29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where comprehensive plan provisions provide, using mandatory language, that certain resource plan and zoning designations shall be used to conserve or protect fish and wildlife habitat from conflicting uses and that land use proposals that have undesirable impacts on those resources shall be reviewed during the plan and zone amendment processes, a local governing body errs in interpreting those provisions to conclude that it may apply nonresource plan and zoning designations to property mapped as fish and wildlife habitat and that any impacts may be evaluated and, if necessary, mitigated during subsequent review of development proposals. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. Linn County*, 81 Or LUBA 338 (2020).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where comprehensive plan and local code provisions provide that the comprehensive plan may be amended only when "[t]here is a demonstrated public need for the change," the governing body may rely on a 12-acre deficit of High Density Residential (HDR) land identified in its acknowledged Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI) to conclude that that there is a "public need" to approve an application to redesignate six acres of land to HDR, even where, subsequent to the adoption and acknowledgment of its BLI, the governing body has approved applications to rezone other lands, totaling 92 acres, to HDR. *Carson Property LUBA Appeal, Inc. v. City of Corvallis*, 81 Or LUBA 175 (2020).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where comprehensive plan and local code provisions provide that the comprehensive plan may be amended only when "[t]here is a demonstrated public need for the change," and where another comprehensive plan provision states that the desired land use pattern in the urban growth boundary includes "[n]eighborhoods with a mix of uses, diversity of housing types, pedestrian scale, a defined center and shared public areas," the governing body does not err in concluding that that there is a "public need" to redesignate the subject property to High Density Residential (HDR) because the property is in a neighborhood of low- and medium-density housing and because introducing HDR zoning into the area will allow higher-density housing in a new location within the jurisdiction and potentially increase housing supply and diversity, even where the jurisdiction's acknowledged Buildable Lands Inventory and other, more recent data indicate that there is no deficit of HDR land in the jurisdiction. *Carson Property LUBA Appeal, Inc. v. City of Corvallis*, 81 Or LUBA 175 (2020).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Although a city code requires that the city's zoning map, the Metro Plan map and Metro Refinement Plan maps must be consistent, a city does not err by amending its zoning map and the Metro Plan map without adopting a conforming amendment to the Metro Refinement Plan map, where another code section provides that amendments to the Metro Plan map result in automatic conforming changes to the Metro Refinement Plan map by operation of law. *Meisenheimer v. City of Springfield*, 77 Or LUBA 96 (2018).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where the city code initially requires the city to choose from low density residential (LDR), medium density residential (MDR) and high density residential (HDR) plan map designations based on which designation's criteria "clearly apply or predominate," it does not necessarily follow that the LDR

criteria could not predominate simply because three of the four MDR criteria are met and five of the six HDR criteria are met, because the criteria for the three map designations are not mutually exclusive and most or all of the LDR criteria appear to be met. *Meisenheimer v. City of Springfield*, 77 Or LUBA 96 (2018).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A county does not err in approving an application to correct an error in the original the plan and zone map designations of an existing mine from its original "Forest" plan map and zoning designation to Quarry and Mine Operations (QM), where the county's program to achieve Goal 5 is the QM designation and the mine was included on the county's inventory of significant aggregate sites when the initial plan and zone error occurred in 1984. *Landwatch Lane County v. Lane County*, 77 Or LUBA 474 (2018).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Nothing in the definition of "tract" in ORS 197.435(7) or any other statute or rule requires a map that shows in totality the locations of an applicant's land ownership within the county for purposes of satisfying the last sentence of ORS 197.435(7), the destination resort "30% Rule." *Root v. Klamath County*, 68 Or LUBA 124 (2013).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Although amendments to county standards for mapping sites that are eligible for destination resort siting are comprehensive plan amendments, and therefore potentially could result in significant affects on transportation facilities that could implicate OAR 660-012-0060, altering the standards for adding sites to the map in the future has no impact on transportation facilities. It is the future map amendments themselves that might significantly affect a transportation facility and implicate OAR 660-012-0060, and a county must consider OAR 660-012-0060 at the time those comprehensive plan amendments are adopted in the future. *Central Oregon Landwatch v. Deschutes County*, 63 Or LUBA 123 (2011).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where a plan amendment standard requires a finding that the change conforms to "applicable goals and polices" in the comprehensive plan, the city's findings address those plan goals and policies the city deemed "applicable," and on appeal petitioner argues generally that the city failed to address all plan goals and policies but does not identify any "applicable" goals or policies not addressed, LUBA will reject the argument. *Smith v. City of Salem*, 61 Or LUBA 87 (2010).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A code provision requiring that a neighborhood plan "shall be the basis for any neighborhood recommendation" to the city council on a comprehensive plan map amendment may govern the neighborhood association, but is not an approval criterion that the city council is required to address, and the neighborhood association's alleged failure to base its recommendation on the neighborhood plan is not a basis for reversal or remand of the city council's decision. *Smith v. City of Salem*, 61 Or LUBA 87 (2010).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A comprehensive plan provision prohibiting application of a Rural Residential plan designation to land that is

currently designated farm or forest "unless an exception to the applicable Goal 3 or 4 is justified" could be interpreted such that the prohibition does not apply to nonresource land that is not subject to either goal. However, the stronger textual reading is that the qualifier "applicable" simply reflects that the subject property is currently designated under either Goal 3 or Goal 4, whichever is applicable, and an exception to the applicable goal is required in order to redesignate the property to Rural Residential. *Rogue Advocates v. Jackson County*, 60 Or LUBA 392 (2010).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A Metro decision to amend the urban growth boundary to include 308 acres for Industrial development that was based on an assumption that only 120 acres of the 308 acres would be developed for Industrial use likely would provide a basis for the local government to plan all but 120 acres of the 308 acres for non-industrial uses. But where the 120 acres the local government designates for industrial uses include acres that were already within the UGB, the local government's comprehensive plan mapping is inconsistent with Metro's map designation for the 308 acres. *Graser-Lindsey v. City of Oregon City*, 59 Or LUBA 388 (2009).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where Metro has designated 308 acres for industrial development, a city decision to plan only 120 of those acres for industrial development based on a finding that Metro only intended 120 acres to be developed industrially must be remanded where the record does not include substantial evidence that Metro only intended 120 of the 308 acres to be developed industrially. *Graser-Lindsey v. City of Oregon City*, 59 Or LUBA 388 (2009).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. LUBA will remand a decision redesignating non-resource land to rural residential, where it is unclear whether the comprehensive plan limits the rural residential plan designation to lands for which an exception to resource goals is taken, the plan includes a different designation, Rural Use, that is specifically intended for nonresource lands, and the county's findings do not address the issue or provide an interpretation of the relevant plan provisions. *Lofgren v. Jackson County*, 55 Or LUBA 126 (2007).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A plan amendment provision stating that the applicant for an amendment must state "compelling reasons" why the amendment should be considered at this time, rather than as part of periodic review, is not an approval criterion requiring a particular finding. To the extent a finding is required, where the petitioner does not dispute that the application stated a compelling reason to proceed immediately, the failure to adopt a finding to that effect is harmless error. *Oregon Shores Cons. Coalition v. Lane County*, 52 Or LUBA 471 (2006).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. LUBA will affirm a governing body's interpretation of a plan provision allowing plan amendments when "necessary to correct an identified error in application of the plan," to include not only instances where the plan was erroneous when first implemented, but also instances where circumstances have changed over time. *Oregon Shores Cons. Coalition v. Lane County*, 52 Or LUBA 471 (2006).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A plan amendment standard requiring consideration of specified "compatibility factors" does not require

the local government to assume that the property will be developed with the most intensive use that could theoretically be approved on the property, given that steep slopes and other development limitations make it highly unlikely that the most intensive use could be developed on the property. *Mason v. City of Corvallis*, 49 Or LUBA 199 (2005).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A post-acknowledgement plan amendment that redesignates more than two acres for commercial use must follow one of the three courses of action set out at OAR 660-009-0010(4). Although one of those permissible courses of action is to demonstrate that the post-acknowledgement plan amendment is consistent with the part of the acknowledged comprehensive plan that was adopted to implement the Goal 9 administrative rule, where the proposed action appears to be inconsistent with implementation strategies in the plan, the city must amend its acknowledged comprehensive plan following the planning requirements of OAR 660-009-0015 through 660-009-0025 and in doing so it must prepare an economic opportunities analysis. *Jaqua v. City of Springfield*, 46 Or LUBA 134 (2004).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A proposal to swap plan designations for two portions of a single parcel does not require separate findings addressing each portion, where the applicable plan amendment criteria do not necessarily require separate findings, and petitioner does not identify any meaningful difference between the two areas that would require separate consideration. *Excelsior Investment Co. v. City of Medford*, 44 Or LUBA 553 (2003).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Absent some requirement to the contrary, a local government need not choose the most minimal means to accomplish its objective, and may choose to amend the comprehensive plan map and zoning map to allow a proposed use, notwithstanding that a zoning map amendment alone might accomplish the same objective. *Excelsior Investment Co. v. City of Medford*, 44 Or LUBA 553 (2003).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards In determining whether there is an adequate supply of commercial land within the city, a city does not err in failing to consider the supply of land outside the city but within the urban growth boundary that might be designated for commercial uses once annexed, where the city's comprehensive plan does not designate any lands outside the city but within the UGB for commercial uses. *Walker v. City of Dayton*, 44 Or LUBA 766 (2003).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards In determining whether the comprehensive plan map should be amended to provide for additional land designated for residential use, the relative scarcity of land zoned under one of three residential zoning districts in the city is not enough to establish that the supply of land designated on the comprehensive plan map for residential use is insufficient. *Walker v. City of Dayton*, 44 Or LUBA 766 (2003).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards In determining whether the comprehensive plan map should be amended to provide additional land designated for residential use, the city does not err in considering lands outside city limits but within the urban

growth boundary, where the city's comprehensive plan designates much of the area outside city limits but within the UGB for residential uses. *Walker v. City of Dayton*, 44 Or LUBA 766 (2003).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. An application to change a unified comprehensive plan and zoning map does not in itself require a "discretionary approval of a proposed development of land" and is therefore not an application for a "permit" within the meaning of ORS 215.402(4). *Rutigliano v. Jackson County*, 42 Or LUBA 565 (2002).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where a county's legislative decision changes the comprehensive plan designation for a property from Industrial to Primary Agriculture, and the record does not reflect that the county considered other potentially suitable designations or explained why other potentially suitable designations should not be applied, the decision and record are insufficient to demonstrate that applicable criteria were considered. *Manning v. Marion County*, 42 Or LUBA 56 (2002).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. LCDC's 1985 acknowledgement of a county's rural residential zone has the legal effect of establishing that the rural residential zoning district *may* be applied consistent with Goal 14 to rural lands outside a UGB. However, the 1985 acknowledgment does not have the legal effect of establishing that *all* future applications of the zoning district to particular properties, no matter what the circumstances, will necessarily comply with Goal 14. *DLCD v. Klamath County*, 40 Or LUBA 221 (2001).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. The existence of vacant land that is planned and zoned for multi-family residential use does not mean there can be no need for additional multi-family residential designated land, where there is a specific multi-family residential need identified and none of the land that is already designated for multi-family residential use is suitable for that specific need. *Hubenthal v. City of Woodburn*, 39 Or LUBA 20 (2000).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. In determining whether rezoning of land from multi-family to single-family residential uses is consistent with Goal 10 and the city's obligation to provide for multi-family dwellings, the relevant inquiry is not limited by the amount of land designated for multi-family residential uses. The city can take into account multi-family dwellings that have been approved in other zones in determining whether the proposed rezoning is consistent with the city's obligation to provide a sufficient number of multi-family dwellings. *Herman v. City of Lincoln City*, 36 Or LUBA 521 (1999).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Approval standards for approval of "development" do not apply to a legislative amendment of a future streets plan. *Fogarty v. City of Gresham*, 34 Or LUBA 309 (1998).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A local government is not required to select the most favorable or logical future streets plan where the applicable criterion simply requires that the streets plan provide logical extension, continuation and interconnection. *Fogarty v. City of Gresham*, 34 Or LUBA 309 (1998).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A legislative comprehensive plan amendment must comply with the statewide planning goals, and that requirement is not met simply because subsequent development applications would be reviewed pursuant to acknowledged criteria. *Fogarty v. City of Gresham*, 34 Or LUBA 309 (1998).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. An amendment to an acknowledged comprehensive plan must be reviewed for compliance with the statewide planning goals, notwithstanding that the acknowledged plan has an acknowledged process for amending the plan, where the amendment can be reviewed for compliance with the statewide planning goals without necessarily challenging the acknowledged process itself. *Fogarty v. City of Gresham*, 34 Or LUBA 309 (1998).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. In approving comprehensive plan and zoning map amendments, the county's findings must demonstrate that Goal 14 is satisfied without reliance on past practices or on plan and code provisions that are subject to revision during periodic review. *Brown v. Jefferson County*, 33 Or LUBA 418 (1997).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. In approving a comprehensive plan amendment, the county's analysis and findings regarding potential effects of an aggregate operation on surrounding lands are sufficient to support a 1B listing on the county's Goal 5 inventory. Because listing the site as a potential aggregate resource does not actually permit a mining operation, the county is not required to address the requirements of ORS 215.296 as part of its decision. *O'Rourke v. Union County*, 32 Or LUBA 447 (1997).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. The county's approval of a minor amendment to its rural comprehensive plan meets the applicable local code criteria when it sets forth specific reasons why the redesignation of the property as rural residential is "desirable, appropriate and proper." *Johnson v. Lane County*, 31 Or LUBA 454 (1996).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A county cannot rely on findings regarding water quality and quantity on other parcels to satisfy criteria in its comprehensive plan that require a site-specific evaluation of the water supply on the subject parcel, absent a determination that the conditions on surrounding lands can be relied upon to determine the water quality and quantity on the subject parcel. *Doob v. Josephine County*, 31 Or LUBA 275 (1996).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where an ordinance changing the plan and zone designations of the subject property provides the property will revert to its former designations if a final order denying a conditional use permit (CUP) for a mobile home park is issued, the local governing body acts within its interpretive discretion in deciding the contingency is not met when LUBA remands a local government decision approving a CUP for a mobile home park and the local government does not take further action on that application. *Burghardt v. City of Molalla*, 29 Or LUBA 223 (1995).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where petitioner challenges the adequacy of one set of local government findings addressing a particular approval

criterion for a comprehensive plan map change, but does not challenge a different set of local government findings also addressing the same criterion, petitioner's assignment of error will be denied. *Mitchell v. City of Medford*, 29 Or LUBA 158 (1995).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. By definition, all land outside an acknowledged UGB and not the subject of an exception to Goal 14 is "rural" land. When amending its acknowledged comprehensive plan and zone designations for such land, a local government must demonstrate that the new plan and zone designations comply with Goal 14 or adopt an exception to Goal 14. *Churchill v. Tillamook County*, 29 Or LUBA 68 (1995).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. In adopting a quasi-judicial comprehensive plan and land use regulation amendment, a local government is obligated either to demonstrate compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) or, alternatively, establish that the TPR does not apply. *ONRC v. City of Seaside*, 29 Or LUBA 39 (1995).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where a comprehensive plan amendment adopts a map indicating a street may be considered to receive a "Green Street" classification in the future, and future application of the "Green Street" classification will itself require a plan amendment, petitioners' challenge to the plan amendment based on Goal 12 and the Transportation Planning Rule is premature. *Opus Development Corp. v. City of Eugene*, 28 Or LUBA 670 (1995).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. When adopting post-acknowledgment plan and zone map amendments affecting residentially designated land within an urban growth boundary, a local government must demonstrate that it continues to satisfy its Goal 10 obligation to maintain an adequate inventory of buildable lands. *Opus Development Corp. v. City of Eugene*, 28 Or LUBA 670 (1995).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where a local comprehensive plan map amendment standard requires that there be no suitable alternative sites in the "vicinity" of the proposed use, the local governing body may interpret "vicinity" to mean a reasonable area around the site of the proposed use, rather than the entire market area served by the proposed use. *Salem Golf Club v. City of Salem*, 28 Or LUBA 561 (1995).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. When adopting a comprehensive plan map amendment, a city can rely on its acknowledged plan and regulations as providing a sufficient number of large parcels of industrially designated land to comply with a plan policy requiring the designation of a sufficient number of such parcels, where the plan map amendment does not affect the inventory or use of such parcels. *Salem Golf Club v. City of Salem*, 28 Or LUBA 561 (1995).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Goal 9 does not require that a post-acknowledgment plan amendment changing the designation of urban land from Industrial-Commercial to Industrial be supported by a demonstration that the proposed industrial

use of the land is necessary to the local economy or will provide products that existing producers cannot supply. *Salem Golf Club v. City of Salem*, 28 Or LUBA 561 (1995).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A local government decision changing the comprehensive plan and zone designations of land with identified Goal 5 resources, must identify conflicting uses potentially allowable under the proposed new designations. *Welch v. City of Portland*, 28 Or LUBA 439 (1994).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. In determining whether land subject to a proposed comprehensive plan and zone map change is composed of predominantly Class I-IV soils, as required by OAR 660-33-020(1)(a)(A), it is permissible for a local government to examine only the acreage under consideration. *DLCD v. Curry County*, 28 Or LUBA 205 (1994).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. In determining whether land subject to a proposed comprehensive plan and zone map change is (1) suitable for farm use, (2) necessary to permit farm use on other agricultural land, or (3) intermingled with lands of Class I-IV soils; as required by OAR 660-33-020(1)(a)(B) to (C) and (b); a local government's analysis must include all property in common ownership with the subject land. *DLCD v. Curry County*, 28 Or LUBA 205 (1994).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A comprehensive plan policy governing "establish[ment] and change" of an urban growth boundary is not applicable to a local government decision amending the plan and zoning map designations of property that is entirely within the urban growth boundary. *Roloff v. City of Milton-Freewater*, 27 Or LUBA 256 (1994).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A local government can show an amendment to its acknowledged comprehensive plan and zoning maps complies with Goal 12 (Transportation) by establishing either (1) there is a safe and adequate transportation system to serve development under the proposed map designations, or (2) development of the property under the proposed designations will not create greater or different transportation demands and impacts than development under the existing, acknowledged designations. *ODOT v. Clackamas County*, 27 Or LUBA 141 (1994).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where petitioners contend the local government may not rely on particular plan provisions in denying a plan map amendment, but the local government did not rely upon those provisions in denying the requested plan map amendment, petitioners' challenge provides no basis for reversal or remand. *Ericsson v. Washington County*, 26 Or LUBA 169 (1993).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. More than the mere possibility of compliance with applicable standards is required to grant land use approval. However, it does not follow that the possibility that the additional development allowable under a requested comprehensive plan map amendment will violate an applicable standard is insufficient

to provide a basis for denial of the request. It is the applicant's burden to establish compliance with all approval standards. *Ericsson v. Washington County*, 26 Or LUBA 169 (1993).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Under Goals 3 and 4, designation of property as agricultural on a comprehensive plan map does not carry any inference that the land is not also forestland. Therefore, the principle in *Urquhart v. Lane Council of Governments*, 80 Or App 176, 721 P2d 870 (1986), does not preclude application of Goal 4 to a plan map amendment for such property. *Westfair Associates Partnership v. Lane County*, 25 Or LUBA 729 (1993).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where nothing requires a local government to determine whether the subject property is a "legal lot" as a prerequisite to approving a plan amendment and zone change, it is unnecessary for the local government to determine whether the subject property constitutes a lawfully created parcel. *Makepeace v. Josephine County*, 25 Or LUBA 370 (1993).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where an applicable standard requires a determination that a proposed plan amendment complies with the plan, findings that state only that the proposal "appears" to satisfy the plan are inadequate to demonstrate compliance with that standard. *Makepeace v. Josephine County*, 25 Or LUBA 370 (1993).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Comprehensive plan amendments must comply with the statewide planning goals. *Neuharth v. City of Salem*, 25 Or LUBA 267 (1993).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where the challenged decision simply replaces one rural comprehensive plan map designation with another rural plan map designation for property located outside an acknowledged urban growth boundary and does not purport to approve any particular present or future use of the property, an exception to Goal 14 is not required. *Reeves v. Washington County*, 24 Or LUBA 483 (1993).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Under ORS 197.175(2)(d), a county is required to assure that amendments to its comprehensive plan map comply with the acknowledged comprehensive plan. Where a number of plan provisions applicable to such a decision impose conflicting requirements, the county must adopt findings balancing those conflicting plan provisions in determining whether the request is consistent with the plan. *Marson Trucking, Inc. v. Clackamas County*, 24 Or LUBA 386 (1993).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where the decision whether to designate property as Agriculture or Forest on comprehensive plan maps is governed by specific plan policies, a county acts within its discretion in determining that it is not required to apply and balance other generally applicable Agricultural and Forest plan policies. *Marson Trucking, Inc. v. Clackamas County*, 24 Or LUBA 386 (1993).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where a county adopts a plan map designating land within three miles of the county's borders as available for destination resort siting, without determining whether such land is within three miles of high-value crop areas located in a neighboring county, the county has failed to comply with the requirement of ORS 197.455 and Goal 8 that land within three miles of high-value crop areas not be available for destination resort use. *Alliance for Resp. Land Use v. Deschutes County*, 23 Or LUBA 476 (1992).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. The amendment of a local government comprehensive plan map designation from agriculture to rural residential to accommodate a large mixed-use development on rural land requires the application of the Statewide Planning Goals because the amendment could have secondary effects on the acknowledged plan and zoning regulations that were unanticipated at the time of acknowledgment, and the question of whether the proposed use is urban or rural requires a case-by-case analysis. *Kaye v. Marion County*, 23 Or LUBA 452 (1992).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. OAR 660-06-003(1)(b) of the amended Goal 4 rules provides that those rules apply immediately to plan map amendments involving forestlands. *Dobson v. Polk County*, 22 Or LUBA 701 (1992).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. That a plan map amendment is legislative rather than quasi-judicial does not mean that the statewide planning goals or comprehensive plan or code provisions do not apply to the decision. Neither does it necessarily mean findings in support of the decision are not required. *Davenport v. City of Tigard*, 22 Or LUBA 577 (1992).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where a local government amends its comprehensive plan transportation map to change the functional classification of existing roadways and designate new collector roadways, it must identify possible conflicts the action may cause with inventoried Goal 5 resource sites and explain how those conflicts are resolved. *Davenport v. City of Tigard*, 22 Or LUBA 577 (1992).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A local government is entitled to rely on existing acknowledged implementation measures when amending its comprehensive plan map, where the plan map amendment will not affect inventoried Goal 5 resources or will affect them only in a manner already anticipated by the acknowledged comprehensive plan. *Davenport v. City of Tigard*, 22 Or LUBA 577 (1992).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where failure contemporaneously to complete all improvements envisioned by a legislative amendment to a comprehensive plan transportation map would result in traffic having to use an inadequate unsignalized intersection, the local government must explain how the amendment satisfies a plan policy requiring it to "plan for a safe and efficient street * * * system that meets current needs and anticipated future growth and development." *Davenport v. City of Tigard*, 22 Or LUBA 577 (1992).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where a local government legislatively amends its comprehensive plan transportation map to designate a new minor collector in a location such that construction of the minor collector will violate applicable code street construction standards, and also amends the plan to exempt the minor collector from all such street construction standards, the local government must adopt findings explaining why the exemption is justified. *Davenport v. City of Tigard*, 22 Or LUBA 577 (1992).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. The applicability of the statewide planning goals depends on the substantive nature of a proposed plan inventory map amendment, not on whether it is characterized as legislative or quasi-judicial. *Gray v. Clatsop County*, 22 Or LUBA 270 (1991).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. It is inconsistent with Goal 18 Implementation Requirement 2 to relocate a construction setback line on a local government comprehensive plan map so that construction of buildings is potentially allowable in an area classified as active dunes. *Gray v. Clatsop County*, 22 Or LUBA 270 (1991).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. When amending a construction setback line on a comprehensive plan map in an area classified as active or conditionally stable dunes, a local government must adopt the findings required by Goal 18 Implementation Requirement 1. *Gray v. Clatsop County*, 22 Or LUBA 270 (1991).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Amendments of acknowledged comprehensive plans and land use regulations must be consistent with controlling provisions of the acknowledged comprehensive plan. *DLCD v. Polk County*, 21 Or LUBA 463 (1991).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where a comprehensive plan provides two agricultural plan map designations, which are applied based on characteristics of the agricultural lands, but includes no standards for determining which designation to apply to properties with some of the characteristics of each, a decision to change the plan map designation from one to the other does not violate the plan. *DLCD v. Polk County*, 21 Or LUBA 463 (1991).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. There is no rule of general applicability to local government plan/zone change proceedings that requires a local government to consider the most intensive uses possible under the new plan/zone designation when approving a plan/zone change. *Brown & Cole, Inc. v. City of Estacada*, 21 Or LUBA 392 (1991).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. While a local government cannot rely upon evidence of changed circumstances since adoption of its comprehensive plan to justify *noncompliance* with plan approval criteria for plan and zone map amendments, it may be able to rely upon evidence of changed circumstances as a basis for finding *compliance* with applicable plan and zone map amendment approval criteria. *Brown & Cole, Inc. v. City of Estacada*, 21 Or LUBA 392 (1991).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where a county comprehensive plan provision states that in acting on certain plan map amendments the county shall "determine the appropriate [plan designation] considering" certain items, those items are *factors* which must be *considered* by the county, not *approval standards*. *Shirley v. Washington County*, 20 Or LUBA 127 (1990).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where there is a proposed plan map amendment from a forest to a farm designation, in the absence of concurrent consideration of a specific nonfarm development proposal, and the county comprehensive plan requires consideration of "demonstrated need consistent with LCDC goals," the "need" to be demonstrated and considered is the need to designate the subject property for exclusive farm use. *Shirley v. Washington County*, 20 Or LUBA 127 (1990).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. There is no rule of general applicability that in all local government plan/zone change proceedings, the impacts of the most intensive uses allowed under the new designation must be considered. *Shirley v. Washington County*, 20 Or LUBA 127 (1990).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A comprehensive plan policy governing "requests for rezonings to higher intensity residential uses" has no applicability where the issue is whether the *plan* map designation should be changed. *Bridges v. City of Salem*, 19 Or LUBA 373 (1990).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where there is a surplus of land planned and zoned for multifamily residential development, a market shortage of multifamily housing does not necessarily demonstrate a "public need" justifying designation of additional multifamily planned and zoned land. *Bridges v. City of Salem*, 19 Or LUBA 373 (1990).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where under the city's comprehensive plan, land for multifamily development is to be designated based on factors such as public facilities, neighborhood plans, renewal and in-fill studies, and sector plans, not according to the proportionate population of subareas of the city, the city's assumption that 12 percent of the additional multifamily housing needed in the city is needed in a particular subarea, simply because 12 percent of the city population currently lives in that subarea, is unjustified. *Bridges v. City of Salem*, 19 Or LUBA 373 (1990).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where a large area of existing single family residential development is designated for multifamily residential use, but the city's findings do not address the potential for providing needed multifamily housing through conversion of existing single-family development, the findings fail to demonstrate that the existing multifamily designated land is inadequate to satisfy the identified public need for such housing. *Bridges v. City of Salem*, 19 Or LUBA 373 (1990).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A comprehensive plan statement that separation of use types along topographic, natural vegetation, and other features

is "desirable" does not establish an approval criterion applicable to plan and zone map amendments. *Bridges v. City of Salem*, 19 Or LUBA 373 (1990).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. Where the subject property qualifies as forestland under provisions of the county's acknowledged comprehensive plan, and petitioner does not explain why the acknowledged plan standards do not control, an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 4 is required before the subject property can be redesignated and rezoned for nonforest uses. *Chambers v. Clackamas County*, 19 Or LUBA 355 (1990).

29.2.5 Comprehensive Plans – Amendment – Map Amendment: Standards. A "public need" criterion which requires determining whether additional land for a proposed destination resort is required "in consideration of that amount already provided by the current zoning district within the area to be served" only requires consideration of other land already designated DR, not other areas which are eligible for destination resort siting. *Foland v. Jackson County*, 18 Or LUBA 731 (1990).