



Sustaining Quality of Life in the Southern Willamette Valley

Region 2050 Alternative Growth Scenarios Evaluation: Land Use and Housing Draft March 28, 2005

This summary evaluates the extent to which each scenario meets the Regional Land Use and Housing Goals and Objectives.

Summary of Findings

The Satellite Communities Scenario rated highest overall, although the Compact Urban Growth Scenario was very close to the Satellite in meeting both the land use and housing criteria.

The Satellite Scenario would maintain urban and small city identities, support downtown revitalization in all cities; maintain and improve access to community, recreational, and cultural services; provide housing in the region that varies by type, affordability, and location; provide affordable housing choices; and promote livable neighborhoods that are walkable and have access to transit and local goods and services. The Compact Growth Scenario rated second highest overall.

The Satellite Scenario would also moderately meet the objective to maintain rural community identity because it would maintain rural communities as there are today, except in Alvadore, Goshen, and Pleasant Hill which would become growth centers, similar to other small towns in the region. The scenario promotes less efficient land uses than the Compact Growth Scenario because housing in the Compact would develop at urban densities rather than the small town densities of the Satellite. The Satellite and the Compact Scenarios would have a negative impact on meeting rural residential development demand because there is decrease in rural residential lands in these scenarios. In contrast to these two scenarios, the Rural Growth Scenario rated lowest on all criteria except meeting rural residential land demand.

The Compact Urban Growth Scenario rated second highest overall. The Compact Scenario rated highest in terms of efficiency of land uses, i.e., redevelopment and increased densities in cities where necessary and desired. Although the Compact Urban Growth Scenario has the highest regional housing densities, the distribution of housing in the small cities in the Satellite makes housing more affordable, e.g., "starter

homes,” because the land is cheaper in the small cities and housing can be built less expensively than in the metro cities. In the metro cities, more infill and redevelopment will occur in the Compact and this can be more expensive than green field development.

The Rural Growth Scenario rated lowest on all criteria, except to meet rural residential land demand. This scenario had the most inefficient use of the land with the lowest regional housing densities. Access to goods, services, and other amenities would be very low because the densities are too low to support additional local goods and services and regional mass transit. Most of the new one and two acre lot rural housing would not be affordable to most income groups, assuming affordability is measured by the median price of housing in the region which ranges from \$85,000 to \$165,000.

Methodology

The three scenarios were digitized at the land use level and data were generated on the regional distribution of population and employment and housing and employment densities (see tables 1 and 2 in Appendix A, Development Type Assumptions in Appendix B, and Scenario Graphics on the following pages.) Staff rated the scenarios on each of the criteria based on the distribution and concentration of development types in the region. The RTAC reviewed and commented on the results of the evaluation and the results were modified based on their input.

Assumptions

- See tables 1 and 2 in Appendix A, Development Type Assumptions in Appendix B, and Scenario Graphics on the following pages for assumptions regarding densities and the distribution of population and employment.
- Average household size in small cities and rural area will be 2.4 and in metro cities 2.24. (These numbers are used to calculate population totals).
- The market will respond to the distribution of jobs and housing as indicated in the tables for the scenarios.
- Adequate public facilities and services will be available to serve housing development in each scenario (note that this assumption is assessed as part of the Community Facilities and Services Evaluation).
- The types of housing identified in each scenario will be appropriate for that location (e.g., metro vs. small cities vs. rural lands).
- See Development Type Assumptions in Appendix B for definitions of development types.

- Regional commuter services and major transportation improvements would be made in the Compact Growth and Satellite Communities Scenarios to Highways 126W and 58, and to Interstate 5 and Clear Lake Road.

Criteria

The evaluation measures the extent to which each scenario satisfies the following applicable Regional Goals and Objectives.

Land Use

Goal

Promote land use and development patterns that sustain and improve quality of life in the Southern Willamette Valley, maintain each community's identity, facilitate economic development, and conserve and manage natural resources.

Objectives

1. Identify the appropriate future distribution of population and employment throughout the region based on the vision of the region and the individual communities.
2. Provide employment opportunities, affordable housing choices, open space and natural areas, and access to goods and services.
3. Promote efficient use of land and limit adverse impacts on environmentally sensitive lands, for example, by encouraging redevelopment and increased densities in cities where necessary and desired (e.g., Smart Growth).
4. Identify regional strategies that support downtown revitalization in all cities.
5. Maintain rural community identities and protect high value farm and forest lands.
6. Consider rural residential development patterns and needs.
7. Develop a regional strategy to maintain and improve access to community, recreational and cultural services.

Housing

Goal

Seek to ensure that each community has an adequate variety of housing types to meet the needs of residents.

Objectives

1. Foster public-private partnerships to address unmet local and regional housing needs.
2. Encourage a variety of housing options for residents in the region, including housing that varies by type, affordability, and location.
3. Encourage the availability of adequate financial and technical assistance to meet the housing needs of residents in the region.
4. Encourage conservation of the existing housing stock.
5. Encourage the incorporation of energy and water efficiency standards in housing for retrofits and remodels, such as by encouraging financial incentives.
6. Encourage urban and small town environments that promote neighborhood livability.

Land Use Assessment

The Satellite Scenario would maintain urban and small city identity more than the other two scenarios because the small cities would be more self-contained than they are today. The small cities would take on a more definable form with more local goods and services, more mixed use areas in pedestrian friendly, “nodal development,” more community activities, and thus more opportunities for interaction and community involvement. This scenario also distributes land uses in a way that retains open space between communities more so than the other two scenarios. The Compact Scenario would maintain urban identity but less so small city; and would impact open space between communities more than the Satellite Scenario. The rural growth scenario would reduce the open space between communities which helps define them.

The Compact Scenario would maintain rural communities more than the other two because the rural communities would remain as they are today, except for Alvadore, Goshen, and Pleasant Hill which would no longer be separate communities but would be part of the metro UGB. The Satellite also retains rural communities, but it transforms these three rural communities into growth centers resembling small towns. All rural communities would become much denser in the Rural Growth Scenario, which is why this scenario rated low on this criterion.

The Compact Scenario does more to promote the efficient use of land, i.e., redevelopment and increased densities in cities where necessary and desired, than the other two scenarios. The Compact develops at urban densities with maximum

redevelopment in the metro cities. The Satellite develops at small town densities, and the Rural at rural densities.

Both the Satellite and the Compact Scenario increase densities to the point where this will support downtown revitalization. This occurs at a more regional level in the Satellite and there is very little downtown revitalization in the Rural Scenario.

The Rural Scenario is the only scenario that meets rural residential land demand because it would more than double the rural residential lots now in the region. Rural residential development decreases in the other two scenarios because these rural lands, located primarily outside UGBs, are absorbed into UGBs as they expand. The Satellite Scenario increases small town population and local goods and services, and thus access to community, recreational, and cultural services which grow as the population and employment grows. The Compact closely resembles the Satellite in this effect, with major transportation improvements between communities improving access to these activities in the metro area. The Rural Scenario disperses development to the extent that densities are not adequate to support access to these amenities.

Housing Assessment

Both the Compact and Satellite Scenarios provide housing in the region that varies by type and affordability. Housing in the Satellite also varies by location because there are more housing starts in the small cities. In the Rural Scenario, housing is largely dispersed and is primarily single family homes on large rural lots.

Both the Compact and Satellite have more medium density and nodal development than today, providing more affordable housing choices. The Compact has the most high density residential and the Satellite provides more affordable single-family “starter homes” because the land and development costs are cheaper than in the metro cities. The Rural Scenario is believed to provide less affordable housing because housing costs tend to increase with lot size, and these one- and two-acre rural lots outside UGBs and rural communities would resemble the type of expensive large lot residential development that occurs inside cities today. More research will be conducted on the market factors that would affect this type of residential development to verify or modify this finding.

Both the Compact and the Satellite promote neighborhood livability in urban areas and small towns through more walkable communities and greater access to transit and local goods and services. Nodes are present in all scenarios in metro and also in small cities in Compact and Satellite. Regional commuter services are assumed in the Compact and Satellite as is nodal development. The Satellite was rated higher because access to local goods and services also improves with increased population in the small towns in that scenario. The Rural Scenario rated low on these criteria because there are not sufficient concentrations of population to support these types of local access.