

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Failure to meet the preservation requirement of ORS 197.763(1) and ORS 197.835(3) and the exhaustion requirement of ORS 197.825(2)(a) and *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003), rev den, 336 Or 615 (2004), removes issues from the scope of LUBA’s review; it does not deprive LUBA of jurisdiction to review final land use decisions. *Nehmzow v. Deschutes County*, 81 Or LUBA 571 (2020).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Where a governing body concludes that a proposed hotel complies with a comprehensive plan provision requiring that such proposals have “no adverse impact” on the function of a nearby wildlife refuge, arguments at LUBA that the governing body improperly focused on impacts related to the operation of the hotel and did not consider impacts associated with demolition of an existing motel and construction of the new hotel provide no basis for reversal or remand where the petitioner did not clarify why demolition and construction were relevant or specify the adverse impacts of concern in their local appeal statement. *Oregon Coast Alliance v. City of Bandon*, 81 Or LUBA 285 (2020).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Where a petitioner is the prevailing party before an initial local decision-maker, *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 510, 79 P3d 382 (2003), does not compel the petitioner to file contingent or precautionary local appeals in order to preserve issues for LUBA’s review in the event that the final local decision-maker reverses the initial decision. *ODFW v. Lake County*, 81 Or LUBA 300 (2020).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Where the petitioner’s local appeal statement did not address an access easement and did not address, either by citation or reference to the operative language, a local code provision at all but, rather, included general statements regarding the petitioner’s concern with the increased traffic that a development would create, the principle of exhaustion-waiver articulated in *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003), rev den, 336 Or 615 (2004), precludes petitioner from raising the issues raised in those assignments of error at LUBA. *Sanga v. City of Eugene*, 81 Or LUBA 236 (2020).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** An argument below that a proposed building was similar to an industrial building and an inappropriate size, and that the area would need to be rezoned, does not fairly raise any issue regarding whether the proposed use meets the definition of “residential facility” in the local code for purposes of ORS 197.763(1) and ORS 197.835(3). *Eagle-Eye v. City of Veneta*, 81 Or LUBA 1 (2020).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Where the staff reports that were available to the public accepted the applicant’s premise that a proposed building is a “residential facility,” as defined in the local code, and where the petitioners do not explain why they could not have raised the issue of whether the proposed building is a “residential facility” prior to the close of the initial evidentiary hearing, LUBA will refuse to allow that issue to be raised on appeal under ORS 197.835(4)(a), even assuming that the definitions section of the

local code was an applicable approval criterion that the local government should have, but did not, identify in its notices. *Eagle-Eye v. City of Veneta*, 81 Or LUBA 1 (2020).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** The issue that proposed dwellings do not qualify for historic preservation incentives on the merits is a different issue than whether the proposed dwellings are even eligible for consideration for an award of historic preservation incentives. And raising the first issue does not give fair notice to decision makers regarding a need to address the second issue. *Friends of Canemah v. City of Oregon City*, 77 Or LUBA 434 (2018).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Arguments that a city erred by failing to adopt findings that address particular spacing and orientation guidelines provide no basis for remand, where petitioners failed to raise any issue concerning those guidelines before the close of the evidentiary record and failed to identify those guidelines in their local notice of appeal. *Friends of Canemah v. City of Oregon City*, 77 Or LUBA 434 (2018).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Where a petitioner appeals two local decisions to the planning commission, but the planning commission decision addresses only one decision, and on appeal of the planning commission decision to the governing body, the petitioner fails to specify any issues regarding the second decision, the petitioner’s failure to do so means that all issues regarding the second decision are beyond LUBA’s scope of review under the reasoning in *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003). *Eng v. Wallowa County*, 76 Or LUBA 432 (2017).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Under *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003), *rev den* 336 Or 615, 90 P3d 626 (2004), a petitioner must specify the issues it wishes to raise in a local notice of appeal to preserve those issues for an appeal to LUBA if land use regulations require that a notice of local appeal set out the issues on appeal. If the relevant local land use regulations do not impose that requirement, the *Miles* requirement to specify issues to preserve them for review at LUBA does not apply. *Rawson v. Hood River County*, 75 Or LUBA 200 (2017).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** The exhaustion/waiver principle articulated in *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500 (2003), requires the petitioner to identify issues in the local appeal to the local appeal body, regardless of whether the appeal body conducts a hearing or whether the local appeal proceeding is on the record or *de novo*. *Central Oregon Landwatch v. Deschutes County*, 74 Or LUBA 540 (2016).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Where the local appeal statement raises no issues regarding whether a particular zoning diagram should be considered in determining whether proposed zoning is consistent with the comprehensive plan map, the issue is waived under the exhaustion/waiver principle articulated in *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500 (2003). *Laurel Hill Valley Citizens v. City of Eugene*, 73 Or LUBA 140 (2016).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** An issue that was raised in a timely filed local appeal is not waived under the exhaustion/waiver principle of *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500 (2003), notwithstanding that the decision-maker approved a version of the local appeal statement in which that issue was redacted, where the decision-maker also accepted a revised version that included the issue, with the apparent intent of recognizing that the issue had been preserved. *Laurel Hill Valley Citizens v. City of Eugene*, 73 Or LUBA 140 (2016).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Where a local appeal statement states issues only in general terms, such as the appealed decision failed to address all applicable standards, requiring the local appeal body and other parties to speculate which standards the appellant believes were not addressed, the local appeal has failed to exhaust or preserve any issues for purposes of appeal to LUBA, under *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 506-07, 79 P3d 382 (2003). *Dion v. Baker County*, 72 Or LUBA 307 (2015).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** While the issues following a LUBA on remand are often fewer and smaller in scope, in order to exhaust or preserve issues for LUBA’s review under the reasoning in *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 506-07, 79 P3d 382 (2003), local appeals of decisions on remand must still identify the issues for local appeal with sufficient specificity that the local government and other parties have reasonable notice of those aspects of the underlying decision on remand the local appellant wishes to challenge. *Dion v. Baker County*, 72 Or LUBA 307 (2015).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** A petitioner does not waive her right to assign error to a hearings officer’s conclusion that a structure qualifies as a nonconforming use, and the hearings officer’s approval of an alteration of that nonconforming use, where the applicant did not apply for verification of a nonconforming use or an alteration of a nonconforming use and the notices of hearing did not identify the county’s nonconforming use regulations as applicable criteria for the decision. *Kaimanu v. Washington County*, 70 Or LUBA 217 (2014).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Where an “Article” of the community development code includes 373 single spaced pages of land use regulations made up of 44 separate sections devoted to a variety of topics, a notice of hearing that identifies that article of the community development code as an applicable standard is not sufficient, under ORS 197.763(3), to provide notice of an eight-page section of that article devoted to nonconforming uses. *Kaimanu v. Washington County*, 70 Or LUBA 217 (2014).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Where a cross petition for review challenges the local government’s application of a standard to a proposal for needed housing on the basis that the city may not apply the standard because it is not a “clear and objective standard” within the meaning of ORS 197.307(4), the cross petition for review may assign error to the city’s application of the standard only if the issue was raised in the applicant’s appeal statement appealing the hearings officer’s decision to the planning commission, under ORS 197.825(2)(a) and the reasoning in *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003). *SE Neighbors Neighborhood Assoc. v. City of Eugene*, 68 Or LUBA 51 (2013).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** ORS 197.825(2)(a) and *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003), do not limit the issues before LUBA to those issues specified in the local appeal to the governing body, where the local government’s appeal regulations do not require specification or limitation of issues for that type of local appeal, and the governing body allowed and considered all issues raised by any party during the appeal proceeding. *White v. Lane County*, 68 Or LUBA 423 (2013).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** To preserve the issue of whether the statewide planning goals apply to a rezoning decision and thus whether notice of hearing must be provided to DLCDD under ORS 197.610, the issue must be raised during the proceedings below to avoid waiver under ORS 197.763(1) and, additionally, specified in the local notice of appeal to avoid waiver under the exhaustion/waiver principle in *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500 (2003). *Conte v. City of Eugene*, 65 Or LUBA 326 (2012).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** On appeal of a planning commission decision, the issue of the city’s failure to impose a condition is waived under the reasoning in *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500 (2003), where the underlying hearings official’s decision also failed to impose the disputed condition, and petitioner did not specify that failure as a ground for appeal in the local notice of appeal to the planning commission. *Conte v. City of Eugene*, 65 Or LUBA 326 (2012).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** The principle of exhaustion/waiver set out in *Miles v. v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003), does not require a party that *prevailed* before the planning commission to appeal the planning commission decision to the governing body, in order to preserve or exhaust issues that the planning commission did not address and could not have been raised in the opposing party’s local appeal of the planning commission decision. *Olstedt v. Clatsop County*, 62 Or LUBA 131 (2010).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Where the local notice of appeal fails to identify any issue regarding whether a proposed farm relative dwelling is “necessary,” that issue cannot be raised on appeal to LUBA, pursuant to ORS 197.825(2)(a) and *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003). *Wellet v. Douglas County*, 62 Or LUBA 372 (2010).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** The main purpose of the exhaustion/waiver doctrine articulated in *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003) is to ensure that the final decision maker has the initial opportunity to address issues that may become the basis for appeal to LUBA. *Miles* is not concerned that findings are adopted addressing approval criteria, and the fact that the final decision includes a finding of compliance with an approval criterion is not sufficient to allow the petitioner to raise the issue of compliance with that criterion to LUBA, if that issue was not identified in the local notice of appeal. *Wellet v. Douglas County*, 62 Or LUBA 372 (2010).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** A statement in the local notice of appeal that the planning commission “has not followed the law” is insufficient to identify any particular issue for purposes of the exhaustion/waiver doctrine articulated in *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003). *Wellet v. Douglas County*, 62 Or LUBA 372 (2010).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Even assuming LUBA has authority to reject an otherwise meritorious exhaustion/waiver challenge based on the argument that the county is equitably estopped from asserting exhaustion/waiver due to alleged erroneous advice from county planning staff in accepting the local notice of appeal, the argument fails where based on petitioners’ affidavits the best that can be said with confidence is that there was mutual misunderstanding and miscommunication regarding the sufficiency of the local notice of appeal and what issues petitioners wished to raise therein. *Wellet v. Douglas County*, 62 Or LUBA 372 (2010).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** A petitioner is not precluded by *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003), and ORS 197.825(2) from raising issues at LUBA merely because he failed to list local appeal issues in the proper location on a local appeal form, when the local code does not specify that such failure is a jurisdictional defect or results in a waiver of the right to raise those issues at LUBA. *Zeitoun v. Yamhill County*, 60 Or LUBA 111 (2009).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Issues raised before LUBA are waived under *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 283 (2003), where a county code requires that the local notice of appeal specify the grounds for appeal, and the local notice of appeal makes no mention of the issues that petitioner wishes to raise before LUBA. *Sommer v. Douglas County*, 60 Or LUBA 32 (2009).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** An assertion in the local notice of appeal that the proposal is inconsistent with Goals 16 and 17, with reference to the appellant’s written testimony on those issues that was submitted to the planning commission, is sufficient to inform the governing body and other participants of the specific grounds the appellant wishes to raise on appeal, and avoid waiver of those issues under the reasoning in *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 283 (2003). *Sommer v. Douglas County*, 60 Or LUBA 32 (2009).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** When a petitioner was required to raise local appeal issues below pursuant to *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003), raising the issue that approval of a nonfarm dwelling would significantly increase the cost of farming practices is not sufficient to raise any issue concerning impacts on the stability of the overall land use pattern, and the petitioner may not raise the stability standard at LUBA. *Zeitoun v. Yamhill County*, 60 Or LUBA 111 (2009).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Raising in the local notice of appeal the issue of compliance with OAR 660-012-0065(3)(a) and (b) regarding transportation improvements that are allowed or conditionally allowed under certain

statutes or rules is not sufficient to raise the issue of compliance with 660-012-0065(3)(o) regarding other transportation facilities, services, or improvements that serve local travel needs. Therefore, the issue may not be raised at LUBA. *Sepulvado v. Douglas County*, 60 Or LUBA 364 (2010).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Where a local code requires a notice of review to contain “the specific grounds relied on in the petition request for review,” and petitioners challenged a planning commission decision on the grounds that the county failed to identify other available industrially zoned properties throughout the county, petitioners may not on appeal to LUBA challenge the decision on different grounds that the county did not properly identify available industrially zoned lands within the specific rural community in which the applicant proposes the plan amendment. *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 506-507, 79 P3d 382 (2003). *Kinnett v. Douglas County*, 59 Or LUBA 293 (2009).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003), did not overrule or modify *Colwell v. Washington County*, 79 Or App 82, 91, 718 P2d 747 (1986), and similar cases holding that the ORS 197.825(2)(a) exhaustion requirement does not require a petitioner to file a local appeal of a lower body’s initial comprehensive plan amendment decision to the governing body, because applicable statutes require the governing body to conduct a hearing on the amendment in any event. *Wetherell v. Douglas County*, 58 Or LUBA 638 (2009).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Notwithstanding that a county’s code provides that the planning commission’s decision on a comprehensive plan amendment is “final” unless a local appeal is filed, under ORS 215.060 the county governing body must hold a public hearing on the plan amendment and take final action, and therefore the planning commission’s initial decision on the plan amendment is not “final” in any meaningful sense. *Wetherell v. Douglas County*, 58 Or LUBA 638 (2009).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Even where a county’s code provides for local appeal as one of three possible paths by which a governing body will review the planning commission’s initial decision on a comprehensive plan amendment, because ORS 215.060 requires the governing body to hold a public hearing on a plan amendment at which testimony and issues can be raised, in that circumstance a petitioner before LUBA is not required to file a local appeal and specify issues in a notice of local appeal in order to exhaust administrative remedies or avoid waiver under *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 382 (2003). *Wetherell v. Douglas County*, 58 Or LUBA 638 (2009).

**28.6.4 LUBA Scope of Review – Waiver of Issues – Failure to Raise in Local Appeal.** Even if the reasoning in *Miles v. City of Florence*, 190 Or App 500, 79 P3d 283 (2003), extends to the proceedings on remand and requires the petitioner to raise below on remand the issues that are presented to LUBA on remand, that requirement is satisfied where the issues before LUBA are the same issues in the first appeal and on remand the petitioner submitted a letter to the city renewing the arguments made in the first appeal. *Coquille Citizens for Resp. Growth v. City of Coquille*, 55 Or LUBA 155 (2007).