

6.3.6 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Exceptions/ Exception Rule – Changes to. While OAR 660-004-0018(4) requires that local governments adopt a new reasons exception when changing the types or intensities of uses within an area subject to a reasons exception, a decision that simply corrects the official zoning map to accurately reflect prior zoning amendments does not change the types or intensities of uses allowed on the property. *Sullivan v. Polk County*, 51 Or LUBA 107 (2006).

6.3.6 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Exceptions/ Exception Rule – Changes to. Simply because OAR 660-004-0018(1) has clarified since 1986 that an exception to one goal does not relieve a local government from other goal requirements does not mean that the converse was true prior to adoption of the rule. Rezoning property located in a Goal 3 exception area adjacent to a UGB requires consideration of Goal 14, even if OAR 660-004-0018(1) was not applicable at the time the Goal 3 exception was taken. *Friends of Yamhill County v. Yamhill County*, 47 Or LUBA 160 (2004).

6.3.6 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Exceptions/ Exception Rule – Changes to. A finding that recreational zoning may be applied to land that is subject to a physically developed exception for industrial uses because some of the uses allowed in an industrial zone may also be allowed in a recreation zone is not responsive to OAR 660-004-0018(2)(a), which requires that the zoning designation must “limit uses, density and public facilities and services to those which are the same as the *existing* land uses on the exception site.” *Doty v. Coos County*, 42 Or LUBA 103.

6.3.6 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Exceptions/ Exception Rule – Changes to. Findings that conclude that a proposed recreational zoning designation will not permit urban uses on rural land because (1) the anticipated use of the property is allowed in the county’s recreation zone, which is acknowledged as a rural zone, and (2) density is limited to the land’s “carrying capacity,” are inadequate to demonstrate compliance with OAR 660-004-0018(2)(b)(A) because acknowledgement of a zone as being generally in compliance with Goal 14 does not mean that all uses that may be approved under that zone are necessarily rural in nature. *Doty v. Coos County*, 42 Or LUBA 103.

6.3.6 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Exceptions/ Exception Rule – Changes to. Findings that assume that a proposed recreation use will be less intensive than the former industrial uses but do not address the diverse impacts that could result from recreational use of the property are inadequate to satisfy OAR 660-004-0018(2)(b)(B) and (C) because the uses are dissimilar and result in different impacts on adjacent and nearby resource land. *Doty v. Coos County*, 42 Or LUBA 103.

6.3.6 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Exceptions/ Exception Rule – Changes to. Whether uses or zones are "identified and authorized by specific related policies" in the local government’s plan within the meaning of OAR 660-004-0018, and thus whether a new exception is necessary to expand uses allowed in an exception zone, depends on whether the policy refers to specific uses or zones in relation to the subject property. *Geaney v. Coos County*, 34 Or LUBA 189 (1998).

6.3.6 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Exceptions/ Exception Rule – Changes to. When a change in the type or intensity of an existing use is proposed for an exception area, the county must (1) make findings showing either that Goal 14 does not apply or the proposal complies with an existing Goal 14 exception; or (2) take a new Goal 14 exception. *Leathers v. Marion County*, 31 Or LUBA 220 (1996).