

**6.1 Goal 2 - Land Use Planning - Generally.** Although Goal 2 requires that “ultimate policy choices” be included in the comprehensive plan, Goal 2 does not dictate the manner in which a local government must make its ultimate policy choices or the form in which the city must express ultimate policy choices. *Home Builders Assoc. v. City of Eugene*, 52 Or LUBA 341 (2006).

**6.1 Goal 2 - Land Use Planning - Generally.** Although the use of different planning periods in different regional planning documents might constitute an internal conflict that would violate the Goal 2 (Land Use Planning) internal plan consistency requirement, the statewide planning goals do not mandate identical planning periods in all planning documents in all circumstances and it is petitioners’ obligation to demonstrate that the use of different planning periods in the particular planning documents constitutes a conflict that violates Goal 2. *Home Builders Assoc. v. City of Springfield*, 50 Or LUBA 134 (2005).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** A city may rely on a recent buildable lands inventory (BLI) that is a completed final document in demonstrating that a proposed transportation project will not result in a deficiency of buildable land under Goal 10 (Housing), even if that BLI has not yet been incorporated into the comprehensive plan. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. City of Dundee*, 49 Or LUBA 601 (2005).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** When a city’s population passes 2,500, more types of needed housing must be addressed, but the city does not have to amend its housing inventory before it can adopt any land use decision that will affect housing. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. City of Dundee*, 49 Or LUBA 601 (2005).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** A city’s decision to rezone land to allow for future residential development notwithstanding the existence of an airport overlay zone on that property that currently prohibits residential uses does not violate Goal 2’s requirement that land use regulations be consistent. *Holcombe v. City of Florence*, 45 Or LUBA 59 (2003).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** A city’s finding that additional residential land is needed to accommodate anticipated population growth is not inconsistent with a 1997 buildable lands inventory that sufficient residential land is available, where (1) a 2000 comprehensive plan indicates that during the late 1990s, there was a significant and unanticipated population increase that was not reflected in the 1997 buildable lands inventory, and (2) the 2000 comprehensive plan includes policies that allow for the designation of additional residential land to address housing needs resulting from that unanticipated growth. *Holcombe v. City of Florence*, 45 Or LUBA 59 (2003).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** Neither Goal 10 nor Goal 14 require a finding of “demonstrated need” for additional residential land within the meaning of Goal 2, Part II or Goal 14, factors 1 and 2 before the city may amend its comprehensive plan map to allow property to be zoned for residential rather than industrial uses. *Holcombe v. City of Florence*, 45 Or LUBA 59 (2003).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** LUBA does not have jurisdiction to review a regional transportation plan to determine whether it is consistent with a regional framework plan consistency requirement, where such consistency is also required by Goal 2 and LCDC has jurisdiction to review the regional framework plan and regional transportation plan for compliance with Goal 2. *Citizens Against Irresponsible Growth v. Metro*, 40 Or LUBA 426 (2001).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** A local government must rely on the housing inventory contained in its acknowledged comprehensive plan to determine whether rezoning property from multi-family residential to commercial use will cause the local government's housing inventory to violate Goal 10. *Craig Realty Group v. City of Woodburn*, 39 Or LUBA 384 (2001).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** Metro's Regional Framework Plan, a master plan that incorporates and coordinates Metro's various functional plans, is a planning document of the type contemplated by Goal 2 that Metro must rely upon in making its required need determination for expanding the urban growth boundary, even though the 1997 population and demand figures in the plan do not reflect subsequent updates. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. Metro*, 38 Or LUBA 565 (2000).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** A demonstration of need for a UGB amendment must be based upon and consistent with the local government's planning documents adopted pursuant to the Goal 2-mandated planning process. In order to amend the UGB based on different population and capacity projections than those in the local government's comprehensive plan, the local government must amend the plan to include those different projections. *Residents of Rosemont v. Metro*, 38 Or LUBA 199 (2000).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** Neither Goal 2 nor ORS 197.175(2) require that zoning ordinance amendments that are necessary to implement a comprehensive plan map amendment be adopted at the same time as the plan amendment. *Neighbors for Livability v. City of Beaverton*, 37 Or LUBA 408 (1999).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** Findings that express confidence that particular existing zoning districts could be applied to implement a conditional plan map amendment are legally irrelevant, where the decision to amend the zoning map to implement the new plan map designation is deferred to a later date. *Neighbors for Livability v. City of Beaverton*, 37 Or LUBA 408 (1999).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** The lack of an available implementing zoning district at the time a conditional plan map amendment is adopted does not provide a basis for reversal or remand. In that event, at the time the city amends its zoning map to implement the conditional plan map amendment, it will be required to (1) adopt a new implementing zoning district or amend an existing zoning district so that it could be applied, or (2) adopt further plan map amendments that may be required to allow adoption of an implementing zoning district. *Neighbors for Livability v. City of Beaverton*, 37 Or LUBA 408 (1999).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** Goal 2 does not forbid a comprehensive plan map amendment that will revert in two years to the previously existing acknowledged plan map designations, under specified conditions. *Neighbors for Livability v. City of Beaverton*, 37 Or LUBA 408 (1999).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** Where a comprehensive plan map amendment adopts a plan map designation that authorizes several zoning districts, LUBA will assume the city will later apply the zoning districts that will comply with housing goals, rather than zoning districts that might violate those housing goals. If inappropriate zoning districts are applied later, the decisions adopting those zoning districts can be corrected through an appeal of those zoning map decisions. *Neighbors for Livability v. City of Beaverton*, 37 Or LUBA 408 (1999).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** A local government does not violate the Goal 2 consistency requirement by using updated population projections instead of population projections in its comprehensive plan to determine the size of the urban land need under the urban reserve rule, OAR 660-021-0030, where the two projections serve different purposes and use of the updated projections does not undermine or conflict with the comprehensive plan or implementing regulations. *D.S. Parklane Development, Inc. v. Metro*, 35 Or LUBA 516 (1999).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** In reviewing a county's legislative comprehensive plan amendment, LUBA does not require detailed findings, but Goal 2 requires a local government to explain why the amendment complies with applicable Statewide Planning Goals. The required explanation can appear in findings, in the record or in the brief the local government files with LUBA. *Valerio v. Union County*, 33 Or LUBA 604 (1997).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** A city violates Goal 2 when it adopts a temporary land use regulation without following the hearing and opportunity for review and comment requirements of Goal 2. *Western PCS, Inc. v. City of Lake Oswego*, 33 Or LUBA 369 (1997).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** Statewide Planning Goal "guidelines" are simply suggested approaches that local governments may use in achieving compliance with the goals; they are not requirements with which local governments must comply. ORS 197.015(9); Goal 2, Part III. *Churchill v. Tillamook County*, 29 Or LUBA 68 (1995).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** The Goal 2 requirement for "ultimate policy choices" does not mean local governments cannot adopt ambiguous or subjective development standards or complex development review processes. Where LCDC interprets a particular Statewide Planning Goal to require that certain uses be subject only to clear and objective standards, it says so in an implementing rule. *Opus Development Corp. v. City of Eugene*, 28 Or LUBA 670 (1995).

**6.1 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Generally.** Where the only inventory of historic structures maintained by a city has not been adopted as part of the city's acknowledged comprehensive plan, a post-acknowledgment decision not to designate an inventoried building as a historical landmark is not a de facto post-acknowledgment plan amendment, even though the decision may ultimately allow the building to be demolished. *Historical Development Advocates v. City of Portland*, 27 Or LUBA 617 (1994).