



# Clatsop Regional Housing Taskforce

---

**October 26, 2022**

**1-3 PM**

**Bob Chisholm Community Center  
1225 Avenue A.  
Seaside, OR 97138**

## **Attendees:**

Denise Lofman, CREST; Brandon Ogilvie, City of Cannon Beach; Bruce St. Denis, City of Cannon Beach; Don Bohn, Clatsop County; Gail Henrikson, Clatsop County; Steve Wright, City of Seaside; John Toyooka, Clatsop County; Zach Hunt, Clatsop County; Henry Balensifer III, City of Warrenton; Brett Estes, DLCD; Robert St. Clair, City of Cannon Beach; Susan Penrod, Seaside School District; Jeff Adams, City of Cannon Beach; Chet Moritz, North Coast Housing Solutions; Laura Jackson, Renovate PDX; Les Sinclair, City of Cannon Beach; Erick Bengel, The Astorian;

## Notes

### **CRHTF September Meeting Three Review**

Discussion of Northwest Housing Authority's role in serving the spectrum of Affordable Housing in the region. The County is seeking to partner with NWOHA to provide more capacity to Elissa's work via the American Rescue Plan Act funds. The limitations of the statewide planning system and how they play out at the local levels from the County's and City's roles and how many of the current rules are in flux and under consideration at the state level.

### **Arch Cape Community Forest Cluster Project, Chet Moritz, North Coast Housing Solutions**

Chet Moritz introduced a cottage cluster concept for Clatsop County surplus lands in the Arch Cape area. A phased development on approximately 12 acres off of Raven Hill and Third Avenue, for twenty to fifty units spread across five clusters in a light footprint, ecologically sensitive development. Current density is one unit per one acre, with clustering of homes to allow preservation of the surrounding natural lands. Deed restrictions to at least 20 years and held to 80% AMI and possibly longer.

### **HomeWork: Scenario Three: Forest Cluster Development**

1. Could this type of Cluster Development (CD) be developed in your jurisdiction?

Answers were split across the county, with about equal parts saying these would be allowed, wouldn't and not sure.

2. How many on-site parking spaces would be required or would they be required to seek a variance?

Equal distribution in responses, with a third saying more than one parking spaces would be required per unit, a quarter saying one per unit and another third unsure.

3. Would they need to provide their own septic on-site?

The majority of responses said 'no, they can hook into the community's system.'

4. Does your jurisdiction require they hook-up to community water system?

The majority of responses said that they would be required to hook-up to the septic system.

5. What would be the largest barriers to such a development?

Lack of available land, NIMBYism and the difficulties in getting through the development process were the major concerns.

6. Is this an outright use in most of your community's residential zoning districts?

The majority were unsure or stated their jurisdictions didn't allow them as outright uses in their residential districts.

7. Do you have incentives for such affordable developments, if they came forward?

Two-thirds stated that they currently don't have any incentives.

8. Does your jurisdiction have comparable examples?

And, there were no examples to be found of comparable projects.

### **HomeWork: Scenario Four: Future Development**

1. What are the biggest constraints to future affordable housing development in your community?

'Current Development Ordinance text is limiting', 'Current Zoning for Affordable Development is limiting', and 'Sensitive Lands limit Affordable Development' were the leading constraints to affordable housing.

2. How should your community develop to best meet the affordable housing needs?

The majority of respondents felt that altering plans to allow for density in focused areas of the Community is the leading method of how to grow, while nearly half of respondents seek to alter plans to expand Urban Growth Boundaries.

3. Where should your community develop to best meet the affordable housing needs?

Whether through in-fill of current vacant lands, under-utilized lands or expansion into or of the UGBs respondents seemed to feel every method should be investigated.

4. What are your community's biggest assets towards affordable housing?

The biggest assets were the partnerships working towards implementing programs or projects and current funding, yet many were unsure of their community's assets.

5. What are the biggest barriers to affordable housing in your community?

Lack of land and the state's constraints on sensitive lands seem to be the leading concerns, along with current policies that limit development.

### **Asset Mapping**

Staff presentation on asset mapping of constraints and opportunities in Cannon Beach as a first model of where we might grow in the future shows the limitations placed on affordable housing by state statutes when that language meets the sensitive lands for which our coastal communities are known. From steep slopes, flood areas, wetlands and tsunami inundation to those vacant lands zoned for multi-family development. In Cannon Beach, after all of the constraints are considered only a dozen or so properties meet the state affordable housing needs. Even if we look at available public lands in the Cannon Beach area they are also limited by the sensitive land constraints. So where do we grow will need to incorporate how we grow, whether we look towards map and zoning amendments within our jurisdictions or look to regional growth opportunities.

### **Foundational Documents**

Staff introduced the Deed Restriction Guidelines at Meeting 3 and provided Eagle County, Colorado's Affordable Housing Guidelines and the Clatsop Regional Affordable & Workforce Housing Guidelines as the second Foundational Document, which we will begin to discuss at our next meeting. The third document, which will be an Intergovernmental Agreement will be provided in the coming weeks for future discussion.

Discussion of whether we are intending a centralized METRO structure was a concern, as well as the state limitations surrounding affordable housing. Gail Hendrikson brought up the State's Oregon Needs Analysis, UGB expansion discussion and the biological opinion interpretation's impact on flood plain properties as areas that we need to have discussion on as they will have major impacts on future development, not just with affordable housing, but all housing. There was also a general consensus from the survey responses, on where and how we grow, that the other key point of discussion will how a communication strategy and policies take into account the NIMBYism that has become a part of every development discussion.

## **Affordable & Workforce Housing in Model Communities, Courtney McEleneey, San Miguel Regional Housing Authority**

The regional Housing Authority is currently funded equally by San Miguel County and the Town of Telluride. They previously administered the Mountain Village deed restricted properties. Funded mainly through general funds, with some coming through fees. They administer the rental and ownership programs and run the education programs for the region. They operate the lottery programs and facilitate the affordable housing discussions within the region, operate the voucher program and partner with the large employers and jurisdictions on policies and programs. Mountain Village isn't as restrictive on their Deed Restriction program, so they didn't need as much oversight. The pricing of housing in the region, continues to drive-out the lower AMI and Section 8 members of the community. The Housing Authority administer 500 deed restricted properties across the region. Board of County Commissioner, County Manager and Town Council Member and Manager, along with an At-Large position. Work with Telluride Foundation on developing new properties, working in tandem with the County on new stock. They also have mitigation units, through inclusionary ordinances. The various jurisdictions work with the development community on the front-end planning and development work. Lotteries are often dependent on where the units are located in relation to workforce. Housing Authority doesn't have a lot of input on the planning and policy fronts. The region is 700 beds short of their Housing Needs report. The deed restriction rental lotteries are on a wait list, while the units for sale, are by application based system. Some units upon resale are limited to lottery, while others sell to whomever qualifies. Moving towards lottery for all units, as a more equitable system. Almost all of the Telluride stock was built by the jurisdiction. Town of Telluride has a more restrictive tier-based system, with appreciation caps, while San Miguel County is more based on workforce housing, without appreciation caps. Deed restrictions and programs reviewed on a bi-annual schedule. Always reworking and retooling their programs.

Discussion followed on where the funding is going to come from? Compared to Colorado and some of these mountain town discussions, Oregon communities are hand-cuffed by taxing structures and the tools local jurisdictions have to attack housing. Excise taxes on second homes or as Colorado utilizing tourism taxes could provide funding streams. Inherent institutional problems with revenue funding models statewide are at the heart of these concerns. Parking, SDCs and other incentives must make sense at the local level. Warrenton has concerns about a centralized planning METRO style that strips local sovereignty, but open to countywide standardized planning.

### **Taskforce Timeline**

Next meeting will be on Organizational Alignment, focusing on who's on board for what.

### **Next Steps**

The 2022 North Coast Housing Summit will be held at the Seaside Convention Center December 6, 2022. Meeting dates were considered for the Fifth Meeting in November. Due to the holiday season and election season we may want to wait to hold that meeting after the holidays, in January.

### **Next Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 1-3 PM**

Bob Chisholm Community Center  
1225 Avenue A  
Seaside, OR 97138