or not designated at all, in the ITP reflect, for the most part, the differences in traffic volume projections for the year 2000 between the Hillsboro model and the work by Metro systems planners. This is, in fact, the second major area of concern identified in this staff review.

#### Year 2000 Traffic Projection Disparities

Carl H. Buttke, Inc., the firm responsible for the Hillsboro Transportation Plan, has employed a projection technique similar to the one used at Metro in order to predict the number of person trips on street facilities in the Hillsboro planning area for the year 2000. From the perspective of this review, the Hillsboro model is potentially more accurate than the Metro model because it is based on a smaller geographic area rather than a zonal matrix covering the entire TSA region. Problems may arise, however, because future traffic volume assignments are based on locally conducted projections which, among other things, predict a seven fold increase in the amount of acreage devoted to industrial use (from 170 acres in 1978 to 1,160 acres in 2000). A sample of the disparities in year 2000 traffic assignments between the Hillsboro model and volumes found in the Discussion Draft of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (it should be noted the Draft has not yet been released) is provided in Table 3.

This situation will probably occur with a number of the region's jurisdictions as many of them relied on "208" projections or other assumptions concerning population and employment. The regional plan is dynamic and it is intended that the existing transportation planning process will resolve these disparities over time.

TABLE 3

Year 2000 Traffic Projection Disparities Between the Hillsboro  
Transportation Plan and the RTP on Selected Equivalent Links

TRAFFIC VOLUME PROJECTIONS  
(Range from lowest to highest)

<u>FACILITY</u>	<u>HILLSBORO</u>	<u>RTP</u>
Evergreen Rd.	11,000	4,000
Cornell Rd.	25,000-35,000	13,000-23,000
Baseline Rd.	15,000-29,000	8,000-11,000
Tualatin Valley Highway	36,000-40,000	29,000-32,000

Except for the two issues discussed above, the Hillsboro Transportation Plan is well conceived and addresses in a professional manner the transportation needs of Hillsboro within a regional context. Especially valuable are the series of recommended prioritized street improvements; the extensive documentation of funding sources and project cost estimates; the degree of public input during the planning process; the ambitious (perhaps overly ambitious) recommendations for local and regional public transportation; and the acknowledgement of the need for compatible high density land use near transit nodes and corridors. (This should be followed up in the housing and land use elements of the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan.) Also stressed are strategies such as car and vanpooling, flex time, restrictive parking policies, new developments which are amenable to pedestrian use, and park and ride facilities.

Neither of the two issues identified in this memo is significant. It is expected that the ITP will be overhauled regarding functional classification and the traffic volumes in the draft RTP will undergo extensive revision following their release and review by local jurisdictions.

I think Carl has done an excellent job and Hillsboro should be commended for the extraordinarily fine transportation plan they have produced.

MS:ss  
6772/99

---

# Metropolitan Service District

527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

## Memorandum

---

**Date:** November 30, 1979  
**To:** Tom Erwert, Planning Director, City of Hillsboro  
**From:** Ken Lerner, Metro Plan Review  
**Subject:** Draft Review of Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan on Agriculture, Forest, Housing and Urbanization

We have completed our review of the four sections of Hillsboro's plan listed above and are impressed with the overall quality and thoroughness of the work. The "self evaluation" you submitted with the documents was very helpful in our review and appreciate the time you took to complete it, and to meet with us to discuss our review.

Following are our comments on each of the concerns outlined in our November 26 meeting. Numbers refer to items on the Metro Plan Review Checklist. If you have any further concerns or question, please do not hesitate to contact myself or Jill Hinckley.

JH:KL:ss  
6108A  
0084A

cc: Linda Macpherson, DLCD  
Jim Knight, DLCD  
Art Schlack, Washington County

Attachment

## Forest Lands

While the policies in this section are adequate, the open space element of the plan should include more specific identification of wooded areas to be preserved and appropriate implementation techniques for preservation.

## Agricultural Lands

This goal does not apply in the urban area. The city's work in this area is an appropriate component of urbanization considerations, however.

## Housing

10.2.1 When you submit for acknowledgment, it would be helpful if your housing data and analysis were assembled in one document. This document should include:

1. An explanation of how lands were identified as suitable for residential use (e.g., that no residential zone is subject to flood or other hazard);
2. A table showing:
  - a. Vacant residential land by plan or zone designation (preferably both).
  - b. Calculation of the number of units expected to be built in each zone (netting out land not available for residential use due to market factors or land for streets, public and semi-public uses. The latter can be "netted out" by means of using an estimate of units per gross rather than net acre, but the basis for this estimate should be explained);
3. An estimate of the number of people that can be accommodated in these units, considering vacancy rates and estimated household size;
4. A comparison with housing needs (e.g., a finding that residential land currently available for urban use is adequate to meet housing needs to 1985).

10.2.2 Metro will support the City's designation of land for Future Urban (FU) use without specific land use designations, provided that strong policies are adopted that will address when and how these areas eventually will be designated for residential use adequate to meet the area's housing needs. As we discussed, this means development of policy and procedures adequate to ensure that total

development of the FU area will (1) accommodate expected population, and (2) be consistent with the City's desired 65:35 housing mix for residential areas.

10.3.1 The City must have implementation measures adequate to implement plan policies. Our understanding is that implementation of the policies and measure relating to mobile homes will be accomplished as follows:

1. The zoning ordinance will be amended to provide clear and objective standards for the application of the mobile home overlay zone, consistent with implementation measure "B."
2. Clear and objective standards for the approval of mobile home parks (implementation measure "C") will be provided either in a new overlay zone or in the existing PUD section.
3. The zoning ordinance has been amended to include mobile homes as a single family residence in the geographic area specified in implementation measure "D" and a copy of the provision will be made available to Metro staff.

In addition, a development review ordinance will be prepared to implement Housing Policies C, E, J and M, and these provisions will set clear and objective standards for approval of all needed housing types.

This development review ordinance should not include provisions or standards which would unreasonably increase housing costs so that they are too high to be competitive.

10.3.1.1 The material submitted includes data that examines land zoned for each use. However, zone designations are sometimes inconsistent with plan designations. The following table lists the two types of inconsistencies found:

I. Zone allows higher density/intensity

ZONE	DENSITY/USE	PLAN	DENSITY/USE
C-1	Commercial	RL	Low Density Res.
C-1	Commercial	OS	Open Space
M-2	Industrial	RM	Med.Density Res.
M-2	Industrial	RL	Low Density Res.
M-2	Industrial	RH	High Density Res.
A-2	Med. Density Res.	RL	Low Density Res.
C-1	Commercial	RH	High Density Res.
C-4	Commercial	RH	High Density Res.
A-1	Med. Density Res.	RL	Low Density Res.
No flood hazard zone yet applied		FP	Floodplain



II. Plan allows higher density/intensity

ZONE	DENSITY/USE	PLAN	DENSITY/USE
R-7	Low Density Res.	RM	Med. Density Res.
R-10	Low Density Res.	I	Industrial
R-7	Low Density Res.	RH	High Density Res.
A-2	Med Density Res.	C	Commercial
A-1	Med Density Res.	C	Commercial
A-3	High Density Res.	C	Commercial
R-85	Low Density Res.	RM	Med. Density Res.
R-10	Low Density Res.	RM	Med. Density Res.
R-10	Low Density Res.	C	Commercial

The inconsistencies in (I) on the above chart ("Baker" conflicts) must be rectified by zoning these areas to conform to the comprehensive plan designation and it is our understanding that such rezoning will be undertaken. For the inconsistencies in (II) on the above chart, it is necessary to insure that: (1) they will eventually be rezoned to be consistent with the plan map designation, and (2) development will not occur in the interim which is inconsistent with that designation. To address the first point, there should be plan policy identifying the public need for rezoning consistent with plan map designations. The following language would be adequate for this purpose: the comprehensive plan map identifies the most suitable locations for land uses needed in the City by the year 2000. To meet the burden of proof for a proposed zone change, it is both necessary and sufficient to demonstrate that the proposed zone is consistent with the comprehensive plan map designation for that area. The City may, however, attach conditions to the zone change or control its timing, consistent with the procedures and standards in the zoning ordinance, provided that those standards are clear and objective and consistent with the comprehensive plan."

It is up to the City, of course, to select whatever language best expresses its intent. For example, the City might wish to specify that the plan map designations represent the most suitable locations once a need is shown but that the burden is still on the applicant to show need. If this approach were taken, however, the City would have to be able to show that its current zoning was adequate for goal compliance, since rezonings could not be assured.

As we discussed, plan provisions adequate to establish minimum as well as maximum development densities allowable would be adequate to insure that development could not take place prior to upzoning in a manner inconsistent with the plan designation.

In addition, to avoid legal tangles, it would be advisable to amend the zoning ordinance by adding a statement to the effect that each zone specifies development standards that apply only in cases where the application of that zone is consistent with the density designations on the comprehensive plan map and that in other cases the land must be rezoned before development can be authorized.

### Urbanization

- 14.2.2.1(a) As we discussed, there are two inconsistencies with the regional UGB: (1) in the area with a plan designation of industrial located S.W. Woods Road, and (2) an area south of the city, between Morgan Road and Winter Hill Rd., with a plan designation of low density residential.

Our understanding is that you will correct the latter problem; we are still investigating whether the former is an error on our part.

- 14.2.2.2(c) Because of the time of its adoption, the wording in the comprehensive plan does not include the recognition of Metro's role in the UGB amendment process. The language in the plan suggests that only the City and county determine such amendments (III, B, 3 and 4). At some point, it would be desirable to update this language to recognize Metro's role.

- 14.2.3.2(b) The inclusion of strong policies to guide land use decisions when future urban land is converted will provide for adequate land to insure market choices (See 10.2.2, above).

- 14.2.3.2  
(c) & (e) As discussed, in order to see that future urban lands are protected for urban use, certain provisions are necessary. Washington County's zoning needs to be examined to insure that the zoning is sufficient for such protection (e.g., 10 acre minimum lot size).

It is our understanding that the county will undertake any rezoning necessary for this purpose. The City's policy to maintain existing zoning in future urban areas prior to conversion will be adequate only if this rezoning occurs, (assuming also a signed urban planning area agreement).

JH:ss  
6108/84

A G E N D A   M A N A G E M E N T   S U M M A R Y

TO: Metro Council  
FROM: Executive Officer  
SUBJECT: Recommending a Continuance of the City of Hillsboro's  
Request for Acknowledgment of Compliance with LCDC Goals

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Adoption of the attached Resolution recommending that LCDC grant a continuance of the city of Hillsboro's request for acknowledgment of compliance. Council action at this meeting will ensure that its recommendation is considered by LCDC.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: This acknowledgment recommendation was developed under the "Metro Plan Acknowledgment Review Schedule," June 20, 1980. This process provides jurisdictions an opportunity to work with Metro staff and interested parties to discuss and clarify acknowledgment issues prior to Regional Development Committee action.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: None

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: Hillsboro submitted its plan to LCDC for acknowledgement in June 1980. LCDC had scheduled a hearing on the City's request for acknowledgement for January 1982. Hillsboro has prepared an "active" plan, i.e., is seeking acknowledgement for its plan for its entire Urban Planning Area (UPA), rather than just the area within its city limits. The City cannot, therefore, be acknowledged until Washington County both adopts a UPA agreement with the City and rezones land in the City's UPA as necessary to be consistent with the City's plan.

Metro conducted a draft review of elements of the Hillsboro plan in November 1979 and February and March of 1980, and forwarded its comments to the City at that time.

Hillsboro's plan is one of the earliest and most thorough plans completed in the region. All the issues of regional concern identified by Metro are primarily technical rather than policy problems, and City Planning Director David Lawrence has expressed the City's willingness to undertake the changes proposed.

On November 9, the Regional Development Committee recommended Council adoption of the attached Resolution, which recommends that LCDC grant the City a continuance to correct deficiencies under Goal Nos. 2, 10, 11 and 14.

Hillsboro's plan does not yet comply with Goal No. 2 (Land Use Planning) because the City has not concluded an Urban Planning Area Agreement with Washington County.

To address regional concerns relating to Goal No. 10 (Housing), the City must:

1. amend plan and ordinance provisions to specify clear and objective criteria for attaching conditions to zone changes; and
2. amend plan policy on the assignment of plan designations for the Future Urban area to provide for an overall density of 10 units an acre and a 50/50 mix of single/multi-family housing.

To address regional concerns relating to Goal No. 14 (Urbanization), the City must:

1. amend its plan policies to provide for the conversion of Future Urban lands as needed to provide a six to ten year supply of immediate urban land; and
2. amend its plan map to be consistent with the regional Urban Growth Boundary.

In addition, the County must provide adequate protection for future redevelopment of future urban areas, e.g., by means of a ten-acre minimum lot size.

In the Metro region, Goal No. 11 (Public Facilities and Services) requires recognition of Metro's responsibility for solid waste disposal. Hillsboro has language pledging to cooperate with Metro's Solid Waste Management Plan, but should add explicit recognition of Metro's procedure for siting a sanitary landfill.

- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Metro staff did not find any issues which warranted serious consideration of an alternative recommendation (i.e., for denial).
- C. CONCLUSION: Metro's recommendation for a continuance will support local planning efforts while protecting regional interests.

JH:gl  
4464B/283  
11/10/81