

2.3 Constitutional Law – Nonspecific Constitutional Claims. Where petitioners argue that the statutory definition of “farm use” is void for vagueness but make no attempt to develop that argument, LUBA will reject the argument. *Best Buy in Town, Inc. v. Washington County*, 35 Or LUBA 446 (1999).

2.3. Constitutional Law – Nonspecific Constitutional Claims. Where petitioner only provides a bare reference to “equal protection” as a constitutional claim, that is not sufficient to afford the local government and the opposing parties an adequate opportunity to respond to the issue pursuant to ORS 197.763(1). *Yontz v. Multnomah County*, 34 Or LUBA 367 (1998).

2.3 Constitutional Law – Nonspecific Constitutional Claims. LUBA will not consider claims of a constitutional violation when the petitioner raising the claim does not make a legal argument sufficient for review of the claim. *Sparks v. Tillamook County*, 30 Or LUBA 325 (1996).

2.3 Constitutional Law – Nonspecific Constitutional Claims. Even if petitioner has constitutional defenses against an action by a local government to enforce its code fence height limitation, that does not provide an independent basis upon which to compel the local government to grant a variance to its code fence height limitation. *Stern v. City of Portland*, 26 Or LUBA 544 (1994).

2.3 Constitutional Law – Nonspecific Constitutional Claims. LUBA will not consider claims of constitutional violations that are not supported by legal argument. *Poddar v. City of Cannon Beach*, 26 Or LUBA 429 (1994).

2.3 Constitutional Law – Nonspecific Constitutional Claims. Allegations that denial of a requested plan map amendment based on a plan groundwater protection policy is unconstitutional, because it is economically infeasible to conduct the studies necessary to demonstrate compliance with the policy, are insufficient to establish the policy is unconstitutional. *Ericsson v. Washington County*, 26 Or LUBA 169 (1993).

2.3 Constitutional Law – Nonspecific Constitutional Claims. LUBA will not consider claims of constitutional violations where the parties raising such claims do not supply legal argument in support of those claims. *Perry v. Yamhill County*, 26 Or LUBA 73 (1993).

2.3 Constitutional Law – Nonspecific Constitutional Claims. LUBA will not consider claims of constitutional violations where the parties raising such claims do not supply legal argument in support of the claims. *Joyce v. Multnomah County*, 23 Or LUBA 116 (1992).

2.3 Constitutional Law – Nonspecific Constitutional Claims. Undeveloped claims of unconstitutionality provide an insufficient basis for LUBA to reverse or remand a challenged decision. *Cummins v. Washington County*, 22 Or LUBA 129 (1991).

2.3 Constitutional Law – Nonspecific Constitutional Claims. LUBA will not consider claims of constitutional violations which are unsupported by legal argument. *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, 20 Or LUBA 411 (1991).

2.3 Constitutional Law – Nonspecific Constitutional Claims. LUBA will not consider claims of constitutional violation where the parties raising such claims do not supply legal argument in support of their claims. *Torgeson v. City of Canby*, 19 Or LUBA 511 (1990).