



1 Opinion by Livingston.

2 We affirm the city's decision with a note of  
3 explanation. The challenged decision follows our remand in  
4 Squires v. City of Portland, \_\_\_ Or LUBA \_\_\_ (LUBA No. 95-  
5 187, July 1, 1996) (Squires I), and describes the  
6 applicant's proposal as follows:

7 "Applicant proposes to create a 20-lot Planned  
8 [Unit] Development on a 5.71 acre parcel and  
9 requests adjustments to increase building coverage  
10 on all lots and to reduce the amount of open area  
11 in common ownership." (Emphasis added.) Record  
12 7.

13 The decision then states that the city council "affirmed its  
14 prior approval of the applicant's proposal." Id.

15 The applicant's proposal as approved prior to Squires I  
16 did not include an adjustment to reduce the amount of open  
17 area in common ownership.<sup>1</sup> The findings adopted in response  
18 to our remand do not address an adjustment to reduce the  
19 amount of open area in common ownership. Intervenor-  
20 respondent Joanne Starr describes the inclusion of the  
21 emphasized language as a clerical error. Brief of  
22 Intervenor-Respondent 12. The city joins in that assessment  
23 in its brief. The city confirmed at oral argument that the  
24 challenged decision does not grant an adjustment to reduce

---

<sup>1</sup>In Squires I we found that only one adjustment, the lot coverage adjustment, had been requested. For that reason, we concluded PCC 33.805.040(C), which addresses applications where more than one adjustment is requested, did not apply. Squires I, \_\_\_ Or LUBA \_\_\_ (LUBA No. 95-187, July 1, 1996), slip op 10-11.

1 the amount of open area in common ownership.