

1 Opinion by Hanna.

2 **NATURE OF THE DECISION**

3 Petitioner appeals the county's amendment of its
4 comprehensive plan changing the designation of 233 acres of
5 a 272-acre parcel from Forest Grazing to Rural Residential
6 and changing the zone of the same property from Forest-
7 Grazing to Rural Residential Ten (RR-10).¹

8 **DISCUSSION**

9 In its first assignment of error, petitioner argues
10 that the challenged decision should be reversed because the
11 subject property is agricultural land under Goal 3, and the
12 county did not take an exception as required by Goal 2 when
13 it approved the plan amendment and zone change.
14 Petitioner's first assignment of error alleges reversible
15 error on three separate bases. The first basis for reversal
16 in the Petition for Review is that the county did not
17 properly consider the subject property as part of a farm
18 unit. For the reasons set forth in the first basis for
19 reversal in the Petition for Review, we agree with
20 petitioner and sustain this assignment of error.

21 In its second assignment of error, petitioner argues
22 that the challenged decision should be remanded because the
23 county failed to properly evaluate the subject property as

¹Neither the county nor the applicant submitted a brief, and no oral argument was held on this appeal.

1 required under Goal 4. Because we reverse the challenged
2 decision on the first assignment of error, no point would
3 be served by addressing petitioner's second assignment of
4 error.

5 The county's decision is reversed.