Comprehensive Plan Update:
Urban Growth Area Boundaries

4/30/15
Planning Commission Meeting
Process

- **Tonight:**
  - Identify preferred UGA boundary alternative

- **May 7 Planning Commission:**
  - *Not* a public hearing
  - If needed, work session to identify an alternative

- **June 11 Special Planning Commission Meeting:**
  - Public hearing
Tonight’s Objectives

- Review UGA boundary alternatives
  - Starting point for discussion
  - Based on staff analysis
  - Based on public input
  - Includes pros/cons
  - Includes cost analysis for potential expansion areas

- No vote on final recommendation tonight
Elements common to all alternatives:

- Incentives for urban villages
- Level of service review
- Infill where allowed with current zoning:
  - Infill housing toolkit
  - Accessory dwelling units (update in progress)
  - Subdivision ordinance revisions (update in progress)
Alternative A

- Mid-range forecast
- Current UGA boundary
- Maintains S. Yew Street Reserve
- Adopted capital facilities costs
- Revisits level of service standards
Alternative A

**PROS**
- Continues urban village strategy
- Planned infrastructure improvements
- No upzones or expansion
- Positioned well to respond to uncertainty

**CONS**
- Does this option support the goal of reducing growth in rural areas?
- How do we provide additional single-family housing options?
Alternative B

- Mid-range forecast
- Current UGA boundary
- Maintains S. Yew Street Reserve
- Adds south half of Caitac to UGA Reserve
- Adopted capital facilities costs
Alternative B

**PROS**
- Continues urban village strategy
- Planned infrastructure improvements
- No upzones
- Positioned well to respond to uncertainty
- Reserve status protects limited expansion options

**CONS**
- Single-family housing options?
- No guarantee reserve areas will be added to UGA
- Reserve land does not count toward land supply
Alternative C

- Between mid- and high-range forecast
- Maintains S. Yew Street Reserve
- Adds south half of Caitac to UGA
Alternative C

PROS
• Provides best opportunity to expand at least cost to city
• Best option for additional single-family housing

CONS
• High cost ($46-$56 million)
• City absorbs cost of new infrastructure and pre-existing conditions
• Can affordable mix of housing options be guaranteed?
• Does further expansion represent community values?
Key Questions

Why didn’t staff recommend low-range forecast?
- Mid-range allows adjustments and provides agility
- Risk losing portions of existing urbanized UGA
- Allows for long-term infrastructure planning, but reduces immediate need
Key Questions

- Why didn’t staff recommend additional infill?
  - Focusing on existing urban village strategy
  - Up-coming subdivision ordinance revisions
  - Up-coming accessory dwelling unit ordinance revisions
  - Up-zoning not viewed favorably in existing neighborhoods
Key Questions

- **Why didn’t staff recommend further UGA expansion?**
  - Costs/unit yield
  - Lake Whatcom Watershed
  - Critical areas/environmental impacts
  - Topography
  - Existing development patterns

- **Why didn’t staff recommend adding S. Yew Street to the UGA?**
  - High cost ($47-$74 million)
  - Half capacity of S. Caitac
Potential Expansion Areas

Need to balance single family housing growth potential with public/private costs.

Key:
- Watershed
- Forested Foothills
- Wetlands
- Exist Low Density Beyond City Services
- Ferndale UGA
- Potential Expansion
- Owners requesting UGA expansion

Bellingham Bay
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### Land Capacity Analysis Housing Unit Breakout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Area</th>
<th>Total Hsg Unit Growth</th>
<th>Single Family Hsg Units</th>
<th>Multi-Family Hsg Units</th>
<th>SF Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>MF Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>SF Persons Per Unit</th>
<th>MF Persons Per Unit</th>
<th>Estimated SF Population Accommodated</th>
<th>Estimated MF Population Accommodated</th>
<th>Estimated Total Population Accommodated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Urban Villages except Waterfront</td>
<td>6,057</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>7.25%</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>9,758</td>
<td>10,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront District Urban Village</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas Inside City Limits</td>
<td>8,754</td>
<td>3,953</td>
<td>4,802</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>7.25%</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>9,448</td>
<td>8,283</td>
<td>17,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Urban Growth Area</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>7.25%</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17,178</td>
<td>5,577</td>
<td>11,601</td>
<td>32.47%</td>
<td>67.53%</td>
<td>40.49%</td>
<td>59.51%</td>
<td>13,331</td>
<td>19,595</td>
<td>32,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Historic & Forecast Housing Units By Type for Entire Urban Growth Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Family Hsg Units</th>
<th>Multi-Family Hsg Units</th>
<th>Percent Multi-Family Units</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>14,374</td>
<td>7,027</td>
<td>32.83%</td>
<td>21,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>15,997</td>
<td>8,267</td>
<td>34.07%</td>
<td>24,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19,452</td>
<td>13,254</td>
<td>40.52%</td>
<td>32,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>22,702</td>
<td>17,926</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>40,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>23,023</td>
<td>18,305</td>
<td>44.29%</td>
<td>41,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>28,600</td>
<td>29,906</td>
<td>51.12%</td>
<td>58,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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