

11. Goal 7 – Natural Disasters and Hazards. Where a decision includes findings addressing Goal 7 and petitioner argues the city erred by not adopting findings that address a comprehensive plan policy adopted to implement Goal 7, but does not argue the plan policy imposes any obligation beyond those imposed by Goal 7, the findings challenge does not demonstrate remandable error. *Nicita v. City of Oregon City*, 75 Or LUBA 38 (2017).

11. Goal 7 – Natural Disasters and Hazards. Where findings in support of comprehensive plan and zoning map amendments point out that the affected property is already planned and zoned for development and subject to overlay zones that impose development restrictions to address natural hazards, as required by Goal 7, and in challenging those findings petitioner makes no attempt to explain why those restrictions will be inadequate to address any wildfire concerns posed by newly authorized uses, petitioner’s argument is insufficiently developed to state a basis for remand. *Nicita v. City of Oregon City*, 75 Or LUBA 38 (2017).

11. Goal 7 – Natural Disasters and Hazards. Where a petitioner argues that a county decision that adopts a new zoning district without applying that new zoning district to any property violates Goal 7, but fails to identify what part of Goal 7 is implicated by such a decision, the petitioner provides no basis for reversal or remand. *Carver v. Deschutes County*, 58 Or LUBA 323 (2009).

11. Goal 7 – Natural Disasters and Hazards. A county could reasonably conclude that numerous standards that it adopted to reduce the fire risk associated with constructing dwelling on forested lands are sufficient to comply with Goal 7, even though the focus of those standards is on protecting dwellings from forest fires, where some of the standards are to reduce the fire risk to forests from such dwellings. *Johnson v. Jefferson County*, 56 Or LUBA 25 (2008).

11. Goal 7 – Natural Disasters and Hazards. Goal 7 requires local governments to evaluate risks from natural hazards and to avoid or prohibit development in areas “where the risk to public safety cannot be mitigated.” A county may reasonably conclude that wildfire risk from destination resorts will be mitigated by the fire siting standards that apply to destination resorts under the county’s zoning ordinance. *Johnson v. Jefferson County*, 56 Or LUBA 72 (2008).

11. Goal 7 – Natural Disasters and Hazards. A county’s interpretation that a comprehensive plan policy, which implements Statewide Planning Goal 7 (Natural Disasters and Hazards), requires regulation of development in known areas potentially subject to natural disasters and is aimed at reducing risks to life and property that are *caused by natural hazards*, is not applicable in the context of a determination whether development is appropriate in a beaches and dunes area, pursuant to a comprehensive plan policy that implements Statewide Planning Goal 18 (Beaches and Dunes), which is aimed at reducing impacts that may be *caused by the proposed development*. *Borton v. Coos County*, 52 Or LUBA 46 (2006).

11. Goal 7 – Natural Disasters and Hazards. A city finding that plan amendments that authorize residential and nonresidential development in a floodplain does not offend Goal 7 because residential development is already allowed in the floodplain under the acknowledged comprehensive plan is sufficient to demonstrate that the plan amendment does not violate Goal 7. That the development authorized in the acknowledged comprehensive plan is residential development and the city does not consider land in a floodplain for purposes of meeting its housing

obligations under Goal 10 does not mean that the land could not be developed residentially under the acknowledged comprehensive plan. *Jaqua v. City of Springfield*, 46 Or LUBA 134 (2004).

11. Goal 7 – Natural Disasters and Hazards. Land use regulations may be adopted to comply with Goals 6 and 7 and related federal law requirements, without first complying with the Goal 5 planning requirements under OAR chapter 660, division 23, where the land use regulations are limited to those that may be required by Goals 6 and 7 and any related federal law requirements. *Rest-Haven Memorial Park v. City of Eugene*, 39 Or LUBA 282 (2001).

11. Goal 7 – Natural Disasters and Hazards. Goal 7 prohibits development in known areas of natural hazards without appropriate safeguards. A county’s decision designating land from agricultural to commercial uses to allow siting of an RV park within a floodplain provides “appropriate safeguards,” where the county imposes conditions designed to minimize potential flood damage, including requiring that RVs be removed from the park in advance of floods. *Smith v. Douglas County*, 37 Or LUBA 801 (2000).

11. Goal 7 – Natural Disasters and Hazards. Goal 7, which restricts or discourages development in areas subject to natural disasters and hazards, is not applicable where a local government vacates a right-of-way within an area potentially subject to hazards, absent a showing that the vacation of the right-of-way itself authorizes or encourages development. *Oregon Shores Cons. Coalition v. Lincoln County*, 36 Or LUBA 288 (1999).