```
1
                BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
                       OF THE STATE OF OREGON
 2.
 3
   FRITZ VON LUBKEN, JOANN VON
    LUBKEN, VON LUBKEN ORCHARDS,
    INC., and HOOD RIVER VALLEY
 7
    RESIDENTS COMMITTEE, INC.,
 8
 9
              Petitioners,
10
11
         vs.
                                            LUBA No. 90-031
12
13
   HOOD RIVER COUNTY,
                                    )
14
                                    )
                                              FINAL OPINION
15
              Respondent,
                                    )
                                        AND ORDER ON REMAND
16
17
         and
18
                                    )
19
    BROOKSIDE, INC.,
20
21
              Intervenor-Respondent.
                                                    )
22
23
24
         Appeal from Hood River County.
25
26
        Max M. Miller, Jr., Portland, represented petitioners.
27
28
         Sally A. Tebbet, Hood River, represented respondent.
29
30
                  Sharp, Hood River, represented intervenor-
         B. Gil
31
    respondent.
32
33
         HOLSTUN, Referee; SHERTON, Chief Referee; KELLINGTON,
34
    Referee, participated in the decision.
35
36
              REVERSED
                                    06/27/90
37
         You are entitled to judicial review of this Order.
38
39
    Judicial review is governed by the provisions of ORS
40
    197.850.
```

- 1 Opinion by Holstun.
- 2 In our original decision in this matter we affirmed the
- 3 county's decision granting conditional use approval for a
- 4 golf course on lands zoned for exclusive farm use. Von
- 5 Lubken v. Hood River County, ___ Or LUBA ___ (LUBA No. 90-
- 6 031, August 22, 1990), reversed and remanded 104 Or App 683
- 7 (1990), adhered to 106 Or App 226, rev den 311 Or 349
- 8 (1991). The Hood River County Comprehensive Plan includes a
- 9 standard which provides that "[d]evelopment will not occur
- 10 on lands capable of sustaining accepted farming practices."
- 11 Hood River County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 3 (Agricultural
- 12 Lands), Standard D(9). In affirming the county's decision,
- 13 we rejected petitioners' argument that the quoted plan
- 14 standard applies to the challenged county decision. Von
- 15 Lubken, supra, slip op at 16.
- 16 In reversing and remanding our decision, the Court of
- 17 Appeals determined the challenged plan standard does apply
- 18 and, since it is not disputed that the subject property is
- 19 capable of sustaining accepted farming practices, "the golf
- 20 course is not allowable under it." Von Lubken v. Hood River
- 21 County, 104 Or App 683, 689, 803 P2d 750 (1990), adhered to
- 22 106 Or App 226, rev den 311 Or 349 (1991).
- In accordance with the Court of Appeals' decision, the
- 24 county's decision is reversed.