

**CITY OF COLUMBIA CITY
STAFF REPORT
LEGISLATIVE TEXT AMENDMENTS TO VARIOUS CHAPTERS OF THE
COLUMBIA CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE**

File No. ZCA-24-01 / LU-24-03

APPLICANT City of Columbia City

LOCATION Citywide

OWNER N/A

APPLICATION These amendments to the code are part of the City's efforts to make the regulations more useable for residents, developers and City staff by correcting errors, eliminating text ambiguities and redundancies and clarifying code text. Amendments are throughout the existing code but focus on correcting previous inconsistencies related to definitions and administration of the code as well as updating definitions and standards related to accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and manufactured homes consistent with state law. They also include the removal of standards that are not clear and objective from chapter 7.120 Site Development Review and changes recommended by the DLCD Oregon State NFIP review to Chapter 7.75 Flood Hazard Overlay. Note that the City is **not** implementing changes to this chapter based on the FEMA Pre-Implementation Compliance Measures for the Endangered Species Act (ESA) at this time.

DECISION PROCESS The Columbia City Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, December 17, 2024, beginning at 6:30 p.m. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission made a recommendation of approval to the City Council. The City Council is scheduled to hear the proposed amendments on January 16, 2025 at or about 6:00 p.m. and hold a public hearing.

I. APPLICABLE CRITERIA

1. Chapter 7.160 Procedures for Decision Making: Legislative.
2. Statewide Planning Goals adopted under ORS 197.

II. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION

As stated above, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, December 17, 2024 where they reviewed the proposed amendments, took public testimony, and deliberated on a recommendation to the City Council. The Planning Commission requested a change to accessory building height limits so that buildings between 201 and 600 square feet have a maximum height limit of twenty (20) feet. Buildings that are 200 square feet or less have a maximum height limit of fifteen (15) feet and buildings greater than 600 square feet would retain their existing height limit of twenty-four (24) feet. This change is explained further in the staff report findings below. With that change, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to City Council.

III. SUMMARY

The City of Columbia City is proposing to amend Title 7 of the City Ordinances and Charter, the Columbia City Land Use and Development Code (CCDC) for the purpose of clarifying and updating various sections. The draft code amendments, which would enact these changes, are included in Exhibit 1. The proposed amendments include provisions that will:

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Changes

Summary of Change	Location in CCDC
Removal of references to “family” in the CCDC. Uses will instead be regulated by household or the type of development rather than the familial structure of occupants. Single family detached residential dwellings are further described as detached single dwelling units.	Global
Removal of zoning ordinance history, pre-existing approvals and exceptions for existing lots which are outdated and no longer applicable as the ordinance has been in effect for several decades. Removal of references to right-of-way dedications and improvements as those standards are found in Chapter 7.92 and do not need to be repeated in the introduction chapter.	7.10 Introduction
Updates and changes to the list of definitions to reflect how features or uses are defined by the state, add missing definitions, and clarify existing ones.	7.25 Definitions
Addition of the River Club Estates Overlay to the list of Overlays.	7.30 Administration
Removal of how zoning map amendments should be listed on the map itself and instead revised that they should be kept on file with the city.	7.30.030 (D) Zoning Map
Clarification that the minimum lot size applies to all uses in the R-1 zone.	7.40.040 (A) Development Standards, R-1 Zone
Re-introduction of the building height limit of 24 feet, consistent with the other residential zones which was mistakenly removed from the R-1 development standards in a previous revision in 2016.	7.40.040 (D) Development Standards, R-1 Zone
Removal of the allowance for pole barn type accessory structures in the R-1 zone. This was intended to be changed when the other residential zones removed the use but was missed.	7.040.040 (E) Development Standards, R-1 Zone
Clarification that the minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet applies to all land uses in the R-2 zone. Addition of exemption for lots created on or before May 17, 1978 which are	7.45.040 (A) Development Standards, R-2 Zone

Summary of Change	Location in CCDC
typically platted at 5,000 square feet. This means that many existing lots within the city are no longer non-conforming.	
Removal of the exception to side and rear setbacks for portable storage structures in the R-2 zone. This was intended to be changed when the other residential zones removed the exception but was missed.	7.45.040 (M) Development Standards, R-2 Zone
Removal of location standards for fire escapes and exterior stairs on corner duplexes in the R-2 zone and clarifications to other language in standards to refer to the correct city review process and that duplex units are attached.	7.45.040 (O) Development Standards, R-2 Zone
Addition of attached or detached accessory dwelling units in the R-3 zone.	7.50.020 Permitted Uses, R-3 Zone
Removal of the allowance for membrane RV structures as a conditional use. This was intended to be changed when the use was removed from other chapters of the code.	7.55.030 (J) Conditional Uses, Manufactured Home Park Zone
Addition of food carts and food cart pods to the list of permitted uses in the Commercial zone.	7.60.020 Permitted Uses, Commercial Zone
Addition of outdoor dining areas and produce stands to the different types of open inventory displays allowed in the Commercial Zone.	7.60.050 Open Inventory Display, Commercial Zone
Addition of food carts and food cart pods to the already permitted use of eating establishments. Removal of the “family-oriented” description of commercial amusement facilities as that is discretionary and not well defined.	7.65.020 Permitted Uses, Commercial Recreational Zone
Addition of food carts and food cart pods to the list of permitted uses in the Industrial zone.	7.66.020 Permitted Use, Industrial Zone
Addition of the definitions of basement, flood proofing, and historic structure to the Flood Hazard Overlay.	7.75.020 Definitions, Flood Hazard Overlay
Edit to error in language that discussed how long recreational vehicles may be located in the Flood Hazard Overlay.	7.75.120 (P) Approval Standards, Flood Hazard Overlay
Addition of language to clarify the elevation requirements in areas where no base flood elevation data is available.	7.75.120 (R) Approval Standards, Flood Hazard Overlay
Correction of reference to a specific flood zone from ‘AZ’ to ‘AH’.	7.75.120 (AA) Approval Standards, Flood Hazard Overlay
Updates to standards around Manufactured Homes Outside of Manufactured Home Parks consistent with state law (HB 4064 passed in 2022) which prohibits jurisdictions from adopting regulations for manufactured homes or prefabricated structures that would not apply	7.94.030 Manufactured Homes Outside Manufactured Home Parks, Manufactured Home Regulations

Summary of Change	Location in CCDC
to detached single-family dwellings on the same land.	
Revision of the review process as the City does not have a defined “Type I” process and instead the CCDC commonly refers to either the Planning Director’s review process or the Planning Commission’s review.	7.95.020 Review Process, Short Term Vacation Rentals
Clarification to the existing language that the signs listed in the section are not subject to the regulations in the chapter on signs. The current language reads as if the listed signs are still subject to this chapter, which is not the intent. If the signs listed do not require a permit, the City cannot subject them to the regulations or review process in this chapter.	7.102.060 Signs that do not require a permit, Signs
Addition of vehicle class and weight limits to the standard about exterior storage of vehicles. The new language would prohibit any vehicle about class 3 or with a maximum legal gross weight greater than 14,000 pounds and those vehicles may not be parked on site as part of the home occupation.	7.104.040 (H) General Approval Criteria and Standards, Home Occupations
Revises the procedure for ordering home occupations that are affecting public health and safety to cease. Previously the Planning Commission would have to call a meeting to order the use to cease pending full Planning Commission review. The revision would allow the City Administrator or Planning Director to order the use to cease pending full Planning Commission Review.	7.104.080 (C) Action Regarding Complaints, Home Occupations
Removal of confusing language that states two different standards that should apply in the same sentence, and that slopes of properties should be determined using the aerial photo for a 1992 sewer improvements project.	7.106.030 Hill sides, Protection of Natural Features
Updates to the square footage ranges for accessory structures to align with building permit requirements (the trigger for a building permit is a structure more than 200 square feet in size) and an exception for free-standing patio covers or other moveable shade structures to the requirement for accessory structures to be separated from other structures by at least six feet. Updates to the height limit for accessory structures 200 square feet or less to reflect the most current state building code which increased from ten (10) feet to fifteen (15) feet. This also updated the height limits for accessory structures	7.111.040 Approval Standards, Accessory Buildings and Structures

Summary of Change	Location in CCDC
<p>between 201 and 600 square feet which originally was fourteen (14) feet but is proposed to increase to twenty (20) feet. Removal of lot coverage standards to reduce potential for future inconsistencies as lot coverage standards primarily reside in the individual zoning district standards. Removal of language about accessory structure projections since structure projections have specific exception standards in section 7.10.110.</p>	
<p>Removal of reference to CC&Rs in where accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are allowed. Any restrictions in CC&Rs are outside the City's jurisdiction.</p>	7.112.020 (A) Applicability and Administration, Accessory Dwelling Units
<p>Removal of discretionary standards that cannot be applied objectively (privacy and noise, crime prevention and safety) as well as standards that are not relevant or necessary (demarcation of public spaces and public transit). Addition of clear and objective standards related to exterior lighting fixtures.</p>	7.120.100 Approval Standards, Site Development Review
<p>Added clear and objective design standards for detached single dwelling units (detached single-family dwelling units) that are subject to the Site Development Review Process. Individual single family detached dwelling units would be exempt from this section; it would apply to subdivisions or larger developments where several homes are built at once. The standards are intended to introduce variety in the designs of the homes so that the same plan is not duplicated over and over again in larger developments.</p>	Added as 7.120.110 under Site Development Review
<p>Removal of a standard related to properties in the Historic Commercial or Historic Residential overlay as those specific overlays do not exist (only a Historic Overlay does). Removal of references to standards in Title 8 of the Municipal Code and the City Historic Review Board as those do not exist either.</p>	7.130.040 (A)(10) Approval Standards and Conditions, Conditional Use
<p>Modification to the threshold for minor variances to allow for 10 percent deviation from standards for building or structure height standards and 20 percent for all other minimum development standards. Previously it was 10 percent for all standards.</p>	7.140.020 Administration and Approval Process, Variance
<p>Clarification that annexations will follow the process in ORS 222, consistent with changes in state law.</p>	7.145.030 (C) Administration and Approval Process, Annexations

Summary of Change	Location in CCDC
Adjustments of naming conventions to be consistent with County naming conventions.	7.150 Property Line Adjustments
Extends the timing for the final plat from one year to two years.	7.154.060 Application Submission Requirements--Final Plat, Subdivisions
Removal of fee exception for neighborhood planning organizations which do not currently exist as identified in the code and the city does not have a process for designating such organizations. The City Council may still continue to waive the appeal fee for nonprofit organizations.	7.160.020 Application Process, Procedures for Decision-Making, Legislative
Removal of fee exception for neighborhood planning organizations which do not currently exist as identified in the code and the city does not have a process for designating such organizations. The City Council may continue to waive the appeal fee for nonprofit organizations.	7.162.300 Fee Waivers, Procedures for Decision-Making Quasi-Judicial
Change in language to allow the Planning Director to approve extension requests (approvals issued in accordance with this chapter are only effective for a period of one year) so long as no changes are made to the tentative plan, the applicant has expressed written intent of submitting a final plat within the one-year extension period, and no changes in policy have occurred.	7.162.360 Expiration and Extension of Approvals, Procedures for Decision-Making Quasi-Judicial
Removal of fee exception for neighborhood planning organizations which do not currently exist as identified in the code and the city does not have a process for designating such organizations. The City Council may continue to waive the appeal fee for nonprofit organizations.	7.164.160 Fee Waivers, Procedures for Decision-Making Limited Land Use Decisions

IV. LAND USE REFERRALS AND PUBLIC NOTICE

Pursuant to CCDC 7.160.030 and ORS 197.610, staff has provided notice of the proposed CCDC text amendments to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). On December 3, 2024 public notice of the proposed CCDC text amendments and public hearings were published in the Business Tribune.

In 1998, Oregon voters passed a law known as Ballot Measure 56. It requires that notices be mailed to landowners when a change in land-use laws might limit property uses. Local government must mail the notice to every landowner whose property could be affected as a result of changes. The City of Columbia City sent out close to eight hundred letters to potentially affected property owners as correcting errors related to height limits, clarifications on ADUs, and the introduction of clear and objective criteria into the Site Design Review process could potentially limit property uses.

Staff did not receive any comments from the DLCD or from members of the public on the proposed text amendment as of the date of this report.

V. REVIEW CRITERIA AND EVALUATION

CCDC 7.160 Procedures for Decision-Making: Legislative

- (1) **7.160.010 Purpose. The purpose of this Chapter is to establish procedures for consideration of legislative changes to the provisions of the Comprehensive Plan, implementing ordinances, and maps.**

FINDING: As the changes are to the provisions of the CCDC, it will be reviewed using the legislative review process.

- (2) **7.160.060 Standards for the Decision. The recommendation by the Planning Commission and the decision by the Council shall be based on consideration of the following factors:**

- 1. Any applicable statewide planning goals and guidelines adopted under Oregon Revised Statutes Chapter 197.**

Goal 1 Citizen Involvement

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 1 requires cities to ensure opportunities for citizens to be involved in all stages of the planning process. The CCDC includes requirements to ensure that Columbia City residents are properly notified of an application; notice of this proposal was published in a newspaper of general circulation at least 7 days prior to the hearing. Starting in December of 2023, the Planning Commission held seven publicly noticed workshops to discuss text amendments to the CCDC. These meetings were open to the public and were held over the course of a year, allowing multiple opportunities for input, discussion, and questions. Under the legislative process, the CCDC also requires at least one public hearing by the Planning Commission and another by the City Council where citizens are given the opportunity to provide testimony. Public notice of the proposed text amendments has been provided in accordance with the CCDC and state law, including notices published in the local newspaper and mailed notices sent to affected property owners.

Several proposed text changes to the CCDC would allow staff to make certain types of determinations instead of the Planning Commission. However, these changes do not curtail the Planning Commission's and therefore the public's involvement in the decision-making process. Under the proposed changes in different section of the CCDC the Planning Commission will have already weighed in on the application (e.g., the proposed change for staff to have the ability to grant one year extensions if the applicant's plans and city regulations have not changed) or will have the opportunity to do so in the future (e.g., the proposed change for staff to have the ability to order home occupations affecting public health and safety to cease pending full Planning Commission review). The proposed modifications are designed to streamline the development review process by allowing staff to make certain decisions that are routine or administrative in nature, rather than requiring multiple meetings of the Planning Commission for matters that do not necessitate in-depth review. This shift helps reduce the overall time and cost burdens on

applicants, as it eliminates the need for applicants to attend several meetings or face delays caused by scheduling and holding additional Planning Commission meetings for matters that are relatively straightforward or clearly aligned with established standards. This goal is met.

Goal 2 Land Use Planning

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 2 requires cities to develop and follow a comprehensive land use plan when making decisions. Goal 2 emphasizes the importance of creating and maintaining a land use planning framework that is both comprehensive and effective in guiding land development, while ensuring consistency with statewide policies and goals. Periodic updates to the development code are a critical tool for ensuring that the city's local land use regulations remain in alignment with this overarching goal. The proposed text amendments to the CCDC reflect changes in state law around manufactured housing, clear and objective standards, and remove outdated, incorrect, or confusing language. The changes ensure that the CCDC provides a clearer planning framework for the public, staff, and decision-makers. This goal is met.

Goal 3 Agricultural Lands

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 3 does not apply to this proposal for text amendments to the CCDC as no properties within Columbia City limits or the UGB are designated farmland or agricultural lands.

Goal 4 Forest Lands

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 4 does not apply to this proposal for text amendments to the CCDC as no properties within Columbia City limits or the UGB contain forest land, commercial timberland operations, or mapped timberland.

Goal 5 Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 5 includes protection for inventoried resources. While the proposed text amendments involve changes to building height limits and the removal of incorrect language concerning the city's historic review processes and advisory boards, they do not reduce the protections afforded to natural resources, scenic views, historic areas, or open spaces. The proposed amendments ensure clarity and better alignment with current practices, policies, and state requirements. The removal of outdated or incorrect language regarding the historic review process and advisory boards does not alter the city's commitment to preserving historic resources. The updated development code maintains a clear framework for reviewing projects that may affect historic properties, in compliance with Goal 5's directive to protect significant historic and cultural resources. The city continues to implement its historic preservation policies through appropriate review mechanisms, which remain in place. The increases to height limits for accessory buildings and structures (between 201 and 600 square feet) from 14 to 20 feet aligns with changes to the state building code which increased the trigger for a building permit from 10 feet to 15, resulting in cascading changes to the standards that are scaled for height.. This height limit is also not greater than the overall height limits for other buildings and

structures in the city's different land use zones, and therefore would not alter the scenic viewsheds beyond what is already established. Additionally, any construction within the city would still need to comply with adopted local, regional, and state regulations for natural resources, scenic and historic areas, and open spaces. This goal is met.

Goal 6 Air, Water, and Land Resources Quality

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 6 instructs cities to consider protection of air, water, and land resources from pollution and pollutants when developing their comprehensive plans. The proposed text amendments would not impact air, water, and land resources due to the existing requirements for construction and development and the fact that the amendment would not drastically increase the density or population of the City resulting in an impact to those resources. New construction and development would still need to meet local, state, and federal requirements related to water quality, air quality, and pollution or impacts to land.

Goal 7 Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 7 requires local comprehensive plans to address Oregon's natural hazards. Any development within the city would be consistent with local, regional, and federal regulations intended to mitigate the impact of natural disasters and hazards including floods, earthquakes, and fire. The proposed text amendments do not include updates to the Flood Hazard Overlay chapter relating to FEMA's Pre-Implementation Compliance Measures (PICMs) under the Endangered Species Act. The PICMs communicated by FEMA to affected cities in July and August of 2024 are intended to ensure no net habitat loss or loss of floodplain function. While the proposed text amendments do not include incorporating the Model Ordinance released by FEMA, the City passed a moratorium on development in special flood hazard areas effective December 1, 2024 which is consistent with one of the options outlined by FEMA for compliance with the Endangered Species Act. This goal is met.

Goal 8 Recreational Needs

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 8 does not apply to this request as the proposed text amendments do not impact recreational resources.

Goal 9 Economic Development

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 9 intends to ensure that cities have enough land available to realize economic growth and development opportunities. The proposed amendment would not reduce or impact the amount of non-residential land within the City and would therefore be consistent with Goal 9.

Goal 10 Housing

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 10 requires the City to maintain and plan for an adequate supply of land to accommodate at least 20 years of future growth, providing flexibility in housing location, type, and density to ensure the availability and prices of housing units are commensurate with the needs and

financial capabilities of households. Comprehensive plans are required to include an analysis of local housing needs by type and affordability, an assessment of housing development potential, and an inventory of residential land; contain policies for residential development and supportive services based on that analysis that increase the likelihood that needed housing types will be developed; and provide for an adequate supply of a variety of housing types consistent with identified policies and meeting minimum density and housing mix requirements (established by OAR 660, Division 007).

The City's first Building Lands and Needs Analysis was completed in 2001. With a forecasted population of 1,996 by 2025, the City of Columbia City is not required to include a broader range of housing types in its analysis. However, single family and duplex housing, multi-family housing, and manufactured homes were included in the City's analysis.

In 2015, the latest update of this original analysis, single family and duplex housing made up 76% of all housing units in Columbia City and had a projected need of 306 units (the Buildable Lands Analysis does not distinguish between single family residences and duplexes). Multi-family housing made up 17% of the percent of all units and had a projected need of 68 units. The analysis showed that an additional 79 housing units were needed in the City.

The proposed changes to the development code aim to streamline and improve the development review process, creating more predictable and efficient pathways for all development projects by removing standards that are not clear and objective.

The city acknowledges that to fully comply with Goal 10, an updated Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI), Housing Needs Analysis (HNA), and Comprehensive Plan are necessary. These documents are essential for accurately assessing housing needs, land availability, and infrastructure requirements, ensuring that the city can meet current and future housing demand. However, these updates will require additional resources and funding. While the development code amendments do not directly address the need for these updates, they create a foundation for future planning work by ensuring that existing policies and regulations are conducive to housing development. This goal is met.

Goal 11 Public Facilities and Services

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 11 applies to the provision of public services/facilities and does not directly apply to the text amendment as no changes to the provision or standards of public services and facilities are included in the amendment. Therefore, the proposed amendment would be consistent with Goal 11.

Goal 12 Transportation

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 12 aims for cities to provide and encourage a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system. The proposed text amendments do not affect transportation facilities in the city. Changes do not introduce new uses that would have transportation impacts beyond what is currently allowed in the different land use zones. Therefore, a TPR analysis is not required with this application.

Goal 13 Energy Conservation

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 13 requires cities to consider the effects of a comprehensive planning decision on energy consumption. Any construction within the city would continue to comply with applicable building code requirements and would not increase energy consumption beyond what the comprehensive plan has previously assessed and planned for.

Goal 14 Urbanization

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 14 pertains to urban growth boundaries and planning for efficient and orderly growth. The amendment would not modify or change the City's UGB or conflict with the goals of the City's comprehensive plan (which all align with the statewide planning goals). The proposed text amendments would not expand or otherwise alter the city's UGB or result in changes to the transition from urbanizable land to urban land uses.

Goal 15 Willamette River Greenway

STAFF COMMENT: Goal 15 does not apply to the proposed text amendments as all impacted properties within Columbia City limits and the UGB are over 20 miles from the Willamette River.

Goal 16: Estuarine Resources & Goal 17: Coastal Shorelands

STAFF COMMENT: The above goals do not apply to the proposed text amendments as it will not impact estuarine resources or coastal shoreland.

Goal 18: Beaches and Dunes & Goal 19: Ocean Resources

STAFF COMMENT: The above goals do not apply to the proposed text amendments as it will not impact beaches, dunes, or ocean resources.

FINDING: As discussed above, the proposed text amendment does not conflict with any applicable statewide planning goals.

2. Any federal or state statutes or rules found applicable.

FINDING: No additional federal or state statutes beyond the statewide planning goals are applicable to this amendment outside of the ones identified above.

3. The applicable Comprehensive Plan policies and map; and

FINDING: No changes to the Comprehensive Plan map are proposed. Consistency with applicable Comprehensive Plan goals and policies is discussed further below:

A. Citizen Participation: As discussed above, the text amendment process included multiple Planning Commission workshops, public notices, and posting of information. The process aligns with all the policies under Goal A and the proposed text amendments do not alter how citizens would participate in future planning processes.

B. Land Use Planning: Policies 5 and 6 relate to how procedures and ordinances should be modified, updated, and adopted as needed to both implement the comprehensive plan and stay in compliance with local and state requirements. The proposed text amendments clean-up and modify the CCDC in compliance with the comprehensive plan and align with the most current state requirements.

C. Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources: Policy 1.a encourages the protection of scenic views through the enforcement of the Columbia City Development code. As discussed above the increases to height limits for some accessory buildings and structures (between 201 and 600 square feet) from 14 to 20 feet aligns with changes to the state building code which increased the trigger for a building permit from 10 feet to 15, resulting in cascading changes to the standards that are scaled for height. This height limit is also not greater than the overall height limits for other buildings and structures in the city's different land use zones, still less than the 24-foot height limit for accessory buildings and structures over 600 square feet, and therefore would not alter the scenic viewsheds beyond what is already established. Additionally, the proposed text amendments would not alter the review process for development impacts to McBride Creek (Policy 2.a).

D. Air, Water, and Land Resources Quality: The proposed text amendments do not alter existing requirements for developers to use erosion control measures (Policy 1) or provide adequate on-site and off-site storm water drainage (Policy 5).

E. Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards: Policy 2 requires engineering studies for development proposed in any slope hazard area. This section is proposed to be updated to remove the outdated language around identification of slope hazard areas (using aerial imagery from 1992) and remove conflicting descriptions of a slope hazard area from the same sentence. However, changes to not remove the requirements for additional study of slope hazard areas. Policy 3 requires compliance with FEMA flood plain construction requirements. As discussed above, the City passed a moratorium on development in special flood hazard areas effective December 1, 2024 which is consistent with one of the options outlined by FEMA for compliance with the Endangered Species Act.

H. Housing: Policy 1.a states that the city shall maintain adequate zoning, land division, and building codes to help achieve the City's housing goals while 1.d requires developers to provide adequate public services with land division approvals. The proposed text amendments do not alter requirements for public services in new developments and make tweaks to the existing standards in the development code to streamline review processes and remove standards that are not clear and objective, therefore providing a clear framework for housing development and production.

J. Public Facilities and Services: Policies 1 and 3 require new development to be served adequately by public services and facilities (e.g., schools, roads, water, sewer, stormwater, police, and fire). The proposed text amendments would not remove those requirements from the CCDC and any applications for new construction would need to demonstrate these services and facilities are available and can serve the development.

K. Transportation: Policies 5 and 11 related to requirements about how new development should provide streets, walkways, and paths. The proposed text amendments do not alter or reduce the minimum standards required in the CCDC nor do they conflict with the policies in the City’s Transportation System Plan.

L. Energy Conservation: Policy 1 requires compliance with the Oregon State Building Code, which would not change under the proposed text amendments. In fact, the proposed text amendments update the development code so that it is consistent with the most current version of the state building code.

M. Urbanization: Policy 4 relates to the orderly and efficient transition from urbanizable land to urban land uses within the City’s urban growth boundary (UGB). The proposed text amendments would not drastically alter allowed land uses within the city, nor would they affect the existing planning framework the city has established for an orderly or efficient transition of uses from the UGB into city limits.

4. The applicable provisions of the implementing ordinances.

FINDING: The text amendment does not conflict with the CCDC. The requested text amendment was reviewed consistent with the CCDC and propose changes that are compatible with the overall purpose and intent of the CCDC which is to regulate the division and location of buildings, structures, and land; divide the City into zones to carry out these regulations and provide for their enforcement; promote coordinated development with consideration for the city’s natural environment, amenities, views, and appearance of buildings and open spaces; achieve a balanced and efficient land use pattern to protect and enhance real property values; promote safe, efficient traffic movement; avoid uses and development that might be detrimental to the stability and livability of the City; and ensure adequate provisions for community utilities and facilities.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the findings contained in this staff report, staff recommends the City Council adopt Council Bill 25-992.

Exhibits:

Exhibit 1: Proposed Legislative Text Amendments to the Columbia City Development Code updated 01/10/2025

Exhibit 2: Council Bill 25-992