

1 Opinion by DuBay.

2 NATURE OF THE DECISION

3 The city appeals from a Columbia County decision amending
4 the county's comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance. The
5 decision granted a request by a public utility district for a
6 Community Service-Utility (CS-U) overlay zone designation for
7 the purpose of siting an operations center on 1.7 acres.

8 FACTS

9 The property in question is located within the city's urban
10 growth boundary. The county's zoning classification is
11 Commercial (C-3) on the property for which the CS-U overlay
12 classification is sought. The city appeared at the hearings
13 before both the planning commission and the county
14 commissioners to object to the proposed development as being in
15 violation of the city's comprehensive plan and the Urban Growth
16 Area Management Agreement between the city and the county.
17 Over the city's objections, the county commissioners voted to
18 grant the change at its meeting on October 17, 1984.

19 ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

20 Petitioner claims the county's action violates the county
21 comprehensive plan provisions calling for adoption of the
22 city's comprehensive plan for unincorporated areas of the
23 county within the city's urban growth boundary. Further,
24 petitioners allege the decision violates the Urban Growth
25 Management Agreement provision prohibiting conflicts in
26 comprehensive plan provisions between the two

1 jurisdictions. However, we are unable to reach these claims
2 because of the county's failure to adopt findings demonstrating
3 compliance of the proposal with the applicable criteria.

4 The only evidence of the decision in the record is in the
5 minutes of the county commissioner's meeting on October 17,
6 1984. The minutes merely show adoption of a motion "to allow
7 the Community Service Utility Overlay for the 1.7 acres for the
8 purpose to accommodate the PUD use...." Record at 1.

9 Decisions without findings have been held insufficient for
10 review by both this Board and the courts on many occasions.
11 See e.g., Sunnyside Neighborhood v. Clackamas Co. Comm., 280 Or
12 3 569 P2d 1063 (1977); Green v. Hayward, 272 Or 693, 552 P2d
13 815 (1976); Allen v. Columbia County, 6 Or LUBA 81 (1982);
14 Hoffman Industries v. Beaverton, 2 Or LUBA 411 (1981).
15 Respondent's failure to provide a record with written findings
16 adopted by the county commissioners provides us no opportunity
17 to review the merits of petitioner's claim that the decision
18 violates the controlling plan documents and implementing
19 agreements. We therefore remand the decision for the adoption
20 of appropriate findings.

21 REMANDED.