

Urban Growth Management Study

Brookings Case Study

Prepared by
ECO Northwest
with
David J. Newton Associates
MLP Associates

November 1990

Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development

Land Conservation and Development Commission

William R. Blosser, Chair

John A. Brogoitti

Virginia M. Burdick

Robert L. Kerr

Hector MacPherson

Lynne Hume Saxton

Tom M. Throop

BROOKINGS CASE STUDY
URBAN GROWTH
MANAGEMENT STUDY

Prepared for:

**Department of Land Conservation
and Development**

Prepared by

ECO Northwest

with

**David J. Newton & Associates
MLP Associates**

November 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION	1
A. PURPOSE	1
B. METHODS	1
C. HOW TO READ THIS REPORT	2
CHAPTER TWO - CASE-STUDY AREA PROFILE	3
A. BOUNDARIES	3
B. SIZE	3
C. ECONOMIC BASE	3
D. GROWTH INDICATORS	4
CHAPTER THREE - FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION	5
A. DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	5
B. LIVABILITY ISSUES	9
C. INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT ISSUES	9
APPENDIX - DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION OF DATA	A-1
A. PREFACE	A-1
1.0 Socioeconomic Indicators	A-2
2.0 Growth Management Policies and Regulations	A-4
3.0 Land Development Data	A-6
4.0 Urban Livability Issues	A-30
5.0 Infrastructure Investment	A-33
6.0 Development Potential	A-37

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

In June 1989 the Oregon State Legislature approved funds for the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) for an Urban Growth Management Study to (1) evaluate the effectiveness of the growth management policies of Oregon's statewide planning program, and (2) determine how they could be improved. One component of that larger study is this study of urban growth in four urban areas.¹

In April 1990, DLCD hired ECO Northwest, a consulting firm in land-use planning and economics, to study issues related to urban growth in the four case-study areas. ECO's previous report (*Case Studies, Phase 1: Methodology*, May 1990) describes in more detail the purposes of the study and the issues it is to address.

B. METHODS

For a detailed description of the issues this case study is designed to evaluate, and the methods for making that evaluation, see the previous reports that were part of this project: *Case Studies, Phase 1: Methodology*, May 1990; and *Supplement to the Methodology Report*, July 1990. For details on specific methods and sources used for this case study, see the Appendix to this report.

We analyzed data describing urban growth in the Brookings area by city and county. To describe growth across all parts of the Brookings case-study area, we analyzed data that describe urban growth in four analysis areas: (1) inside the Brookings city limits, (2) between the city limits and the urban growth boundary (UGB), (3) the urban fringe, and (4) the exurban area. *Note that the Brookings case study area does not include all of Curry County.*

We defined the Brookings urban fringe generally as that area no farther than two miles outside the Brookings UGB. We defined the fringe area using tax maps adjacent or near the UGB. In cases where the UGB cut through a tax map, we put the data for the map inside or outside the UGB based on where the majority of the area fell. We defined the rest-of-county area (exurban area) as all areas that met all of the following criteria: (1) outside the Brookings UGB; (2) outside the Brookings urban fringe; (3) within commuting distance of Brookings (from the California border to Cape Ferrelo); and (4) with Curry County zoning.

Our analysis focuses on changes in urban growth between 1985 and 1989. We chose this five-year period because (1) it represents the period after acknowledgement of comprehensive plans by LCDC when most growth occurred, and (2) we wanted to have comparable data for all case studies. We organized this report to address the seven urban growth management issues identified by DLCD.

¹Brookings is in the process of amending its UGB. This study is necessarily general and is not intended to be used without refinement to project future land use needs or to determine appropriate areas for UGB expansion.

C. HOW TO READ THIS REPORT

Readers not familiar with the Brookings area should begin with **Chapter Two**, which gives a brief overview of growth in the area. Readers wanting a summary of the findings should go to **Chapter Three**, which describes changes in three classes of issues of concern to DLCD: (1) land development, (2) livability, and (3) infrastructure investment between 1985 and 1989.² The data in Chapter Three are all contained in more detail in the **Appendix**, which describes sources, methods, and our analysis of all the data we collected. The full Appendix will probably be of interest only to a technical audience; others may want to scan it or turn to it for more detail about issues of interest to them.

² We provide these three classifications to help organize the report. DLCD's concerns remain the individual issues that compose these classes, not the classes themselves.

CHAPTER TWO CASE-STUDY AREA PROFILE

In this chapter we provide an overview of the Brookings case-study area. We describe the following key characteristics that affect growth in Brookings case study area: (1) jurisdictions included in this case study; (2) size (e.g., population, employment, and land area); (3) base economic activities; and (4) historic population and employment growth.

A. BOUNDARIES

This report defines the Brookings case study area roughly as the area within commuting distance of Brookings in southern Curry County, excluding the cities of Gold Beach and Port Orford. The Brookings case study area is defined by the California border on the south, the Pacific Ocean on the west, federally-owned land to the east and the Cape Ferrelo area approximately 10 miles to the north.

Our analysis focuses on the Brookings UGB and includes no other urban areas. Thus, our analysis of growth on urban (within the Brookings city limits), urbanizable (outside the city limits, but within the UGB), and urban fringe land (one to two miles outside the UGB) is for Brookings only; our analysis of exurban land is for all the rest of land in the study area beyond the Brookings urban fringe.

B. SIZE

Curry County covers 1,648 square miles, 21st among Oregon's 36 counties. All of the county is in the study area. As of 1989, the Portland State Center for Population Research and Census (CPRC) estimated that Curry County had a population of about 19,200. Curry County had the third fastest rate of population growth (12.9 percent) between 1980 and 1989. Only Washington and Deschutes counties grew at a faster rate.

Curry County's overall population density in 1989 was 11.7 persons per square mile. By the year 2000, Curry County's population is expected to grow to about 25,000. Brookings had a population of just over 4,400 in 1989, representing a 31 percent increase over 1980, with most of this growth occurring between 1986 and 1989. Brookings' current population growth spurt comes primarily from in-migration rather than natural increase (the excess of births over deaths).

According to Oregon's State Employment Division, Curry County had an annual average employment of about 8,700 in 1988, a 40 percent increase over 1980. Accurate employment data for Brookings are not available.

C. ECONOMIC BASE

The study area's principal industrial sectors are agriculture, fishing, lumber and wood products, tourism, and other export-based industries like boat building and cargo handling. According to data collected for the 1987 U.S. Census of Agriculture, Curry County had a total of 80,000 acres of farmland. In 1988 the farm sector averaged about 300 jobs in Curry County. Due to technological change within the industry, accompanied by the closure of less efficient facilities and reductions in available timber harvest lands, employment in the wood products industry in Curry County has declined over the last ten years. In 1989, there were about 960 Curry County residents employed in the lumber and wood manufacturing industry, down from about 1,100 in 1979.

Over the next decade, lumber and wood product jobs are likely to decline in Curry County. Tourism and the retirement industry will continue to be strong areas of economic growth in Curry County. The growth

in these industries will cause increased employment in trade and services. In addition, the Pelican Bay State Prison, located near Crescent City, will have an important impact on jobs and income in Curry County, especially Brookings³.

D. GROWTH INDICATORS

The Brookings case study area has exhibited rapid growth in population and employment over the last decade. Table 2.1 shows historic population and employment growth in Brookings and Curry County (historic employment data are not available for Brookings). Both Brookings and Curry County have experienced a much higher annual population growth rate over the past nine years than has the state as a whole. Curry County's total employment also grew faster than the state as a whole between 1980 and 1988. Much of Curry County's and Brookings' recent growth in population can be attributed to an influx of retirees from other western states, especially California. Local officials believe that actual growth may be higher than PSU estimates indicate.

**TABLE 2-1
HISTORIC POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH FOR
BROOKINGS, CURRY COUNTY, AND OREGON, 1980-89**

Jurisdiction	1980	1988 Employment	1989 Population	Avg Annual Growth Rate
Population				
Brookings	3,384	NA	4,465	3.1%
Curry County	16,992	NA	19,200	1.4%
Statewide	2,633,156	NA	2,791,100	0.8%
Employment				
Curry County	6,230	8,730	NA	4.3%
Statewide	1,188,000	1,343,000	NA	1.5%

Source: *Population Estimates for Oregon 1980-89*, Portland State Center for Population Research and Census; *Oregon Resident Labor Force*, Oregon Employment Division, 1990.

³*Business and Employment Outlook*, State Employment Division, 1990.

CHAPTER THREE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents key findings and conclusions about (1) land development, (2) livability, and (3) infrastructure investment issues in the Brookings case study area. See the Appendix for a more detailed description of the data that led us to the conclusions.

A. DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

Our discussion of development is organized according to the four development issues identified by DLCD, which correspond roughly to the four analysis areas we used for this study: outside the Brookings UGB and urban fringe but within commuting distance (*exurban*), outside and adjacent to the Brookings UGB (*urban fringe*), urbanizable (unincorporated) land inside the UGB, and urban land (unincorporated) inside the UGB. Table 3-1 summarizes development data for these areas.

DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARIES VERSUS DEVELOPMENT INSIDE URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARIES

Summary. About 45% of the residential units sited in the Curry County study area from 1985 through 1989 were outside the Brookings UGB. About 20% of commercial and industrial developments were located outside the Brookings UGB. At its present rate of rural residential development, Curry County has a 12-year supply of land in exceptions areas. Table 3-1 summarizes the results.

About 37 percent of the 699 single and multiple family dwelling units built or placed in the Brookings study area from 1985 through 1989 were located outside of the Brookings UGB. See Table 3-1 for a breakdown of these units by type and location.

About 44 percent of the 497 single family dwelling units built or placed in the Brookings study areas from 1985 through 1989 were located outside the Brookings UGB.

Of the 202 multiple family units built in the Brookings study area from 1985 through 1989, 36 (18 percent) were located outside the Brookings UGB.

Commercial, industrial, and multiple family residential development is concentrated inside UGBs. About 80% of new commercial and industrial construction, and 100% of new multiple family construction in the Brookings study area took place within the Brookings UGB.

TABLE 3-1

**BUILDING AND LAND DIVISIONS
BROOKINGS CASE STUDY AREA
1985-89**

Analysis Area	Residential Permits				Subdivision/ Partition Lots		Commercial/Industrial	
	Single-Family Units		Multiple Family Units					
	# of Units	%	# of Units	%	# of Lots	%	# of Com/Ind Developments	%
Inside Brookings UGB	277	55.7	166	82.2	342	64.7	45	80.4
City of Brookings	181	36.4	166	82.2	319	60.3	26	46.4
City Limits to UGB	96	19.3	0 ^a	0	23	4.3	19	33.9
Outside Brookings UGB	220	44.2	36	17.8	187	35.3	11	19.6
Urban Fringe	73	14.7	36	17.8	53	10.0	3	5.4
Exception Areas	68	13.7	36	17.8	34	6.4	3	5.4
Resource Areas	5	1.0	0	0.0	19	3.6	0	0.0
Exurban	147	30.0	0	0.0	134	25.3	8	14.3
Exception Areas	141 ^b	28.4	0	0.0	117	22.1	8	14.3
Resource Areas	6	1.2	0	0.0	17	3.2	0	0.0
Total	497	100.0	202	100.0	529	100.0	56	100.0

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

^a Does not include 22 mobile home spaces approved in Harbor area.

^b Includes 95 permits issued in the Cape Ferrello, and Woodchuck River areas.

DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE OF AND ADJACENT TO URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARIES

Summary. From 1985 through 1989, 73 single-family and 36 multiple-family dwelling units were constructed in the urban fringe. Eighty-three percent of the single family residential building permits issued in the urban fringe were for houses on lots with two acres or less--making redevelopment at urban densities difficult. It is unlikely that this pattern will continue because a 10-acre minimum lot size has been applied to areas within the immediate vicinity of the Brookings UGB. Table 3-2 summarizes the data.

Of the single-family dwelling units built or sited outside the Brookings UGB in the study area, about 33 percent occurred in the urban fringe area.

Of the subdivision lots developed outside the Brookings UGB in the study area, 28 percent occurred in the urban fringe area.

Of the multiple family units developed outside the Brookings UGB in the study area, 100 percent (36 dwelling units) occurred in the urban fringe. All of these occurred at Rainbow Rock PUD. Such a development could not occur again under Curry County zoning.

TABLE 3-2

**RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS AND LAND DIVISION
IN THE BROOKINGS URBAN FRINGE
1985-89**

Analysis Area	Lot Size					Total Lots	Average Lot Size (Acres)
	< 1 Acre	1-2 Acres	2-5 Acres	> 5 Acres			
Building Permits	34	24	10	5	73	2.1	
Residential in Resource Zones	2	1	1	1	5	8.9	
Residential in Exceptions Areas	32	23	9	4	68	1.6	
Partition Lots	4	6	16	27	53	5.8	
Resource Zones	0	2	7	10	19	8.0	
Residential in Exceptions Areas	4	4	9	17	34	4.5	
Subdivision Lots	0	0	0	0	0	-	

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

One third of all single family residential permits on county land were issued in the Brookings urban fringe. The 73 residential units constructed just outside the Brookings UGB had an average density of one unit every two acres, with the highest densities in the more buildable Harbor Bench area.

Of 53 lots created in the Urban Fringe, 20% had an average lot size of less than two acres. This pattern cannot continue because Curry County has established a minimum lot size of 10 acres for most of the Urban Fringe area. However, existing development surrounding the UGB, especially in the Harbor Bench area, will make future urbanization difficult.

DEVELOPMENT IN URBANIZABLE AREAS (Unincorporated areas within the Brookings UGB)

Summary. Single family residential development in the Brookings urbanizable area (outside the City Limits) has occurred at less than half the allowable density. One reason for this is that Curry County zoning allows for residential development at one unit per acre or greater when public sewer and water services are not available. Another reason may be that sewered land in the flat Harbor Bench area is in relatively short supply. There were 4 subdivision lots platted outside the City Limits of Brookings. Parcels resulting from the partitioning process averaged 1.0 lots per acre. There were two mobile home park additions which occurred at just over four units per acre. Table 3-3 summarizes the data.

Of the 443 single family and multiple family residential building permits approved for sites inside the Brookings UGB, 96 (22 percent) occurred inside the UGB but outside of the Brookings City Limits.

Of the 277 single family residential building permits approved for sites inside the UGB, 96 (35 percent) occurred in urbanizable areas.

Of the 166 total multiple family dwelling unit construction approvals inside the Brookings UGB, none occurred on urbanizable areas.

TABLE 3-3

**ACTUAL VS. ALLOWABLE DENSITY OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
For Single Family Resident Subdivisions and Multiple Family
Building Permits Issued Inside the Brookings UGB and Urban Fringe
Units Per Acre, 1985-89**

Analysis Area	Single-Family			Multiple Family		
	Actual Density	Allowable Density	% of Allowable	Actual Density	Allowable Density	% of Allowable
Brookings City Limits	3.6	6.0	60.0	10.3	20	51.5
Brookings UGB	2.7	4.4	61.8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Brookings Urban Fringe	1.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Curry County Public Services Department.

N/A - Not Available

Single family lots (in subdivisions) developed from 1985-89 averaged 2.7 lots per net acre in urbanizable areas. The average lot size was between 6,000 and 12,000 square feet. The minimum lot size in the urbanizable area is 6,000 square feet. When compared with allowable densities, the data suggest strongly that zoning has not been a major constraint on achieving higher development densities. There appears to be a clear market preference for large lots in the Brookings area.

Actual development for single family lots was in urbanizable areas was about 62 percent of allowable densities.

There were no multiple family units developed from 1985-89 in the unincorporated area within the Brookings UGB. There were, however, 22 new mobile home park spaces.

DEVELOPMENT IN URBAN AREAS

Summary. The City of Brookings appears to be approving development at about two-thirds of allowable densities. From 1985 through 1989 single family residential construction has occurred at approximately 4.9 units per acre, and multiple family development has averaged 16 units per acre. However, recent land division data suggests that lot sizes are increasing in the Brookings area.

Of the 277 single family residential building permits approved for sites inside the UGB, about 65 percent occurred inside the city limits.

Of the 166 total multiple family dwelling unit construction approvals inside the UGB, all occurred inside the Brookings City Limits.

Multiple family housing accounted for about 48 percent of all building permits approved between 1985 and 1989 inside the city limits.

Single family units (in subdivisions) developed from 1985-89 averaged about 3.6 lots per net acre in the city, about 60 percent of allowable density.

Multiple family units developed from 1985-89 averaged about 10 units per acre in the city--about 50 percent of allowable densities.

For all land inside the UGB (city and county):

Multiple family development accounted for about 38 percent of all new units built between 1985 and 1989.

The average single family density inside the UGB was 3.5 units per acre.

Single family units in subdivisions were built at an average of about 60 percent of allowable density.

B. LIVABILITY ISSUES

Our intent was to address urban livability issues by describing changes in housing affordability, traffic congestion, parks, and air quality in the Brookings case study area between 1985 and 1989. The air quality data are not available at all, and information on traffic congestion we got from ODOT is meager (see Appendix).

The average home selling price in the Brookings area is increasing at a faster rate than total personal income. The average home selling price in Brookings increased from about \$89,000 to \$107,000 between 1988 and 1989, an increase of about 20 percent. This increase was significantly more than experienced in Bend, Portland, and Medford between 1989 and 1990. As larger number of new residents move to Curry County, housing costs are increasing at a higher rate than is typical for most other parts of the state. According to Carolyn Hubbard, President of the Curry County Board of Realtors, home values increased by about 1 percent per month between mid-1986 and November of 1989, and are currently increasing at about 2 percent per month. By comparison, personal income was forecasted by the Bureau of Economic Analysis to grow at an annual rate between about 5 and 6 percent per year between 1987 and 1990. In short personal income appears to be growing at about one-half the annual rate of home values in the Brookings area.

No new parkland has been created in the city of Brookings. Brookings relies primarily on state parks and federal forest land just outside its boundary.

C. INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT ISSUES

Below we address infrastructure investment issues by describing expenditures for transportation, sewer, water, and storm drainage improvements in the Brookings case study area between 1985 and 1989.

Summary. Although Brookings has done well in funding sewer and water, the City has not adopted a public facilities plan for key facilities that includes in the Harbor area (where much of the growth is occurring), and has no reliable funding sources for streets and drainage.

Brookings has been successful in funding sewer and water facilities. It has successfully passed general obligation bonds and secured federal funding (through DEQ) for sewer and water facilities. Those facilities provide a good base for accommodating future growth in the urban area. The city has \$6.9 million of sewer facilities under construction (with a comparable amount unfunded), and \$1.6 million for water facilities (with funding for another \$1.3 million and \$2.0 million unfunded).

Brookings has not been successful in funding drainage or roads. For these facilities it has completed few projects and has no reliable funding sources for new projects. It is considering modifying its system development charges to improve this situation. The city has no drainage projects under construction (with \$0.2 million funded and \$1.2 million unfunded), and \$0.3 million of road improvements under construction (with an additional \$1.2 million funded, and \$0.6 million unfunded). The unfunded estimate for roads is understated, by as much as ten times.

Brookings lacks an integrated public facilities plan. Though the city has developed facility master plans for sewer, water, storm drainage, and transportation, it has no single document that takes a comprehensive look at needed key facilities, or at service issues south of the Chetco River. Its transportation needs appear to be underestimated and underfunded. Its ability to manage growth effectively may be compromised if it cannot manage effectively the key public facilities that allow that growth to occur.

The public facility planning that the city has done for many services does not address coordination issues between the city and the Harbor area. Although it is clear that informal coordination occurs between the City and the Harbor Water District, Harbor has sewer and water district plans that need to be integrated into the public facility planning process for periodic review.

APPENDIX DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION OF DATA

A. PREFACE

This appendix describes and evaluates the data we used to address urban growth issues in the Brookings case study area. We focus on data that describe changes in land development, livability, and infrastructure investment between 1985 and 1989.

We organize the appendix by data source. For each source we describe the data source, evaluate its reliability, and show the data. We organize the data into six categories, corresponding to the six sections of this appendix:

- 1.0 Data describing historic socioeconomic conditions
- 2.0 Data describing growth management policies
- 3.0 Data describing changes in land development
- 4.0 Data describing changes in livability indicators
- 5.0 Data describing infrastructure investment
- 6.0 Data describing residual development potential

In Chapter Three we use the data in this appendix to develop conclusions about the amount and type of urban growth that occurred between 1985 and 1989 in the Brookings case study area.

1.0 SOCIOECONOMIC INDICATORS

1.1 SOURCE *Population Estimates for Oregon 1980-89*, Portland State University Center for Population Research and Census, 1990; *Business and Employment Outlook*, State Employment Division, 1990.

Description Population estimates for each case study area and Oregon for the years 1980 and 1989 (by Portland State University's Center for Population Research and Census (CPRC)). Estimates are driven by area births, deaths, and net migration. Table A-1 shows historic population growth for the Brookings case study area and other case study areas across Oregon. Employment estimates for each case study area and Oregon for the years 1980 and 1988. Table A-2 shows historic employment growth for Curry County and counties within other case study areas across Oregon.

Evaluation The population estimates by the CPRC are the only consistent sources available in each case study area. Although the CPRC does not actually count people, it periodically updates the data to ensure a close approximation to actual population trends. The 1980 Census of Population is used as a base. Employment data are extrapolated from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), U.S. Department of Commerce, and Oregon unemployment insurance files. The BEA estimates are the best available for time-series analysis. The BEA's employment data for each county are estimated jointly, and thus are comparable with one another.

ANALYSIS Tables A-1 and A-2 below show that the total population and employment of Curry County grew at faster rates between 1980 and 1988 than for the state as a whole. Brookings population also grew at an annual rate that was higher than the state as a whole between 1980 and 1988.

Much of the growth in Curry County's and Brookings' populations was due to an influx of retired citizens from the western states, especially California. Attracted by the area's climate, recreational opportunities, and a relatively low cost of living, many retired citizens are relocating to Curry County.

Another key factor leading to increases in population and employment in the area was the opening of the Pelican Bay State Prison in Crescent City, California. Many of the people employed at the prison have chosen to relocate to the Brookings area.

sewer and water districts, the City's street, water and storm drainage plans are limited to areas north of the Chetco River.

Inside the City Limits of Brookings, urban services required and most of the development that occurred during the study period was as a result of new subdivision activity. However, the Brookings Comprehensive Plan does not include policies that directly address issues of land use efficiency. For example, neither the plan nor the City's partitioning standards prohibit "serial partitioning," which has resulted in an inefficient (i.e., large lot with poor access) pattern of development in some areas.

Recent subdivision activity has resulted in increasingly larger lot sizes. In part, this has been the result of development in more steeply-sloped areas.

There is a signed "Urban Growth Area and Sphere of Influence Management Agreement" that requires notification to the City of County land use actions. This agreement is the process of revision, and does not include specific policies related to growth management other than to define jurisdictional boundaries.

3.0 LAND DEVELOPMENT DATA

3.1 SOURCE *Curry County Building Permit Data, City of Brookings Building Permit Data, Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.*

Description The Curry County building permit data provide information on the amount and configuration of development in the Brookings case study area. Building permits are recorded by the City and County for the year a permit is issued. The City of Brookings Building Permit data do not include density measures or location within the city. Because we define "urban areas" as within the Brookings city limits, all permits issued by the City occurred in urban areas. Density measures for single family residential City permits were not available, and are not reflected in the density tables (Tables A-4 through A-6). We have developed density measures for multiple family residential based on our review of individual multiple family developments with the Brookings building official. We used the following information from this data base in our analysis of development in the Brookings case study area and analysis areas (Tables A-3 through A-6): location information (map I.D. and tax lot number), size of lot or parcel, square feet of improvements, zoning, and number of dwelling units for residential properties.

Tables A-3a and A-3b show the amount and percent of development by type and analysis area. Tables A-4a and A-4b show the distribution and percent of residential development density (by permits issued) for single and multiple-family dwellings by analysis area. Tables A-5a and A-5b show actual versus allowable density (as specified by the Brookings and Curry County zoning codes) in terms of number of dwelling units constructed and percent by density class by analysis area. Table A-6 compares maximum allowable density with actual density by zone and analysis area in terms of actual average lot size and average percent of allowable density.

Evaluation The Curry County and City of Brookings building permit records are the most complete and consistent source of information available to us on the amount, configuration, and density of development in the Brookings case study area. However, not all records in the Brookings data base are complete. Some records did not include the number of dwelling units or acreage. This information is instrumental in development of density measures. We did not include incomplete records in our analysis of development density. Note that the Brookings data base was not disaggregated by zone and location. Thus we have assumed that all permits issued by the City of Brookings occurred in urban areas. Because no density measures are available for permits issued by the City, these figures are not included in Tables A-4 through A-6.

METHODS Curry County and City of Brookings building permit records identify building permits -- not actual construction. Thus, there is a period of time between the date the permit is issued and the date the building is constructed, and a small amount of building permits issued are never built.

Table A-3 shows the amount of development by type and analysis area. We counted building permits by analysis area and zone (for example all zones permitting single family uses were included in the single family residence) to determine the amount of development by type for single and multiple-family dwellings. The number of permits were then divided by the number of acres in each analysis area to derive a measure of overall development density (lot size). To determine the amount of commercial and industrial development, we aggregated data in

commercial and industrial zones by analysis area. Square feet of improvements was divided by square feet of land to develop the lot coverage ratios.

Table A-4a shows the distribution of residential development density (in lots/acre) for single and multiple-family dwellings by analysis area. To develop the figures presented in Table A-5, we created a density field for residential zones (lots/acre) and then summed the number of dwelling units for each density class by analysis area.

ANALYSIS

We used building permit data as one indicator of the amount and configuration of development that occurred in the Brookings case study area from 1985 through 1989. Curry county zones R-1, R-2, and R-3 allow smaller lots sizes in areas where water and sewer services exist (1 acre where no services exist, 12,000 sq. ft. if water or sewer service is available, and 6,000 sq. ft. if both water and sewer are available). In our analysis we assumed that all county-zoned lots inside the Brookings UGB will have both water and sewer service within the next 20 years, and as such, a minimum lot size of 6,000 sq. ft. was allowable.

Tables A-3a and A-3b provide an overview of the amount of development by type and analysis that occurred in the Brookings case study area from 1985 through 1989. A total of 497 single-family building permits were issued in the study area from 1985-89. Of these, 220 were located in County zones. About 95 percent of this development occurred in residential zones. The remaining 5 percent occurred in resource, commercial, and industrial zones. A total 95 permits were issued in the Cape Ferrello area and other exurban areas between 1985 and 1989. Of these, 37 were for single family residences and 58 were for mobile homes.

Overall, our analysis of county building permit records shows that about 15 percent of building permits issued occurred in the urban fringe area. About 56 percent of the building permits were issued in the Brookings UGB. A total of 166 multiple family dwelling unit permits were issued inside the Brookings UGB between 1985 and 1989. A total of 56 commercial and industrial developments occurred in the study area, with about 80 percent of these developments occurring inside the Brookings UGB. We have analyzed only the number of permits -- not their value or square footage. It is recognized that larger commercial and industrial developments tend to occur inside UGBs.

Tables A-4a and A-4b show the number and percentage of dwelling units constructed by density class and analysis area. Our analysis of the distribution of dwelling densities for building permits issued in single-family residential zones suggests (1) housing constructed inside the Brookings UGB is built at higher densities than outside the UGB (nearly 84 percent were built at densities between 2 and 8 units/acre), (2) a considerable amount of single-family building permits were issued in the urban fringe area between 1985 and 1989 (a total of 73 permits were issued in the urban fringe area), (3) residential development in the urban fringe occurred at densities lower than any other analysis area (31.6 percent were between 2 and 8 lots per acre), and (4) housing in the rest of county analysis area is being constructed at densities ranging from less than 0.2 units/ac to 10 units/ac.

commercial and industrial zones by analysis area. Square feet of improvements was divided by square feet of land to develop the lot coverage ratios.

Table A-4a shows the distribution of residential development density (in lots/acre) for single and multiple-family dwellings by analysis area. To develop the figures presented in Table A-5, we created a density field for residential zones (lots/acre) and then summed the number of dwelling units for each density class by analysis area.

ANALYSIS

We used building permit data as one indicator of the amount and configuration of development that occurred in the Brookings case study area from 1985 through 1989. Curry county zones R-1, R-2, and R-3 allow smaller lots sizes in areas where water and sewer services exist (1 acre where no services exist, 12,000 sq. ft. if water or sewer service is available, and 6,000 sq. ft. if both water and sewer are available). In our analysis we assumed that all county-zoned lots inside the Brookings UGB will have both water and sewer service within the next 20 years, and as such, a minimum lot size of 6,000 sq. ft. was allowable.

Tables A-3a and A-3b provide an overview of the amount of development by type and analysis that occurred in the Brookings case study area from 1985 through 1989. A total of 497 single-family building permits were issued in the study area from 1985-89. Of these, 220 were located in County zones. About 95 percent of this development occurred in residential zones. The remaining 5 percent occurred in resource, commercial, and industrial zones. A total 95 permits were issued in the Cape Ferrelo area and other exurban areas between 1985 and 1989. Of these, 37 were for single family residences and 58 were for mobile homes.

Overall, our analysis of county building permit records shows that about 15 percent of building permits issued occurred in the urban fringe area. About 56 percent of the building permits were issued in the Brookings UGB. A total of 166 multiple family dwelling unit permits were issued inside the Brookings UGB between 1985 and 1989. A total of 56 commercial and industrial developments occurred in the study area, with about 80 percent of these developments occurring inside the Brookings UGB. We have analyzed only the number of permits -- not their value or square footage. It is recognized that larger commercial and industrial developments tend to occur inside UGBs.

Tables A-4a and A-4b show the number and percentage of dwelling units constructed by density class and analysis area. Our analysis of the distribution of dwelling densities for building permits issued in single-family residential zones suggests (1) housing constructed inside the Brookings UGB is built at higher densities than outside the UGB (nearly 84 percent were built at densities between 2 and 8 units/acre), (2) a considerable amount of single-family building permits were issued in the urban fringe area between 1985 and 1989 (a total of 73 permits were issued in the urban fringe area), (3) residential development in the urban fringe occurred at densities lower than any other analysis area (31.6 percent were between 2 and 8 lots per acre), and (4) housing in the rest of county analysis area is being constructed at densities ranging from less than 0.2 units/ac to 10 units/ac.

TABLE A-3a
NUMBER OF BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED BY TYPE
1985-89

Building Type	Brookings City Limits ^a	Brookings UGB ^b	Brookings Urban Fringe ^c	Exurban ^d	Other Exurban ^e	Total
Single Family						
Number of Permits	181	96	73	52	95 ¹	497
Units/acre	N/A	0.87	0.48	0.16	N/A	
Multi-Family						
Number of Permits	166	0	36 ³	0	N/A	202
Units/acre	10.3	-	2.4	-	-	
Commercial/Industrial						
Number of Permits ²	26	19	3	8	N/A	56
Improved square feet	N/A	158,798	6,012	13,524	-	178,334
Acres	N/A	49.7	6.5	39.6	-	95.8
Lot coverage ratio	N/A	7.3%	2.11%	0.78%	-	4.3%

Source: Curry County Public Services Department.

N/A - Not available

^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City limits

^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits

^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB

^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

^e Includes Cape Ferello, and other exurban areas not included in the 1989 Curry County study

¹ Of the 95 residential building permits issued in the other exurban areas, 37 were single family residences and 58 were mobile homes

² The commercial/industrial permit data does not account for the size or value of development. It is recognized that larger, more costly developments are more likely to occur inside the UGB.

³ Rainbow Rock Condominiums, located just north of Brookings UGB.

TABLE A-3b
PERCENT OF BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED BY TYPE
1985-89

Building Type	Brookings City Limits ^a	Brookings UGB ^b	Brookings Urban Fringe ^c	Exurban ^d
Single Family				
Number of Permits	36.4%	19.3%	14.7%	29.6%
Multi-Family				
Number of Permits	82.2%	0.0%	17.8%	0.0%
Commercial/Industrial				
Number of Permits	46.4%	33.9%	5.4%	14.3%
Improved square feet	-	89.0%	3.4%	7.6%
Acres	-	71.6%	20.7%	7.7%

Source: Curry County Public Services Department.

N/A - Not available

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City limits
- ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits
- ^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB
- ^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

TABLE A-4a

DISTRIBUTION OF SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS
 Number of Permits Issued by Density Class
 1985-89

Density (Units/Acre)	Brookings City Limits ^a	Brookings UGB ^b	Brookings Urban Fringe ^c	Exurban ^d
0 - .2	0	11	5	6
.2 - .5	0	4	9	5
.5 - 1	0	9	9	5
1 - 2	0	21	14	14
2 - 4	0	29	17	10
4 - 6	181 ¹	6	2	0
6 - 8	0	16	0	5
8 - 10	0	0	0	1
> 10	0	0	1	1
Total	181	96	73	147

Source: Curry County Public Services Department.

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City limits
 - ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits
 - ^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB
 - ^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings excludes 95 permits for which densities were not available
- ¹ Data is not available to determine single-family residential densities. However, the building official estimates that the average lot size for single-family residences has ranged from 6,000 to 12,000 sq. ft. over the last 5 years. For this reason, we have placed all of the permits issued for single-family residences inside the City Limits in the 4-6 unit density class (i.e. 9,000 sq. ft. lots)

TABLE A-4b

DISTRIBUTION OF SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS
 Percent of Permits Issued by Density Class
 1985-89

Density (Units/Acre)	Brookings City Limits ^a	Brookings UGB ^b	Brookings Urban Fringe ^c	Exurban ^d
0 - .2	0.0%	11.5%	6.8%	11.5%
.2 - .5	0.0%	4.2%	12.3%	9.6%
.5 - 1	0.0%	9.4%	12.3%	9.6%
1 - 2	0.0%	21.9%	5.5%	26.9%
2 - 4	0.0%	30.2%	23.4%	19.2%
4 - 6	100.0% ¹	6.3%	2.7%	0.0%
6 - 8	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	9.6%
8 - 10	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
> 10	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	1.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Curry County Public Services Department.

^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City limits

^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits

^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB

^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings. Excludes 95 permits for which density figures were not available

¹ Data is not available to determine single-family residential densities. However, the building official estimates that the average lot size for single-family residences has ranged from 6,000 to 12,000 sq. ft. over the last 5 years. For this reason, we have placed all of the permits issued for single-family residences inside the City Limits in the 4-6 unit density class (i.e. 9,000 sq. ft. lots)

3.2 SOURCE *Curry County and City of Brookings Subdivisions Records 1985-89, Curry County and City of Brookings Planning Departments.*

Description This data source includes all approved subdivisions in Brookings and the Curry County study area from 1985-89. Subdivisions include all land divisions of 4 or more lots. This data base was used to analyze the amount, configuration, and density of approved subdivisions in the Brookings case study area (Tables A-8 through A-11). This analysis is presented by analysis area (defined on the tax map level). To analyze approved subdivisions we analyzed zoning, number of lots, acreage, and density (lots/acre).

Table A-5a shows the total number of lots and the average lot size created by analysis area for the period 1985-89. Table A-5b shows the percentage of subdivision lots created by analysis area. Table A-6a shows the distribution of new subdivision lots by density class for each analysis area. Table A-6b shows the percentage of subdivision lots created by density class. Table A-7a shows actual density of subdivision lots created as a percent of allowable density by zone and analysis area. Table A-7b shows the percentage of lots as a percent of allowable density by analysis area and zone. Table A-8 presents a comparison of actual versus allowable lot size by zone and analysis area.

Evaluation This data base is the best source of approved subdivisions in the Brookings case study area.

METHODS Table A-7 shows the total number of lots and the average lot size created by analysis area for the period 1985-89. Lot sizes are presented in net acres. To develop these figures, we totaled the number of subdivision lots created by analysis area during the period 1985-89. We then subtracted 25% of the total subdivision acreage to account for public right-of-way and open space. Next we divided the net subdivision acreage for each analysis area by the number of subdivision lots created to obtain our estimate of net average lot size.

Table A-8 shows the distribution of new subdivision lots by density class for each analysis area. To develop the figures presented in Table A-8, we calculated the net density of each subdivision and then summed the number of lots created by density class and analysis area.

Table A-9 shows actual versus allowable density for the number of subdivision lots created as a percent of allowable density by zone and analysis area. To develop our estimates of actual v. allowable densities for residential subdivisions, we aggregated the number of lots created by zone and analysis area. We then compared actual density (as a percent of allowable density) with the maximum allowable density for each zone designation as specified in the Brookings and Curry County zoning codes.

Table A-7 presents a comparison of actual versus allowable lot size by zone and analysis area. The data presented in Table A-7 summarize the raw data presented in Table A-8. The maximum allowable densities (in DU/acre) were converted into a minimum lot size (the reciprocal of DU/acre) and compared with the average actual lot size from the subdivision data. We then present the average percent of allowable density by zone. The total number of lots which had the corresponding acreage figures are also presented.

ANALYSIS We analyzed approved subdivisions in the Brookings case study area as an alternative measure of the amount and configuration of residential development.

Our analysis shows that 299 subdivision lots were approved in the Brookings case study area between 1985 and 1989. Over 95 percent of approved subdivision lots occurred in residential zones.

The majority (83.9 percent) of approved residential subdivision lots occurred in urban areas (inside the Brookings city limits).

Forty-four subdivision lots were approved in unincorporated areas within the Brookings UGB (urbanizable areas) from 1985-89.

Tables A-6a and A-6b show the number of subdivision lots created by density class. Note that densities are in lots per net acre. In all analysis areas of the Brookings case study area, 100 percent of approved subdivision lots fell between 2 and 8 lots per acre.

Tables A-7a and A-7b summarize the extent to which approved subdivisions are reaching allowable densities. Of the 251 residential subdivision lots created in the City limits, none attain densities of 90 percent or more of allowable density.

Table A-8 compares actual versus allowable density in lots created per net acre. For city zones, actual densities range from about 50 percent to 80 percent of the allowable density.

TABLE A-5a
APPROVED SUBDIVISIONS
1985-89

Subdivisions	Brookings City Limits ^a	Brookings UGB ^b	Brookings Urban Fringe ^c	Exurban ^d	Total
Number of lots					
Residential Zones	227	31	0	4	262
Multiple Family Zones	24	0	0	0	24
Non-Residential Zones	0	13	0	0	13
Total	251	44	0	4	299
Average lot size (Acres)					
Residential Zones	0.28	0.31	-	0.35	
Multiple Family Zones	0.16	-	-	-	
Non-Residential Zones	-	-	-	0.20	
Average Lot Size	0.35	0.31	-	0.28	

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City limits
- ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits
- ^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB
- ^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

TABLE A-5 b

APPROVED SUBDIVISIONS
 Percent of Lots Created by Analysis Area
 1985-89

Subdivisions	Brookings City Limits ^a	Brookings UGB ^b	Brookings Urban Fringe ^c	Exurban ^d	Total
Percent of lots					
Residential Zones	85.4%	11.8%	0.0%	1.5%	100.0%
Multiple Family Zones	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Non-Residential Zones	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits
- ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits
- ^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB
- ^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

TABLE A-6a

DISTRIBUTION OF NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION LOTS
 Number of Subdivision Lots Created by Density Class
 1985-89

Density (lots/acre)	Brookings City Limits ^a	Brookings UGB ^b	Brookings Urban Fringe ^c	Exurban ^d	Total
Single Family					
0 - .2	0	0	0	0	0
.2 - .5	0	0	0	0	0
.5 - 1	12	0	0	0	10
1 - 2	20	0	0	0	20
2 - 4	94	18	0	4	116
4 - 6	69	4	0	0	73
6 - 8	32	9	0	0	41
8 - 10	0	0	0	0	0
> 10	0	0	0	0	0
Total	229	31	0	4	262

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits
- ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits
- ^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB
- ^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

TABLE A-6b

DISTRIBUTION OF NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION LOTS
 Percent of Subdivision Lots Created by Density Class
 1985-89

Density (lots/acre)	Brookings City Limits ^a	Brookings UGB ^b	Brookings Urban Fringe ^c	Exurban ^d	Average
Single Family					
0 - .2	0.0%	0.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%
.2 - .5	0.0%	0.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%
.5 - 1	5.2%	0.0%	-	0.0%	3.8%
1 - 2	8.8%	0.0%	-	0.0%	7.6%
2 - 4	41.4%	58.1%	-	100.0%	44.2%
4 - 6	30.4%	12.9%	-	0.0%	27.9%
6 - 8	14.1%	29.0%	-	0.0%	15.6%
8 - 10	0.0%	0.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%
> 10	0.0%	0.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits
- ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits
- ^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB
- ^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

TABLE A-7a

SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: ACTUAL VS. ALLOWABLE DENSITY
Number of Subdivision Lots Created as Percent of Allowable Density
1985-89

Analysis Area/ Zone	Number of Lots Created by Density Class						Total Subdivision Lots Created
	Percent of Allowable Density						
	1-25%	25-50%	50-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100+ %	
Brookings City Limits^a							
City of Brookings							
R-1-6/R-LD	11	68	78	52	11	0	220
R-1-10	0	0	7	0	0	0	7
Subtotal	11	68	85	52	11	0	227
Brookings UGB^b							
Curry County							
R-2/R-3	0	18	0	0	4	9	31
Subtotal	0	18	0	0	4	9	31
Total	11	86	85	52	15	9	258

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits

^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits

^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB

^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

Notes: Curry County zone districts R-1, R-2, and R-3 allow a minimum lot size of 12,000 sq. ft. if the lot is served by a water or sewer district, and a minimum lot size of 6,000 sq. ft. if the lot is served by both a water and a sewer district. We have assumed that all county-zoned lots inside the Brookings UGB have services and are developable at a size of 6,000 sq. ft. We have also assumed that all county-zoned lots outside the Brookings UGB do not have services and the minimum lot size is 1 acre.

The City of Brookings zoning districts R-LD, R-MD, and R-HD no longer exist under the new City Zoning Code.

TABLE A-7b

SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: ACTUAL VS. ALLOWABLE DENSITY
Percent of Subdivision Lots Created as Percent of Allowable Density
1985-89

Analysis Area/ Zone	Number of Lots Created by Density Class						Total Subdivision Lots Created
	Percent of Allowable Density						
	1-25%	25-50%	50-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100+ %	
Brookings City Limits^a							
City of Brookings							
R-1-6	5.2%	32.5%	37.3%	24.9%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
R-1-10	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Subtotal	5.1%	31.5%	39.4%	24.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Brookings UGB^b							
Curry County							
R-2/R-3	0.0%	51.8%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%	29.0%	100.0%
Subtotal	4.5%	34.8%	34.4%	21.1%	1.6%	3.6%	100.0%

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits
- ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits
- ^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB
- ^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

Notes: Curry County zone districts R-1, R-2, and R-3 allow a minimum lot size of 12,000 sq. ft. if the lot is served by a water or sewer district, and a minimum lot size of 6,000 sq. ft. if the lot is served by both a water and a sewer district. We have assumed that all county-zoned lots inside the Brookings UGB have services and are developable at a size of 6,000 sq. ft. We have also assumed that all county-zoned lots outside the Brookings UGB do not have services and the minimum lot size is 1 acre.

The City of Brookings zoning districts R-LD, R-MD, and R-HD no longer exist under the new City Zoning Code.

TABLE A-8

SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ACTUAL VS. ALLOWABLE DENSITY
 Comparison of Actual and Allowable Lot Size
 1985-89

Analysis Area/ Zone	Maximum Allowable Density		Actual Average Density (DU/Net Acre)	Average Percent of Allowable Density	Number of Lots
	Minimum Lot Size	Density (DU/Net Acre)			
Brookings City Limits^a					
City of Brookings					
R-1-6/R-LD	6,000 sq ft	7.3	3.6	49.3%	220
R-1-10	10,000 sq ft	4.4	3.5	79.5%	7
Brookings UGB^b					
Curry County					
R-2/R-3	6,000 sq ft	7.3	5.8	79.5%	31
Brookings Urban Fringe^c					
Note: No subdivisions occurred in the urban fringe area during the period 1985-1989					
Exurban^d					
Curry County					
R-2	12,000 sq ft	3.6	2.8	72.2%	4

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits
- ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits. No subdivisions occurred in the Brookings UGB.
- ^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within two miles of the Brookings UGB
- ^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

Note: Curry County zoning districts R-1, R-2, and R-3 allow a minimum lot size of 12,000 sq. ft. if the lot is served by a water or sewer district, and a minimum lot size of 6,000 sq. ft. if the lot is served by both a water and a sewer district.

3.3 SOURCE

Curry County and City of Brookings Partition Records 1985-89, Curry County and City of Brookings Planning Departments.

Description The Curry County and City of Brookings partition data provide information on all approved partitions in the Brookings case study area during the period 1985-89. Partitions include all land divisions up to three parcels. We analyzed partition data by analysis area using Curry County tax maps. Our analysis of the amount, configuration, and density of approved partitions in residential areas is based on zoning, number of parcels, and acreage of new parcels. Tables A-9 through A-12 present the results of this analysis.

Table A-9a shows the number of residential partitions and the average parcel size by analysis area for the period 1985-89. Table A-9b shows the percent of parcels created by analysis area. Table A-10a shows the distribution of new parcels for single and multi-family zoning by analysis area. Table A-10b shows percent of parcels created by density class. Table A-11a shows actual versus allowable density for new parcels created as a percent of allowable density by analysis area and zone. Table A-11b shows percentage of parcels created as a percent of allowable density by analysis area and zone. Table A-12 shows actual versus allowable parcel size by analysis area and zone.

Evaluation The Curry County and City of Brookings partition data are the best available source for approved partitions in the Brookings case study area. However, not all records in the data base provided complete information. Some records did not include zoning, lots, or acreage figures. Because this information affects our density analysis, we did not include incomplete records.

METHODS

Curry county zones R-1, R-2, and R-3 allow smaller lots sizes in areas where water and sewer services exist (1 ac where no services exist, 12,000 sq ft if water or sewer service is available, and 6,000 sq ft if both water and sewer are available). In our analysis we assumed that all county-zone lots inside the Brookings UGB had both water and sewer service, and as such, a minimum lot size of 6,000 sq. ft. was allowable. Outside the Brookings UGB, we assumed some urban services (water or sewer) were available and that the minimum allowable lot size was 12,000 sq ft.

Table A-9 shows the number of residential partitions and the average parcel size by analysis area for the period 1985-89. We derived the figures presented in Table A-9 by summing the number of parcels by analysis area. We summed the total acreage of partitioned parcels and divided it by the number of parcels for each analysis area to obtain our estimate of average parcel size.

Table A-10 shows the distribution of new parcels for single and multi-family zoning by analysis area. To develop the figures presented in Table A-10, we summed the number of parcels in each density class by analysis area.

Table A-11 shows actual versus allowable density for new parcels created as a percent of allowable density by analysis area and zone. To develop our estimates of actual v. allowable densities for residential partitions, we aggregated the number of parcels created by zone and analysis area. We then compared actual density (as a percent of allowable density) with the maximum allowable density for each zone designation as specified in the Brookings and Curry County zoning codes.

Table A-12 shows actual versus allowable parcel size by analysis area and zone. The data presented in Table A-12 summarize the raw data presented in Table A-11. The maximum allowable densities (in DU/acre) were converted into a minimum lot size (the reciprocal of DU/acre) and compared with the average actual parcel size from the partition data. We then present the average percent of allowable density by zone. The total number of lots which had the corresponding acreage figures are also presented.

ANALYSIS

Our analysis of partitions in the Brookings case study area indicate that during the period 1985 through 1989, a total of 253 parcels were created through land partitions. Over 80 percent of partitions occurred on parcels in residential zones.

In the Brookings City Limits, 91 parcels were created accounting for 36.0 percent of all partitions in the study area. Parcel sizes in the urban area averaged 1.97 acres overall, and 2.09 acres for residential partitions. Our analysis of the Brookings UGB (urbanizable) area shows 25 parcels created, accounting for 10 percent of the study area total. The average parcel size was 1.0 acres overall and 0.9 acres in residential zones.

Our analysis shows 51 parcels were created in the Brookings urban fringe area. Parcels created in the urban fringe averaged 6.1 acres overall, and 4.8 acres in residential zones. Of the 86 parcels created in the rest of county area, 69 were in residential zones.

Our analysis of approved partitions shows a pattern of increasing parcel size from the urbanizable area outward. Parcels created in the urban area were larger (1.97 acres overall) than those in urbanizable areas.

Tables A-10a and A-10b show the distribution of new parcel size by density class. As one might expect, parcels in urban and urbanizable areas are occurring at higher densities than in the less-developed and partially serviced urban fringe and rest of county areas.

Tables A-11a and A-11b show actual versus allowable density for new parcels in the study area. Sixty-eight percent of partitions occurred at less than 90 percent of allowable density.

Table A-12 shows a comparison of actual versus allowable density for partitioned parcels from 1985-89. Overall, no patterns emerge from this analysis. Considerable variation is shown between both analysis areas and zones.

TABLE A-9a

NUMBER OF APPROVED PARTITIONS
1985-89

Partitions	Brookings City Limits ^a	Brookings UGB ^b	Brookings Urban Fringe ^c	Exurban ^d	Total
Number of parcels					
Urban/Exception Zones	80	23	32	69	204
Commercial/Industrial Zones	11	2	0	0	13
Resource Zones	-	-	19	17	36
Total	91	25	51	86	253
Average parcel size (Acres)					
Residential Zones	2.14	0.91	4.80	1.57	
Commercial/Industrial Zones	0.78	2.08	-	-	
Resource Zones	-	-	8.02	41.66	
Average	1.97	1.01	6.07	21.61	

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits
- ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits
- ^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB
- ^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

TABLE A-9b
PERCENT OF APPROVED PARTITIONS
1985-89

Partitions	Brookings City Limits ^a	Brookings UGB ^b	Brookings Urban Fringe ^c	Exurban ^d	Total
Percent of parcels					
Urban/Exception Areas	39.2%	11.3%	15.7%	33.8%	100.0%
Resource Zones	-	-	52.8%	47.2%	100.0%
Total	36.0%	9.9%	19.1%	34.0%	100.0%

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits
- ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits
- ^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB
- ^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

TABLE A-10a

DISTRIBUTION OF NEW PARCELS BY SIZE
Number of Parcels by Density Class
1985-89

Density (Parcels/acre)	Brookings City Limits ^a	Brookings UGB ^b	Brookings Urban Fringe ^c		Exurban ^d		Total
			Residential	Resource	Residential	Resource	
0 - .2	4	2	6	19	18	17	66
.2 - .5	10	5	10	0	2	0	28
.5 - 1	11	5	8	0	5	0	32
1 - 2	17	8	4	0	7	0	39
2 - 4	30	3	4	0	22	0	62
4 - 6	8	0	0	0	10	0	19
6 - 8	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
8 - 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
> 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total	80	23	34	19	69	17	253

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits
- ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits
- ^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB
- ^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

TABLE A-10b

DISTRIBUTION OF NEW PARCELS BY SIZE
Percent of Residential Parcels by Density Class
1985-89

Density (Parcels/acre)	Brookings City Limits ^a	Brookings UGB ^b	Brookings Urban Fringe ^c	Exurban ^d	Total
0 - .2	5.0%	8.7%	18.7%	26.1%	26.1%
.2 - .5	12.5%	21.7%	31.3%	2.9%	11.1%
.5 - 1	13.8%	21.7%	25.0%	7.2%	12.6%
1 - 2	21.3%	34.8%	12.5%	10.1%	15.4%
2 - 4	37.5%	13.1%	12.5%	31.9%	24.5%
4 - 6	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.5%	7.5%
6 - 8	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	2.0%
8 - 10	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
> 10	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits
- ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits
- ^c Brookings urban fringe is defined as tax maps within one to two miles of the Brookings UGB
- ^d Exurban is defined as areas of south Curry County within commuting distance of Brookings

TABLE A-11a

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: ACTUAL VS. ALLOWABLE DENSITY
Number of New Parcels by Density Class
1985-89

Analysis Area/ Zone	Number of Parcels Created by Density Class						Total Number of Parcels
	Percent of Allowable Density						
	1-25%	25-50%	50-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100+ %	
Brookings City Limits^a							
City of Brookings							
R-1-6/R-LD	35	32	5	2	0	0	74
R-HD	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
Subtotal	37	32	5	2	0	2	78
Brookings UGB^b							
R-1	7	0	3	0	0	0	10
R-2	3	8	2	0	0	0	13
Subtotal	10	8	5	0	0	0	23
Total	47	40	10	2	0	2	101

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits

^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits

Note: Curry County zone districts R-1, R-2, and R-3 allow a minimum lot size of 12,000 sq. ft. if the lot is served by a water or sewer district, and a minimum lot size of 6,000 sq. ft. if the lot is served by both a water and a sewer district.

TABLE A-11b

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: ACTUAL VS. ALLOWABLE DENSITY
Percent of New Parcels by Density Class
1985-89

Analysis Area/ Zone	Number of Parcels Created by Density Class						Total Number of Parcels
	Percent of Allowable Density						
	1-25%	25-50%	50-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100 + %	
Brookings City Limits^a							
City of Brookings							
R-1-6/R-LD	47.2%	43.2%	6.8%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
R-HD	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Brookings UGB^b							
Curry County							
R-1	70.0%	0.0%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
R-2	23.1%	61.5%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Subtotal	43.4%	34.8%	21.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total Brookings UGB	46.5%	39.6%	9.9%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	100.00

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

- ^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits
- ^b Brookings UGB is defined as all areas inside the Brookings UGB and outside the Brookings City limits

Note: Curry County zone districts R-1, R-2, and R-3 allow a minimum lot size of 12,000 sq. ft. if the lot is served by a water or sewer district, and a minimum lot size of 6,000 sq. ft. if the lot is served by both a water and a sewer district.

TABLE A-12

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: ACTUAL VS. ALLOWABLE DENSITY
 Actual and Allowable Parcel Size
 1985-89

Analysis Area/ Zone	Maximum Allowable Density		Actual Average Density (Lots/Acre)	Average Percent of Allowable Density	Number of Parcels
	Minimum Lot Size	Density (Lots/Net Acre)			
Urban^a					
City of Brookings					
R-1-6	6,000 sq ft	7.3	0.21	2.9%	39
R-LD	6,000 sq ft	7.3	0.34	4.7%	37
R-HD	6,000 sq ft	7.3	0.35	4.8%	4
Curry County					
R-1	6,000 sq ft	7.3	0.25	3.4%	10
R-1	6,000 sq ft	7.3	0.23	3.2%	13

Source: Curry County Public Services Department, City of Brookings Planning Department.

^a Brookings city limits includes all areas inside the Brookings City Limits

Note: Curry County zoning districts R-1, R-2, and R-3 allow a minimum lot size of 12,000 sq. ft. if the lot is served by a water or sewer district, and a minimum lot size of 6,000 sq. ft. if the lot is served by both a water and a sewer district.

4.0 URBAN LIVABILITY ISSUES

4.1 SOURCE *Home Selling Price Listings, Oregon Multiple Listings Service, Brookings, Medford, Bend, and Portland; Phone Interview with Carolyn Hubbard, President Curry County Board of Realtors.*

Description Oregon Multiple Listings Service (OMLS) is an organization that compiles information about the housing market for specific areas across the state. OMLS collects its housing sales information from realtors who sell houses. Once a participating realtor sells a home, they provide information including (1) sales price, (2) number of days on the market, and (3) type of house sold to the OMLS.

OMLS uses this information to issue monthly reports that include the following data: (1) number of homes sold by type during the previous month; (2) average sales price by type for the previous month; and (3) current average selling time for homes, by type. Table A-12 shows the average selling price for homes in Brookings, Bend, Portland, and Medford between 1985 and 1989.

Evaluation OMLS data for Brookings has only been kept for the past two years. Although the OMLS home sales price data does not include all homes sold in a particular area over time, it is the most complete standard source available that allows comparison between different parts of the state.

ANALYSIS Table A-13 below shows that the average home selling price in Brookings increased from about \$89,000 to \$107,000 between 1988 and 1989, an increase of about 20 percent. This increase was significantly more than experienced in Bend, Portland, and Medford between 1989 and 1990. As larger number of new residents move to Curry County, housing costs are increasing at a higher rate than is typical for most other parts of the state.

Although the OMLS data only presents information about home prices in Brookings over the past two years, a recent ECO Northwest Study (*Forecast of the Long-Run Demand for Housing in the Brookings-Harbor Area, January 1989*), described the current boom in real estate in the Brookings area. According to one real estate broker interviewed, home values increased by about 1 percent per month between mid-1986, the start of the boom, and November of 1989.

According to Carolyn Hubbard, President of the Curry County Board of Realtors, home prices in Brookings are currently increasing at about 2 percent per month. Hubbard has verified this increase through examination of County records. (*by comparison, personal income was forecasted to grow at an annual rate between about 5 and 6 percent per year between 1987 and 1990¹; in short personal income appears to growing at about one-half the annual rate of home values*)

As the Brookings area continues to attract residents (mainly retirees and employees of the Pelican Bay State Prison), this influx of people with savings and jobs will be accompanied by a demand for housing. Because of the diversity of the growth, the demand for housing will affect all housing types and prices.

¹ Oregon Economic and Revenue Forecast, June 1988.

TABLE A-13

AVERAGE HOME SELLING PRICE
BY CASE STUDY AREA
1985-89

Jurisdiction	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	% Change
Brookings	NA	NA	NA	\$89,000	\$107,000	20.2
Bend	\$45,594	\$53,926	\$51,901	57,286	67,583	48.2
Portland	70,015	NA	73,382	76,883	85,546	22.1
Medford	56,381	55,592	57,245	59,410	69,637	23.5

Source: Oregon Multiple Listings Service Annual Summary Reports, OMLS.

4.2 SOURCE *Oregon State Highway Division, Traffic Engineering Section, Traffic Volumes and Level of Service.*

Description The Oregon State Highway Division keeps traffic volume counts for many Oregon highways. Level of service (LOS) is a commonly used indicator of traffic congestion. LOS is based on a scale of A to F with LOS A equivalent to free-flowing traffic and LOS F equivalent to gridlock. LOS is based on traffic volume capacity and actual traffic volumes.

Evaluation The State Highway Division compiles traffic volume data on a regular basis. However, LOS is not calculated on a regular basis. LOS is only calculated by the State Highway Division on a project by project basis. In addition, the LOS calculations were based on Highway Division traffic counts at different seasons of the year.

ANALYSIS Table A-14 shows traffic volumes and level of service for the intersection of Highway 101 and Oak Street in Brookings for 1982 and 1989. Level of service remained at LOS A at the intersection between 1982 and 1989. Traffic volumes decreased from 19,276 to 16,916. Note that these counts were made during different months of the year. The 1982 counts were made in July and the 1988 counts were done in September.

TABLE A-14

**TRAFFIC VOLUMES AND LEVEL OF SERVICE
Highway 101 and Oak Street
1982 and 1988**

Intersection	Total Vehicles		Level of Service	
	1982	1988	1982	1989
Highway 101 and Oak Street	19,276	16,916	A	A

Source: Oregon State Highway Division, Traffic Engineering Section.

5.0 INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

5.1 SOURCE

Draft Water Intake, Treatment Plant, and Distribution Study for the City of Brookings (CH2M Hill, 1988); *A Comprehensive Plan for Storm Drainage Development, Brookings, Oregon* (HGE Engineering, 1985); *City of Brookings Wastewater Facilities Plan* (Brown and Caldwell, 1988); and *Comprehensive Street Improvement and Traffic Circulation Plan, City of Brookings* (GLD, 1989).

Discussions with Brookings Community Development Director Leo Leightle.

Description The City of Brookings does not have a Public Facilities Plan, *per se*. Discussions with the Community Development Director clarified the status, rough costs and funding sources for each project.

Evaluation The CH2M Hill water study we used was in draft form. Since its adoption, Brookings passed a \$1.2 million dollar bond measure and has already constructed many of the identified improvements. Projects for the Harbor Bench area south of the City of Brookings have not been determined by the City. We have not attempted to determine these costs from the Harbor Water District because we have not calculated needed project costs for special districts in any of the other study areas.

The HGE storm drainage plan is five years old. The only major storm drainage project that has been planned for Brookings did not appear on the list of drainage basin improvements. The Harbor Bench area was not considered in this study.

The Brown and Caldwell sewer plan is being revised. Phase 1 of the recommended improvements in that plan have already been constructed as a result of a \$3.2 million bond measure passed by City voters. The cost of phase one was under-estimated by 46 percent. Data on public facilities projects was not available from the Harbor Sanitary District.

The GLD transportation plan is also limited to the area north of the Chetco River (excluding the Harbor Bench), and has not determined costs of projects that may be funded by ODOT. Local costs appear to have been seriously underestimated because City standards may not have been uniformly applied in determining project costs.

Method This section of the case study focuses on major sewer, water, storm drainage and transportation projects that have been deferred because of limited financing capability. In some of the case studies, the PFP process has not been completed, and this fact will be noted.

In each study, we have conferred with the local planning and public works staff to categorize each project identified in the PFP as follows:

- (1) Projects that have been constructed or are under construction. If the project falls in this category, it's funding has not been deferred for lack of funding.
- (2) Projects that have an assured funding source. Goal 14 requires that growth be "orderly and efficient," which implies geographic phasing of public facilities to support planned growth. Many communities rely on utility fees, local improvement districts, systems development charges and other means to make sure that projects are built to support development over time. Thus, the fact that a project has not yet been built, or that a project has been scheduled in the future, does not mean that the project has been

"deferred" for lack of funding. For the purposes of this study, we assume that if funding will be available when the project is scheduled for construction in the PFP, then the project has not been deferred for lack of funding.

- (3) Projects that are necessary to support growth during the planning period, but have no assured source of funding. If the project does not fall into categories 1 or 2 above, then, for the purposes of this study, the project has been "deferred because of limited funding capability."

The capital costs for each project in the unfunded (deferred) category will be determined in 1990 dollars. The sum of the deferred capital costs then will be determined for each type of facility (sewer, water, storm drainage and transportation).

**TABLE A-15
BROOKINGS UGB
PUBLIC FACILITIES PROJECTS**

<u>Project</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Cost (1989\$)</u>	<u>Funding Sources</u>
SANITARY SEWER			
Stage I Treatment and Collection	C	6,900,000	\$3.2 Million Bond Measure, EPA Grant
SUBTOTAL - UNDER CONSTRUCTION (C)		6,900,000	
State II Treatment and Collection	U	7,397,338 ¹	Proposed Bond Measure, Possible EPA Grant, SDC's
SUBTOTAL - UNKNOWN FUNDING SOURCE (U)		7,397,338	
WATER²			
Water Intake	C	1,200,000	\$1.2 Million Bond Passed
Water Distribution System ³	C	401,310	Water Rates, Developer Contributions, SDC's
SUBTOTAL - UNDER CONSTRUCTION (C)		1,601,310	
Water Treatment Plant	F	292,956	Water Rates, Developer Contributions, Revenue, and G.O. Bonds.
Water Distribution System ³	F	344,799	Water Rates, Developer Contributions, SDC's.
SUBTOTAL - KNOWN FUNDING SOURCE (F)		637,755	
Water Treatment Plant	U	544,062	Water Rates, Developer Contributions, Revenue and G.O. Bonds.
Water Distribution System ³	U	1,976,481	Water Rates, Developer Contribution, SDC's.
SUBTOTAL - UNKNOWN FUNDING SOURCE (U)		2,520,543	
STORM DRAINAGE			
Drainage Basins North of Chetco River ⁵	F	183,117	SDC's ⁴
SUBTOTAL - KNOWN FUNDING SOURCE (F)		183,117	
Drainage Basins North of Chetco River ⁵	U	1,648,050	Bancroft Bonds, Developer Contributions
SUBTOTAL - UNKNOWN FUNDING SOURCE (U)		1,648,050	
TRANSPORTATION⁶			
Street and Parking Improvements	C	308,880	Developer Contributions, Gas Tax, County Road Funds

**TABLE A-15
BROOKINGS UGB
PUBLIC FACILITIES PROJECTS**

SUBTOTAL - UNDER CONSTRUCTION (C)		308,880	
Street and Parking Improvements	F	1,228,240	Developer Contributions, Gas Tax, County Road Funds
SUBTOTAL - KNOWN FUNDING SOURCE (F)		1,228,240	
Street and Parking Improvements	U	567,840	Developer Contributions, Gas Tax, County Road Funds
SUBTOTAL - UNKNOWN FUNDING SOURCE (U)		567,840	
TOTAL - UNDER CONSTRUCTION (C)		8,810,190	
TOTAL - KNOWN FUNDING SOURCE (F)		2,049,112	
TOTAL - UNKNOWN FUNDING SOURCE (U)		12,133,771	

- ¹ The actual figure in the 1988 Brown and Caldwell Wastewater Facilities Plan is \$5,060,000. However, since the actual cost for Phase I was 46% higher than originally estimated, we have increased the estimate for Phase II by 46%.
- ² The Harbor Water District (HWD) currently serves the area inside the UGB south of the Chetco River. The CH₂M Hill Water Study excluded the area served by the HWD from its study.
- ³ These figures are based on the 1984 CH₂M Hill Water Study and discussions with the Brookings Community Development Director, Mr. Leo Leightle. Mr. Leightle's rough estimate of funded projects is based on the probability that existing SDC revenues will cover 10% of actual costs.
- ⁴ Community Development Director, Leightle, estimates that approximately 10% of identified storm drainage projects can be funded by existing SDC's.
- ⁵ The HGE Storm Drainage Study did not address the Harbor Beach area.
- ⁶ The 1988 Dyer Street and Traffic Plan does not include estimates for State Highway improvements, part of which would be funded by ODOT. It appears that the Dyer Plan seriously underestimates street improvement costs for several reasons: (a) new streets appear to have already been constructed in Brookings that did not appear in the plan; (b) cost estimates may not have been based on improvement to City standards; and (c) the plan did not address the Harbor area south of the Chetco River.

6.0 DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

6.1 SOURCE *Curry County Comprehensive Plan Inventory and Development Suitability of Vacant Land within Rural Land Exception Areas in the Vicinity of the Brookings Urban Growth Boundary, 1990.*

Description Table A-16 shows the number of developed lots and the potential number of developed lots within the 11 exception areas in the Curry County study area. The total acreage of vacant lots and the average vacant lot size for each area is also reported.

Evaluation In 1989, the Curry County Planning Department performed a physical inventory of vacant and developed lots in the vicinity of the Urban Growth Boundary. Each exception area was mapped and reported in the 1989 Curry County Comprehensive Plan. Each map showed the number of vacant and developed lots within the exception area. A summary sheet showing the total number of vacant acres within each area was also included. Information on zoning and lot area for each lot was not provided. The data is the most current and complete available.

METHOD The Rural Comprehensive Plan provided a count for the total acreage of vacant lots, the total number of vacant and developed lots was not provided. Maps for each area showing the vacant and developed lots within each area were provided. We counted the number of lots that were developed and the number of vacant lots. Because Curry County has adopted minimum lot sizes of 5 and 10 acres for exceptions acres, we have determined that there is negligible potential for further lot division. The average vacant lot sizes ranged from .65 to 7.49 acres by exception area. To divide a lot zoned RR-5 at least 10 acres is required. To divide a lot zoned RR-10, at least 20 acres is required. The results are shown in Table A-16.

ANALYSIS There are 11 exception areas, consisting of a total of 976 residential lots, in the vicinity of Brookings Urban Growth Boundary. Approximately 72 percent of these residential lots are developed. The vacant lots within each exception area average 2.14 acres in size. Further partitions or subdivisions within each exception area is limited. It appears that the small parcel size and the extent of development within each exception area makes resource production impracticable. Also, the availability of over 270 vacant residential lots should contain residential development to parcels within exception areas.

TABLE A-16

EXCEPTION AREA RESIDUAL DEVELOPMENT
CURRY COUNTY STUDY AREA

Exception Area	Developed Lots	Vacant Lots	Total Vacant Acres	Average Vacant Lot Size
RLE-48	30	12	38.32	3.19
RLE-49	83	52	150.74	2.90
RLE-50	20	28	59.57	2.13
RLE-51	14	11	32.05	2.91
RLE-61	60	19	68.07	3.58
RLE-62	113	27	64.63	2.39
RLE-63	91	48	70.61	1.47
RLE-64	8	1	7.49	7.49
RLE-65	89	30	19.61	.65
RLE-66	34	4	2.84	.71
RLE-67	161	41	71.40	1.74
TOTAL	703	273	585.33	2.14

Source: *Curry County Comprehensive Plan Inventory and Development Suitability of Vacant Land in the Vicinity of the Brookings Urban Growth Boundary, 1989.*

6.2 SOURCE *Laren Woolley, Planner, Curry County Planning Department, 1990.*

Description The number of nonforest and nonfarm dwellings that were approved in the Curry County study area for the period of 1985 through 1989 is shown in Table A-17. The yearly average of approvals during this period is also shown.

Evaluation The estimates for nonfarm and nonforest dwelling approvals in Curry County study area is the most current available. The estimates were derived from reviewing all approved applications for a nonresource dwelling in the study area. Estimates for future approvals was derived by calculating the average number of yearly approvals for the years 1985-1990. This figure was then multiplied by 11 to determine the number of approvals for years 1990-2000. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Estimates for future approvals does not account for land availability or market conditions.

ANALYSIS For the period of 1985 through 1989, 4 nonresource dwellings were approved in the Curry County study area. If this rate continues through the 1990's, then 8 additional nonresource dwellings will be approved in the Curry County study area. It does not appear that the approval of nonresource dwellings is significantly reducing the availability of resource land in the study area. However, one reason for low approval rate is that much of the land in the study area is either within the Urban Growth Boundary or is designated as an exception area. It can be expected that the a larger number of nonresource dwellings are being approved outside of the study area, which consists of a greater percentage of resource land.

TABLE A-17

NONFARM AND NONFOREST DWELLING APPROVALS
 CURRY COUNTY STUDY AREA
 1985-2000

Year	Nonfarm Dwellings	Nonforest Dwellings
1985	0	0
1986	1	0
1987	1	1
1988	0	0
1989	0	1
Total Approvals 1985-89	2	2
Yearly Average 1985-89	0.4	0.4
Estimated number of Approvals 1990-2000	4	4
Estimated number of Approvals 1985-2000	6	6

Source: Laren Woolley, Planner, Curry County Planning Department, estimates by ECO Northwest.

