

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. The obligation to adopt findings under OAR 660-007-0060(2), part of the Metropolitan Housing Rule, is triggered only by plan and land use regulation amendments that are either intended to comply with the construction and density mix standards in the rule or that impact local government provisions complying with those standards. *J.T. Smith Companies v. City of West Linn*, 54 Or LUBA 339 (2007).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. A legislative decision that establishes a floor area ratio (FAR) standard for residential housing does not trigger application of the construction and density mix standards in OAR chapter 660, division 007, where the petitioner fails to demonstrate that the FAR standard affects the city's obligation to provide for an overall density of eight or more dwelling units per acre. *J.T. Smith Companies v. City of West Linn*, 54 Or LUBA 339 (2007).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Absent a focused challenge from petitioners, staff reports analyzing proposed floor area ratio (FAR) standards for residential development and concluding that the FAR standards would have no impact on future residential construction and development are sufficient to demonstrate that the FAR standards are consistent with Goal 10. *J.T. Smith Companies v. City of West Linn*, 54 Or LUBA 339 (2007).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. LUBA will reject an argument that a legislative decision must be remanded to adopt findings addressing whether a proposed land use regulation is consistent with applicable comprehensive plan policies, where the petitioner identifies no local obligation to adopt findings, and the local government cites to a staff report that concludes the regulation is consistent with applicable plan policies. *J.T. Smith Companies v. City of West Linn*, 54 Or LUBA 339 (2007).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Where a petitioner appeals a legislative decision (1) that adopts a new zone potentially applicable to a number of properties but (2) does not actually apply that new zone to any property, the only challenges LUBA can meaningfully review are facial challenges to the new zone, that is, arguments that the new zone is facially inconsistent with controlling legal standards. LUBA cannot meaningfully review hypothetical challenges that anticipate future decisions to apply the new zone to particular property. *Okray v. City of Cottage Grove*, 47 Or LUBA 297 (2004).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Where a decision includes discrete determinations that, viewed in isolation, would constitute quasi-judicial decisions, whether the decision is viewed as legislative or quasi-judicial depends on the character of the whole decision. The entire decision will either be legislative or quasi-judicial, not a hybrid of both. *NWDA v. City of Portland*, 47 Or LUBA 533 (2004).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Assuming, without deciding, that it is reversible error to combine a unitary legislative proceeding with a geographically

and otherwise unrelated site-specific proposal, a city decision that applies a height bonus to a particular property that is within a 535-acre study area subject to a number of legislative plan and land use regulation amendments is not geographically or otherwise unrelated to the legislative proceeding. *NWDA v. City of Portland*, 47 Or LUBA 533 (2004).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Although all legislative decisions need not be supported by findings when the local government can supply argument and citation to the record in its brief to demonstrate compliance with the applicable criteria, such arguments must be based on evidence contained in the record rather than created out of whole cloth. *Naumes Properties, LLC v. City of Central Point*, 46 Or LUBA 304 (2004).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. A decision to annex property owned by more than 60 property owners and encompassing more than 125 acres is not directed at a “closely circumscribed factual situation” or “a relatively small number of persons,” and thus is not subject to notice requirements and hearing procedures prescribed by ORS 197.763 for a quasi-judicial land use decision. *Miner v. Clatsop County*, 46 Or LUBA 467 (2004).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Even absent a specific legal requirement that a legislative decision be supported by findings, remand may be necessary if LUBA and the appellate courts cannot perform their review function without the missing findings to determine whether applicable decision making criteria are satisfied. *Witham Parts and Equipment Co. v. ODOT*, 42 Or LUBA 435.

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Where a county’s legislative decision changes the comprehensive plan designation for a property from Industrial to Primary Agriculture, and the record does not reflect that the county considered other potentially suitable designations or explained why other potentially suitable designations should not be applied, the decision and record are insufficient to demonstrate that applicable criteria were considered. *Manning v. Marion County*, 42 Or LUBA 56.

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. A county decision to amend a property description of a significant aggregate site in its comprehensive plan to mirror the property description contained in its mineral sites inventory, along with other, unrelated policy and housekeeping amendments, is a legislative, and not a quasi-judicial, decision. *DeBell v. Douglas County*, 39 Or LUBA 695 (2001).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. The highly deferential standard of review stated in ORS 197.829(1) and *Clark v. Jackson County*, 313 Or 508, 836 P2d 710 (1992), is expressly limited to *interpretations* by local governments of comprehensive plan and land use regulations. It does not apply to *enactments* by local governments of comprehensive plan and land use regulations. *Downtown Community Assoc. v. City of Portland*, 32 Or LUBA 1 (1996).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. There is no statutory or administrative law requirement that *all* legislative land use decisions be supported by findings. However, where a challenged legislative land use decision was made by the local governing body and the apparently applicable legal standards at issue on appeal are local comprehensive plan provisions, the interpretation of those provisions must initially be made by the governing body in its decision. *Central Eastside Industrial Council v. Portland*, 29 Or LUBA 429 (1995).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. The absence of findings in support of a legislative decision is not in itself a basis for reversal or remand. It is possible for respondents to defend against a challenge to a legislative decision through argument in their briefs and citations to plan provisions, code provisions and evidence in the record. *Churchill v. Tillamook County*, 29 Or LUBA 68 (1995).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Where a legislative comprehensive plan amendment adopts policies arguably relevant to OAR 660-12-060, either the decision must be supported by findings addressing OAR 660-12-060 or respondents must demonstrate, through arguments in their briefs and citation to provisions of the local government's plan and regulations or the record that the challenged policies comply with OAR 660-12-060. *Opus Development Corp. v. City of Eugene*, 28 Or LUBA 670 (1995).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. There is no statutory or administrative law requirement that *all* legislative decisions be supported by findings. However, where there is a local code provision requiring that findings be adopted in support of legislative decisions, the absence of such findings, or the adoption of purely conclusory findings, can provide a basis for reversal or remand. *Foster v. Coos County*, 28 Or LUBA 609 (1995).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. That a legislative land use decision is not supported by findings is not, in itself, a basis for reversal or remand, because no applicable legal standard requires that *all* legislative land use decisions be supported by findings. *Redland/Viola CPO v. Clackamas County*, 27 Or LUBA 560 (1994).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. With regard to providing an explanation of the basis for a challenged legislative decision, the Goal 2 "adequate factual base" requirement will be satisfied if the decision is supported by either (1) findings demonstrating compliance with applicable legal standards, or (2) argument and citations to facts in the record, in respondents' briefs, adequate to demonstrate compliance with applicable legal standards. *Redland/Viola CPO v. Clackamas County*, 27 Or LUBA 560 (1994).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Where petitioners contend legislative land use regulation amendments are inconsistent with certain arguably relevant comprehensive plan provisions, and those plan provisions are not interpreted in the

challenged decision, LUBA must remand the challenged decision for the local government to adopt the necessary plan interpretations as part of its decision. *Redland/Viola CPO v. Clackamas County*, 27 Or LUBA 560 (1994).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Statewide Planning Goal 2 requires that comprehensive plan and land use regulation amendments have an adequate factual base, regardless of whether they are legislative or quasi-judicial in nature. *Rea v. City of Seaside*, 27 Or LUBA 443 (1994).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Statewide Planning Goal 2 requires that planning decisions and actions have an adequate factual base, regardless of the legislative or quasi-judicial nature of the decision. The Goal 2 requirement for an adequate factual base is equivalent to the requirement for substantial evidence in the whole record. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. City of North Plains*, 27 Or LUBA 372 (1994).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. There is no legal requirement that a local government adopt findings to support a legislative land use decision. However, where the local government does not adopt findings explaining why a challenged legislative decision complies with applicable approval criteria, LUBA relies upon the responding parties to provide argument and citations to the record to assist the resolution of petitioners' allegations. *DLCD v. Fargo Interchange Service District*, 27 Or LUBA 150 (1994).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. There is no legal requirement that local governments adopt findings in support of legislative land use decisions. Where a local government does not adopt findings explaining why a challenged legislative land use decision complies with applicable approval criteria, LUBA relies on the responding parties to provide argument and citations to the record to assist in the resolution of petitioners' allegations. *Andrews v. City of Brookings*, 27 Or LUBA 39 (1994).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. For LUBA review of a legislative land use decision, either the legislative land use decision must be accompanied by findings addressing relevant legal standards or the local government must explain in its brief how the challenged legislative decision complies with applicable legal standards. *McInnis v. City of Portland*, 27 Or LUBA 1 (1994).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Although nothing requires that all legislative land use decisions be supported by findings, in order for LUBA to perform its review function, it is necessary either that legislative land use decisions be accompanied by findings demonstrating compliance with relevant legal standards or that respondent explain in its brief how the challenged legislative decision complies with applicable legal standards. *Rea v. City of Seaside*, 26 Or LUBA 444 (1994).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. No statute or appellate court case requires that all legislative land use decisions be supported by findings. Absent allegations by petitioner that a legislative decision violates particular legal standards, a

local government's failure to adopt findings in support of that legislative decision addressing the statewide planning goals and local comprehensive plan is not, of itself, a basis for reversal or remand of the decision. *Oregon City Leasing, Inc. v. Columbia County*, 25 Or LUBA 129 (1993).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. ORS 215.130(1) indicates the legislature contemplated that legislative land use decisions could be adopted by the electorate. However, nothing exempts legislative land use decisions from the procedural and substantive requirements applicable to the enactment of legislation affecting land use. Therefore, a decision adopted by the electorate is subject to the requirements governing legislative land use decisions. *Riverbend Landfill Company v. Yamhill County*, 24 Or LUBA 466 (1993).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. While nothing requires that all legislative land use decisions be supported by findings, in order for LUBA to perform its review function, it is necessary either that legislative land use decisions be accompanied by findings of compliance with relevant legal standards or that respondents explain in their briefs how the legislative decision complies with applicable legal standards. *Riverbend Landfill Company v. Yamhill County*, 24 Or LUBA 466 (1993).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. There is no statutory requirement that legislative decisions be supported by substantial evidence. *Riverbend Landfill Company v. Yamhill County*, 24 Or LUBA 466 (1993).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. That the electorate may have exceeded its authority in adopting land use legislation by initiative, is a question bearing on the merits of an appeal from such a decision, not on LUBA's jurisdiction to review the appealed decision. *Riverbend Landfill Company v. Yamhill County*, 24 Or LUBA 607 (1992).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. ORS 197.835(7)(a)(C) does not require a legislative land use decision to be supported by substantial evidence. Where petitioners cite no independent basis for a requirement that the challenged legislative land use decision be supported by substantial evidence, petitioners provide no basis for reversal or remand. *Cope v. City of Cannon Beach*, 23 Or LUBA 233 (1992).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. ORS 197.835(7)(a)(C) does not impose a substantive requirement that legislative land use decisions be supported by substantial evidence in the whole record. *Alexiou v. Curry County*, 22 Or LUBA 639 (1992).

28.5 LUBA Scope of Review – Legislative Decisions. Although not required by statute, findings in support of legislative amendments to a comprehensive plan may be required to permit LUBA to determine whether the plan, as amended, complies with the statewide planning goals. *Von Lubken v. Hood River County*, 22 Or LUBA 307 (1991).