

29.1.1 Comprehensive Plans – Adoption – Generally. There is no internal comprehensive plan conflict if lands that were previously added to a comprehensive plan map under prior mapping standards are allowed to remain on that map after the county adopts new mapping standards that those lands do not satisfy, so long as the county intended the new mapping standards to apply prospectively. *Central Oregon Landwatch v. Deschutes County*, 63 Or LUBA 123 (2011).

29.1.1 Comprehensive Plans – Adoption – Generally. A regional parks, recreation and open space plan that the controlling regional plan requires to be adopted at least in part as a refinement of the controlling regional plan may not be adopted as a purely aspirational document that is binding on no one. *Home Builders Assoc. v. City of Eugene*, 52 Or LUBA 341 (2006).

29.1.1 Comprehensive Plans – Adoption – Generally. Any parks and recreation planning obligation that is imposed by the ORS 197.015(6) definition of “comprehensive plan” does not necessarily have to “indicate specific locations of any [recreational] area, activity or use.” *Home Builders Assoc. v. City of Eugene*, 52 Or LUBA 341 (2006).

29.1.1 Comprehensive Plans – Adoption – Generally. Goal 8 is “[t]o satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.” While it might be consistent with Goal 8 to do so, Goal 8 does not mandate that comprehensive plans include a list of park, open space and recreation facilities that will be constructed during the planning period or include an estimate of the costs of such facilities. *Home Builders Assoc. v. City of Eugene*, 52 Or LUBA 341 (2006).