

6.4 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Alternative Courses of Action. Evidence that an alternative site zoned for residential use is needed to satisfy a shortfall in residential lands, and is adjacent to high-density residential development, is sufficient to demonstrate that the alternative site cannot “reasonably accommodate” a proposed need for industrial land, for purposes of OAR 660-004-0010(1)(c)(B)(ii). *Alliance for Responsible Land Use v. Deschutes Cty.*, 40 Or LUBA 304 (2001).

6.4 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Alternative Courses of Action. Land owned by the federal government and not subject to local zoning and planning need not be considered as an alternative site to proposed industrial development on resource land, for purposes of OAR 660-004-0010(1)(c)(B)(ii). The rule does not require the local government to consider the speculative possibility that federal land might someday be exchanged or otherwise become subject to the local government’s zoning and planning jurisdiction. *Alliance for Responsible Land Use v. Deschutes Cty.*, 40 Or LUBA 304 (2001).

6.4 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Alternative Courses of Action. Evidence that an alternative site (1) is needed to satisfy a city’s identified need for future residential lands, (2) is surrounded by residential uses, (3) does not have adequate access for industrial uses, and (4) is located far from existing industrial uses, is sufficient to demonstrate that the alternative site cannot “reasonably accommodate” an identified need for industrial land, for purposes of OAR 660-004-0010(1)(c)(B)(ii). *Alliance for Responsible Land Use v. Deschutes Cty.*, 40 Or LUBA 304 (2001).

6.4 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Alternative Courses of Action. Findings that other resource lands that are potential candidates for inclusion in the UGB are better or more productive resource lands than the subject property, and therefore the environmental, social, energy, and economic (ESEE) consequences of urbanizing other resource lands would be more adverse than urbanizing the subject property, are adequate for purposes of OAR 660-004-0010(1)(c)(B)(iii). Such findings need not specifically identify and discuss each ESEE consequence with respect to each alternative site, absent issues raised below that would require more detailed discussion. *Alliance for Responsible Land Use v. Deschutes Cty.*, 40 Or LUBA 304 (2001).

6.4 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Alternative Courses of Action. It is not inconsistent for findings to reject alternative sites under OAR 660-004-0010(1)(c)(B)(ii) because proposed industrial uses would conflict with surrounding high-density residential uses, while concluding under OAR 660-004-0010(1)(c)(B)(iv) that, as limited by conditions of approval, industrial use of the subject property is compatible with rural residential uses that border the subject property on one side. *Alliance for Responsible Land Use v. Deschutes Cty.*, 40 Or LUBA 304 (2001).

6.4 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Alternative Courses of Action. The requirement that a proposed development of resource land be compatible with adjacent uses under OAR 660-004-0010(1)(c)(B)(iv) does not require that all conflicts or adverse impacts be eliminated. *Alliance for Responsible Land Use v. Deschutes Cty.*, 40 Or LUBA 304 (2001).

6.4 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Alternative Courses of Action. The impracticability standard of the Metro Code (MC) for locational amendments to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) performs a limited version of the functional role that Goal 14, factor 6, and Goal 2, Part II(c)(2) play in the context of more comprehensive UGB amendments: ensuring that agricultural land is included in the UGB only when nonagricultural lands cannot reasonably accommodate the proposed use. Because the MC must be consistent with Goals 2 and 14, the decision is not entitled to deference under ORS 197.829(1). *Malinowski Farm v. Metro*, 38 Or LUBA 633 (2000).

6.4 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Alternative Courses of Action. “Practicable” has two distinct connotations: (1) technical possibility; and (2) prudential balancing of costs and other relevant considerations. An alternative is impracticable where it is either technically infeasible or, based on all relevant considerations, including consideration of cost, it would not be a feasible alternative. *Malinowski Farm v. Metro*, 38 Or LUBA 633 (2000).

6.4 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Alternative Courses of Action. The present development intentions of current owners are not determinative as to whether undeveloped lands may require urban services in the near future. A local government may assume that continued resource use will render near term urbanization of property within the urban growth boundary impracticable, even if the current owners of urbanizable land testify that they do not intend to develop their property for urban uses anytime soon. *Malinowski Farm v. Metro*, 38 Or LUBA 633 (2000).

6.4 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Alternative Courses of Action. In conducting the alternative site analysis required to include lower priority resource lands in the UGB under Goal 2, Part II and ORS 197.298(3)(a), the relevant question is whether higher priority exception lands can “reasonably accommodate” the identified need, not whether such exception lands can satisfy that need as well as or better than resource lands. Findings that, due to parcelization and existing development patterns, exception lands cannot accommodate as much or as dense residential development per acre as resource lands are not sufficient to establish that exception lands cannot “reasonably accommodate” that residential development. *Residents of Rosemont v. Metro*, 38 Or LUBA 199 (2000).

6.4 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Alternative Courses of Action. In determining whether land is suitable for inclusion in urban reserves, OAR 660-021-0030(2) requires that, prior to including any lower priority land in urban reserves pursuant to OAR 660-021-0030(4), the local government must conduct an alternative sites analysis sufficient to demonstrate that nonresource lands cannot reasonably accommodate the need that justifies the inclusion of land under OAR 660-021-0030(4). *D.S. Parklane Development, Inc. v. Metro*, 35 Or LUBA 516 (1999).