

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Even though a mining operation on the applicant’s property may be indistinguishable from mining on adjacent properties that does not mean that there is no adverse effect on petitioner’s adjacent property. The cumulative effects of the additional mining may increase the adverse effects on petitioners. *Michaels v. Douglas County*, 53 Or LUBA 16 (2006).

24.2.5 Standing - Before LUBA - Adverse Effect. A city is adversely affected by a second city’s annexation ordinance, within the meaning of ORS 197.830(3), where the first city has annexed some of the same territory that was annexed by the second city and an appeal is pending challenging the first city’s annexation ordinance. *City of Damascus v. City of Happy Valley*, 51 Or LUBA 150 (2006).

24.2.5 Standing - Before LUBA - Adverse Effect. Where a county code grants standing to file a local appeal to parties who are “adversely affected” by planning commission decisions, but the local code does not define the term “adversely affected,” LUBA will assume the county’s intended meaning of that term is consistent with its meaning in other land use laws. As that term is used in the 1979 statute that governed standing to appeal to LUBA, adversely affected means the “decision impinges upon the petitioner’s use and enjoyment of his or her property or otherwise detracts from interests personal to the petitioner.” *Jefferson Landfill Comm. v. Marion Co.*, 297 Or 280, 283, 686 P2d 310 (1984). *Burke v. Crook County*, 46 Or LUBA 413 (2004).

24.2.5 Standing - Before LUBA - Adverse Effect. Where a local code grants standing to appeal planning commission decisions to parties who are “adversely affected,” a county may not limit standing to appeal to the applicant, nearby property owners and persons who testified, where the local code does not clearly adopt that limited interpretation of the term “adversely affected.” *Burke v. Crook County*, 46 Or LUBA 413 (2004).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Voter approval of a initiative that adopts additional impediments to residential development of land that includes petitioner’s property is sufficient to render petitioner “adversely affected” by the initiative for purposes of ORS 197.830(3), notwithstanding that petitioner does not currently propose residential development and current zoning does not allow for additional residential development of petitioner’s property. *Sievers v. Hood River County*, 46 Or LUBA 635 (2004).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. For purposes of establishing standing to appeal to LUBA under ORS 197.830(3), petitioners who reside within sight of a disputed sign are presumptively adversely affected. Exactly how the sign affects petitioners and how many times petitioners have seen it are irrelevant considerations under that presumption, and depositions to resolve those matters are not warranted. *Frymark v. Tillamook County*, 45 Or LUBA 685 (2003).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Depositions of two petitioners to inquire into their allegations that they are adversely affected by the challenged decision for purposes of ORS 197.830(3) are not warranted, where the movant fails (1) to specifically controvert those allegations, and (2) to establish that depositions of two petitioners are likely to affect

the outcome of LUBA's review proceeding. *Frymark v. Tillamook County*, 45 Or LUBA 685 (2003).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Under *Utsey v. Coos County*, 176 Or App 524, 32 P3d 933 (2001), *pet for rev pending*, a party seeking judicial review of a LUBA decision under ORS 197.850(1), in addition to meeting the statutory standing requirements, must also establish that the Court of Appeals' decision will have a practical effect on the appealing party's rights. LUBA is an executive branch agency rather than a court. Therefore, the standing requirements to appeal a local government land use decision to LUBA are established by ORS 197.830; and the statute does not require that the appellant establish that LUBA's decision will have a practical effect on the appellant. *Doob v. Josephine County*, 41 Or LUBA 569 (2001).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. A petitioner's undisputed claim that he owns property adjoining the property on which a proposed waste water processing facility will be located and is therefore within sight and sound of the proposed facility is sufficient to establish that the petitioner is adversely affected by the proposal. *Farrell v. Jackson County*, 39 Or LUBA 149 (2000).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Petitioner's allegations that a decision extending approval for an RV park expansion to be constructed partially on fill in a floodplain will exacerbate flooding and traffic problems on the road that serves petitioner's property and that the development will harm fishing in an adjoining creek where petitioner fishes are sufficient to demonstrate that petitioner is adversely affected by the decision. *Willhoft v. City of Gold Beach*, 38 Or LUBA 375 (2000).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. LUBA will consider supplemental affidavits, submitted after oral argument in support of petitioners' standing, where the parties' arguments did not focus on the theory of standing supported by the affidavits and the facts asserted in the affidavits are not disputed. In that circumstance, an evidentiary hearing is not required for LUBA to consider the affidavits. *Wilbur Residents v. Douglas County*, 34 Or LUBA 634 (1998).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Whether a person is "adversely affected" within the meaning of ORS 215.416(11)(a) is a fact-specific inquiry that depends upon the nature of the development and its externalities, the proximity of the person's property to the development, and any factors regarding the person's property or activities thereon that render the property more or less susceptible to impacts from the development. *Wilbur Residents v. Douglas County*, 34 Or LUBA 634 (1998).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Merely because a person owns property from which he can see or hear a proposed development does not necessarily render that person adversely affected by the decision. *Wilbur Residents v. Douglas County*, 34 Or LUBA 634 (1998).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Petitioners demonstrate they are adversely affected by a sewage treatment facility, where there is no attempt to rebut

petitioners' allegations that they are adversely affected because they are within "sight and smell" of the facility and petitioners also allege "direct, specific, tangible and negative impacts" from the proposed facility. *Wilbur Residents v. Douglas County*, 34 Or LUBA 634 (1998).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Where a county makes a permit decision without a hearing and fails to send the notice of decision required by ORS 215.416(11)(a) to persons "adversely affected" by the decision, such adversely affected persons have standing to appeal to LUBA within 21 days of actual notice of the decision. *Wilbur Residents v. Douglas County*, 34 Or LUBA 634 (1998).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Where the procedure followed by the county to approve a permit only provided the applicant a right to participate or appeal, the county may not rely on ORS 215.416(11)(a) to contend petitioner lacks standing to appeal because petitioner is not "adversely affected." *Hugo v. Columbia County*, 34 Or LUBA 577 (1998).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Although a lot line adjustment only has intangible impacts, those impacts may nevertheless adversely affect proximate property owners. Persons within sight or sound of property are presumptively adversely affected by a property line adjustment decision affecting the property. *Goddard v. Jackson County*, 34 Or LUBA 402 (1998).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. A party may not claim standing before LUBA exclusive of all other parties on the grounds that it is the only party adversely affected by a local decision. *Purdy v. City of Shady Cove*, 33 Or LUBA 331 (1997).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. When challenged decision requires that some of petitioners' property be acquired and dedicated as a road, petitioners are "adversely affected" and have standing under ORS 197.830(3). *Franklin v. Deschutes County*, 30 Or LUBA 33 (1995).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Persons within sight and sound of a development proposal are presumed to be adversely affected by it. *Kamppi v. City of Salem*, 21 Or LUBA 498 (1991).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Statements that petitioners' interests in developing their property are substantially impaired by local government adoption of a corrective program which will not correct the problem justifying a previously adopted moratorium, and will create a situation in which there is no foreseeable end to that moratorium, are adequate to allege petitioners have interests which are substantially affected by the adopted corrective program. *Schatz v. City of Jacksonville*, 21 Or LUBA 214 (1991).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Where petitioner's affidavit in support of standing includes allegations concerning economic impact of the challenged decision on his law practice and is the only testimony or evidence in the record specifically addressing the alleged economic injury, the allegations in the affidavit are sufficient to establish standing based on the alleged economic impact. *Seto v. Tri-Met*, 21 Or LUBA 185 (1991).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. Allegations that (1) petitioners have ownership interests in land which is subject to an adopted moratorium on new construction, and (2) the moratorium prevents petitioners from developing such land for purposes for which it is zoned, are sufficient to demonstrate that petitioners' interests are substantially affected by the moratorium and, therefore, petitioners have standing to appeal the adoption of the moratorium to LUBA. *Schatz v. City of Jacksonville*, 21 Or LUBA 149 (1991).

24.2.5 Standing – Before LUBA – Adverse Effect. An allegation that a person is adversely affected by the *appeal* of a land use decision to LUBA does not satisfy the standing requirement of ORS 197.830(2)(1987) that an appellant be adversely affected by *the land use decision*. *McKay Creek Valley Assoc. v. Washington County*, 19 Or LUBA 537 (1990).