

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where the “Decision” section of a land use decision expressly grants only “planned unit development subdivision plan” approval, but the decision read as a whole clearly also grants the zoning map amendment that was included in the planned unit development and subdivision plan application, LUBA will interpret the decision to grant all three of the requested approvals. *Wasserburg v. City of Dunes City*, 52 Or LUBA 70 (2006).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances - Amendment - Generally.** City findings that there has been increased commercial development in the neighborhood and that traffic has increased on a nearby state highway and resulted in increased noise are sufficient to demonstrate compliance with a subjective “changed neighborhood conditions” rezoning criterion. *Jaffer v. City of Monmouth*, 51 Or LUBA 633 (2006).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Absent some authority to the contrary, the uses allowed within a Public Parks zone or a Public Amusement zone are not limited to “recreational” or “public amusement” uses. *Cox v. Polk County*, 49 Or LUBA 78 (2005).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** A hearings officer errs in concluding that a commercial zone implements the medium density residential plan designation, simply because some commercial uses are allowed in some residential zones. *Knutson Family LLC v. City of Eugene*, 48 Or LUBA 399 (2005).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** An assignment of error that challenges a county’s failure to apply code criteria governing zoning map amendments provides no basis for reversal or remand where the assignment of error contends the zoning code criteria should have been applied to a comprehensive plan map amendment. *Doherty v. Morrow County*, 44 Or LUBA 141 (2003).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances - Amendment - Generally.** Where an ordinance that adopts legislative amendments to a zoning ordinance includes no findings responding to concerns that the amendments violate Statewide Planning Goals 5 and 9 and a comprehensive plan policy, (2) there is no evidence in the record that would allow LUBA to conclude those concerns are without merit, and (3) the comprehensive plan provision pertaining to protection of industrial lands and quarries under Goals 5 and 9 is ambiguous, LUBA will remand the ordinance. *OCAPA v. City of Mosier*, 44 Or LUBA 452 (2003).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** The fixed goal post rule established by ORS 215.427(3) does not apply to an application for a zone change where (1) that application for a zone change is part of, or submitted contemporaneously with, an application for a comprehensive plan amendment, and (2) the zone change is requested to implement the requested comprehensive plan amendment rather than as a separate request that could be approved independently of the requested comprehensive plan map amendment. *Friends of the Applegate v. Josephine County*, 44 Or LUBA 786 (2003).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where the ORS 215.283(1)(w) authorization for rural fire service facilities in EFU zones had taken effect, but a county had not yet amended its zoning ordinance to reflect the statutory change, ORS 215.283(1)(w) applies directly, and the county does not violate the zoning ordinance by approving a rural fire service facility in its EFU zone. *Keicher v. Clackamas County*, 39 Or LUBA 521 (2001).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** ORS 215.050(2) requires that zoning amendments shall implement the adopted comprehensive plan. When a local government adopts a zone change but does not adopt a contemporaneous comprehensive plan change, resulting in plan map/zoning map inconsistency, the decision must be remanded. *DLCD v. Klamath County*, 38 Or LUBA 769 (2000).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Criteria governing an application to rezone property to allow for the siting of a mobile home park need not comply with requirements in ORS 197.307 and ORS 197.480 for “clear and objective” standards regulating the siting of needed mobile homes, at least when a city has otherwise planned and designated sufficient land to satisfy the need for mobile home parks within its jurisdiction. *Evergreen Development, Inc. v. City of Coos Bay*, 38 Or LUBA 470 (2000).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** New land use regulations can only become acknowledged under ORS 197.625(2) if the ordinance adopting those new land use regulations is “affirmed on appeal under ORS 197.830 to 197.855.” Where LUBA remands the adopting ordinance because a portion of the new land use regulations is found to be defective, without specifically affirming the remaining portions of those regulations, no part of the ordinance is considered acknowledged under ORS 197.625. *Western States v. Multnomah County*, 37 Or LUBA 835 (2000).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** In amending an acknowledged zoning ordinance to reduce maximum building heights, a city is not required to demonstrate that the amendment complies with the statewide planning goals where the acknowledged comprehensive plan contains “specific policies or other provisions which provide the basis for the regulation.” ORS 197.835(7)(b). However, where the comprehensive plan includes only general policies that make no reference to maximum building heights, the city must demonstrate that the amendment complies with the statewide planning goals. *Marine Street LLC v. City of Astoria*, 37 Or LUBA 587 (2000).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** A county acts within the discretion afforded by ORS 197.829(1) and *Clark v. Jackson County*, 313 Or 508, 515, 836 P2d 710 (1992), where the zoning ordinance requires a finding that utilities and services likely to be needed by the “anticipated uses” are available, the county limits allowed uses on the property to the applicant’s proposed use, and the county interprets the term “anticipated uses” to consist solely of the proposed use. A reasonable person could construe the term “anticipated uses” to denote something less than the range of uses allowed in the zone. *City of Newberg v. Yamhill County*, 36 Or LUBA 473 (1999).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** That a local government might in future quasi-judicial proceedings recognize that the procedures required by its amended zoning ordinance conflict with the procedures required by ORS 215.416(11) for permit decisions, and therefore follow the procedures required by the statute, does not make the procedures required by the amended zoning ordinance consistent with the statute and does not make a LUBA appeal challenging the zoning ordinance amendment premature. *Rochlin v. Multnomah County*, 35 Or LUBA 333 (1998).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where petitioner fails to assign error to detailed findings explaining why certain acknowledged comprehensive plan provisions constitute "specific policies" that, under ORS 197.835(7)(b), make it unnecessary for the city to demonstrate compliance with statewide planning goals when amending city land use regulations to implement those policies, LUBA will reject an assignment of error alleging the city erred by failing to demonstrate that the new and amended land use regulations comply with the statewide planning goals. *Rogue Valley Assoc. of Realtors v. City of Ashland*, 35 Or LUBA 139 (1998).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Under OAR 660-012-0045(2) local codes must require compliance with ODOT access standards or require that an applicant obtain an access permit from ODOT as a condition of approval. *Dept. of Transportation v. Douglas County*, 34 Or LUBA 608 (1998).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** LUBA's scope of review is not precluded or affected when petitioner assigns error to a plan amendment but fails to assign error to a corresponding zone change. Under ORS 197.175(2)(b) and 197.835(7)(b), zoning ordinances must conform to and comply with the local government's comprehensive plan, therefore a remand on the basis of error respecting the plan amendment would necessarily invalidate the corresponding zone change. *Geaney v. Coos County*, 34 Or LUBA 189 (1998).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where the county's decision to apply overlay zoning directly implements plan policies that were previously determined to comply with the statewide planning goals, and the policies are sufficiently specific to provide the basis for case-by-case evaluation of development applications, ORS 197.835(7)(b) does not require the local government to apply the goals independently to the decision. *Cuddeback v. City of Eugene*, 32 Or LUBA 418 (1997).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Under ORS 197.646(3), there is no grace period prior to required local government compliance with amendments to statutes, rules or Statewide Planning Goals. *DLCD v. Lincoln County*, 31 Or LUBA 240 (1996).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where a local government does not identify specific provisions in its comprehensive plan which it contends provide the basis for challenged land use regulation amendments, under ORS 197.835(5)(b), LUBA is required to reverse or remand the land use regulation amendments if they do not

comply with applicable provisions of the Statewide Planning Goals. *Churchill v. Tillamook County*, 29 Or LUBA 68 (1995).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where amendments to a local government's comprehensive plan or land use regulations do not amend or affect the local government's acknowledged Citizen Involvement Program (CIP), the only way a petitioner can demonstrate a violation of Goal 1 is by demonstrating a failure to comply with the acknowledged CIP. *Churchill v. Tillamook County*, 29 Or LUBA 68 (1995).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where respondents do not identify specific provisions in the applicable comprehensive plan, which they contend provide the basis for challenged zone changes, under ORS 197.825(5)(b) LUBA is required to reverse or remand the zone changes if they do not comply with applicable provisions of the Statewide Planning Goals or their implementing rules. *Opus Development Corp. v. City of Eugene*, 28 Or LUBA 670 (1995).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Legislative changes to acknowledged comprehensive plans or land use regulations that reduce a local government's supply of industrially designated land must be supported by (1) findings demonstrating the remaining industrially designated land is adequate to satisfy the requirements of Goal 9, (2) argument establishing compliance with Goal 9 based on plan provisions, code provisions and evidence in the record, or both. *Opus Development Corp. v. City of Eugene*, 28 Or LUBA 670 (1995).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where the deadlines established by OAR 660-12-055(1) and (2) for adoption of regional and local transportation system plans (TSPs) have not yet passed, and the local government has not yet adopted a TSP, the requirements of OAR 660-12-045(2) and (3) for regulations implementing TSPs are inapplicable to a decision amending the local code. *Melton v. City of Cottage Grove*, 28 Or LUBA 1 (1994).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** That the record shows a code amendment will affect a site that has direct access onto a particular road is a sufficient basis for requiring the local government's determination under OAR 660-12-060(2)(c), that the amendment does not allow land uses resulting in "levels of travel or access \* \* \* inconsistent with the functional classification of a transportation facility," to include consideration of impacts on that road. *Melton v. City of Cottage Grove*, 28 Or LUBA 1 (1994).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where a local government decision amending its land use regulations does not interpret comprehensive plan goals and map designations as being inapplicable to such amendments, but rather explains how the proposed amendment implements certain comprehensive plan goals and is consistent with certain plan map designations, it is clear the governing body interprets those plan goals and map designations as being applicable to the land use regulation amendment. *Melton v. City of Cottage Grove*, 28 Or LUBA 1 (1994).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Post-acknowledgment local code amendments which are not adopted to satisfy periodic review requirements are deemed acknowledged under ORS 197.625, if such amendments are not appealed to LUBA. *Historical Development Advocates v. City of Portland*, 27 Or LUBA 617 (1994).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** ORS 215.503(2)(a), requiring all legislative acts related to comprehensive plans or zoning adopted by a county governing body to be by ordinance, applies to legislative decisions adopting or amending comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances, not to quasi-judicial plan or zone changes. *Sahagian v. Columbia County*, 27 Or LUBA 592 (1994).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** 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).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Providing notice of a post-acknowledgment plan or land use regulation amendment to the Department of Land Conservation and Development under ORS 197.610(1) is inadequate to satisfy a local government's coordination obligations. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. City of North Plains*, 27 Or LUBA 372 (1994).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where petitioners contend a land use regulation amendment fails to comply with the statewide planning goals and implementing rules, and respondents fail to identify specific provisions in the local comprehensive plan that provide the basis for the challenged amendment, LUBA will assume no such provisions exist, and under ORS 197.835(5)(b) LUBA has authority to reverse or remand the land use regulation amendment if it does not comply with the statewide planning goals or implementing rules. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. Marion County*, 27 Or LUBA 303 (1994).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where LUBA has remanded a city decision annexing certain property, a subsequent city decision amending the comprehensive plan and zoning designations for that property, in reliance on the annexation, exceeds the city's authority. *Roloff v. City of Milton-Freewater*, 27 Or LUBA 256 (1994).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Any amendment to an acknowledged land use regulation must comply with all applicable statewide planning goals, if the comprehensive plan "does not contain specific policies or other provisions that provide the basis for the regulation." ORS 197.835(5)(b). *Roloff v. City of Milton-Freewater*, 27 Or LUBA 256 (1994).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Comprehensive plan and zone amendments which *lessen* the impacts or demands that goal, plan and code standards were adopted to address are likely to be consistent with those goal, plan and code standards. *McInnis v. City of Portland*, 27 Or LUBA 1 (1994).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** An amendment to an acknowledged land use regulation must comply with the local government's acknowledged comprehensive plan. ORS 197.175(2)(d); 197.835(5)(a). *Rea v. City of Seaside*, 26 Or LUBA 444 (1994).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Prior to local government action to designate new or existing plans and regulations as its Transportation System Plan (TSP), in the manner required by OAR 660-12-010(2), any challenge to adoption of a plan or regulation amendment based on failure to comply with the TSP requirements of OAR 660-12-010 through 660-12-050 is premature. *Pacific Rivers Council, Inc. v. Lane County*, 26 Or LUBA 323 (1993).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** An ordinance that amends an acknowledged land use regulation is subject to the requirements of ORS 197.610 and 197.615. *Oregon City Leasing, Inc. v. Columbia County*, 26 Or LUBA 203 (1993).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** It is impermissible for a local government to amend a land use ordinance or comprehensive plan provision in the guise of interpreting either. *Murphy Citizens Advisory Comm. v. Josephine County*, 26 Or LUBA 181 (1993).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** A local government cannot simply conclude its failure to list shopping centers as a permitted or conditional use in any existing zoning district creates an ambiguity and, on that basis, determine it will allow shopping centers as a conditional use in a particular zoning district. Such an action constitutes improperly amending the zoning ordinance in the guise of interpreting it. *Loud v. City of Cottage Grove*, 26 Or LUBA 152 (1993).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where a local government's final decision is not to adopt a legislative amendment to its acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use regulations, ORS 197.830(2) and 197.620(1) deny standing to appeal such a final decision to LUBA. *ODOT v. Klamath County*, 25 Or LUBA 761 (1993).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** If a challenged permit decision misconstrues an acknowledged land use regulation, that provides a basis for reversing or remanding the decision under ORS 197.835(6) and (7)(a)(D). It does not mean the challenged decision is a land use regulation amendment. *Heceta Water District v. Lane County*, 24 Or LUBA 402 (1993).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Plan text and map amendments and zoning text and map amendments are not "permits," as that term is defined in ORS 215.402(4). *Leonard v. Union County*, 24 Or LUBA 362 (1992).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** That a local government may have provided inadequate notice of a post-acknowledgment plan and land use regulation amendment to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) will not excuse a person's failure to file a notice of intent to appeal that decision with LUBA within 21 days after the decision became final, where the person was not entitled to receive notice of the challenged decision from DLCD. *Leonard v. Union County*, 24 Or LUBA 362 (1992).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** LUBA does not apply land use decision making approval criteria in the first instance. It is the local government's responsibility to consider the evidentiary record, identify the applicable standards, make the decision in the first instance and explain the basis for its decision in its findings. *ODOT v. City of Waldport*, 24 Or LUBA 344 (1992).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** The applicant for comprehensive plan and zone map amendments has the burden of establishing compliance of the proposed amendments with the applicable approval standards. *Hess v. City of Portland*, 23 Or LUBA 343 (1992).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Under ORS 197.835(5)(b), an amendment to a local government land use regulation is subject to reversal or remand for failure to comply with the Statewide Planning Goals, unless the comprehensive plan contains "specific policies \* \* \* which provide the basis for" the amended regulation. *Ramsey v. City of Portland*, 23 Or LUBA 291 (1992).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** That a previously approved zone change included a condition providing that if a conditional use permit for a mobile home park on the subject property is not obtained, the property would revert to its previous zoning, does not make the merits of the previous rezoning decision subject to LUBA's review in an appeal of the local government decision approving the conditional use permit. *Burghardt v. City of Molalla*, 22 Or LUBA 369 (1991).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** There is nothing unconstitutional about providing only published notice of legislative rezoning. *Sabin v. Clackamas County*, 20 Or LUBA 23 (1990).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** ORS 197.615(2)(a) requires that a local government give notice of decisions amending its acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use regulations to persons who participate during the local proceedings and request such notice in writing. *Club Wholesale v. City of Salem*, 19 Or LUBA 576 (1990).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where a local government has no rules establishing specific procedures or forms for persons participating in post-acknowledgment plan and land use regulation amendment proceedings to utilize in making a written request for notice under ORS 197.615(2)(a)(B), and has no rules establishing to whom requests for such notice must be directed, a request for a copy of the city's final *decision* directed to the city attorney is sufficient to satisfy ORS 197.615(2)(a)(B). *Club Wholesale v. City of Salem*, 19 Or LUBA 576 (1990).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** Where a local government provides a party with a copy of the decision amending its comprehensive plan and land use regulations, but fails to advise the party of the date the challenged decision became final or of the requirements for appealing the decision to LUBA, the notice requirements of ORS 197.615(2)(b)(B) and (D), applicable to post-acknowledgment plan and land use regulation amendments, are not satisfied. *Club Wholesale v. City of Salem*, 19 Or LUBA 576 (1990).

**30.2.1 Zoning Ordinances – Amendment – Generally.** While a decision to approve a zone change does not approve a "permit," within the meaning of ORS 227.160(2), a decision that approves both a variance and a minor partition does approve a "permit." *Harvard Medical Park, Ltd. v. City of Roseburg*, 19 Or LUBA 555 (1990).