

Housing

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
<u>[Introduction] Preface</u>	1
<u>Basic Housing Findings</u>	3
<u>Housing Policies</u>	4
Summary of Findings	6
Current Housing Stock	6
Housing Age and Condition	6
Vacancy Rates	6
Rentals	6
Second Homes	7
<u>[Mobile] Manufactured Homes</u>	7
Low Income and Elderly Housing	7
<u>[Special Housing for the Elderly]</u>	
Household Size	8
Housing Unit Size	8
Housing Prices	8
Costs of Home Ownership	8
Sales Activity	8

Residential Building Activity	8
Demolition and Conversion	8
Housing Rehabilitation	8
<u>County-wide Housing Projections to 1980</u>	9
Estimated Housing Demand to the Year 2000	10
[Impact of Pacific Fabricators]	
[Summary of Housing Market Analysis]	
[Summary of Housing Problems]	

Table of Contents (continued)

Page

Appendices:

[A. Housing Price Survey Results Contractor Bank/Savings Loan, Title Company Realtor/Salesperson	
B. Housing Survey Results Clatsop Plains Wauna-Westport/Knappa-Svensen Lewis & Clark Elsie-Jewell	
C. Housing Condition Guidelines]	
[D.] <u>A</u> School Enrollment	56
[E. Housing Market Analysis Tables	
F. Formula for Vacation Homes	
G. Land Values in Clatsop County	
H. Household Income Levels and Distribution]	

List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1. <u>[Current Dwelling Units, 1978] Unincorporated Dwelling Units, 1978 and 1989</u>	11
Table 2. <u>[Age of Structures] Unincorporated Current Dwelling Units, 1989</u>	11
Table 3. <u>[Condition Rating] 1980 and 1989 Estimates of Housing and Household Estimates</u>	18
[Table 4. Total Unincorporated County Housing Vacancy Rates.	
Table 5. Total Clatsop County Housing Vacancy Rates.	
Table 6. Assumed Household Characteristics Unincorporated County, 1970.	
Table 7. Assumed Household Characteristics Unincorporated County, 1978.	
Table 8. Location of County's Low Income Households.	
Table 9. Clatsop County Residents Receiving Public Assistance and/or Food Stamps.	
Table 10. Households Eligible for Section 8.	
Table 11. Homes for Elderly.	
Table 12. Housing Characteristics from 1970 Census.	
Table 13. Housing Characteristics as of July 1978.	
Table 14. Number of Rooms and Bedrooms for Housing by Percentage.	
Table 15. Assessor's Sales Records]	

Table of Contents (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
[Table 16. Total Assessor's Sales Records	
Table 17. Average Annual Residential Construction Activity Unincorporated County]	
<u>Table 4. Occupied Housing Units by Occupancy Status</u>	21
<u>Table 5. Renter Occupied Housing Units</u>	22
<u>Table 6. Vacant Housing Units Held for Occasional Use, 1980</u>	25
<u>Table 7. Clatsop County Residents Receiving Public Assistance and/or Food Stamps</u>	29
<u>Table 8. Housing Characteristics from 1970 Census</u>	34
<u>Table 9. 1970 Census, Number of Rooms and Bedrooms for Housing</u>	35
<u>Table 10. Owner Occupied Housing Units in Selected Value Categories and Median Value</u>	39
<u>Table 11. Assessor's Sales Records</u>	41

<u>Table 12. Sales from January 1989 to December 1989</u>	42
<u>Table 13. Assessor's Sales Records</u>	43
<u>Table 14. Additional Housing Units Needed</u>	51

<u>Table A-1. School Enrollment</u>	56
-------------------------------------	----

[Table 16. Total Assessor's Sales Records.

Table 17. Average Annual Residential Construction Activity
Unincorporated County.

Table 18. Residences Demolished Since 1970-1977.

Table 19. Housing Allocation Scheme to 1980 for Unincorporated
Clatsop County.

Table 20. Additional Housing Units Needed.

Table 21. Brown and Root Impact.]

[List of Tables in the Appendices]

Table D-1. School Enrollment-September Reports.

Table E-1. Benchmark Data, Current Estimates and Projections.

Table E-2. Average Annual Changes.

Table E-3. Clatsop County Estimated Net Quantitative Demand.

Table E-4. Estimated Annual Demand for New Non-subsidized Housing.

Table E-5. Building Construction for Single Family Residences.

Table F-1. The Proportional Distribution, in Rank Order, of Second
Homes in Oregon--1970.

Table F-2. The Absolute Number, in Rank Order, of Second Homes in
Oregon--1970.

Table F-3. Income as Related to Types of Amenities Demanded for
Second Home Location.

Table F-4. Travel Distance Between Primary and Second Homes.

Table H-1. Clatsop County 1969 After Tax Income by Deciles.

Table H-2. Median Income.

Table H-3. Income Spent on Housing.

[List of Graphs]

Residential Building Activity, 1940-1976

Graph 1. Clatsop County, Single Family and Mobile Homes.

Graph 2. Clatsop County, Multi-family and Duplex.

Graph 3. Clatsop Plains.

Graph 4. Lewis and Clark.

Graph 5. Wauna/Westport/Knapapa.

Graph 6. Arch Cape.

Graph 7. Seaside Rural.
Graph 8. Elsie/Jewell.

Preface

Clatsop County's housing needs have not changed since the data was collected for the Comprehensive Plan adopted in 1980. New housing information will be made available with the 1990 U.S. Census. There are, at present, no major changes anticipated which could cause either a dramatic increase or decline in population.

The acknowledged Comprehensive Plan (1980) included population projections associated with certain proposed development(s) and the anticipated secondary employment. The development did not take place. However, the population projections will continue to reflect an influx of retirees to the Southwest Coastal planning area, and an increase in construction of second homes, as well as normal growth through births and natural migration, increased tourism and industrial development.

Detailed housing inventory information will be made available for each incorporated city with their respective Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review documents.

The Housing Policies developed with the 1980 Comprehensive Plan are still appropriate to meet the requirement of the Statewide Housing Goal #10.

[INTRODUCTION]

[Our population is growing and likewise the need for housing. There is no escaping this need. Right now there is a housing shortage. That means that there are not enough vacant houses and apartments to allow much variety of choice for the home seeker. This factor is compounded by the growth in the number of households. So, the need for housing units is going up because fewer people share each unit.

The cost of housing is also going up. People who five years ago would have bought a "starter home" are now completely priced out of the buying market.

Without alternatives to choose from, such as multi-family dwellings, single-family attached housing, condominiums, and mobile homes, additional pressure will be placed on the existing housing supply and prices will continue to soar.

We need land for housing but we also need to preserve our resources. It hurts the economy when the land is no longer available for agriculture or timber. The less spread out we are willing to live, the less expensive it will be. Planning ahead saves money. This means that the County should take an active role in providing adequate land to meet the demands for housing in the area at prices people can afford.

The purpose of this report is to assist the County in this effort by:

1. identifying the County's housing problems,
2. identifying unique situations in the County which will affect housing, such as the Brown and Root project and the demand for second homes,
3. describing the characteristics of the existing housing supply,
4. projecting the future demand for housing at various price ranges and rent levels and the amount of land needed to accommodate this demand,
5. estimating the distribution of the demand within the citizen

planning areas,

and, based on the findings of this report, to recommend County-wide policies for housing.

The inventory of housing throughout this report was prepared by the County planning staff with the assistance of the local building departments, the County Assessors and Data Processing offices, and the Pacific Power and Light Company. Local realtors, contractors, lending institutions and title companies were surveyed to get as true a picture as possible of current economic conditions.

The market analysis was developed by the planning staff with the assistance of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Area Economist. The analysis and projections were prepared with information available as of July 1, 1978. Assumptions and judgments made on the basis of information available on this data will most likely be modified by subsequent developments.]

[The prospective demand or occupancy potentials in this report are not forecasts of what will or must be built, but are a measure of the level of construction which would maintain a reasonable balance between the demand for the supply of housing under the conditions analyzed.

The information contained in this report meets the requirements of the statewide Housing Goal #10 and provides the necessary information to local governments, particularly the County, wishing to apply for Housing Assistance Plans.]

Basic Housing Findings

There [are] were approximately [15,100] 16,548 dwelling units in Clatsop County in 1980. The unincorporated areas represented about [33%] 31% of this total, or approximately [5,000] 5,292 dwelling units. The majority of the dwellings [are] were single family units.

[Most] Much of the housing stock is older, lacks insulation, and is sometimes difficult to finance. In 1980, in the unincorporated County it [is] was estimated that nearly 28% of the total units needed major repairs. [Many programs are still available in the area to assist in this effort.] A comprehensive housing study has not been done since that time.

From 1960 to 1980, almost half of all new residential building construction in the County [has] occurred in the unincorporated areas.

[since 1960.] [About one out of every 3.5 homes built in the unincorporated County is a second home] While in 1980, [mobile] manufactured homes constituted a third of all new building permits issued, [each year.] in 1988, they totaled only one fourth of the permits for single family units. Overall, it appears that for the County as a whole the demand for [mobile] manufactured homes as a economic alternative to conventional housing will [increase] continue; [each year, while the demand for second homes is expected to decrease due to non-availability of loans for second homes, gas crisis and continued inflationary pressures.] however, the needs of the low-income and elderly cannot totally be met by the [mobile] manufactured home industry. While comparatively cheaper than [the new] conventional dwellings, a [mobile] manufactured home is still expensive. The 1970 Census showed that nearly 14% of the County's total population was below poverty level. Most of these people [are] were eligible for rental assistance and [will be] were provided with housing in cities.

While sales activity in the County from 1970 to 1980 was [in the past 10 years has been] very good, many people [are being] were priced out of the market due to rising land prices, interest rates, and high construction costs. [Choices are also somewhat limited due to the lack of building sites and high development costs, although mostly applicable to the cities.]

Without alternatives to choose from, such as multi-family dwellings, single family attached housing, condominiums, and [mobile] manufactured homes, additional pressure will be placed on the existing housing supply and prices will continue to soar. Likewise, the less land areas available for development in areas serviced by public facilities, the more pressure will be placed on rural areas to accommodate housing needs and the more expensive it will be.

[At current household size projections,] If past and existing trends continue, permanent housing needs will be 150 to 200 new units per year.

Goal

To provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state.

Housing Policies

Residential Development

1. Clatsop County shall encourage residential development only in those

areas where necessary public facilities and services can be provided and where conflicts with forest and agricultural uses are minimized.

2. Clatsop County shall assist in planning for the availability of adequate numbers of housing units at price ranges and rent levels commensurate with the financial capabilities of County residents.
3. Clatsop County shall encourage planned developments and subdivisions to cluster dwelling units. The clustering of dwellings in small numbers and the provision of common open space assures good utilization of the land, increased environmental amenities, and may be used as an open space buffer between the residential use and adjacent agricultural or forest uses.
4. Clatsop County shall permit residential development in those designated areas when and where it can be demonstrated that:
 - a. Water is available which meets state and federal standards;
 - b. Each housing unit will have either an approved site for a sewage disposal system which meets the standards of the County and the Department of Environmental Quality or ready access to a community system;
 - c. The setback requirements for the development of wells and septic systems on adjacent parcels have been observed;
 - d. Development of residential units will not result in the loss of lands zoned or designated for agriculture or forestry and will not interfere with surrounding agricultural or forestry activities.
5. Clatsop County shall permit temporary siting of mobile homes in specified locations in the event of an emergency.
6. Clatsop County shall encourage multi-family housing and mobile home park developments to develop within the various urban growth boundaries.
7. Clatsop County shall encourage the development of passed over lots that already have services such as water and roads be preferred for development over tracts requiring an extension of services.
8. Clatsop County shall make provisions for housing in areas

designated for Rural, Urban Growth Boundaries, and Rural Service Areas which provide variety in location, type, density and cost where compatible with development on surrounding lands.

Governmental Cooperation and Coordination

9. Clatsop County shall cooperate with governmental agencies and Clatsop County Housing Authority in promoting unified housing policies and in ensuring an equitable distribution of assisted housing throughout the County.

10. Clatsop County shall encourage state and federal agencies to develop programs and funding sources to increase the level of support for the maintenance and rehabilitation of existing housing and for the development of additional housing.

Housing Rehabilitation

11. Clatsop County shall develop and maintain an inventory of the type and condition of the current housing stock. The rural housing needs should be reexamined every two years to reflect the market changes and new information.

12. Clatsop County shall encourage the retention of the current housing stock and, where necessary and feasible, will assist in the rehabilitation of substandard housing units.

Assisted Housing

13. Clatsop County shall set aside tracts of lands which it owns within the cities and their urban growth boundaries which can be used for low cost housing. The lands should be inventoried and a program developed through the Northwest Oregon Housing Association to release those lands for this purpose. Clustering techniques, common wall and townhouse construction, both for sale and for rent, could be employed in the development of these lands.

14. Clatsop County shall activate support programs which serve to improve housing conditions of those homeowners who are physically or financially unable to make improvements on their own.

Current Housing Stock

The number of dwelling units occurs in response to the population and household formation. Thus, it is necessary to assess the current housing stock in order to determine housing needs for the future within the framework of supply and demand.

As of 1980, there [are] were approximately [(as of 1978)] 16,548 [15,103] dwelling units in all of Clatsop County. The unincorporated areas represent about 33% of this total, or [5,035] 5,292 dwelling units.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Current Housing Stock

The unincorporated County contains [5,035] 6,950 dwelling units of [33%] 41% of the entire County housing stock. Conventional single family dwellings represent [85%] 83%, mobile homes [14%] 15%, and multi-family units comprise the remaining [1%] 2% of the current housing stock.

Housing Age and Condition

In 1978, when the last housing study was done, fifty-six percent of the housing stock in the unincorporated County [is] was over 30 years old. Thirty-four percent of the dwellings [are] were over 50 years of age, the largest number located in Lewis & Clark. Most of the housing stock [is] was rated a Class 3 by Assessor standards, and [is] was considered "less than fair". The largest percentage again is located in the Lewis and Clark area. Clatsop Plains and the Southwest Coastal planning areas contained the largest numbers of newer homes with a "fair" to "very good" rating. The Elsie-Jewell area contained the poorest rated housing in the unincorporated County, due to a large number of cabins. There has not been a comprehensive housing study done since that time.

Vacancy Rates

The overall vacancy rate of the unincorporated County as of [March 1979 is 1.8%] 1988 was 2.9%, or a total of [75] 492 vacant units. [The total number of vacant units appear to be declining when compared to 1976, 1977, and 1978 figures.] Although this figure is higher than 1979's 1.8%, according to the State Housing Division the rate should be at least 5% for the market to operate effectively.

The existence of vacant units for rent or sale permits people to change their housing and enables newcomers to settle in the area. The

unincorporated County, as well as the rest of the County, [is experiencing a very "tight" market this year.] has experienced a very "tight" market since 1980.

Rentals

The 1960 Census for Clatsop County found that 34 percent of the housing units were renter occupied. In 1970 the Census showed this percentage declined to 27 percent. A similar decrease [is] was expected for the 1980 Census. [However, since] However, the 1980 Census found that 35.5 percent of the housing units were renter occupied. Coupled with the fact that vacancy rates for rentals are declining, it is assumed that there is a shortage of available rental units.

In 1970 the median rental price asked was \$68. In 1978 it [is] was estimated to be \$225.00, an increase of 24% per year since 1970. Based on income levels and current demand for various unit sizes, the estimated annual demand for rentals [is] was estimated at 10 efficiencies, 500 one bedroom, 45 two bedroom and 10 three or more bedroom units. It was anticipated that the cities [may] would perhaps be able to meet this demand while the unincorporated County [is] was expected to meet the large majority of the mobile home demand.

Second Homes

In 1980, the unincorporated County [could currently] contained approximately 921 seasonal units or approximately 18% of the total dwelling units. [Since 1970] From 1970 to 1980, the unincorporated County [has] received an average of 34 new second homes each year. This [means] meant that about one out of every 3 to 3.5 homes built in the unincorporated County [is] was a second home.

[The future demand for second homes may be on the decline due to the "tight money" situation in which very few banks are loaning on second homes, the gas crisis, and continuing inflationary pressure. Condominiums, however, may continue their popularity on the coast because of favorable tax treatments, low maintenance, lower prices, etc. In fact, many second home purchasers prefer a fully equipped home or a condominium with the potential for permanent occupancy.]

In 1989, the Oregon Housing Agency estimated 3,000 second home units in Clatsop County, but state that estimate is probably too low. The 1990 Census figures may provide a more accurate number.

Many homes initially constructed for recreational use are now permanent dwellings. (Shoreline Estates, Sunset Lake, and Surf

Pines are good examples). This factor of conversion, however, is undetermined.

[Mobile] Manufactured Homes

In 1980, over 73% of the [mobile] manufactured homes in Clatsop County [have] were located in the unincorporated area, constituting 17% of all single family dwelling types in the unincorporated area. [If the cities do not provide for mobile homes,] Since that time, the unincorporated County [will] continued to receive the largest share of [mobile] manufactured homes [in the future.] From 1965 to 1980, [Since 1965] the unincorporated County [has] averaged 46 [mobile] manufactured homes per year; the largest portion of these went to the Northeast County followed by the Clatsop Plains. The Seaside Rural area, however, [has] had the largest proportion of [mobile] manufactured homes to other dwelling types.

As of 1989, over 94% of the total manufactured homes in the County are located in the unincorporated area. Of these, the highest percentage is still in Northeast County, followed by Clatsop Plains.

Low Income and Elderly Housing

The mild climate and substantial supply of smaller, less expensive housing, although often marginal, has attracted many elderly and low income households. These people generally spend more than 25% of their income on housing. In the unincorporated County these households are located generally in the Svensen, Lewis & Clark/Olney, and Jewell areas.

[Since the first of March] At present, NOHA has assisted 235 persons and 100 more people are on the waiting list for rental assistance. By subsidizing their rent, tenants can occupy decent housing they could not otherwise afford. [The fact that many available rental units in the County do not meet the standards for rental assistance makes it increasingly difficult to provide less expensive housing.]

Household Size

County-wide, average household size in 1970 was approximately 2.7. Family size in the unincorporated County was slightly higher at 3.3.

Household size in the unincorporated County [has] dropped to 2.7 in eight years time, and it [is] was expected that the entire County [is] would experience a similar decrease. Generally, household size

for Clatsop County has always been lower than the rest of the state and decreasing every census year. County-wide, average household size dropped to 2.54 in 1980, and decreased further to 2.47 in 1988.

Since the direction has been toward a smaller household, the number of households will tend to increase at a greater rate than the rate of growth in total population.

Housing Unit Size

Housing of the unincorporated County was somewhat smaller than housing in the cities in 1970. Generally, the size of the housing unit, in terms of number of rooms, etc., changes over time in response to the size of families, living customs, and the level of income and assets.

Housing Prices

Family incomes have not been able to keep up with rising home prices.

[Over a period of 8 years] From 1970 to 1978, median family incomes in the County [has risen] rose 99% or 12% annually while home prices [have] increased 215% or 27% annually. [This fact, however, has not slowed sales.]

Land prices are a national problem and the most striking element in higher home prices, although it is unlikely that this trend will be reversed. Construction costs have also risen rapidly due to increase labor costs and escalating wood prices.

The price of a house, however, is likely to overstate the cost because the house is also an investment that is expected to appreciate in value. Moreover, rising home prices have little impact on homeowners who seek to sell one house and buy another; in general the prices of both houses will rise.

Cost of Home Ownership

Rapid increases in mortgage interest payments, maintenance costs and property taxes have contributed much to the overall cost of home ownership.

[The present mortgage interest rate is expected to rise even further since the ceiling is now 12%. This] The impact of inflation on interest rates has been the most important factor in increasing the difficulty of buying a home for the first time.

Being able to deduct mortgage interest and property taxes from taxable income, however, makes them less of a component in home ownership costs than maintenance. Maintenance costs, therefore, probably constitute the largest percentage of housing costs, especially for the older dwelling.

Sales Activity

The [recent] strength of the housing market in the early 1980's[is] was partially a result of pent up demand for housing experienced during the slow building years of 1974-1975. Inflation of home prices also appeared to be influencing people to buy homes [now] rather than postponing purchases until the future. [Nationally, it appears that people now look on housing more as an investment than as shelter. It is possible that the majority of the sales this year were to trade up because of investment possibilities.] The housing market has continued to fluctuate over the past ten years.

Residential Building Activity

[Since 1960] From 1960 to 1978, the unincorporated County [has] averaged between 100-150 building permits each year, remaining stable over this period as construction in the cities fluctuated [up and down.]

Overall, it appeared that building activity in the unincorporated County [has] comprised from 40-50% of all new construction in the County and provided about 80% of all new [mobile] manufactured homes.

From 1978-1989, the unincorporated County averaged approximately 170 building permits per year. However, much of this activity appears to have been generated in the past year. Until the Cities' Comprehensive Plan inventory updates are complete, it is not possible to compare the unincorporated figures to the overall construction within the County.

Demolition and Conversion

Yearly losses do not appear to be significant in comparison with new building construction. For the ten year period from 1960-1970 housing unit losses amounted to 110. Residences demolished from 1970-1977 in Seaside and Astoria totaled approximately 95 or more. These demolitions could be considered a loss of a potential home for a low income household. There is no available information as to how many demolitions have occurred since 1977, but the State Building Codes Agency believes the number to be negligible.

Housing Rehabilitation

In 1978, at least 200 clustered housing units [have been] were identified in the unincorporated County as target areas for rehabilitation. Most of these [are] were located in the Northeast County. The overall number of housing units needing repairs in the unincorporated County [are] was estimated to be 1,396 or 28% of the total units. By 1980 it [is] was hoped that at least 150 of the units will have been rehabilitated. Many programs [are] were available in the area to assist in this effort. There has not been an updated study to determine how many of these units were rehabilitated. There are still programs available in the area to assist eligible homeowners.

County-wide Housing Projections to 1980

The results of a housing market analysis to project housing demand to 1980 designed by the State Housing Divisions [shows] showed a total of 267 dwellings needs annually in the County plus an additional 90-100 second homes. Rental units needed [are] were estimated to comprise 44% of new construction. Those units most in need [are] were one bedroom units at \$170-\$190 per month, and two bedroom units were for \$200-\$220. A total of 151 owner-occupied units [are] were projected each year to 1980 at a price range of between \$45,000-\$55,000.

Estimated Housing Demand to Year 2000

In 1980, it was [An] estimated that 4,238 homes [will] would be needed in the County by the year 2000, not including second homes. It was assumed that over half of these units [will] would be constructed in the unincorporated areas.

No current studies have been completed regarding projections to 2000.

[Table 1]
Current Dwelling Units, 1978

<u>Area</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>Single Family</u> <u>(incl.condos)</u>	<u>Mobile</u> <u>Home</u>	<u>Duplex</u>	<u>Triplex</u> <u>& Over</u>	
Astoria 2,689	36	396	1,347	4,468	
Seaside 2,059	49	100	424	2,632	
Gearhart 594	4	8	34	640	
Cannon Beach	989	17	18	1,041	
Warrenton	715	105	38	201	1,059

Hammond	<u>160</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>228</u>	
TOTAL INCORPORATED	7,206	254	578	2,030	10,068	
Clatsop Plains	1,246	195	16	7	1,464	
Northeast	1,190	270	2	4	1,466	
Seaside Rural	183	51	2	--	236	
Southwest Coastal	174	--	--	--	174	
Elsie-Jewell	428	111	--	--	539	
Lewis & Clark	<u>1,058</u>	<u>,84</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>1,156</u>	
Total Unincorporated	4,279	711	34	11	5,035	

Sources: Unincorporated area totals were taken from Assessor's records and verified by County staff personnel and are approximate. Incorporated area totals were taken from City Comprehensive Plan Inventories for 1978 and/or Assessor's records verified by city staff and are approximate.

[In the County, as a whole, conventional single family dwellings represent 76%, mobile homes 6%, and duplexes and multi-family units comprise the remaining 18% of the total housing stock.

In the cities conventional single family dwellings represent 72% of the current housing stock, mobile homes comprise 2%, and duplexes and multi-family units 26% of the housing stock.

In the unincorporated County conventional single family dwellings represent 85% of the current housing stock, mobile homes comprise 14%, and duplexes and multi-family units comprise the remaining 1%.]

Table 1

<u>Units</u>	<u>July 1978 Total Units</u>	<u>May 1989 Total</u>
Clatsop Plains	1,464	1,670
Northeast	1,466	1,516
Seaside Rural	236	314
Southwest Coastal	174	404
Elsie-Jewell	539	565
Lewis & Clark	1,156	1,134

Source: 1980 and 1988 Estimates of the Housing Stock for Oregon

Counties and the Assessor's Records. The Cities' Comprehensive Plan Inventories Updates are not yet available.

<u>Table 2</u>				
<u>Current Dwelling Units</u>				
<u>1989</u>				
<u>Area</u>	<u>Single Family</u>	<u>Mobile</u>	<u>Triplex</u>	
<u>Total</u>	<u>(incl. condos)</u>	<u>Home</u>	<u>Duplex</u>	<u>& Over</u>
Clatsop Plains	1,670	258	1	2
<u>1,931</u>				
Northeast	1,516	408	1	-
<u>1,925</u>				
Seaside Rural	314	69	-	-
<u>383</u>				
Southwest Coastal	404	2	-	-
<u>406</u>				
Elsie-Jewell	565	168	-	-
<u>733</u>				
Lewis & Clark	1,134	139	2	-
<u>1,275</u>				
 TOTAL UNINCORPORATED	 5,603	 1,044	 3	 2
<u>6,653</u>				

Source: Unincorporated area totals were taken from Assessor's records and verified by County staff personnel and are approximate. The Cities' Comprehensive Plan Inventories updates are not yet available.

[HOUSING AGE AND CONDITIONS]

[Housing is generally long-lived and with appropriate maintenance may be made to last indefinitely. The natural forces of deterioration require decades to take their toll; complete obsolescence will take longer. The chief usefulness of housing age and condition information is to reveal a guide to the number of units in need of rehabilitation or replacement in the future. Comparing this data periodically will be helpful in analyzing the historical improvement or deterioration of the housing stock.]

Table 2 below shows that 56% of the housing stock is over 30 years old. Thirty-four percent of the dwellings are over 50 years of age,

with the largest number located in the Northeast County.

Table 2
Age of Structures

<u>Area</u>	<u>0-5</u>	<u>6-10</u>	<u>11-20</u>	<u>21-30</u>	<u>31-50</u>	
<u>51+</u>						
Clatsop Plains 11%	10%	14%	13%	18%	34%	
Northeast County	10%	12%	5%	13%	19%	41%
Seaside Rural 18%	9%	15%	18%	28%	13%	
Southwest Coastal	9%	6%	28%	41%	15%	1%
Elsie-Jewell 14%	10%	10%	10%	19%	37%	
Lewis & Clark <u>8%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>19%</u>	<u>32%</u>	<u>32%</u>	
Unincorporated						
Total 11%	9%	9%	15%	22%	34%	

Table 3 further describes the housing stock for each planning area individually. Since some of the areas have not been appraised in five years or so, not all the information is up-to-date.

Table 3
Condition Rating

<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	Class	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	
Clatsop Plains	1%	6%	36%	30%	22%	4%	1%	--	
Northeast County		2%	10%	47%	30%	10%	1%	--	
Seaside Rural	2%	15%	41%	23%	17%	2%			
Southwest Coastal			4%	17%	42%	28%	6%	2%	1%
Elsie-Jewell	10%	23%	41%	22%	4%				
Lewis & Clark	<u>2%</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>52%</u>	<u>28%</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Total	3%	8%	43%	29%	13%	3%	1%		

The rating class used is the Assessor's "percent good" system which takes into account the original construction, age, condition, replacement costs and other factors. The Assessor describes each rating class as follows:]

1 - Cabin or shack (\$8/sq.ft.)	5 - Medium
2 - Poor but better than a cabin	6 - Good
3 - Less than fair	7 - Very Good
4 - Fair	8 - Excellent (\$50/sq.ft.)

Most of the housing stock is rated a Class 3 by Assessor standards. The largest percentage of Class 3 housing is Lewis and Clark.

Clatsop Plains contains the largest number of newer homes with a "fair" to "very good" rating. Most of the homes in the Clatsop Plains, however, are over 30 years old and are rated less than fair. 1977 and 1978 were good building years in the Clatsop Plains, adding nearly 200 new homes to the housing stock. Perhaps the area most in need of rehabilitation is Sunset Lake. These homes are mostly smaller, fairly close together and were probably beach cabins at one time converted to permanent dwellings.

The Northeast County contains 22 cabins, most of which are over 50 years old. Forty-seven percent of the dwellings fall into the Class 3 category, the majority being over 30 years old. This area has also experienced quite a bit of new building activity in 1977 and 1978, including a large number of mobile homes. There appear to be concentrations of homes in need of rehabilitation in this planning area. (See Housing Rehabilitation Section).

The Seaside Rural area contains a fair amount of homes over 30 years old rated Class 3. Many homes are between 20 years and 50 years old and according to the Assessor probably are in need of a new roof, plumbing work, or other repairs to the home that have reached the end of their lifespan.

The homes in the Southwest Coastal area are mostly newer, between 10-30 years old. Eighty percent of these homes fall in the Class 4 category and above. According to the Assessor there are no "so-called" cabins. This area contains better homes than the other planning areas.

The Elsie-Jewell area contains 34 cabins, and most of the housing is rated Class 3. Generally, these homes are older. This area contains the poorest rated housing in the unincorporated County.

Sixty percent of the homes in the Lewis & Clark area are over 30 years old. Here again, the majority of the housing is rated Class 3 by Assessor standards. Perhaps the largest concentration of homes needing rehabilitation can be found in the Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens area. (See Housing Rehabilitation Section).

In November of 1977, the County undertook a housing survey providing a broad but basic data base on housing. Some of the information is helpful to determine the homeowner's or renter's personal feelings regarding housing conditions. The greatest concern noted was inadequacy of insulation and other weatherization in their homes. When asked what the most important repair was, 53% said painting their house. The results in particular planning areas to questions 4, 5, 6, and 11 and their comments are included in the Appendix. The complete Housing Survey results are available in the office of Planning and Development at Clatsop County. Any of the questions can be correlated with any other question to obtain statistics for a particular housing project or concern.]

VACANCY RATES

The number of vacant units, as a percentage of all units, is a key measure in determining the adequacy of the housing stock. According to the State Housing Division it should be at least 5 percent for the market to operate effectively. However, not all units classified as being vacant will be available to the populace. Some will already be owned or rented but not yet occupied; and others may be too dilapidated for occupancy.

Of the total [14,548] 16,880 units [(PP&L's estimate)] (Oregon Housing Agency) in Clatsop County as of [March 1979] 1988 (see Table 5), the total vacant was estimated to be [369] 492 or an overall vacancy rate of [2.5%] 2.9%. This compares to 3.2% in March of 1976, 3.1% in 1977, [and] 2.9% in March of 1978, and 2.5% in March 1979. It appears from this data that residential demand exceeds supply, and the situation is not improving. In other words, it is a very "tight" market.

[The average vacancy rate for conventional single family dwellings in the whole County is 1.5%. This is considered normal by most standards.¹ Mobile homes tend to be vacant longer evidenced by a rather high average vacancy rate of 6.3%. This could be an indicator that mobile homes remain on the sales or rental market longer than conventional units. It could also mean that many mobile homes are seasonal or used very seldom, necessitating shutting off utilities. Since mobile homes generally are not rented out for weekends or summers like beach homes, this could be part of the reason for such a high vacancy rate.

The average vacancy rate for multi-family units is 6.5%, indicating a fairly healthy market. This figure, however, may be somewhat

distorted by the fact that condominiums are included in this category. In actuality, therefore, the vacancy rate could be lower.

Of the total 4,244 units (PP&L's estimated) in the unincorporated County as of March 1979 (see Table 4), the total vacant was estimated to be 75 or an overall vacancy rate of 1.8%. This compares to 2.7% in March of 1976, 2.6% in 1977, and 2.3% in March of 1978. The total number of vacant units appear to be declining.

The unincorporated County has a somewhat lower than normal average vacancy rate of 1.2% for conventional single family dwellings. Vacancy rates for mobile homes, however, are relatively high. Again the same reasons could apply (see above). It appears that the vacancy rates are declining from 1976 figures but are still very high in comparison with other single family dwelling types.

Multi-family units, on the other hand, have a low average vacancy rate of 4.0%. Since most multi-family units are located in the Clatsop Plains area it may be reasonable to assume that demand is greater and renters are less migratory. Here again, condominiums should be excluded. There also may be some discrepancy due to the areas used to calculate the totals in the unincorporated area. PP&L's franchise areas do not necessarily coincide with planning areas. Therefore, these rates should only be used as a rough indicator of present conditions.

¹Per telephone conversation with Bob Clay, Oregon State Housing Division.]

This data does not include 3,000+ other vacant units which are not offered for sale or rent, i.e. second homes and vacation rental units.

The County-wide estimated vacancy rates for owner-occupied housing in 1980 was 1.66%, and in 1988 was only .83%. The County-wide estimated vacancy rates for renter-occupied housing was 15.63% in 1980, and decreased to 7.81% in 1988.

At this time, there is no available data indicating the vacancy rates for single family units, multi-family units and mobile home units.

[The existence of vacant units for rent or sale permits people to change their housing and enables newcomers to settle in the area. Vacancy rates themselves, however, do not indicate what price levels or unit sizes are most in need.]

[Table 4]
Total Unincorporated County
Housing Vacancy Rates

[Table 5]
Total Clatsop County
Housing Vacancy Rates

Table 3
 1980 and 1988 Estimates of Housing
 and Household Estimates
 for Clatsop County
 Housing Agency, State of Oregon

<u>Households</u> <u>Age Group</u>	Total Population		Population in
	1980	1988	1980
0-146,862	6,922	6,862	6,922

15-245,751	4,429	5,005	3,986	
25-345,375	6,015	5,300	5,931	
35-443,368	5,204	3,337	5,156	
45-542,885	3,128	2,879	3,121	
55-643,503	2,868	3,490	2,857	
Over 64	4,745	5,434	4,520	5,108
Totals	32,489	34,000		31,393
				33,082

Persons per household: 2.54 2.47

Number of owner-occupied households:	8,259	8,408
Number of renter-occupied households:	4,536	4,980
Total households:	12,795	13,388

Estimated vacancy rates for owner-occupied housing: 1.66% 0.83%

Estimated vacancy rates for renter-occupied housing: 15.63% 7.81%

Number of units vacant for sale:	135	70
Number of units vacant for rent:	613	422
Number of other vacant units:	3,023	3,000

Number of single-family units:	11,306	11,534
Number of multi-family units:	4,235	4,236
Number of mobile homes:	1,025	1,111

Total Housing Stock: 16,566
16,881

RENTALS

The 1970 Census for Clatsop County found that 27.07 percent of the housing units (3,384 units) were renter occupied. Since, in most cases, renter occupied units are likely to be multi-family or duplex type housing, the total multi-family units subtracted from the total renter-occupied [eaves] left 837 units which [are] were single-family

Bedroom-----	225.00	
	Three	
Bedroom-----	270.00	
	Four	+
Bedroom-----	350.00	

The increase in rent from 1970 to 1978 is 194% or 24% per year. Although lower than escalating housing prices it is still higher than the annual increase in family income.]

[The estimated annual demand for rentals is estimated at 10 efficiencies, 55 one bedroom, 45 two bedroom, and 9 three or more bedroom units. (see Market Analysis in Appendix E Table E-4). These estimates are based on income levels to determine what will be affordable to persons seeking rental housing and current demand for various unit sizes.

(Note: The rents listed above also include some utilities. Most all include water and garbage).]

Table 4

Occupied Housing Units by Occupancy Status

Table had to be done on typewriter. See report.

Table 5
Renter Occupied Housing Units in Selected Contract Rent Categories
and Median Contract Rent

Table had to be done on typewriter. See report.

SECOND HOMES

In 1973 a report by Donald Ulrich, [The number of second homes in Clatsop County for this report is based upon Donald Ulrich's] A Market Analysis of Recreation - Vacation Homes, [1973] [According to Ulrich's report, (Appendix F), Clatsop County is] ranked Clatsop County fifth in the State for the number of vacation homes with 6.3% of the total.

Ulrich used a formula based on the 1970 Census of Housing, Detailed Housing Characteristics, Oregon. To determine the number of second homes per County he [adds] added "seasonal and migratory" units plus "other vacant" units minus "units held for migratory workers". "Migratory" units are defined as "vacant units held for occupancy by migratory labor employed in farm work during the crop season". Using this formula with no migratory workers, the County's housing stock contained 1,749 second homes in 1970. This amounts to approximately 14% of the total housing units in the County at that time.

[Using Ulrich's formula it may also be possible to estimate the number of second homes in the unincorporated County. The 1970 Census of Housing contains two categories (see Table 6). Unfortunately, the

total units in the "Rural County" category is much higher than the total units estimated for that year in the CAC planning areas. However, for this report the percentages will be used. (see Table 7). According to the Assessor's records there were 3,534 total units in 1970. "Vacant - Seasonal & Migratory" total 164 and the "Other Vacant" category totals 482. These two figures added together gives the total number of second homes, less no migratory workers, or 646 in 1970. This amounts to approximately 5% of the total units in the County or 37% of the total second homes.

Table 7 for 1978 assumes the same percentages as Table 6 for 1970. Using Ulrich's formula, the unincorporated County could currently contain 921 seasonal units, approximate 18% of the total dwelling units. This 18% was supported in a November 1977 Housing Survey which showed 18.9% of the respondents spent less than 176 days per year in the unincorporated County. Since 1970, the unincorporated County has received an average of 34 new homes each year. This means, therefore, that about one out of every 3 to 3.5 home built in the unincorporated County is a second home.

Current building permit information for 1977 and 1978 reveals that the areas of the unincorporated County receiving the greatest demand for second home construction are Arch Cape, Seaside Rural, Elsie-Jewell, and Clatsop Plains, in that order. Building permits are not a true indicator, however, since the contractor normally files the application and many build to sell as second homes. Undoubtedly, however, the Southwest Coastal (Arch Cape) area would be a prime second home location and it is very possible that over 50% of the new homes projected for construction to the year 2000 (See Graph 6, page 44) in this area will be second homes.]

In 1980, 15% of Clatsop County's housing stock was second homes (vacant housing units held for occasional use). Second homes as a percentage of the total housing stock was essentially the same in unincorporated portions of the County and in the cities.¹ (see Table 6).

¹Clatsop County 1980 Census Information on Population and Housing, November 1982, CTIC.

[This is supported by many local realtors according to a local Title Insurance Company representative who frequently conducts surveys in the area. It was his opinion that second home purchases are on the decline. The Arch Cape, Cannon Beach areas, however, are still in demand and second home purchases in those areas long the coast will continue to do well. This decline is due to the "tight money"

situations in which very few banks are loaning on second homes. (see Appendix A). It is also due, he says, to the recent gas price rises and a time of inflationary "tightening of the purse strings". Condominiums, however, may continue their popularity on the coast. This could be for many reasons; for instance, favorable tax treatments, low maintenance, lower prices, etc.

Prior to this year's gas crisis and continuing inflationary pressure, the demand for recreational properties on the coast and in the area of the lower Columbia was considered very heavy by many real estate offices. A report prepared in March, 1977 entitled "Columbia River Island Research / Magruder Project" studied the feasibility of marketing recreational lots in Oregon along the Columbia River, about 30 miles east of Astoria. It also dealt with coastal property. Eleven companies surveyed felt there was a deficiency in supply at the coast. Private clubs and organizations interested in recreational activities were contacted to acquire mailing lists to get a sampling of potential recreational property owners. It was determined that the consumer with the greatest potential for purchase will be employed in a business or professional occupation, earning \$20,000-\$30,000, with a high school or college education, 4 person family, a spouse who is also employed and has a comparable education and with an interest in boating, fishing, and/or hiking. It was also determined from the results that about 40% of the respondents would like either a fully equipped home or a condominium. This was interpreted to mean that many persons think in terms of a permanent residence or a potentially permanent residence for retirement purposes.

A housing report prepared for Lincoln County by Richard Ragatz Associates, Inc. in September 1978 also explored the absentee owner situation. Of those that commented, almost 17% of the second home owners felt that taxes were too high and assessments unfair. Although attitudes are always biased when dealing with consumer responses to taxes (the survey was sent out just prior to the vote on Proposition 13), some respondents (5%) indicated that costs of owning a second home are becoming prohibitive. Many cannot foresee retiring to their second home because of rising taxes.]

Many older second homes in the County are gradually converting to permanent dwellings, as second home owners sell or seek other accommodations. It is also evident that new recreational homesites are being purchased by permanent residents, rather than the second home buyer that they were originally intended for, (i.e. Shoreline Estates, Surf Pines, etc.).

Table 6
Vacant Housing Units Held for Occasional Use
Clatsop County 1980

<u>In</u>	<u>Total Housing</u>	<u>Units for</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Use</u>	<u>Units*</u>	<u>Occasional Use</u>	<u>Occasional</u>
Clatsop County	16,548	2,483	15.0
Astoria	4,699	25	0.5
Warrenton	1,077	49	4.5
Hammond	236	26	11.0
Seaside	3,326	695	20.9
Gearhart	648	248	38.3
Cannon Beach	1,270	691	54.4
<u>Unincorporated</u>			
Clatsop County	5,292	749	14.2

*Does not include 65 units that are classified as migratory or seasonal.

Source: C.T.I.C.

【Table 6】
 Assumed Household Characteristics*
 Unincorporated County
 1970

<u>Units</u>	<u>No. of Units</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
1. Total Units	3,534	
2. Year-Round Units	3,370	95.36
3. Vacant - Seasonal & Migratory	164	4.64

4. Owner Occupied	2,172	64.45
5. Renter Occupied	627	18.60
6. Vacant Year-Round	571	16.95
a. For Sale	24	4.19
b. For Rent	65	11.45
c. Other Vacant	482	84.36

【Table 7】
 Assumed Household Characteristics*
 Unincorporated County
 1978

<u>Units</u>	<u>No. of Units</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
1. Total Units	5,035	
2. Year-Round Units	4,801	95.36
3. Vacant - Seasonal & Migratory	234	4.64

4. Owner Occupied	3,094	64.45
5. Renter Occupied	893	18.60
6. Vacant Year-Round	814	16.95
a. For Sale	34	4.19
b. For Rent	93	11.45
c. Other Vacant	687	84.36

*Based on same percentages for Rural County category.

MANUFACTURED [MOBILE] HOMES

Increased housing costs are partly responsible for the demand in mobile homes. Accordingly, there have been significant changes in physical features. While growing in size, [mobile] manufactured homes have also been increasing in durability, with life expectancy also increasing.

The primary factors contributing to the increased costs of conventional housing are the very same factors that help to make [mobile] manufactured home prices so competitive. Labor prices are a relatively small component of [mobile] manufactured home construction costs. Also, as land prices rise, the advantages of [mobile] manufactured homes increase because they usually require a smaller lot. This is especially true where sewer services are available. Most important is industrialization (mass production) and the lack of dependency on wood products.

[According to a local mobile home dealer, the most popular size of a mobile home is the double wide 24' x 60'. Prices vary, but on the average one would cost \$30,000, which includes dishwasher, refrigerator, stove, carpet, drapes, set up and delivery. A mobile home with wood siding and a composition roof of the same size sells for approximately \$35,500.

Triple wides are not as popular because of the increased price. They start at \$47,000 on up. Single wides (14' x 60') are still popular, especially with built in fireplaces. Prices range from \$8500 to \$16,500 for a single wide.]

There are currently [965] 1,111 [mobile] manufactured homes in Clatsop County. Over [73%] 94% have located in the unincorporated County.

[mobile] Manufactured homes now constitute [nearly 17%] 18.8% of all single family dwelling types in the unincorporated areas.

The Northeast CAC area contains the largest share of [mobile] manufactured homes, or 38% of the total number of [mobile] manufactured homes in the unincorporated County. Nearly twenty-two percent of the housing in the Seaside Rural CAC area is made up of [mobile] manufactured homes, representing the area with the largest proportion of [mobile] manufactured homes to other dwelling types.

Overall, it appears that for the whole County the demand for [mobile] manufactured homes as an economical alternative will increase each year. [Nearly one-third of all new permits for single family dwellings was for [mobile] manufactured homes since 1965.] If the cities do not provide the [mobile] manufactured homes, the unincorporated County will continue to receive the largest share. The Northeast County will probably receive the largest number, considering the larger proportion of low-income families (1970 Census), the rural setting and nature of employment in the area (mill work, agriculture). The Clatsop Plains [will probably] may experience some development and expansion of [mobile] manufactured home parks within areas close to cities (UGBs) but land prices along the coast are generally higher due to the proximity to the beach catering to more expensive housing and second home construction. The Lewis & Clark area contains [11%] 13% of all mobile homes in the County. [At present, about one-third of all building permits in Lewis & Clark is for mobile homes.] Considering the lower land prices and proximity to employment centers, the proportion of mobile homes in this area could increase.

The typical [mobile] manufactured home is still considered to be incompatible with conventional dwellings unless located on a very large lot or within a mobile home park. Although the [mobile] manufactured home appreciates in value, the existence of one in a neighborhood of conventional dwellings tends to decrease the value and desirability of the other home. This is also true of other low-cost housing.

LOW INCOME AND ELDERLY HOUSING

Clatsop County is very typical of many coastal areas in that the mild climate and once substantial supply of smaller less expensive housing, although often marginal, has attracted many elderly and low income households. In fact, Clatsop County has more poor families than most other counties in the state, in spite of a high median income. [(see Appendix H).]

The [1970] 1987 report from the State of Oregon, Dept. of Human Resources, Adult and Family Services Division showed that there were [3,814] 3,680 poor or that [13.4%] 11.1% of the County's total population were below poverty level compared to [11.2%] 9.8% of the State's population. A family is classified poor if its total money income amounts to less than approximately three times the cost of the "economy" food plan, designed by the Department of Agriculture for "emergency or temporary use when funds are low."¹

[The Census also showed where these people were by census division.]

[Table 8]

Location of County's Low Income Households
(1970 Census)

Ranked by % Total 3,814

	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
1. Astoria	1,119	30%
2. Svensen	874	23%
3. Seaside	681	18%
4. Clatsop Plains	535	14%
Warrenton		
Hammond		
Gearhart		
5. Seaside Rural	163	4%
Cannon Beach		
Arch Cape		
6. Lewis & Clark	131	3%
7. Olney	117	3%
8. Jewell	85	2%
Total 3,814 100%		

[In June, 1977 the Astoria Branch Office of the public welfare division tabulated the number of people receiving public assistance and/or food stamps in the County as an indication of the number of people in the County now who have low incomes and especially to find out how much they spent for housing. The results of their tabulation is shown below.

The Astoria office surveyed one hundred twenty-three Aid to Dependent Children households and fifty-nine elderly or handicapped Adult households and found that the average percentage of monthly income spent for shelter costs was fifty-five percent.]

[¹1969 Income and Poverty Data, Bureau of Governmental Research and Service, May 1972.]

[Table 9]
Clatsop County Residents Receiving Public Assistance
And/Or Food Stamps
June, 1977

Approximate number of persons over 65 receiving money payment
48

Approximate number of blind adults receiving money payment
9

Approximate number of permanently disabled adults receiving money payment
79

Approximate number of temporarily disabled adults receiving money payment
46

Approximate number of persons receiving Aid to Dependent Children
1,421

Approximate number of adults receiving Medical Assistance only
181

Approximate number of persons receiving Food Stamps (not receiving Public Assistance)
727

The 1987 report from the State of Oregon, Dept. of Human Resources, Adult & Family Services Division provides the following information regarding low incomes:

Table 7

	Food Stamps		Aid to Dependent Children
	Public Assist	Non-Public Assist	
	(Persons)	(Stamps only)	Actual Cases
Clatsop Co.	2,398	1,231	331
873			
Astoria	1,167	1,231	
	Persons Below Poverty	Est. Pop. @ 18	% of 1987 Pop. Below Total
Clatsop Co.	3,680	8,170	(33,100)
11.1%			
Oregon State	274,601	701,393	(2,690,000)
9.8%			

As costs of other commodities rise, shelter costs become even more significant, becoming higher than people on fixed incomes can afford. Unfortunately, these families will depend more and more on public assistance programs to meet their needs.

The high cost of land and construction costs for new homes drive prices up beyond even most subsidized loan program limits. Most older and smaller homes do not meet construction specifications. Much of the housing stock was built on post and pier foundations, lacks insulation and adequate wiring, etc. [In addition, the area has a high percentage of homes over 30 years old in need of major repairs. (see Housing Age and Condition Section).]

According to "A Report of the National Housing Policy Review" by HUD, 1974, the provision of housing subsidies increases the quantity and quality of housing for relatively few and reduces the construction of new housing units for everyone else. The whole program of subsidized housing is to offer home ownership to the low income family but there are real problems which discourage their ownership. Some of these are building codes, racial discrimination, deed restrictions, zoning, and taxes. The deductibility of mortgage interest and property taxes is not an advantage to the low income family. Housing as an investment for low income individuals is liquid and risky, requires complex management and has high maintenance costs.¹ Rental assistance may be a far better way to help the low income household.

According to the Portland State University Center for Population Research and Census:

"Similar to the U.S. pattern, Oregon's population has become older during the 1980's as evidenced by the increase in the median age of the population from 30.2 to 33.8 years old. The growth of the over-65 population has been particularly dramatic and is more than triple the average population growth of the state (19.1% to 6.0%). Although Clatsop County's aged population remains high in 1989 (15.5%), eight counties exceed 17.0%, and of these eight, three counties' over-65 population accounted for more than one-fifth of their total population."²

[According to "Regional Land Use and Housing Elements" prepared by CTIC in February 1978, the number of elderly persons in the region ranges from 15% to 30% of the population, or 1-1/2 to 3 times the national average. Many of these people have moved to the area to retire, some are residents of local nursing homes and care centers, and many are living strictly on social security payments (less than \$2,000 annually).] The Northwest Oregon Housing Association which formed in 1975 administers the Section 8 Rental Assistance Program for Clatsop, Columbia, and Tillamook Counties. Participating tenants pay no more than [25%] 30% of their income for rent, with HUD making up the difference. [Since the first of March,] Currently there are approximately 235 persons [have been] being assisted. It is

estimated that approximately 1,000 elderly and

family rental households are eligible in the district and there are approximately 100 people on the waiting list.

These figures changes annually, and are updated in October of each year.

According to NOHA, most units in the County are located in Astoria and Seaside. [and barely pass inspection for the program.]

Rents, including utilities, must not exceed HUD's specifications:

[\$177] \$405 - 1 bedroom
[\$211] \$476 - 2 bedroom
[\$264] \$594 - 3 bedroom
\$666 - 4 bedroom

¹U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, "Housing in the Seventies: A Report of the National Housing Policy Review." 1974.

²Portland State University, Center for Population Research and Census, Population Estimates for Oregon. 1980-1989.

The Section 8 program is not for the elderly only but for all low income families. By subsidizing their rent, tenants can occupy decent housing they could not otherwise afford.

[Table 10]
Households Eligible for Section 8

Clatsop County Elderly

<u>Eligible</u>		<u>Total</u>
One person households	474	416
Two person households	<u>87</u>	<u>58</u>
Total	561	474

Family

Two person households	178	115
Three & four person households		238 142
Five person households	37	21
Six+ person households	<u>86</u>	<u>29</u>

Total 540 307

Source: 1977 Housing Division Market Analysis

The table above shows an estimated number of elderly and low income households who are eligible for Section 8 Housing Assistance because they are living under substandard, overcrowded conditions and paying too much for rent.

[SPECIAL HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY]

[This category of housing includes care centers, nursing homes and retirement homes, public and private.

There are four such homes in operation within the County, one under construction, and one across the river in Washington.

They operate at an average of 90% capacity; as of the end of March 1979 only 27 beds were unoccupied. All of the homes have been in operation in excess of ten years and have no plans for expansion.

When the Columbia Memorial Hospital went out of the nursing home business the Clatsop Care and Rehabilitation Center was formed. They have plans for 29 nursing home beds, 10 homes for the aged, and 20 retirement units. They hope to open the facility the first of July at about half capacity.]

[On the average, costs range between \$400 (without nursing care) to \$800 (with nursing care) per month (welfare pays less) for an individual to reside in this type of facility.]

[Table 11]
Homes for Elderly

Year <u>Opened</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	Current %		
			<u>1970</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
1. Clatsop Care & Rehabilitation Center 7-1-79	Astoria	(59)	--	--	--

(under construction)

2.	Crestview Care Center	Astoria	82	92%	99%	88%	1966
3.	Seaside Care Center	Seaside	100	82%	99%	94%	1968
4.	New Seavera Convalescent						
	Home	Long Beach, WA	53	--	92%	85%	
	1964						
5.	Ocean Park Nursing Home	Seaside	22	99%	95%	95%	
	1959						
6.	Riverview Guest Home	Astoria	<u>15</u>	--	87%	87%	1969
			Total	331			

Source: Per Telephone Conversation with Managers 3-29-79.

HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

According to the Clatsop County 1980 Census information on population and housing, prepared by the Clatsop-Tillamook Intergovernmental Council - 1982, between 1970 and 1980 Clatsop County's households grew by 25.4 percent, while its population growth was 14.1%. The rate of growth in households relative to population was less in Clatsop County than in Oregon. In 1980, among coastal counties, Clatsop County had the highest percentage of one person households. Clatsop County's average household size was 2.7, while Oregon's was 2.9. The vacancy rate in the unincorporated County in 1980 was 14.2, as compared to 15% for the total County (see Tables).

[Table 13]
Housing Characteristics
as of July 1978

	Total	Occup.	Household	
	<u>Units</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>% Occup.</u>	<u>Size</u>
<u>Population</u>				
Clatsop Plains	1,464	1,024	70%	2.2 2,213
Northeast	1,466	1,382	94%	3.3 4,562

Seaside Rural	236	155	66%	2.5	387
Southwest Coastal		174	70	40%	140
Elsie-Jewell	539	339	63%	1.8	616
Lewis & Clark	<u>1,156</u>	<u>1,063</u>	<u>92%</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2,984</u>
Total	5,035	4,028	80%	2.7	10,902

[The table above was prepared through the use of all available information from the Assessor's Office, assuming an overall average household size of 2.7 (November 1977 Housing Survey), and assuming 20% of the housing units are seasonal or vacant (see section on Vacancy Rates and section on Second Homes). Total population of the unincorporated County was then calculated and distributed to each planning area in the same way as 1970. Housing units and occupied units were also distributed proportionately. The information on Southwest Coastal and Seaside Rural areas, which were combined in the 1970 census, were estimated during the planning study and adjustments made proportionately to the remainder of the totals.]

Household size in the unincorporated County [has] dropped from 1970 to 1978. [in 8 years time.] This factor is not conclusive but is supported by population and migration statistics (see Economic Element) which show [that] large numbers of people in the 20 to 30 year old age bracket (those likely to have children) [are] leaving the County and a strong immigration of people 60 and over. [School enrollment figures also support the decrease in household size. (see Appendix D).]

In surveying the household size in November 1977, the County also examined the make up of the family in the unincorporated County. The survey revealed that 28% of the children who [are] were 12 years old and younger [have] had only one parent. This [has] had some impact on the reduced size of households.

[Lincoln County has also shown a decrease to about 2.5 household size as indicated by a housing survey they prepared in September 1978. It is likely that Clatsop County is experiencing a similar decrease in household size. Generally, household size for Clatsop County has always been lower than the rest of the State since 1940, and decreasing every census year.]

Nationally, the trend is to a high proportion of single person households or non-family households.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development says that the rate of growth in the number of households is the principal housing demand

determinant. Since the direction has been toward a smaller household, the number of households will tend to increase at a greater rate than the rate of growth in total population.

HOUSEHOLD SIZE

The size of housing units should be built to satisfy the needs of the community. Therefore, it is extremely important to assess household size distributions and monitor this pattern at regular intervals. This is especially important in Clatsop County where the number of older households is increasing annually.

Table 3 [12] and [13] shows changes that have occurred over a period of 8 years. Table [12] 8 was taken from the 1970 Census using aerial photos to adjust boundaries and Assessor records to check the number of housing units in the particular planning area.

Table [12] 8
Housing Characteristics
from 1970 Census

<u>Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Occup. Units</u>	<u>Household</u>	
			<u>% Occup.</u>	<u>Size</u>
Clatsop Plains	902	677	75%	3.0 2,019
Northeast	1,041	989	95%	4.2 4,161
Seaside Rural/	139	92	66%	2.5 (234)
Southwest Coastal		128	51	40% 2.4 (121)
Elsie Jewell	360	256	71%	2.0 502
Lewis & Clark	<u>964</u>	<u>896</u>	<u>93%</u>	<u>3.2 2,857</u>
Total	3,543	2,961	84%	3.3 9,894

Note: Numbers of () designate areas outside census which were combined.

County-wide, average household size in 1970 was approximately 2.7, the same as Lincoln County. In 1980, Lincoln County's average household size dropped to 2.4 and Clatsop County's dropped to 2.5.

This table indicates that family size in the unincorporated County [is] was somewhat higher than the cities.

HOUSING UNIT SIZE

The demand for space, in terms of number of rooms, size of rooms,

etc. changes over time in response to the size of families, living customs, and by the level of income and assets. When income and assets are at higher levels, households tend to desire improved living standards and conditions. In addition, or because of convenience requirements (washer-dryers, more than one complete bath, larger closets, double garages) people demand more space. When incomes and assets are lower, a general attitude of "make do" prevails.

The table below compares housing unit size of the unincorporated County with the total County. It should be remembered that bathrooms, foyers, utility rooms, unfinished attics or basements, etc. are not included in the count of rooms.

Table [14] 9
1970 Census
Number of Rooms and Bedrooms for Housing
by Percentage
(excludes mobile homes)

Total County	Unincorp.	Total	Unincorp.
	<u>County</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>County</u>
1 room	12%	1%	0 bedrooms 7% 2%
2 rooms	33%	5%	1 bedroom 25%19%
3 rooms	25%	13%	2 bedrooms 40%35%
4 rooms	44%	22%	3 bedrooms 25%30%
5 rooms	16%	23%	4+ bedrooms 3%14%
6 rooms	6%	17%	
7+ rooms	4%	19%	

The table shows that the housing of the unincorporated County was somewhat smaller than housing in the total County at the time of the census; however, household size was larger. (see section on Household Size).

There is no current data which would provide an update of this information.

[HOUSING PRICES]

[Prices are a function of the interaction of supply and demand for a product. Construction costs, land prices, loan costs, etc. are all factors in determining price.

The average sale price for a house in Clatsop County in 1970 was \$13,400. (see Table 18). In 1978 it was \$42,321. (see Table 17).

This amounts to an increase of 215% in a period of 8 years, of 27% annually. If prices continue this dramatic upward trend, the average price of a home could approach \$65,000 in 1980 and \$100,000 in 1985.]

[From the information obtained, the greatest increase in housing prices has occurred in the City of Gearhart where the average sales price of a home was a little less than \$10,000 in 1970, and in 1978 rose to \$47,000. Among the cities, Astoria's housing prices have increased the least, or about 25% annually. In the unincorporated areas, the greatest increase in housing prices appears to be in the area outside Seaside.

Sales prices of existing homes are increasing at approximately the same rate as prices of newly constructed homes. In a letter survey of November, 1978 to realtors, contractors, lending institutions and title companies, it was revealed that the median price of a new conventional home (3 bedroom, 1-1/2 bath, about 1200 sq.ft.) was \$51,500. (see Appendix A). This same survey placed the median price of an older three bedroom home at \$49,000 and the lowest price for a new two bedroom at \$42,500.

When asked what the biggest housing problems were, respondents placed financing and the shortage of building sites as the number one problem. Escalating land costs and moratoriums were also cited. Some realtors and contractors responding said that there were portions of the County's regulations which were unnecessarily restricting or increasing the price of housing, but they didn't mention which restrictions.

Land prices are a national problem and the most striking element in higher home prices. It is unlikely, however, that this trend will be reversed since land tends to become available very slowly for housing uses and the quantity of land is limited.

Construction costs, the other basis determinant of a home's purchase price, have also risen rapidly due to increased labor costs and wood prices.

Family incomes have not been able to keep up with rising prices. The median family income in the 1970 Census was \$9,430 and was \$18,823

as of January 1, 1979 (State of Oregon Housing Division). Over a period of 8 years, family income has increased 99% or 12% annually. This fact, however, has not slowed sales. Following a national trend, it appears that new home buyers are willing to spend a large portion of their income on housing.

The price of a house, however, is likely to overstate the cost because the house is also an investment that is expected to appreciate in value. Moreover, rising home prices have little impact on homeowners who seek to sell one house and buy another; in general, the prices of both houses will rise.

Home price increases apply mostly to the household that is buying a house for the first time--e.g. a renter or newly formed household.]

HOUSING PRICES

Prices are a function of the interaction of supply and demand for a product. Construction costs, land prices, loan costs, etc. are all factors in determining price.

The average sale price for a house in Clatsop County was \$13,400 in 1970, compared to \$42,321 in 1978. This amounts to an increase of 215% over an 8 year period, or an average of 27% annually. The median value for a house in Clatsop County was \$50,400 in 1980.

The greatest increase in housing prices has occurred in the City of Gearhart where the average sales price of a home was a little less than \$10,000 in 1970, and in 1978 rose to \$47,000. Among the cities, Astoria's housing prices have increased the least, or about 25% annually. In the unincorporated areas, the greatest increase in housing prices appears to be in the area outside Seaside. Among Clatsop County cities, the highest median value of owner-occupied housing in 1980 was in Cannon Beach, and the lowest was in Hammond. The median contract rent in Clatsop County was \$164 in 1980, compared to Oregon's median contract rent of \$212. Of the Clatsop County cities, 1980's highest median rent was in Gearhart and the lowest was in Warrenton. (see Tables 4 and 5).

COSTS OF HOME OWNERSHIP

The increase of home purchase price has contributed most to the increase in the overall cost of home ownership. More rapid, however, are increases in mortgage payments, maintenance costs, and property taxes.

[Mortgage interest rates have risen to a record 10-1/2%, with terms of 20% down for a 30 year loan. The present rate is expected to rise even further since the ceiling for the rate is now 12%, anticipating continued inflation.] For most households, however, the purchase of a house is a relatively infrequent occurrence and those who bought and financed a house prior to 1967 are probably not affected by new out-of-pocket housing costs. The impact of inflation on interest rates, however, has been the most important factor in increasing the difficulty of buying a home for the first time.¹

Some part of the rise in property taxes is used to finance a demand for more public services--more school facilities, police protection, etc. But, being able to deduct mortgage interest and property taxes from taxable income makes them less of a component in home ownership costs.

Maintenance costs, therefore, probably constitute the largest percentage of housing costs, especially for the older dwelling. The fact that over 50% of the housing stock in the unincorporated County is over 30 years old presents a major problem. Since many of the low income and elderly are presumably housed in the older dwellings, the major impact of rising home maintenance costs is upon them.

¹Weicher, John C., "The Affordability of New Homes", Journal of the American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association, Vol. 5, No.2, Summer 1977.

[Table 10]

Renter Occupied Housing Units in Selected Contract Rent Categories
and Median Contract Rent

Table 10

Owner Occupied Housing Units in Selected Value Categories and Median Value

Type this on typewriter.

SALES ACTIVITY

The sales market has continued to experience a significant increase over the past [8] 20 years. In 1970, only 99 sales were recorded in the County. [(see Table 16).] In contrast for a period of four months in 1978, 251 sales occurred. [(see Table 15).] In 1989, 601 sales occurred. (See Tables 11 and 12).

This demand does not appear to be a result of increased population or economic growth. It also seems unlikely that financing has anything to do with increased sales. When interest rates are high

and availability of money is tight, sales usually drop.

Second home sales [could have a lot to do with the market, however, nearly all the lending institutions contacted in the November 1978 survey (see Appendix A) do not loan on second homes and only one realtor cited vacation homes as the predominant sales type.] account for a significant number of purchases.

The strength of the housing market [is] in 1978 was partially the result of pent-up demand for housing experienced during the slow building years of 1974 and 1975. [(see Section on Residential Building Activity). In addition, inflation of home prices appears to be influencing people to buy homes now rather than postponing purchases to some future date.

According to a national housing seminar report of the United California Bank, the American consumer now looks on housing more as an investment than as shelter. It was pointed out that two of three houses sold in 1978 were to trade up because of the investment possibilities.¹]

[¹"The Oregonian", Tuesday, April 10, 1979, page 89.]

Table 11

[Table 16]

Total

Assessor's Sales Records

1970

(From Assessor 1971 Sales Ratio Report)

Average <u>Area</u> <u>Sale Price</u>	Number of <u>Total Sales</u>	Lowest <u>Sale Price</u>	Highest <u>Sale Price</u>
Astoria 60	\$ 1,600	\$29,580	\$13,026
Outside Astoria	1		2,000
Lewis & Clark/Olney	3	3,200	15,000 10,900
Seaside (Assessment Year - No Information)			
Outside Seaside	2	2,900	10,500 13,400
Gearhart 10	1,420	24,500	9,944
Outside Gearhart	1	14,000	23,500 18,750
Cannon Beach	3	8,500	20,900 15,300
Warrenton 7	14,650	25,000	12,014
Outside Warrenton	5	2,800	28,350 21,730
Northeast County	<u>7</u>	2,200	28,000 14,202
Total	99		

Average Sales Price Overall: \$13,486.66

Table 12

Sales From January 1989 to December 1989
Single Family Residential

<u>Average</u> <u>Area</u> <u>Sale Price</u>	<u>Number</u> <u>of Sales</u>	<u>Lowest</u> <u>Sale Price</u>	<u>Highest</u> <u>Sale Price</u>
Astoria	185	\$ 6,000	\$185,000
<u>\$ 45,207</u>			
Outside Astoria	3	40,000	47,500
<u>44,165</u>			
Lewis & Clark	22	4,000	79,000
<u>36,965</u>			
Olney	4	20,000	35,000
<u>26,037</u>			
Seaside	128	14,000*	162,000
<u>57,677</u>			
	8	140,000**	280,000
<u>196,375</u>			
Outside Seaside	3	26,750	47,000
<u>35,483</u>			
Gearhart	32	20,000	249,500
<u>79,428</u>			
Outside Gearhart	15	38,500	344,000
<u>117,933</u>			
Cannon Beach	63	14,000*	200,000
<u>79,463</u>			
	8	99,950**	330,000
<u>232,406</u>			
Outside Cannon Beach	11	26,750*	161,000
<u>64,745</u>			
	4	134,000**	215,000
<u>175,250</u>			
Warrenton	45	9,000	78,500
<u>40,246</u>			
Outside Warrenton	7	25,000	93,000
<u>48,986</u>			
Hammond	14	4,000	67,500
<u>34,206</u>			

Northeast County	49	4,000	97,000
<u>40,877</u>			
Total	<u>601</u>		

Average Sales Price Overall:

*Non-ocean front

**Ocean front

Table 13
Assessor's Sales Records
September 1978 to January 1979
(From Assessor's Sales Ratio Report)

<u>Average Area</u>	<u>Number of Total Sales</u>	<u>Lowest Sale Price</u>	<u>Highest Sale Price</u>
Astoria 64	\$10,590	\$105,000	\$39,595
Outside Astoria	2	41,700	61,000
Lewis & Clark/Olney	9	12,800	44,000
Jewell 8	8,000	45,000	24,875
Seaside 65	6,000	122,000	42,867
Outside Seaside	10	8,700	218,000
Gearhart 19	11,292	102,000	47,165
Outside Gearhart	16	35,000	83,000
Outside Cannon Beach	4	13,000	73,500
Cannon Beach	16	31,000	165,000
Warrenton 20	2,500	55,000	37,118
Outside Warrenton	2	16,000	70,500
Hammond 1			49,500
Northeast County	<u>8</u>	17,500	52,000

Total 251

Average Sales Price Overall: \$42,321.

DEMOLITION AND CONVERSION

Housing unit losses in the County for the ten-year period from 1960-1970 amounted to 110. This [is] was determined by the "demolition abstraction" method recommended by the State Housing Division of subtracting the number of housing units in 1960 from the number of units in 1970. The number of units built during this period [is] was then subtracted from the difference to determine housing units lost.

Demolitions usually occur in the cities where old residential areas are in a period of transition to commercial or industrial uses. This [is occurring] has occurred in both Astoria and Seaside as commercially zoned vacant land becomes scarce and these homes enter the sales market. Conversions are also popular when determined to be economically feasible, especially to offices and restaurants, etc. However, the number of such conversions are not easily ascertainable on building permit records. For the unincorporated areas the numbers of demolitions and conversions are considered negligible according to the Building Department.

[Table 18]
Residences Demolished Since 1970-1977

Astoria: Total = 52+ (Note: The number of apartment units were not recorded in all instances)

<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>
<u>1977</u>						
2 Apts.	7+ Apts.	2+ Apts.	6	10	13	2+ 4

Seaside: Total = 43 () denotes figures which may include buildings other than residences

<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>
<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>					
(14)	(14)	0	(3)	(1)	(1)	(2)
4						4

Yearly losses do not appear significant in comparison with new building construction. However, demolitions would probably be not necessary if homes were adequately maintained and moved to appropriate residential zones when necessary for redevelopment. Each demolition and conversion could be considered a loss of a potential home for a low income household.

RESIDENTIAL BUILDING ACTIVITY

New housing construction[, as illustrated in the following graphs,] rises and falls with economic activity in the area. From 1940 to the early 1950's after the war, new construction was very active, but from 1955 to 1965 it dropped considerably. According to the State Employment Division for records from 1960, the period from 1960 to 1965 was a high unemployment period because of the closing of Tongue Point in 1962. Opening of the Wauna Mill in the last 1960's caused a building surge, predominantly in the northeast county area. In 1974, another high unemployment period, construction dropped and in 1977 surged upward again as employment rose.

In 1985, Clatsop County had to absorb the impact of the oil module department and the late 1985 Crown Zellerbach logging closure. However, Clatsop County is expected to have one of the lower rates of unemployment in Clatsop, Columbia, Lincoln and Tillamook counties. Continued growth in such tourist-related industries as trade and services, activity associated with the expansion of the Wauna paper plant, and an anticipated stable (sea) foods products work force level are factors cited for this outlook.¹

The Clatsop Plains area experienced its highest number of new homes in 1977, when the EQC partially lifted the moratorium establishing a 1 acre minimum lot size.

The Lewis and Clark area [has] also received a fair amount of new housing since 1970, including mobile homes. A major attraction [is] was the pastoral setting characterized by farming and large lot residential development.

The Northeast County received 30 building permits for conventional single family homes, and 25 for mobile home installations in 1978. [Land use policies are not very restrictive and prices tend to be cheaper than Lewis and Clark or Clatsop Plains (see Appendix G).]

The Southwest Coastal (Arch Cape) area contains a large number of second homes and so [is unaffected by the local economy.] has been less affected by the local economy. The typical development pattern [is] has been on a lot by lot basis rather than through large scale developments which explains the relatively low number of new homes constructed each year.

The Seaside Rural area received almost an equal amount of mobile homes to conventional single family dwellings in 1977 and 1978. Thirty-six percent of the new construction was for out-of-town owners.

Twenty percent of the building permits issued in 1977 and 1978 in the Elsie-Jewell area were out-of-town owners.

[Overall it appears] From 1970 to 1980, it appeared that building activity in the unincorporated County [has] comprised from 40-50% of all new construction in the County, [since 1970] and about 80% of all new mobile homes.

[Graphs 1-8]
Residential Building Activity

From 1978 to 1989, 647 homes were constructed in the Clatsop Plains area, and 63 manufactured homes were placed.

Northeast planning area has 326 more homes than in 1978, and 138 more manufactured homes.

The Seaside Rural planning area has experienced a growth of 131 houses and 18 manufactured homes.

The Southwest Coastal area shows 230 more homes in 1989 than in 1978, plus 2 additional manufactured homes.

Elsie-Jewell has 137 new homes and another 57 manufactured homes.

The Lewis & Clark area has added 76 homes plus 55 manufactured homes.

¹State of Oregon, Employment Division, Dept. of Human Resources, Business and Employment Outlook, Program Year 1988 & 1989, (JTPA District 1).

[Table 17]
Average Annual Residential Construction Activity
Unincorporated County

% of Area Total	Ave. No. of Conv. Single Family Dwellings/1960-1978	%	Ave. No. of Mobile Homes 1960-1978
		of Total	
Clatsop Plains	29/year	39%	12/year 25%
Northeast 20/year	27%	18/year	38%
Seaside Rural	4-5/year	5%	6/year 13%
Southwest Coastal	3/year	4%	0 0%
Elsie-Jewell	8/year	11%	6/year 13%
Lewis & Clark	10/year	14%	5/year 11%
Total Unincorporated	75/year	100%	47/year 100%

[Residential building activity in the unincorporated County has remained stable over this period as the cities rise and fall. This trend will probably continue for the next 10 years providing an average of between 100-150 building permits each year.

The impact of a new major industry (Brown and Root Pacific Fabricators, for instance) can change the short range picture significantly. According to the "Community Impact Assessment for the Proposed Pacific Fabricators Steel Structure Facility" prepared by the Clatsop County Impact Task Force and CTIC in December of 1978, the unincorporated County will receive approximately 400-500 or more new homes. The results of the report do not indicate the timing of the distribution or which areas would receive the brunt of the new construction. However, they will probably be distributed between Clatsop Plains, Lewis and Clark, and the Northeast County, the latter receiving the lesser amount (see Section on Impact of Pacific Fabricators).]

HOUSING REHABILITATION

[The condition rating used in the section on page ___ was field checked in the summer of 1978 by John Mills, Planner, and Glen Jones, Assessor, to help identify clusters of housing which can become target areas for rehabilitation efforts. The system used was adopted from the State Housing Division (see "Condition Rating System" and "Criteria for Evaluation of Condition" in the Appendix). The areas listed below had a large proportion of substandard housing:

- 1.Svensen -- Township 8 Range 8 Sections 22, 23, and 27.
Number of substandard units: 54 units.
Percent of all units (236) in area:
22.9%.
- 2.Miles Crossing/Jeffers Garden -- Township 8 Range 9 Sections 19
and 30; and Range 10 Section 25.
Number of substandard units: 50 units.
Percent of all units (259) in area:
19.3%
- 3.Jewell -- Township 5 Range 7 Sections 28 and 32; and Township 4
Range 7 Section 4.
Number of substandard units: 35 units.
Percent of all units (81) in area:
43.2%.
- 4.Westport -- Township 8 Range 6 Sections 35 and 36.
Number of substandard units: 28 units.

Percent of all units (101) in area:
27.7%.

5. Stanley Lake and South Seaside areas -- Township 6 Range 10 Sections
15 and 28.

Number of substandard units: 32 units.
Percent of all units (105) in area:

30.0%.

In 1978, the Planning Department and Assessment and Taxation worked toward identifying clusters of housing which could be targeted for rehabilitation efforts. Utilizing a system adopted from the State Housing Division, they determined that Svensen, Miles Crossing/Jeffers Gardens, Jewell, Westport and the Stanley Lake and South Seaside areas had a large proportion of substandard housing.

The preservation and restoration of this housing stock is essential in order to maintain them in a decent and safe condition. Further degeneration could eventually cause them to reach a point where they will no longer be economical to restore.

Much of the housing was built without permanent foundations, indoor plumbing, insulation, or conventional materials. In addition, much of the housing needing repair is occupied by the low income or elderly who cannot afford repair and maintenance costs.

To assist the situation of the low income homeowners, a number of programs are available for housing rehabilitation.

[1. The Community Services Administration (CSA) of the federal government operates a program which grants eligible homeowners up to \$350 in labor and materials for home weatherization. This includes such things as repairing roof leaks, insulation, weather stripping, adjusting or repairing faulty furnaces and hot water heaters, etc. This program is administered in the County by the Area Agency on Aging out of their Camp Rilea office.

2. Clatsop and Tillamook Counties also received a federal grant, which is being administered by the Northwest Oregon Housing Association, Inc. (NOHA), to provide deferred payment loans of up to \$5,000 to eligible low and moderate income homeowners. The loan is secured by a lien against the property which does not have to be repaid until the owner moves or title is transferred. There is no interest on the loan; only the original amount of the loan is repaid. Repairs may include the installation, repair, or replacement of roofs and siding, floors

and walls, electrical and plumbing, foundations and heating systems. At least 38 households are on the waiting list but no loans have been disbursed at this time. It is expected that once the program gets underway there will be more applications than money and the NOHA will be applying for new funds.

3. The NOHA has also been administering the program for the City of Seaside in which a target area was located for a Community Development Block Grant.

4. The Farmers Home Administration 515 is administered in Astoria twice a month. The St. Helens office reveals that nearly 20 persons in Clatsop County have taken advantage of this program. Funds are limited, however, and are quickly exhausted. Loans of up to \$5,000 are available at one percent interest to those qualified. An applicant's gross income must be below \$6,000/year.

5. Funds for rehabilitation are also disbursed by FmHa under their Rural Housing program, at 9% interest.

6. Some banks offer home rehabilitation loans through the HUD Title I Property Improvement Loan Insurance Program. HUD provides insurance on these loans which carry a 10 to 12 percent interest rate, a 10-12 year term, and a maximum loan amount of \$10,000.]

1. The Community Action Team of Columbia County operates a tri-county (Columbia, Clatsop, Tillamook) program which assists eligible homeowners and renters with winter heating bills. Weatherization assistance is provided in amounts of up to \$5,000.00 through funding from the Low Income Energy Assistance Program (LEAP), and the Department of Energy (DOE). The waiting list for the winter heat program gives priority to the handicapped, residents over 60, and to families with children under six years of age. Extra priority points are also given for each year an applicant has been on the waiting list.

2. Community Development Block Grant funds are administered through the weatherization and housing and rehabilitation programs. Homeowners who qualify may be eligible for up to \$12,500 weatherization loans at 0% interest with deferred payments. Only the original amount of the loan is repaid, and does not have to be repaid until the owner moves or the title is transferred.

3. The Farmers Home Administration 502 provides housing improvement loans for low-income families. This is a rehabilitation program for qualified housing. Typically, the house cannot be more than 15 years old and repairs are only authorized for reasons of safety or health, such as roofs or septic systems. The applicant must sign a promissory note for the amount of the loan at current interest rate (presently 9.25%), but the payments are pro-rated, based on the amount of the loan and the applicant's income.
4. The Farmers Home Administration 504 loan grant program for repair provides funds for homeowners 62 years and older who meet the low income guidelines. Qualified applicants may receive up to \$5,000 grant money for authorized repairs. Approved loan applicants may borrow up to \$25,000 at 1% interest, not to be repaid until such time as the title is transferred and 3 months' time has elapsed.
5. Clatsop and Tillamook Counties received a federal grant in the late seventies, which is being administered by the Northwest Oregon Housing Association, Inc. (NOHA), to provide deferred payment loans of up to \$5,000 to eligible low and moderate income homeowners. The loan is secured by a lien against the property which does not have to be repaid until the owner moves or title is transferred. There is no interest on the loan; only the original amount of the loan is repaid. Repairs may include the installation, repair or replacement of roofs and siding, floors and walls, electrical and plumbing, foundations and heating systems. The money is all loaned out at present, but as houses are sold and funds paid back, the money will again be available to loan.

These loans and grants have the effect of decreasing the amount a low-income household spends on needed repairs and improving energy conservation in the home. They also help to maintain the housing stock in good condition.

[Table 19]
 Clatsop-Tillamook Intergovernmental Council
 Housing Allocation Scheme
 to 1980
 For Unincorporated Clatsop County

Units	No. of Total Substandard	1980 Units	Total Rehab Units	CDBG*	FmHA Assorted

5,035 1,396/28% 5,325 100 50 150

CTIC staff coordinates housing data gathering for both Clatsop and Tillamook Counties. In their efforts they compiled the information in the Table above to give direction for administration of various funding programs.

*CDBG (Community Development Block Grants)

EXPECTED HOUSING DEMAND TO THE YEAR 2000

The following anticipated housing demand figures were designed to accommodate the projected growth to the year 2000 and to guide in the provision of sufficient land area for a level of flexibility and freedom in the market place. The figures were computed using the population projections prepared by County staff personnel in July of 1979. [and may need revision after the 1980 Census.] Seasonal units for the unincorporated County were estimated through the use of past building and occupancy rates. The Southwest Coastal CAC area is expected to receive a larger percentage of recreational homes than they have in the past; the Clatsop Plains area is expected to receive a smaller percentage. (see second homes). The total number of second homes constructed is shown on the decline from an estimated 34/year to approximately 28/year.

Table [20]14
Additional Housing Units Needed

<u>CAC Planning Areas</u>	<u>H.H.S.*</u>	<u>Year 2000</u>	<u>Seasonal Units</u>	<u>Total</u>
Clatsop Plains	2.2	361	279	640
Northeast County	3.3	573	50	623
Seaside Rural	2.5	55	81	136
Southwest Coastal	2.0	26	49	75
Elsie Jewell	1.8	123	115	238
Lewis & Clark	2.75	297	26	323
Total		1,435	600	2,035

*Household Size.

No attempt has been made to distribute the number throughout the twenty-two year period since a housing market analysis every two years such as that contained in this report is a more preferable method

of determining annual needs.

The estimate has not been updated since 1979; however, because of the timing of the 1990 Census, if another housing market analysis is made, it should occur after the census is complete.

[IMPACT OF PACIFIC FABRICATORS]

[The Brown and Root project is a proposal by Pacific Fabricators, Inc., a subsidiary of Brown and Root, to build a fabrication yard in Warrenton for constructing offshore oil well drilling platforms. the construction was scheduled to begin in the spring of 1979; however, due to delays and uncertainty, the project's starting date has been alternatively scheduled for spring 1982.

A task force of community members met during the summer of 1978 to refine and improve the information concerning the project's impact on nearby communities that was compiled in an EIS of the project by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The task force considered both the primary and secondary impacts (direct employment and related services employment) of the project using information provided by Brown and Root as well as from other projects in the county of a similar nature.

The yard is expected to take five years to build with the peak employment in the fourth year. Secondary employment in related services is expected to lag about a year behind direct employment.

Warrenton is expected to take the brunt of the new residents over the first two years; however, the unincorporated County is expected to be "significantly impacted". Three planning areas in the rural County will be in the project's growth area. The number of households and population expected in these areas are given below without an effort to distribute the impact over the five year period.

Table 21
Brown and Root Impact

New

New <u>Housing</u>	<u>Households</u>	<u>Household Size</u>	<u>Population</u>
Clatsop Plains	275	2.17	745 247
Lewis & Clark	140	2.7	375 126
Northeast County	<u>135</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>365 122</u>
Total Unincorporated	550	2.7	1,485 495

The table above also shows the resulting population from the new households based on an assumed household size of 2.7. The table also shows the number of newly constructed homes needed to accommodate the new residents. This figure assumes that 90% of the 550 households will need to be accommodated through new construction.

Again the table includes both the direct and secondary impacts of employment from the Brown and Root fabrication project, and is based on the "Community Impact Assessment for the Proposed Pacific Fabricators' Steel Structure Facility in Warrenton, Oregon," prepared in December 1978 by the Clatsop County Community Impact Task Force and the Clatsop-Tillamook Intergovernmental Council staff.]

[SUMMARY ON HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS]

[The Housing Market Analysis tables in the Appendix take into consideration a number of factors which influence housing demand, including the existing housing supply, past building permit activity, population and employment projections, vacancy rates, construction rates, and income levels of the population. Due to the rapid change in conditions a market analysis is most effective when used to project the demand for two to three years into the future.

A housing market area is the geographic area within which all dwelling units can be substituted for one another as a competitive alternative and is determined by the transportation system, the number and location of employers, and the size of the labor force. Clatsop County including all of the incorporated cities and unincorporated places can be considered as such an area. The one exception is the Crown Zellerbach Paper Mill in Wauna which attracts 450 workers out of a total 850 at the mill from Longview and Clatskanie. However, for this report, the employment figures used include the total employment at Wauna.

An area smaller than the total County cannot be used for analysis of housing demand because of a lack of information about employment,

income levels, and vacancy rates at any smaller scale.

One problem with using the County as a market area is that the demand for second homes and/or retirement homes (two closely related markets) are unpredictable except on a larger regional basis. Because of this situation, these two types of demand have been treated separately from the more localized demand that is tied to local employment opportunities.

Another market factor that is unique to Clatsop County is the possible location of a steel fabrication yard in Warrenton in the near future.

The yard, proposed by Brown & Root Inc., would directly employ about 1,000 people over 5 years.

Tables E-1, E-2, and E-3 in Appendix E give benchmark data and the projections and assumptions used to project housing demand to the year 1980. The results of this data, shown in Table E-4, shows a total of 267 dwellings needed annually plus an additional 90-100 second homes. Rental units needed are estimated to comprise 44% of new construction. Those units most in need are one bedroom units for \$170-\$190 per month and two bedroom units for \$200-\$220. A total of 151 owner occupied units (presumed to be primarily single family units) are projected each year to 1980. The price range determined to be most affordable to persons seeking housing in the area is estimated at \$45,000-\$55,000.

The market analysis gives qualitative demand of what price ranges and rent levels will be affordable to people of the area based on estimates of income levels.]

SUMMARY OF HOUSING PROBLEMS

1. Inflated home prices - Although sales prices and interest rates are high and the market fluctuates, sales activity has been very active [the last couple of] for the past year. [It is estimated that 2 out of 3 sales] Some of these sales are second homes, and some are to current homeowners who are buying to move up for investment purposes[, and,]. Anticipating more inflation in the future, they are buying now rather than later. This activity affects the prospective home purchaser (buying a home for the first time) adversely - existing homeowners benefit.
2. Rising land prices are the most striking element in higher home prices.
3. Rising interest rates are the most important factor in increasing

the difficulty of buying a home for the first time.

4. High construction costs are due primarily to the rising cost of wood and wood products.
5. Shortage of building sites - The lack of public facilities and new development costs have certainly been a factor in the shortage of building sites. Vast stretches of single family detached development (a phenomenon of the automobile age) however, has also contributed. To offset this shortage and to reduce costs of development, many urban areas are turning to clustering and townhouse development.
6. Manufactured [Mobile] homes - Because of increased size and better construction methods to make mobile homes more attractive, the price of the mobile home is approaching that of the conventional building.
7. Very "tight" market - Although building construction has been very active, choices are somewhat limited in the housing market for first time buyers in lower income brackets.
8. Second homes - Speculating a demand for recreational properties decreases the options for the permanent resident. Those properties most suited for development are generally along the coast in and around the resort towns, where prices tend to be high. The permanent resident is, therefore, forced to compete with the potential vacation home buyer or look elsewhere.
9. Homes are older and sometimes difficult to maintain - Most of the homes in the County are over 30 years old, lack insulation, are too large to heat or too small, and are sometimes difficult to finance. Physical deterioration, however, is not inevitable.
10. Rising home maintenance costs present a major problem for the low income and elderly homeowner.
11. Shortage of rental housing for low income - Households with fixed incomes are desperately in need of assistance in these inflated times. Many rental units do not meet the standards applied by assistance programs.

APPENDICES

- [A. Housing Price Survey Results]
- [B. Housing Survey Results]
- [C. Housing Condition Guidelines]
- [D. School Enrollment]
- A. School Enrollment
- [E. Housing Market Analysis Tables]
- [F. Formula for Vacation Homes]
- [G. Land Values in Clatsop County]
- [H. Household Income Levels and Distribution]

Appendix [D]A
 Table [D-1]A-1
 School Enrollment - September Reports

School Change District to 1990	1970	1972	1975	1978	1970 to 1978	1990	Change 1970
Astoria (1-C) (29.6%)	2500	2338	1953	1722	-778 (31%)	1785	-715
Seaside (10) 11.2%	1487	1402	1386	1501	+ 14 1%	1664	+177
Warrenton/ Hammond (30) 32%	647	634	619	676	+ 29 4.5%	859	+212
Lewis & Clark (5)* (15%)	415	389	356	328	- 87 (21%)	342	- 73
Olney (11-C) 14.5%	62	58	44	64	+ 2 3%	71	+ 9
Columbia (5J)	774	799	773	745	- 29 (3.5%)	648	-126

(16.2%)									
Jewell (8)	96	110	107	109	+ 13	13.5%	178	+82	
	85.4%								
Private Schools									
Lewis & Clark			35	87	+ 52	149%			
Star of the Sea	120			174	+ 54	45%	91	+29	
	24%								

Note: In 1978 most of the schools in the County added kindergarten grade. This added an age group of children that were not going to school in earlier years. In order to look at growth in the same age group over time, the kindergarten grade in [1978] was not counted above. The 1990 figures, however, do include the kindergarten grade.

It is important to note that these schools all have several grades (K-12) and that some of these grades have seen rapid growth while others have declined. [For example, the high school in Northeast county has doubled in students since 1970 while the much larger enrollment in the lower grades has declined slightly.]

*Lewis and Clark merged with Astoria as of July 1990.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bureau of Governmental Research and Services, University of Oregon, 1969 Income and Poverty Data - Cities and Counties of Oregon, May, 1972.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Detailed Housing Characteristics - Oregon, February, 1972.

Clatsop-Tillamook Intergovernmental Council, Regional Land Use and Housing Elements, February, 1978.

Bureau of Governmental Research and Services, University of Oregon, Special Studies - Oregon Housing - Development of a Housing Information

Base, 1971.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Housing Division, Planning for Housing and People in Oregon, July 1974.

Clatsop-Tillamook Intergovernmental Council, Clatsop County 1980 Census Information on Population and Housing Paper #1, November 1982.

State of Oregon, Oregon Housing Agency, 1980 and 1988 Estimates of the Housing Stock for Oregon Counties, September 8, 1989.

State of Oregon, Employment Division, Department of Human Resources, Business and Employment Outlook, Program Year 1988 and 1989 (for JTPA District 1).

Portland State University, Center for Population Research and Census, Population Estimates for Oregon, 1980-1989.