

Columbia County Assessors Record of District Boundaries

Tuesday, May 26, 2020

Init Date: 5-22-2017

Also See No.: .

No.: 2017 . 03

How Initially Received: Email from St Helens

Affected District Name: City of St Helens

Remarks:

District Ord No: A.1.17

Effective Date: 5-17-2017

Name of Approving Jurisdiction: St Helens

Jurisdiction Ord No:

Effective Date:

Legal Description Received: Y

Map Received: Y

If A School Dist, Has OAR 150-330.123 Been Filed:

If Non-SchoolDist, List LB-50 Valuation:

Type Of Action: A

With Whom:

Correction Remarks:

DOR Approved: Y

No: 5-325-2017

Date: 5-22-2017

Recording Information:

1) Col. Co. Deed Records:

Comm Journal:

2) Other :

Name:

:

Number:

Date:

Code Areas Affected or Changed:

Affected Area:

From Code Area: 02-02

Townships

Ranges

Sections

To Code Area: 02-11

4

1

08-CA-03000

Date Completed: 5-30-2017

Remarks:

Notice to Taxing Districts

ORS 308.225



Cadastral Information Systems Unit
PO Box 14380
Salem, OR 97309-5075
fax 503-945-8737
boundary.changes@oregon.gov

Jacob A. Graichen
City of St. Helens
Attn: City Planner
P.O. Box 278
St. Helens OR 97051

Description and Map Approved
May 22, 2017
As per ORS 308.225

☒ Description ☒ Map - Received from: Jacob Graichen
On: 5/18/2017

This is to notify you that your boundary change in Columbia County for:
ANNEX to CITY OF ST. HELENS (Weigandt)

ORD. #3216-- (Annexation A.1.17)

has been: ☒ Approved 5/22/2017
☐ Disapproved

Department of Revenue File Number: 5-325-2017

Reviewed by: Elise Bruch, 503-302-8353

Boundary: ☒ Change ☐ Proposed Change

The change is for:

- ☐ Formation of a new district
☒ Annexation of a territory to a district
☐ Withdrawal of a territory from a district
☐ Dissolution of a district

If you have not already done so, the approved version of the map(s), legal descriptions(s) and signed ordinance must also be filed with the County Assessor and Secretary of State

- ☐ Transfer
☐ Merge
☐ Establishment of Tax Zone

Notice from Taxing District

Boundary change packets must be received by the **Department of Revenue** and the **County Assessor(s)** by March 31.

For Department of Revenue use only			
Prepared by		DOR file number	
Date received	Date approved	Date disapproved	
Notes			

District name City of St. Helens			
Mailing address PO Box 278	City St. Helens	State OR	ZIP 97051
County name Columbia	Second county name (if applicable)		
Contact person Jacob Graichen	Second contact person (if applicable)		
Phone (503) 366-8204	Email jacobg@ci.st-helens.or.us		
Ordinance/resolution/order ORD No. 3216	Planning file number A.1.17		
Election date n/a	Effective date June 16, 2017		

Notes

DOR Preliminary Review DOR 5-P6-2017

Boundary

☒ Change ☐ Proposed change ☐ Preliminary review ☐ Delayed annexation

The change is for

- ☐ Formation of a new district
- ☒ Annexation of territory to a district
- ☐ Withdrawal of territory from a district
- ☐ Dissolution of a district
- ☐ Transfer
- ☐ Merge
- ☐ Establishment of tax zone

Documents included

- ☒ Ordinance/Resolution/Order
- ☒ Map of Boundary Change (shows point of beginning and all bearings and distances.)
- ☒ Legal description of Boundary Change

Send to

Oregon Department of Revenue
Cadastral Information Systems Unit
PO Box 14380
Salem OR 97309-5075

Contact us

Email: boundary.changes@oregon.gov
Fax: 503-945-8737

City of St. Helens
ORDINANCE NO. 3216

AN ORDINANCE TO ANNEX AND DESIGNATE
LOTS 19 AND 20, BLOCK 2, GOLF CLUB ADDITION

WHEREAS, applicant Wayne and Judith Weigandt have requested to annex to the City of St. Helens property described as **Lots 19 and 20, Block 2, Golf Club Addition, Columbia County, Oregon**. This property is also depicted per **Exhibit A**; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has consented in writing to the proposed annexation; and

WHEREAS, the applicant constitutes 1) all the owners of the property to be annexed, and 2) more than half of the owners of the property to be annexed own more than half of such property representing more than half of the assessed value pursuant to ORS 222.170(1); and

WHEREAS, the City Council must determine the incorporated Comprehensive Plan Map designation and the Zone Map designation; and

WHEREAS, appropriate notice has been given and a public hearing was held April 19, 2017 on the annexation proposal; and

WHEREAS, the Council has considered findings of compliance with criteria and law applicable to the proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF ST. HELENS DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The above recitations are true and correct and are incorporated herein by this reference.

Section 2. The property described as **Lots 19 and 20, Block 2, Golf Club Addition, Columbia County, Oregon** and depicted in **Exhibit A** is hereby accepted for annexation to the City of St. Helens.

Section 3. The St. Helens Zoning Ordinance Map is hereby amended to reflect that the property described herein shall be zoned Highway Commercial, HC.

Section 4. The St. Helens Comprehensive Plan Map is hereby amended to reflect that the property described herein shall be designated as Highway Commercial, HC.

Section 5. In support of the above annexation and amendments described herein, the Council hereby adopts the Annexation A.1.17 Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, attached hereto as **Exhibit B** and made part of this reference.


Section 6. The effective date of this Ordinance shall be 30 days after approval, in accordance with the City Charter and other applicable laws.

Read the first time: May 3, 2017
Read the second time: May 17, 2017

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 17th day of May, 2017 by the following vote:

Ayes: Locke, Carlson, Conn, Scholl

Nays: None


Rick Scholl, Mayor

ATTEST:


Kathy Payne, City Recorder

N.E. 1/4 S.W. 1/4 SEC. 8 T. 4N. R. 1W. W.M.

COLUMBIA COUNTY

04 01 08 CA

04 01 08 CA

Last Revised:
11-20-15

**CITY OF ST. HELENS PLANNING DEPARTMENT
FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
Annexation A.1.17**

APPLICANT: Wayne Weigandt
OWNER: Wayne & Judith Weigandt
ZONING: Columbia County's General Commercial, C-3
LOCATION: 4N1W-8CA-300; Lots 19-20, Block 2 of the Golf Club Addition
PROPOSAL: The property owner filed consent to annex to develop the site in the City

The 120-day rule (ORS 227.178) for final action for this land use decision is n/a [Clark v. City of Albany, 142 Or App 207, 921 P2d 406 (1996)].

SITE INFORMATION / BACKGROUND

The subject property is about 0.51 acres located off Highway 30 behind Les Schwab Tire Center at the corner of First Street and Kavanagh Avenue. It is a level, vacant site with about half of the parcel paved and half gravel. It is accessed from First Street. First Street lacks right-of-way frontage improvements (sidewalk and curb) in front of the subject property except along the Les Schwab Tire Center property where it was constructed as part of a recent re-construction of the facility. Kavanagh Avenue also lacks sidewalks and curb and dead ends at the edge of the Les Schwab Tire Center's property. Kavanagh Avenue was developed for truck access as part of the Les Schwab Tire Center reconstruction.

PUBLIC HEARING & NOTICE

Hearing dates are as follows: April 11, 2017 before the Planning Commission and April 19, 2017 before the City Council.

At their April 11, 2017 meeting, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommended approval of the annexation proposal.

Notice of this proposal was sent to surrounding property owners within 300 feet of the subject property(ies) on March 15, 2017 via first class mail. Notice was sent to agencies by mail or e-mail on the same date. Notice was published in the The Chronicle on March 29, 2017. Notice was sent to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on March 7, 2017 via e-mail.

AGENCY REFERRALS & COMMENTS

City Engineering: Public sanitary sewer is stubbed to this property at the southeast corner. Public water is located in the First Street right-of-way and will have to be extended to serve the property. Frontage improvements shall be required when development of the property occurs, including a plan for disposing of storm drainage.

APPLICABLE CRITERIA, ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

SHMC 17.08.040 (1) – Quasi-judicial amendment and standards criteria

- (a) A recommendation or a decision to approve, approve with conditions, or to deny an application for a quasi-judicial amendment shall be based on all of the following standards:
 - (i) The applicable comprehensive plan policies and map designation; and that the change will not adversely affect the health, safety, and welfare of the community; and
 - (ii) The applicable Oregon Statewide Planning Goals adopted under ORS Chapter 197, until acknowledgment of the comprehensive plan and ordinances; and
 - (iii) The standards applicable of any provision of this code or other applicable implementing ordinance.
- (b) Consideration may also be given to:
 - (i) Any applicable evidence of change in the neighborhood or community or a mistake or inconsistency in the comprehensive plan or zoning map as it relates to the property which is the subject of the development application.

Discussion: (a)(i) The Comprehensive Plan designation for the subject property is Unincorporated Highway Commercial (UHC). Applicable designation and zoning district for annexation are discussed later.

There is no known conflict with the general Comprehensive Plan policies identified in Chapter 19.08 SHMC. Note that SHMC 19.08.030 discusses public services and facilities and includes utility provisions (e.g., water and sewer) as well as services such as police and library. In sum, all services are intertwined; the consent to annexation allows connection to City sewer to support existing and future development on the subject property, and, once annexed, all other City services/facilities. By this process, the proposal complies with this aspect of the Comprehensive Plan.

There is no known conflict with the specific Comprehensive Plan policies identified in Chapter 19.12 SHMC.

There is no known conflict with the addendums to the Comprehensive Plan which includes Economic Opportunities Analysis (Ord. No. 3101), Waterfront Prioritization Plan (Ord. No. 3148), the Transportation Systems Plan (Ord. No. 3150), the Corridor Master Plan (Ord. No. 3181), and the Parks & Trails Master Plan (Ord. No. 3191).

Finally, there is no evidence that this proposal will be contrary to the health, safety and welfare of the community.

(a)(ii) The City's Comprehensive Plan has been adopted by the State, thus, the applicable Oregon Statewide Planning Goals adopted under ORS Chapter 197 do not need to be analyzed per this section.

(a)(iii) In addition, Section 3 of the City's Charter states that "annexation, delayed or otherwise, to the City of St. Helens, may only be approved by a prior majority vote among the electorate." However, during the 2016 Legislative Assembly, Senate Bill 1578 was passed. It states that a

City shall annex the territory without submitting the proposal to the electors if certain criteria are met:

1. Property is within the UGB
2. Property will be subject to the City's Comprehensive Plan
3. Property is contiguous to the City limits or is separated by only a public right of way or body of water
4. Property conforms to all other City requirements

As this proposal meets these criteria, this property will not be subject to a majority vote among the electorate.

Other provisions applicable to this proposal are discussed elsewhere herein.

(b) There is no evidence of a change in neighborhood, or mistake or inconstancy in the Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Map.

Finding: The quasi-judicial amendment and standards criteria are met.

SHMC 17.08.060 – Transportation planning rule compliance

- (1) Review of Applications for Effect on Transportation Facilities. A proposed comprehensive plan amendment, zone change or land use regulation change, whether initiated by the city or by a private interest, shall be reviewed to determine whether it significantly affects a transportation facility, in accordance with OAR 660-012-0060 (the Transportation Planning Rule ("TPR")).
"Significant" means the proposal would:
 - (a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);
 - (b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or
 - (c) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:
 - (i) Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;
 - (ii) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP; or
 - (iii) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.
- (2) Amendments That Affect Transportation Facilities. Comprehensive plan amendments, zone changes or land use regulations that significantly affect a transportation facility shall ensure that allowed land uses are consistent with the function, capacity, and level of service of the facility identified in the TSP. This shall be accomplished by one or a combination of the following:
 - (a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility.
 - (b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of OAR 660-012-0060.
 - (c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for vehicle travel and meet travel needs through other modes of transportation.
 - (d) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.

- (3) Traffic Impact Analysis. A traffic impact analysis shall be submitted with a plan amendment or zone change application, as applicable, pursuant to Chapter 17.156 SHMC.

Discussion: This section reflects State law regarding the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR): Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), OAR 660, Division 12. The TPR requires that where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards of the facility. **Current zoning of the property is Columbia County's General Commercial, C-3 and the City zoning option given annexation is Highway Commercial (HC).**

Generally, when comparing potential land use impact on transportation facilities, the *reasonable worst case scenario* for the existing and proposed designation/zone are considered. The potential land uses are very similar for both the City and County. The City's zoning is comparable to the County with regards to the possible intensity of uses allowed and potential vehicular trips generated. Thus, this proposal will not affect an existing or planned transportation facility.

Finding: No transportation facility will be significantly affected by this proposal. No traffic impact analysis is warranted.

SHMC 17.28.030 (1) – Annexation criteria

- (a) Adequate public facilities are available to the area and have sufficient capacity to provide service for the proposed annexation area; and
- (b) Comply with comprehensive plan amendment standards and zoning ordinance amendment standards and not be in conflict with applicable comprehensive plan policies and implementing ordinances; and
- (c) Complies with state laws; and
- (d) Abutting roads must meet city standards or property owner will be required to sign and record an irrevocable consent to local improvement district; and
- (e) Property exceeding 10 acres in gross size must show a need on the part of the city for such land if it is designated residential (e.g., less than five years' supply of like designated lands in current city limits).

Discussion: (a) Currently, the site is not connected to either City water or McNulty PUD water. This property is within the McNulty Water PUD boundary. The City and the PUD have an Urban Service Agreement that states the City will service commercial properties west of Highway 30 if City water is available. There is a City water line at the southeast corner of the property in the First Street right-of-way. City law states "all water users in the city whose closest property line is within 160 feet of a city water main shall be connected to the city water system." In this case, the property is well within 160 feet of a water main.

The City's current water capacity is 6 million gallons/day and the peak flow, usually in the summer, is 3 to 4 million gallons/day. Additionally, the City has the capacity of approximately 10 million gallons to meet future demands. Any additional uses that occur on the subject property can be accommodated by the City's municipal water system as infrastructure has substantial capacity available.

There is a City sewer line along Kavanagh Avenue and First Street. With regards to capacity, the City's waste water treatment plant currently has the capacity (physically and as permitted by DEQ) to handle 50,000 pounds of Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD), which is the "loading" or potency of the wastewater received by the plant. The average daily BOD is well below this at only 1,500 pounds. Thus, any potential uses that occur on the subject property can be accommodated by the City's sanitary sewer system as infrastructure is in place or can be upgraded and there is substantial capacity available.

As described above, this proposal poses no significant affect on a transportation facility.

Adequate public facilities are available to the area and have sufficient capacity to provide service for the proposed annexation area.

(b) There is no established land use for this site. It is a vacant lot.

There is no known conflict with the Comprehensive Plan and implementing ordinances.

(c) With regards to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS), city annexations of territory must be undertaken consistent with ORS 222.111 to 222.183.

Pursuant to ORS 222.111(1), a City may only annex territory that is not within another City, and the territory must either be contiguous to the annexing City or be separated from the City only by a body of water or public right-of-way. The subject property is not within another City's jurisdiction and City of St. Helens corporate limits lies on two sides of the subject property.

Although undertaking an annexation is authorized by state law, the manner in which a city proceeds with annexation is also dictated in the city charter. ORS 222.111(1) references a city's charter as well as other ORS. St. Helens' Charter requirements pertaining to annexations are noted above.

Per ORS 222.111(2) an annexation may be initiated by the owner of real property or the city council. This annexation request was initiated by the property owners.

Further, ORS 222.125 requires that that all property owners of the subject property to be annexed and at least half of the electors residing on the property consent in writing to the annexation. These documents were submitted with the annexation application.

ORS 197.175(1) suggests that all annexations are subject to the statewide planning goals. The statewide planning goals that could technically apply or relate to this proposal are Goals 1, 2, 11 and 12.

- ***Statewide Planning Goal 1: Citizen Involvement.***
Goal 1 requires the development of a citizen involvement program that is widespread, allows two-way communication, provides for citizen involvement through all planning phases, and is understandable, responsive, and funded.

Generally, Goal 1 is satisfied when a local government follows the public involvement procedures set out in the statutes and in its acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use regulations.

The City's Development Code is consistent with State law with regards to notification requirements. Pursuant to SHMC 17.20.080 at least one public hearing before the Planning Commission and City Council is required. Legal notice in a newspaper of general circulation is also required. The City has met these requirements and notified DLCD of the proposal.

- ***Statewide Planning Goal 2: Land Use Planning.***

This goal requires that a land use planning process and policy framework be established as a basis for all decisions and actions relating to the use of land. All local governments and state agencies involved in the land use action must coordinate with each other. City, county, state and federal agency and special districts plans and actions related to land use must be consistent with the comprehensive plans of cities and counties and regional plans adopted under Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 268.

Generally, Goal 2 requires that actions related to land use be consistent with acknowledged Comprehensive Plans and coordination with affected governments and agencies and be based on an adequate factual base. The City has an adopted Comprehensive Plan, compliance of this proposal which is addressed herein. Moreover, explanation and proof of coordination with affected agencies and factual base are described herein, as well, including inventory, needs, etc.

- ***Statewide Planning Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services.***

Goal 11 requires cities and counties to plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development. The goal requires that urban and rural development be "guided and supported by types and levels of urban and rural public facilities and services appropriate for, but limited to, the needs and requirements of the urban, urbanizable and rural areas to be served."

City water and sewer capacities are adequate to serve the subject property. This is explained above. Moreover, there is no evidence that adequate infrastructure cannot be made available to serve the annexed area if redeveloped. The existing development is adequately served.

- ***Statewide Planning Goal 12: Transportation.***

Goal 12 requires cities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations, and ODOT to provide and encourage a "safe, convenient and economic transportation system." This is accomplished through development of Transportation System Plans based on inventories of local, regional and state transportation needs. Goal 12 is implemented through OAR 660, Division 12, also known as the Transportation Planning Rule ("TPR"). The TPR

contains numerous requirements governing transportation planning and project development.

Traffic impacts and the City's provisions that address the TPR are explained above. This proposal will not significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility.

(d) The subject property abuts two streets: Kavanagh Avenue and First Street. First Street and Kavanagh Avenue are technically County streets; however, the County Road Department typically yields to the City's street standards for development within the St. Helens Urban Growth Boundary.

First Street is improved (asphalt) but lacks frontage improvements such as sidewalk and curb along the subject property's frontage. City standards require such improvements. Kavanagh Avenue is also improved with asphalt but lacks frontage improvements such as sidewalk and curb along the subject property's frontage.

This property is not the subject of a current development land use review, which provides the legal nexus and proportionality to require such improvements. As such, the only option is for the property owner to be required to sign and record an irrevocable consent to local improvement district, though, the applicant could improve the frontages if desired.

The City's Transportation Systems Plan designates First Street and Kavanagh Avenue as Local Streets and if improved, would be subject to Local Streets standards. The existing right-of-way widths for both First Street and Kavanagh Avenue is sufficient for this classification of street. Therefore, right-of-way dedication is not necessary.

(e) The subject property is not designated residential. Thus a needs analysis is not necessary.

Finding: The annexation approval criteria are met for this proposal.

SHMC 17.28.030 (2) – Annexation criteria

The plan designation and the zoning designation placed on the property shall be the city's zoning district which most closely implements the city's comprehensive plan map designation.

Discussion: The Comprehensive Plan designation is currently Unincorporated Highway Commercial, UHC. Upon annexation, the Comprehensive Plan designation would thus be Highway Commercial (Incorporated). The zoning would be Highway Commercial, HC.

Finding: The subject property shall be designated Highway Commercial (Incorporated), HC and zoned Highway Commercial, HC upon annexation.

SHMC 17.112.020 – Established & Developed Area Classification criteria

(1) Established Area.

- (a) An "established area" is an area where the land is not classified as buildable land under OAR 660-08-0005;
- (b) An established area may include some small tracts of vacant land (tracts less than an acre in size) provided the tracts are surrounded by land which is not classified as buildable land; and
- (c) An area shown on a zone map or overlay map as an established area.

- (2) Developing Area. A "developing area" is an area which is included in the city's buildable land inventory under the provisions of OAR except as provided by subsection (1)(b) of this section.

Discussion: OAR 660-008-0005 generally defines "Buildable Land" as vacant residential property not constrained by natural hazards or resources, and typically not publicly owned. The subject property is not zoned residential. This provision does not apply.

Finding: This provision is not applicable.

CONCLUSION & DECISION

Based upon the facts and findings herein, the City Council approves this annexation and that upon annexation, the subject property have a Comprehensive Plan designation of Highway Commercial, HC, and be zoned Highway Commercial.

*This annexation will **not** be subject to voter approval subsequent to this land use process.*


Rick Scholl, Mayor

5-17-12
Date