SAMPLE PETITION FOR REVIEW

Disclaimer: This sample brief is for your information only. The Land Use Board of Appeals ("LUBA" or "the Board") does not offer this brief for, or otherwise endorse, the substance of the example arguments. This brief is presented only as a sample brief that acceptably complies with the form and format requirements of the Oregon Administrative Rules. See OAR 661-010-0000 through OAR 661-010-0075, current as of November 1, 2024, available online at Oregon Secretary of State Administrative Rules. Please make sure that your brief complies with OAR 661-010-0030, current as of November 1, 2024, which specifically lays out the requirements for filing a petition for review with LUBA.

A Note on Citing Rules, Statutes, and Cases:

Rules should be cited in the following form: OAR 123-45-6789.

Statutes should be cited in the following form: ORS 123.456.

Oregon Court of Appeals opinions should be cited in the following form: John Doe v. XYZ County, 123 Or App 345, 567 P3d 789 (2020).

Oregon Supreme Court opinions should be cited in the following form: John Doe v. XYZ County, 123 Or 345, 567 P3d 789 (2020).

In accordance with OAR 661-010-0075(8), citations to LUBA decisions shall be in the following form:

Reported Cases: John Doe v. XYZ County, 5 Or LUBA 654 (1981). Unreported Cases: John Doe v. XYZ County, ___ Or LUBA ___ (LUBA No 80-123, Feb 15, 1981).

Most cases are reported and should be cited properly whenever possible. LUBA's website includes citations to reported cases. Specific citations to page numbers, where appropriate, should also be included. If you do not have access to an online legal database to find the correct citations and page numbers, the Oregon law school libraries and libraries at county courthouses are often open during certain hours of the day to the general public.

The petition for review must contain a copy of the challenged decision, including any adopted findings of fact and conclusions of law. See OAR 661-010-0030(4)(e).

BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS

OF THE STATE OF OREGON

[NAME],	LUBA No	
Petitioner,		
and		
[NAME],		
Intervenor-Petitioner,		
VS.		
[NAME],		
Respondent,		
and		
[NAME],		
Intenvenor-Respondent.		
PETITION FOR REVIEW		
[Name], OSB # (if applicable) [Name], OSB # [Address] [Phone Number] [Phone Number] [Email] [Email] [Email] Attorney for Petitioner (or Attorney for Respondent Petitioner, if unrepresented)		
[Name], OSB # [Address] [Phone Number] [Email]	[Name], OSB # [Address] [Phone Number] [Email]	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. P	ETITIONER'S STANDING	1
II. S	TATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
A.	NATURE OF THE LAND USE DECISION AND RELIEF SOUGHT	1
В.	SUMMARY OF MATERIAL FACTS	2
C.	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS	2
III. L	UBA'S JURISDICTION	3
IV. F	IRST ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR [Optional subheading for First Assignment for. EXAMPLE: "The decision is not supported by substantial evidence in the record because"]	it e
A.	PRESERVATION OF ERROR	3
B.	STANDARD OF REVIEW	3
C.	ARGUMENT	4
Assig	ECOND ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR [Optional subheading for Second ment of Error. EXAMPLE: "The decision misconstrues the applicable law	1
Δ	PRESERVATION OF ERROR	т 4
В.	STANDARD OF REVIEW	
C.	ARGUMENT	5
Assig	HIRD ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR [Optional subheading for Third anneat of Error. EXAMPLE: "Respondent failed to follow the applicable dures in a manner that prejudiced Petitioner's substantial rights because"]	6
A.	PRESERVATION OF ERROR	6
B.	STANDARD OF REVIEW	6
C.	ARGUMENT	6
VII.	CONCLUSION	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases
Bogus Business v. Sham Special District, 425 Or 673, 234 P2d 122 (1984)6
Fictious Farm v. Legendary Local Gov't, 22 Or LUBA 564 (1999)4
Imaginary Land Friends v. Concocted County, 567 Or App 201, 780 P3d 101
(2009)
Nonexistent Neighbor v. Mythical Municipality, Or LUBA (LUBA No 50-
456, May 23, 2023)4
Statutes
ORS 197.015(10)(a)(A)
ORS 197.825(1)
ORS 197.829(1)(d)6
ORS 197.825(1)
ORS 197.830(2)(a)1
ORS 197.830(2)(b)1
ORS 197.835(9)(a)(B)7
ORS 197.835(9)(a)(B)
ORS 197.835(9)(a)(D)5
Other Authorities
CC 12.34.5675
CC 34.56.789(2)7

1	I. PETITIONER'S STANDING
2	[State the facts that establish Petitioner's standing to appeal the challenged
3	decision. See ORS 197.830(2) which provides the requirements for standing.]
4	EXAMPLE: Petitioner timely filed a notice of intent to appeal under ORS
5	197.830(1). ORS 197.830(2)(a). Additionally, Petitioner appeared orally or in
6	writing before the decision-making body during the proceedings. ORS
7	197.830(2)(b).
8	II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE
9	A. NATURE OF THE LAND USE DECISION AND RELIEF SOUGHT
10	[Describe the challenged land use decision or limited land use decision.
11	What was applied for? What action did the local government take?]
12	EXAMPLE: Petitioner appeals Respondent's land use decision approving an
13	application for a conditional use permit.
14	[Describe how Petitioner requests that LUBA resolve the appeal. LUBA will
15	review the decision and prepare a final order affirming, reversing, or remanding the
16	decision. See ORS 197.835(1)(a).]
17	EXAMPLE: Petitioner seeks reversal or, in the alternative, remand of
18	Respondent's decision.

B. SUMMARY OF MATERIAL FACTS

- 2 [State the facts in the record that are necessary for LUBA's review of the
- 3 challenged decision. The facts might include but are not limited to a description of
- 4 the subject property, the parties, the application(s) approved or denied by the local
- 5 government, and the local government proceedings. The summary should be in
- 6 narrative form with citations to the pages of the record where the facts alleged can
- 7 be found.]

8

1

C. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS

- 9 [Provide a brief summary of the arguments included within the assignments
- of error in the body of the petition below. Each assignment of error should provide
- one or more grounds on which LUBA might provide the requested relief. See ORS
- 12 197.835.]
- 13 EXAMPLE: Respondent's decision is not supported by substantial evidence
- on the whole record because. . . Further, Respondent's decision misconstrues the
- 15 applicable law because. . . Finally, in reaching its decision, Respondent failed to
- 16 follow the applicable procedures in a manner that prejudiced Petitioner's
- 17 substantial rights because . . .

1	III. LUBA'S JURISDICTION	
2	[State why the challenged decision is a land use decision or limited land use	
3	decision subject to the Board's jurisdiction. See ORS 197.015(10)(a) defining	
4	"land use decision" and ORS 197.015(12)(a) defining "limited land use decision."]	
5	EXAMPLE: Respondent's final decision applies County Code provisions to	
6	the subject property. Accordingly, Respondent's decision is a land use decision as	
7	that term is defined under ORS 197.015(10)(a)(A). LUBA has jurisdiction to	
8	review the challenged decision under ORS 197.825(1).	
9 10 11 12	[Optional subheading for First Assignment of Error. EXAMPLE: "The decision is not supported by substantial evidence in the whole record	
13	A. PRESERVATION OF ERROR	
14	[Demonstrate how the issue raised in the First Assignment of Error was	
15	preserved in the proceedings below, including citations to the record. If the issue is	
16	not identified as preserved during the proceedings below, state why preservation is	
17	not required.]	
18	B. STANDARD OF REVIEW	
19	[State the applicable standard of review.]	
20	EXAMPLE: The Board shall reverse or remand a land use decision under	
21	review if the Board finds the local government or special district "made a decision	
22	not supported by substantial evidence in the whole record." ORS 197.835(9)(a)(C).	

1	Substantial evidence is Fictious Farm v. Legendary Local Gov't, 22 Or LUBA
2	564, 568 (1999).
3	C. ARGUMENT
4	[State the legal argument(s) supporting the First Assignment of Error.
5	Include citations to code provisions, rules, statutes, and cases, where applicable.
6	Include citations to the record, where applicable.]
7	EXAMPLE: Respondent made a decision not supported by substantial
8	evidence in the whole record when it approved the application because Recently,
9	in Nonexistent Neighbor v. Mythical Municipality, the local government based its
10	decision on Or LUBA (LUBA No 50-456, May 23, 2023) (slip op at
11	28). Likewise, here, Respondent based its decision on Rec. 782. In <i>Nonexistent</i>
12	Neighbor, LUBA found that the local government made a decision not supported
13	by substantial evidence because <i>Id.</i> at 582. The same outcome is necessary here
14	where Rec. 2102-2110. Accordingly, the Respondent made a decision not based
15	on substantial evidence in the whole record by
16 17 18 19	V. SECOND ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR [Optional subheading for Second Assignment of Error. EXAMPLE: "The decision misconstrues the applicable law because"]
20	A. PRESERVATION OF ERROR
21	[Demonstrate how the issue raised in the Second Assignment of Error was
22	preserved in the proceedings below, including citations to the record. If the Second

- 1 Assignment of Error raises an issue that is not identified as preserved during the
- 2 proceedings below, state why preservation is not required.]

3 B. STANDARD OF REVIEW

- 4 [State the applicable standard of review.]
- 5 EXAMPLE: The Board shall reverse or remand a land use decision under
- 6 review if the Board finds the local government or special district "improperly
- 7 construed the applicable law." ORS 197.835(9)(a)(D)." The Board shall affirm a
- 8 local government's interpretation of its land use regulations, unless the Board
- 9 determines the local government's interpretation "is contrary to a state statute, land
- use goal or rule that the * * * land use regulation implements." ORS 197.829(1)(d).

11 C. ARGUMENT

- 12 [State the legal argument(s) supporting the Second Assignment of Error.
- 13 Include citations to code provisions, rules, statutes, and cases where applicable.
- 14 Include citations to the record where applicable.]
- 15 <u>EXAMPLE</u>: Respondent misconstrued the applicable law in approving the
- application for a conditional use permit because... County Code ("CC") CC
- 17 12.34.567 implements Goal 21. In Bogus Business v. Sham Special District, the
- Oregon Supreme Court held that Goal 21 requires... 425 Or 673, 680-82, 234 P2d
- 19 122 (1984). When applying CC 12.34.567 to the application, Respondent decided
- 20 that... Rec. 1562. This interpretation is inconsistent with the Supreme Court's

1	ruling in <i>Bogus Business</i> and the requirements of Goal 21, which CC 12.34.567 is	
2	meant to implement. Accordingly, Respondent misconstrued the applicable law	
3	by	
4 5 6 7	VI. THIRD ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR [Optional subheading for Third Assignment of Error. EXAMPLE: "Respondent failed to follow the applicable procedures in a manner that prejudiced Petitioner's substantial rights because"]	
8	A. PRESERVATION OF ERROR	
9	[Demonstrate how the issue raised in the Third Assignment of Error was	
10	preserved in the proceedings below, including citations to the record. If the Third	
11	Assignment of Error raises an issue that is not identified as preserved during the	
12	proceedings below, state why preservation is not required.]	
13	B. STANDARD OF REVIEW	
14	[State the applicable standard of review.]	
15	EXAMPLE: The Board shall reverse or remand a land use decision under	
16	review if the Board finds that the local government or special district failed to	
17	follow the procedures applicable to the matter before it in a manner that prejudiced	
18	the substantial rights of the petitioner. ORS 197.835(9)(a)(B).	
19	C. ARGUMENT	
20	[State the legal argument(s) supporting the Third Assignment of Error.	
21	Include citations to code provisions, rules, statutes, and cases where applicable.	
22	Include citations to the record where applicable.]	

1	EXAMPLE: Respondent failed to follow the applicable procedures because	
2	under County Code, Respondent was required to, but did not CC 34.56.789(2).	
3	In failing to follow the applicable procedures required under County Code,	
4	Respondent prejudiced Petitioner's substantial rights because Imaginary Land	
5	Friends v. Concocted County, 567 Or App 201, 222, 780 P3d 101 (2009). In	
6	Imaginary Land Friends, the Court of Appeals agreed with the Board that, where a	
7	county fails to, and that failure denies a petitioner the ability to, it prejudices	
8	the petitioner's substantial rights. <i>Id.</i> at 245. Similarly, here Rec. 564.	
9	Accordingly, Respondent failed to follow the applicable procedures in a manner	
10	that prejudiced Petitioner's substantial rights by	
11	VII. CONCLUSION	
12	[Provide a brief summary of the above arguments and restate the relief	
13	requested.]	
14	DATED this [#] day of [month], [year].	
	Respectfully submitted,	
	Sign Here	
15 16	[Name], OSB # (if applicable) Attorney for Petitioner (or Petitioner, if unrepresented)	

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH BRIEF LENGTH, TYPE SIZE, AND COPY OF DECISION REQUIREMENTS

Brief Length

I certify that (1) this brief complies with the word count limitation in OAR 661-010-0030(2) and (2) the word count of this brief as described in OAR 661-010-0030(2) is words. [OR]		
I certify that (1) I do not have access to a word-processing system that provides a word county; (2) this brief complies with the page limitation in OAR 661-010-0030(2); and (3) the number of pages in this brief is pages. [OR]		
The board granted a motion to exceed the length limit for this brief. The order granting that motion was dated and permits a brief of up to words [OR] pages. I certify that (1) this brief complies with that order and (2) the word count of this brief (as described in OAR 661-010-0030(2)) is words [OR] the number of pages in this brief is pages.		
Type Size		
I certify that the size of the type of this brief is not smaller than 14 point for both the text of the brief and footnotes as required by OAR 661-010-0030(2).		
Copy of Decision		
I certify that the petition for review contains a copy of the challenged decision, including any adopted findings of fact and conclusions of law as required by OAR 661-010-0030(4)(e).		
DATED this [#] day of [month], [year].		
Sign Here		
[Name], OSB # (if applicable) Attorney for Petitioner (or Petitioner, if unrepresented)		

CERTIFICATE OF FILING

I hereby certify that on [date], I filed the original of this PETITION FOR		
REVIEW in LUBA No, together with one copy, with the Land Use		
Board of Appeals, 201 High Street SE, Suite 600, Salem, Oregon 97301-3398,		
pursuant to OAR 661-010-0075(2)(a)(B), by [method of filing. EXAMPLE:		
certified mail, return receipt requested].		
DATED this [#] day of [month], [year].		
Sign Here		
[Name], OSB # (if applicable)		
Attorney for Petitioner (or Petitioner, if unrepresented)		
Tentioner, it unrepresented)		

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on [date], I see	erved a true and correct copy of this
PETITION FOR REVIEW in LUBA	No, by [method of service.
EXAMPLE: first-class mail], on the foll	owing:
[Name] [Address] Attorney for Intervenor-Petitioner	[Name] [Address] Attorney for Respondent
	[Name] [Address] Attorney for Intervenor-Respondent
DATED this [#] day of [month], [year].	year].
	Sign Here
	[Name], OSB # (if applicable) Attorney for Petitioner (or Petitioner, if unrepresented)