

3.000 The Physical Environment

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.100	CURRENT LAND USE CHARACTERISTICS	1
3.110	CUMMULATIVE EFFECT OF PLAN MAP AMENDMENTS.....	2
3.120	COMMUNITY SERVICE USES.....	3
3.130	RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CHARACTERISTICS.....	4
3.140	RESTRICTIONS ON RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	6
3.700	FIRE AND POLICE PROTECTION	13
3.710	POLICE PROTECTION	14
3.900	ENERGY AND COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES.....	15

3.100 CURRENT LAND USE CHARACTERISTICS

Annexations since 1980 have brought significant changes to Gresham's land base, both in total area and in the percentage of land designated for different land uses. The total land area has increased from 9,400 acres in 1980, to 15,063 acres in the Planning Area in 1988. Most of the acreage in the Planning Area has been annexed, and the remainder is expected to be annexed by July 1989.

Residential land continues to dominate the city, with 44% of the land base designated for detached (single family) dwellings, and another 9% of the acreage designated for attached (multiple family) units. Although this represents a decrease for residential land as a percentage of the total, actual acreage for all residential land increased from 5,646 acres in 1980, to 7,890 in 1988. This represents a 40% increase since 1980.

Industrial land jumped from less than 7% of the land base in 1980, to over 13% in 1988. This remarkable increase reflects the addition of the Columbia South Shore industrial areas, which helped to increase the industrial land inventory from 631 acres in 1980 to 1,963 acres in 1988.

While the commercial land base more than doubled from 355 acres in 1980 to 801 acres in 1988, the percentage of commercial land as a portion of the total land base increased only slightly from just under 4% in 1980 to just over 5% in 1988.

Open space remained nearly unchanged as a percentage of the land base at 6%, though the acreage increased from 632 acres in 1980, to 948 acres in 1988. Similarly, land committed to streets and public facilities dropped slightly to 21% in 1988 from 23% in 1980, reflecting a change in acreage from 2,136 acres in 1980 to 3,156 in 1988.

3.110 CUMULATIVE EFFECT ON PLAN MAP AMENDMENTS

The intent of the plan map amendment process is to provide a means for redesignating the allowed use for a specific parcel. However, plan map amendment proposals are reviewed carefully, since many would allow more intensive land uses, and could thus have substantial impacts on surrounding property, as well as to increase property value. To ensure that potential impacts on neighboring properties are considered, and that increased land value is not the only motive, the decision is based on a demonstrated need for a proposed land used designation, and a lack of appropriately designated alternative sites within the vicinity. The amendment must be consistent with applicable policies and implementation strategies of the city's Community Development Plan as well as the potential effects on existing and future public facilities are considered.

Over forty applications for plan map amendments were submitted to the city between 1980 and 1987, with twenty-one of these proposals ultimately adopted. However, the total acreage affected by plan map amendments is somewhat misleading, since two major amendments were responsible for over ninety percent of the total area for all amendments.

The first major amendment was initiated by the city in 1982, when the Central Business District (CBD) was redesignated into eight separate districts, encompassing over 400 acres in the downtown area. This amendment impacted the city's ability to meet minimum requirements for buildable housing land, since the CBD designation allowed housing development of up to forty-two units per acre. Based on the 1986 land use inventory results, about 113 of the 424 acres within the CBD district were vacant or significantly underutilized, with a potential for 4,731 housing units when developed to maximum density. However, since the CBD district also allowed commercial uses, this total is not a reasonable estimate of actual development potential.

When the CBD district was amended, some of the designations for the area were new land use districts, including the Central Urban Core (CUC), High Density Residential (HDR) district, and the Transit Development (TD) district. The CUC and TD districts were unique, as they were the first designations to mix commercial and residential uses.

The 113 acres of vacant and underutilized land has a potential for 4,025 housing units under the new designations, some 700 units less than the maximum for the CBD district. Of these, 1,627 units could be built on land limited to residential developments, with the remaining 2,398 units on CUC and TD land. Since the CUC and TD districts also permit commercial uses, like the CBD district, it is not reasonable to assume total development of housing at the maximum density for the CUC and to districts.

In order to examine the net effect of the CBD amendment on buildable lands in the central area, the following analysis (shown in figure 3-3) assumes a 50/50 mix of commercial and residential development in districts that allow mixed uses, and 100% development in exclusively residential districts.

The second major amendment also occurred in 1982, when approximately 250 acres of land owned by the Fujitsu Corporation was redesignated from county Medium Residential-3 (MR-3) zoning to

Industrial (IND). At the time that this property was annexed, there was no indication that the city would soon be annexing huge portions of unincorporated Multnomah County, and the loss of residential land was not a significant concern to the city. Fortunately, even though annexations have dramatically affected the amount of buildable land for housing, the loss of 250 acres of medium density residential land to the Fujitsu development still does not significantly affect the city's ability to meet the housing mix and overall density requirements of the Metropolitan Housing Rule (see section 3.111).

The remaining amendments adopted by 1987 affected a total of 67 acres. In 1988, eight plan map amendment proposals were submitted prior to the completion of the Periodic Review process; of these, four proposals were adopted, affecting a total of 14 acres.

The net effect of plan map amendments adopted through spring 1988 is shown in Figure 3-4. The net changes in acreage did not significantly change the balance of vacant land within any single land use district and had no significant impact on the city's ability to meet state requirements for buildable land inventories. The net effect on buildable residential lands was a reduction of 2.8 percent for attached housing, and 0.5 percent for detached housing, which does not significantly affect either the housing mix, or overall density requirements of the Metropolitan Housing Rule (see section 3.131).

Though the net acreage within any given district did not change significantly as a result of plan amendments, there was a clear desire to designate additional commercial and industrial lands on behalf of the applicant. Figure 3-5 shows privately initiated plan amendment proposals, including denied and withdrawn applications. This demonstrates not only the desire for designations such as Extensive Commercial (EC), and General Commercial (GC), but also the lack of interest in other designations, such as Low and Moderate Density Residential (LDR, MDR).

Many of the amendments that were adopted led to economic development for the city. The Fujitsu property added a huge amount of serviceable industrial land to the city's inventory, and several of the commercial amendments were directly related to new developments, such as new shopping centers or other retail activities. Only the Fujitsu amendment substantially enhanced the city's ability to provide services, since it enabled public grants to fund extensions of sewer mains along Glisan and 202nd, serving properties in that area.

As a part of the Periodic Review process, the city redesignated a large number of parcels as the areas annexed since 1980 were incorporated into the updated Comprehensive Plan. While most of the redesignations had little effect on allowed uses or development standards, several were determined to be of significant impact, and required more detailed review and justification. The effect of these amendments is shown in Figure 3-6.

3.120 COMMUNITY SERVICE USES

In addition to the primary development intended for a district, there are community service developments that are appropriate in a particular area because of social or technical need. These uses

are permitted under community service guidelines of the Development Code, and include such activities as public utilities, parks, schools, hospitals, care facilities, churches, and cemeteries.

Though community service developments do not represent a change in permitted use, they still impact the buildable land inventory within each district. This impact is most significant in residential areas, where potential housing units are precluded by community service developments such as churches and clinics.

From 1980 to 1987, 39 applications for community service developments were submitted, and all of these have been approved. Of the additional 4 applications that were submitted in 1988 prior to completion of Periodic Review, all were approved. The greatest impact of these developments has been on the Moderate Density Residential district, where 40 acres of buildable land were precluded from development by new community service uses; this in effect displaces as many as 960 potential dwelling units.

The Low-Density Residential district was also significantly affected, where community service developments expanded to occupy an additional 32 acres of the buildable land, displacing 159 potential residential units.

Two large developments were responsible for a significant portion of the total area converted to area accessory uses; the Mount Hood Medical Center complex occupies over 20 acres of Moderate Density Residential land, and the various light rail stations and maintenance facilities occupy 23 acres of industrial and commercial land.

3.130 RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CHARACTERISTICS

See Section 4.800 2021-2041 Housing Capacity Analysis.

3.131 Residential Land Use Inventory

The Gresham Planning Area was inventoried in the fall of 1986 (Appendix 27) to determine the amount of existing housing, as well as buildable lands available for future residential development. Using building permit records, this inventory has been updated through 1987.

The results of the inventory show an existing housing stock of 21,659 dwelling units. Of the total amount, 13,975 dwelling units (65%) is detached housing, and the remaining 7,684 (35%) is attached housing.

With the restricted development potential for lands that lie within a physical constraint district taken into account, a potential for as many as 28,600 new housing units exists. Of these, over 16,760 could be attached units, and 11,840 detached dwellings. An additional 6,000 potential attached housings units are currently displaced by non-conforming uses in residential districts.

Metropolitan Housing Rule

During the periodic review process, extensive field research was required in order to evaluate Gresham's compliance with the requirements of OAR 660.07, the Metropolitan Housing Rule. The purpose of the rule is to "assure opportunity for the provision of adequate numbers of needed housing units and the efficient use of land... [and] to provide greater certainty in the development process and so to reduce housing costs." This objective is achieved through concise definitions of "needed housing" that jurisdictions are required to accommodate, minimum overall development densities for all housing types, and a prescribed new construction mix of attached and detached housing on buildable residential land.

The definition of "needed housing" includes the mix of attached and detached housing specified in the rule, but also specifically mentions manufactured homes, and government assisted housing. Gresham accommodates all of these housing needs in its housing districts and standards.

The new construction mix on buildable residential land must provide the opportunity for at least 50% of new housing to be attached housing. Using a combination of sources, including the 1986 Land Use Inventory, building permit records, and 1988 residential map amendments that resulted from the periodic review process, a new construction mix of 41.4% detached housing, and 58.6% attached housing was determined to be available (Figure 3-8). However, this is a conservative estimate of potential attached housing, since future housing was not included for mixed use districts such as Office Residential (OFR), Transit Development District (TD), Central Urban Core (CUC) and the Moderate Density Residential-12 (MDR-12) district, which permits mobile home developments.

The rule also requires several cities in the Portland area, including Gresham, to meet a minimum overall density of ten or more units per net buildable acre for new residential construction. Gresham meets the standard, since new construction maximum allowed density for residential districts would achieve an overall density of 11.75 units per net buildable acre (Figure 3-9). The "ID, OFR, CUC, and MDR-12 districts are excluded from this estimate, as well, making the overall density a conservative estimate.

At each periodic review of the Portland Metro Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), Metro is required to review the findings for the UGB and determine whether a shortage of buildable lands for any land use, including housing, exists. However, Gresham retains a large amount of undeveloped residential land for all housing types, and it is unlikely that the Metro findings would support expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary where it forms the eastern and southern limits of the city.

Legislation adopted in 1993 (HB 2835) requires most cities in the state, including Gresham, to amend its comprehensive plan and land use regulations to allow manufactured homes on all lands designed for single-family residential uses. The legislation does not apply to any area designated as a historic district or residential land immediately adjacent to a historic landmark.

(Amended by Ord. 1205 passed 2/18/90; effective 1/17/91)

(Amended by Ord. 1308 passed 4/5/94; effective 5/5/94)

3.132 Structural Conditions

A review of demolition permits issued from late 1982 through fall 1987 indicates that of the estimated 75 single family demolition permits issued, all but 15 were for structures located along arterial streets. Of the 15 units not located on major streets, most were non-conforming uses in industrial or commercial areas. Although the number of housing units that continue to exist despite structural problems is unknown, figures suggest that the total number is a small percentage of the housing stock, because units demolished during this period were not being replaced with similar residential uses, and many structures that have been allowed to deteriorate are either non-conforming or in an undesirable location for residential uses.

3.140 RESTRICTIONS ON RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Special purpose districts are overlay district designations shown on the Community Development Special Purpose District Map. Uses permitted in areas with these designations are generally those permitted in the underlying district, subject to special development standards. All of the special purpose districts are related directly to development constraints or to the presence of significant natural or cultural resources, or open space values, and frequently impact the development potential for residential land. Development proposals within these special purpose districts must include data for determining the actual portions of a development site which are within one of the districts and therefore subject to special development standards.

3.141 Natural Resources and Physical Constraints

See Section 4.800 2021-2041 Housing Capacity Analysis.

3.142 Historic Resources

In 1987, a Historic Resource Inventory Report (Appendix 9) was compiled for the Gresham Planning Area. The goal of the inventory was to create a product which would serve as the primary historic resource management tool for future land use decisions and establish a guide for future preservation policies of the city. The inventory is based on a visual overview of the planning area, a literature search for historic dates and records, and survey information for each site listed. These sites ranged from historic bridges and cemeteries, to churches, schools, and residences. Of 238 sites inventoried, 191 were residences. The 1987 inventory report served as the data base from which a landmarks inventory, containing the most significant of the city's historic and cultural resources, was prepared. This landmarks inventory is attached as Appendix 9. The following is a description of the special purpose district for historic and cultural resources:

Historic Landmark District: This special purpose district designation is applied to historic landmark sites which have been identified in the Inventory of Historic and Cultural Landmarks. It also applies to property lying north of Interstate 84, where discovery of archeological resources during the course of development is likely. Some landmarks with this designation require prior review and approval of

proposed exterior alterations, and all landmark structures are subject to standards which could delay issuance of demolition permits.

The history of Gresham is reflected both in the city's form and in the buildings and structures erected over time by the citizens. As buildings fall into disuse and deterioration, the city's historic and cultural heritage passes into oblivion. Positive public policy is required in order to draw civic attention to our historic heritage and to provide impetus for continuing activity. Historic resource planning is especially needed in a city like Gresham, where recent extremely high growth rates threaten to blur the past and obliterate its tangible evidence. Historical resources can play a vital role in establishing a community identity and enhancing educational and aesthetic qualities.

In accordance with Statewide Land Use Goal 5, resources surveyed in the 1987 Historic Resource Inventory Report were evaluated to determine their relative significance in the Gresham area. The most significant of these resources have been designated as landmarks. These landmarks are listed in Figure 3-10 and described in detail in the inventory of Historic and Cultural Landmarks (Appendix 9), adopted as an appendix to the Community Development Plan. Those listed as Class 1 landmarks are considered to be the most significant. Four of the Class 1 resources are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. These are the Zimmerman House, the Louise Home, the First Bethel Baptist Church, and the Gedamke Residence. The Class 2 resources are somewhat less significant but still of considerable value to the community due to their age or architecture.

As described in the Inventory of Historic and Cultural Landmarks, each of these resources is subject to conflicting uses in the form of periodic alterations or demolition. Additional conflicting uses have been documented for some of the landmarks. In order to protect these historic landmarks against conflicting uses which would result in their being degraded or eliminated, a program has been developed to provide appropriate levels of protection. This program is based not only on an identification of conflicting uses which threaten the landmarks, but also on a recognition of the Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy (ESEE) consequences which protection of the landmark would have on the landmark and on the identified conflicting uses. The inventory contains an analysis of the ESEE consequences. This analysis indicates that none of the landmarks are so significant or so threatened by impending actions that all conflicting uses should be prohibited. At the same time, all of the landmarks warrant some degree of protection against hasty demolition, and those identified as Class 1 landmarks should be protected against major permanent alterations which would adversely affect the character and integrity of their exterior appearance.

Figure 3-10 Inventory of Historic and Cultural Landmarks

Source: Gresham Historic and Cultural Resources Inventory (1990), 93-32-CPA, and Gresham Comprehensive Plan Map

No.	Address	Name	Points	Use	District
Class 1 Landmarks					
1	17111 NE Sandy	Zimmerman House	100	Institutional	BP
2	410 N. Main	Carnegie Library	95	Institutional	CUC
3	1304 E. Powell	William Gedamke House	90	Commercial	DC-2

No.	Address	Name	Points	Use	District
4	722 NE 162 nd	The Louise Home	90	Institutional	LDR
5	1420 SE Roberts	Bernard Witter Residence	85	Residential	LDR
6	3680 SW Towle	Heiney House	85	Residential	LDR
7	101 S. Main	1 st Bethel Baptist Church	80	Institutional	CUC
8	938 SE Roberts	Bernard Witter Residence	85	Residential	LDR
9	330 W. Powell	W. Gresham Grade School	80	Institutional	CUC
10	140 SE Roberts	Rev. Thompson Resid.	80	Residential	LDR
11	1325 W. Powell	J. R. Elkhorn Ranch	75	Residential	LDR
12	2415 SE Ambleside	Ambleside House	90	Residential	LDR
13	43 NE Ava	W. K. Hamilton Residence	70	Residential	DR-12
14	307 NE Kelly	Freeman Property	75	Residential	CUC
15	1229 W. Powell	Dr. Hughes Residence	65	Residential	LDR
16	1265 SE Roberts	Judge Stapleton House	80	Residential	LDR
17	3655 SE Powell	Peterson Residence	80	Residential	LDR
18	611 NW Wallula	Fred Honey House	75	Residential	LDR
19	31 NW 11 th	Lunceford Residence	80	Residential	LDR
20	53 NW 12 th	Walker Residence	80	Residential	LDR
21	54 NW 12 th	Aldrich/Bliss House	80	Residential	LDR
22	1801 NE 201 st	Lowitt Estate	70	Residential	MDR-24
23	2202 SW Pleasant View	Giese House, Workshop & Cellar	50	Residential	LDR
Class 2 Landmarks					
24	103 W. Powell	US Post Office	85	Institutional	CUC
25	122 N. Main	Duane C. Ely Building	75	Commercial	CUC
26	58 W. Powell	Gresham Lodge #152	75	Institutional	CUC
27	225 W. Powell	Jake Metzger Residence	75	Commercial	CUC
28	19720 SE Stark	11-Mile marker	75	Object	GC
29	23500 SE Stark	13-Mile marker	75	Object	GC
30	25700 SE Stark	14-Mile marker	75	Object	LDR
31	I-84 & NE 169 th	Pioneer Grave	75	Object	BP
32	18706 E. Burnside	Satellite Restaurant	70	Commercial	TD
33	101-117 N. Main	Congdon Building	60	Commercial	CUC

(Amended by Ordinance 1194 passed 10-2-90; effective 11-2-90)

(Amended by Ordinance 1414 passed 2-4-97; effective 3-6-97)

To implement this program, measures have been adopted as part of the Community Development Code and Standards Volumes. These measures seek to involve interested citizens in protecting

landmark resources, promoting the economic and cultural benefits of historic resources, and designating additional landmark resources as new information is presented.

(Amended by Ordinance 1194 adopted 10/2/90; effective 11/2/90.)

3.143 Cultural Resources

There are few precisely identified or documented archaeological sites in Gresham. This, however, does not suggest that such sites are non-existent or that indications of pre-history in the Gresham area are lacking.

The lack of archaeological sites is related to the lifestyles of west coast aboriginal peoples who sustained themselves through hunting and gathering as opposed to large scale agricultural settlements. American Indian settlements in Multnomah County were primarily in the flood plain of the Columbia River. Evidences of man's occupation of the Columbia region dates back to 10,000 B.C. in The Dalles. Evidence of settlements in the Portland area date back to 3,000 B.C. (Kongas, p. 11).

Occupation of most sites was seasonal. Permanent villages were built along the Columbia River. Fishing along the Columbia in the spring, gathering wapato in the ponds and picking berries in the bottomlands in the summer, and hunting in the uplands in fall provided the basis of the Indian seasonal migrations.

Two tribes of upper Chinook dialect people, the Clackamas, and the Cascades, were the most common to the local area. Relatively little is known about the Clackamas peoples. Their hunting range took them through most of present-day east Multnomah County and throughout the Mt. Hood National Forest west of the Cascade summit. They were not believed to be a populous people - in 1806 their number was estimated at 1,800.

Lewis and Clark estimated 8,000 people lived between present day Portland and the Cowlitz River during their visit in 1806. Decimation of the Indian population in the Pacific Northwest began prior to Lewis and Clark's visit and really dates from the first maritime explorations in the sixteenth century. Lewis and Clark reported a smallpox epidemic had occurred about 1780. Four major subsequent epidemics are known: 1829 measles on Sauvie Island, 1830 malaria in Fort Vancouver, 1847 measles at The Dalles, and 1853 smallpox epidemic. By 1830, between 75% and 90% of the Indian population in the lower Columbia River area had died.

The Cascade Tribe was a name commonly applied by whites to native residents of the Cascade Mountain area of the Columbia River. Their language, the Wathale dialect, is thought to be transitional between the Wishram and the Clackamas dialects. The tribes were highly transient, primarily living off fishing and trading activities. The majority of Cascade villages were located on the north bank of the Columbia River. The Indian village closest to present-day Gresham was at the western end of what is now Blue Lake Park, although signs of early habitation are found throughout the Columbia South Shore area. The name of this village was Necha-co-kee, according to Lewis and Clark. Clark used an Indian guide from this village. In his journal, he described in detail a long house in this village. The remains of five other houses stood behind the occupied long house. The father of Clark's guide told Clark that

villagers who occupied the other houses had died in a smallpox epidemic thirty years earlier. (Kongas, p. 21). About 100 people were left. These people were related to a tribe in The Dalles. Due to the construction style and materials used, no dwellings have survived.

Due to the isolated nature of campsites and the vast amounts of humus accumulations on the forest floor, archaeological sites are usually found accidentally.

Figure 3-11 City of Gresham – March 1987
Historic Resource Inventory Evaluation Criteria

Total Rating _____ Points

Resource Name: _____ Address: _____

Evaluation Factors: _____ Evaluators: _____

A. Resource reflects one or more of the following themes:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| _____ Prehistory | _____ Government |
| _____ Exploration | 1. Federal Government |
| 1. Maritime | 2. Local Government |
| 2. Transcontinental | 3. State Government |
| 3. Settlement | _____ Military Activities |
| _____ Native American | _____ Culture |
| _____ Agriculture | 1. Art |
| 1. Farming | 2. Religion |
| 2. Horticulture | 3. Education |
| _____ Commerce & Industry | 4. Architecture |
| 1. Transportation & Travel | 5. Science & Engineering |
| 2. Manufacturing & Processing | 6. Humanitarian/Social Program |
| 3. Communication | 7. Outdoor Recreation |
| 4. Service & Dist. Of Goods | 8. Conservation |
| | 9. Monuments |

HISTORIC CONSIDERATIONS: (30 Points)

RATING: _____

B. The Resource possesses interpretive potential:

_____ The Resource is associated with past events, trends, or values that may be either cultural, economic, social, or political.

_____ The Resource is associated with a group or organization relevant to city, county, state, or national history.

_____ The Resource is associated with the life or activities of a person significant in the past.

ARCHITECTURAL CONSIDERATIONS: (40 Points)

C. The Resource is significant under the following criteria:

_____ Resource represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.

_____ Resource embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction.

_____ Resource was developed early in the sequence of local history.

_____ Resource is one of the few remaining resources of its type in the area.

_____ Resource is the work of a major local architect, builder, or engineer.

_____ Resource represents the work of a nationally famous architect.

_____ Resource is a rarity of type, style, or design.

_____ Resource retains integrity of the original design. Resource alternations have been compatible with original design.

PHYSICAL & SITE INTEGRITY: (20 Points)

D. The Resource must possess historic integrity.

_____ Resource is on the original site.

_____ Resource contains sufficient original workmanship and material to identify period construction.

_____ Resource contributes to its immediate environment.

_____ Resource contributes to the character and physical development of the neighborhood or city.

_____ Site character contributes to the resource's integrity.

USE CONSIDERATIONS: (10 Points)

E. The resource is in good condition but may be threatened by public or private action.

_____ The resource through public interest, sentiment or uniqueness offers educational value to the community.

_____ The resource can be adapted to new use without damaging significant architectural elements.

TOTAL:

FINAL RATING

_____ 50-100	Eligible for Inclusion in Inventory
_____ 0-50	Surveyed But Not Eligible for Inclusion in Inventory

Source of Factors:

1. Gresham Development Code
2. Multnomah County Zoning Code
3. National Register of Historic Criteria
4. State of Oregon, Land Use Goal 5

Fire pit lenses and other isolated finds have been recorded and investigated along the Sandy River and along Deep Creek in northwestern Clackamas County.

Eighteen archaeological sites have been inventoried in Gresham by the State Historic Preservation Office. The extent of investigation varies considerably among these sites. However, sufficient data have been gathered in connection with these investigations to determine that archaeological resources do exist in the Gresham area, and that more are likely to be encountered in connection with development activity. Detailed assessments of the significance of archaeological sites disturbed or discovered in this manner should take place at the time of discovery. At that time, the ESEE consequences of protecting the site or allowing development can be considered based on the input of qualified professionals and the State Historic Preservation Office.

Age of Structure

The earliest residential development in the Gresham area occurred in the late 1800s, when the great migration along the Oregon Trail brought settlers through the region on their way to the Willamette Valley. Many claimed land along the Barlow Road, and along the network of subsequent roads that crossed what is now east Multnomah County. A few houses and farm buildings from that era still exist.

By the early 1900s, Portland was experiencing enormous growth, largely as a result of the 1905 Lewis and Clark Exposition, which gave the city international exposure, and helped to establish Portland as a major marine port. The booming population, and generally increased affluence prompted owners of large land claims in the east County area to divide their property into large, rectangular "junior acre" lots, providing a rural lifestyle in close proximity to the city, but away from the congestion of Portland's increasingly urbanized east side.

This pattern of development continued until the 1940s along early county roads such as Barker (now 162nd), Jenne (174th), Stark, Burnside, Division, and Powell. Today, many of these structures still exist,

despite the substantial widening of many of the streets on which they are located. The large "junior acre" lot patterns are also evident, and these early land divisions continue to have a significant impact on new development and land divisions.

By the 1950s, demand was increasing for smaller subdivision lots as a result of Federal Housing Authority (FHA) loan programs and suburban growth throughout the metropolitan area. This resulted in new subdivisions that were created from the remaining large tracts, behind existing "junior acre" lots, with local access streets typical of today's residential development. These homes make up the majority of the 4,500 single family structures that were annexed to the city after 1980 and were built almost entirely during the 1950s and 60s.

The 1960s and 70s brought unprecedented growth to the area, with single family development spreading eastward into Gresham. Over 6,000 housing units were built in Gresham during the 1970s, which constituted almost 60% of the city's housing stock at that time. During this period, multiple family developments also occurred, usually along major arterial streets, and in close proximity to commercial districts, such as Rockwood and the Burnside Strip. By 1980, the housing stock for the planning area had grown to an estimated 12,000 single family dwellings, and 7,000 multiple family units, with nearly all of the housing stock less than thirty years old.

Today, continued growth has increased the housing stock of the planning area to 13,500 single family units and 8,000 attached dwellings. Nearly all of the city's housing is still less than forty years old.

3.700 FIRE AND POLICE PROTECTION

Gresham's Fire Department operates from four existing fire stations. The main station is located at the Gresham City Hall, Station 2 at Kane and Division, Station 3 at SW 23rd and Pleasant View Drive, and Station 4 at 192nd and Halsey. All stations are staffed 24 hours a day. A backup force of volunteer firefighters provide additional service from Stations 2 and 3. A future fifth station may be necessary to meet the needs of southeast Gresham residents.

The City of Gresham has a class 3 fire insurance rating. The rating is based on several factors, including the adequacy and reliability of water supply, staffing levels and the kinds and numbers of firefighting equipment available.

The Gresham Fire Department provides a full range of fire protection services including fire suppression, emergency medical services at an advanced life support level, fire safety inspections, public education, fire investigation, disaster planning and new development plans review and inspection. In addition, Gresham operates a regional hazardous materials emergency response team.

In 1984 a citizens committee reviewed the fire department and its operations and developed a five year Fire Service Master Plan which was adopted by the City Council in November of 1984. The Master Plan identified specific performance standards for the department and identified recommendations for future service levels. The Plan has been updated annually by the committee so that it continues to project five years ahead.

Recent annexations have greatly increased the responses made by the Fire Department. The Department responded to 3,070 calls in 1987 and expects to respond to over 4,500 in 1988.

Until early 1987 Gresham required the installation of fire sprinkler systems in buildings with over 10,000 square feet. This ordinance, more restrictive than the State Building Code, was declared invalid by a State Attorney General's Opinion, and consequently has not been enforced since. However, the Fire Department continues to support the installation of these systems whenever possible including the installation in single and multi-family residences.

3.710 POLICE PROTECTION

In order to successfully achieve the City of Gresham's public safety policy, the Gresham Police Department provides a full range of services including patrol, investigation, traffic enforcement, crime prevention, and several specialty units, all of which are operated to enhance the safety and security of Gresham residents.

Requests for police service are prioritized according to their severity, with the most serious calls (life threatening or crimes in progress) dispatched first. In an effort to provide responsible service to our citizens, the Gresham Police Department strives to respond to high priority calls in an average of under five minutes. The average response time goal for low priority calls is set at under nine minutes. Currently, the city is sectioned into six patrol districts to maintain these average response times. As the city's population increases, these geographical areas will be appropriately realigned to maintain acceptable average response times within each district.

As the city grows through annexation and development, the Police Department plans to expand and reorganize services to meet the increasing police service needs of the fourth largest city in the state. In fiscal year 1987-88 the per capita ratio for police was 1.29 officers per thousand persons, as compared to a state average of 1.5 officers per thousand for cities with a population of over 50,000. Recommendations to increase the police density will be made as necessary and appropriate.

The Police Department recognizes the advantage to deterring crime through effective review of new building design proposals. The review allows the department to assist in recommending design changes prior to the construction stage to enhance security and emergency access.

As the City of Gresham expands, there will be a concerted effort to bring targeted problem areas up to the same standard of safety that has been expected by established Gresham citizens. This will be accomplished by intense visibility of patrol officers in program areas; selective traffic enforcement in hazardous traffic areas; tailored educational crime prevention programs for specific problems; and in-depth analysis of crime problems within the various neighborhoods and business centers to provide the most appropriate service.

3.900 ENERGY AND COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES

Service providers in Gresham include:

Electricity. Portland General Electric (PGE).

PGE has offices and shops in Gresham. As of March 1980, PGE served 11,022 residential accounts and 1,148 commercial, industrial and other accounts, for a total of 12, 170 accounts.

Telephone. General Telephone Company (GTE).

General Telephone Company has district officers in Gresham. General Telephone does not maintain account records by political jurisdiction, but rather by service area. The Gresham District service area extends west to the general area of 181st Street, north to the Columbia River, east to the Sandy River and south to the Clackamas River. As of 1979, the Gresham District included 45,454 accounts.

Gas. Northwest Natural Gas Company.

Northwest Natural Gas Company serves the Gresham area with a total of 4,712 accounts as of March 31, 1980. Northwest Natural Gas accounts consist of 4,245 residential, 463 commercial and 4 industrial customers.

News Media. Gresham Outlook.

Gresham is served by the Gresham Outlook newspaper, published three times weekly, with a paid circulation in excess of 17,000. Two Portland newspapers also are available and include Gresham news. A local radio station, KRDR, focuses on Gresham news and events. The area is also served by numerous Portland radio stations and five area television stations.

Capacity, Needs and Problems.

No specific service delivery problems related to the energy service providers have been identified. The Energy Sources and Conservation Sections (Vol. 1, Sec. 2.371 – 372) identify energy issues affecting Gresham. Plans of service providers to continue or expand service to Gresham will undoubtedly be made in the context of national, regional and metropolitan conditions and policies. Plans for energy service to Gresham will be shaped by energy supply, demand and pricing policies of more than local significance. Sections 2.380 – 28.381.7 of Volume 1 discuss energy resources and renewable energy systems potential in Gresham.

(Amended by Ord. 1724 effective 2/14/13)