Executive Order No. 26

Authority: Metro Code 3.01.015

Effective Date: Upon receipt of notification that the area affected

has annexed to Metro.

This administrative interpretation was requested by Jerald Powell, Annexation Assistant for the City of Portland, in a letter dated February 3, 1986, attached as Exhibit A. Mr. Powell requests that the UGB be defined to follow the nearest property line, rather than dividing that property, as currently mapped. Metro Code 3.01.015(a) allows administrative interpretation "when the UGB map and the legal description of the UGB are found to be inconsistent."

The location of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) in this area is uncertain because of the legal description, which is "city limits extended" (see Exhibit B). There are two problems with this description. First, the UGB follows city limits both to the east and to the southwest (see yellow lines on Exhibit C). The mapped UGB roughly approximates an extension of the city limits line to the southwest, but the legal description does not so specify. More troublesomely, the city limits line to the southwest is a meandering line, rather than a straight one from which an extension could meaningfully be drawn.

The legal description thus does not describe any one specific line with which the mapped line can be compared. However, if the last straight segment of city limits to the southwest were extended, that line would differ from the mapped location of the UGB, as would any extension of the city limits to the east (see red lines on Exhibit C). An administrative interpretation is thus an appropriate way to resolve the location of the UGB in this area.

#### Findings

Metro Code 3.01.015(a) provides that "the map should be preferred over the legal description in absence of clear evidence to the contrary." There is no record of legislative intent regarding this particular stretch of the boundary. However, there is clear evidence of both CRAG and Metro policy that tax lots should be divided only when needed to follow another existing, definable demarcation.

The Land Use Framework Element, or LUFE, of the CRAG Regional Plan, (Article II, Section 1(a)) defined Type 1, or final, boundaries as follows: "Boundaries fully specified along identified geographic features such as rivers and roads or other described lines such as section lines and district boundaries." Metro policy on this issue is expressed by Metro Code 3.01.040(d)(l), which provides special, simplied standards to make the UGB coterminus with the nearest property lines when two acres or less are affected.

If the UGB were defined to follow the nearest property line as Portland requests, about three and one-half acres of the currently split property, some which is below the bankline, would be "added" to the urban area. The property is developed as a marina, through which the mapped location of the UGB now runs. Two or so acres of water area would be removed.

The Metro boundary in this area follows city limits, excluding the subject property and others nearby.

## Conclusion

In the absence of any record of specific legislative intent in this area, the general legislative intent of CRAG and Metro to follow tax lot or other identifiable "described" lines provides sufficient basis to correct the mapped location of the UGB.

The UGB shall, therefore, be defined in this area to include all of the subject tax lot, and to follow its lot lines to join with city limits on either side. More precisely, the UGB would run from the northeast corner of lot 5 in the Harborton subdivision in T2N RlW Section 2 (at the point at which the Portland city limits, which define the UGB to the southwest of this point, turn southeasterly along the northeastern lot line of lot 5) northeasterly along the northwestern lot lines of lots 4, 3, 2 and 1 in the same Harborton subdivision, thence northeasterly in a straight line from the northeast corner of lot 1 to the southwest corner of tax lot 3 in T2N RlW Section 34, thence along the western and northern lot lines of tax lot 3 to the point of intersection with the Portland city limits (following the west line of Jacob Sanders D.L.C. by compromise), and then north and east along Portland city limits. Maps of the UGB shall be corrected to show the UGB as described, and as mapped on Exhibit D.

Because the property is not currently within Metro's jurisdiction, this order shall not become effective until the property is annexed to Metro. The effective date of this order does not, however, affect the deadline for appeal to the Metro Council, which, under Metro Code 3.01.015(d), is 20 days from the date of receipt of this order.

Signed this 28th of Murch, 1986.

Executive Officer

JH/srs 5259C/452-3 03/25/86



## CITY OF

# PORTLAND, OREGON

#### BUREAU OF PLANNING

Margaret D. Strachan, Commissioner Norman A. Abbott, AICP, Director Room 1002, 1120 S.W. Fifth Avenue Portland, Oregon 97204-1966 (503) 796-7700

Annexation Central City Plan Housing Land Development Land Use Neighborhood Planning Urban Design February 3, 1986

Metropolitan Service District 527 SW Hall Street Portland, OR

RE: A-39-85

Attention: Jill Hinkley

Dear Jill:

The City of Portland has received petitions for annexation from several residents in the "Harborton" area of NW Portland. This area is adjacent to the Urban Growth Boundary and is a "notch" on Portland's City boundary. One parcel on this area is apparently traversed by the Urban Growth Boundary. The boundary, as drawn, cuts through a marina which is located principally in the NW corner of Tax Lot 3, Section 34, T2N, RIW.

It appears to us that this location of the Urban Growth Boundary was not intended to be a hard and fast line, and that it would be far better to designate the entire parcel "urban" with its marine-oriented manufacturing use.

We know of no services that would be affected by such a change. It appears unlikely that any change in land use would result. The area of the parcel part in question looks to be about three and one-half acres, although a good deal of that area is beyond the bank line.

It is, therefore, our request that the Urban Growth Boundary in this area be reviewed administratively to determine if in fact the boundary as described is properly located. It appears to us that a very good case can be made for declaring that the entire parcel that is bisected is urban, has been urban for generations and should not have been divided by the Urban Growth Boundary in the first place.

I am enclosing a map and aerial of the area, identifying the parcel in question. If you need further information please call me. My phone number is 796-7728.

Thanks.

Very truly yours,

Jerald M. Powell Annexation Assistant

JMP/sb











