1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS		
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON		
3			
4	WAL-MART STORES, INC.,		
5	Petitioner,		
6	•		
7	and		
8	DOCKY VOLINCED I LANICE VOLINCED		
9	ROCKY YOUNGER and JANICE YOUNGER,		
10	Intervenors-Petitioner,		
11 12	1 10		
13	VS.		
13 14	CITY OF OREGON CITY,		
15	Respondent,		
16	кезропшені,		
17	and		
18	and		
19	HILLTOP PROPERTIES, LLC,		
20	Intervenor-Respondent.		
21	Thervelor Respondent.		
22	LUBA No. 2004-124		
23			
24	FINAL OPINION		
25	AND ORDER		
26			
27	Appeal on remand from the Court of Appeals.		
28			
29	E. Michael Connors, Portland, represented petitioner.		
30			
31	James H. Bean, Portland, represented intervenors-petitioner.		
32			
33	William K. Kabeiseman, Portland, represented respondent.		
34			
35	Kelly S. Hossaini, Portland, represented intervenor-respondent.		
36			
37	BASSHAM, Board Chair; HOLSTUN, Board Member, participated in the decision.		
38	A EFID MED 07/10/2007		
39 40	AFFIRMED 07/19/2006		
40 41	Vou are entitled to judicial review of this Order Judicial review is governed by the		
41 42	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by the provisions of ORS 197.850.		

\circ	1	D 1
Opinion	nv	Bassham.
0 0 1111011	~ ,	_ ~~~~

2	On September 1, 2005, we remanded the city's de	ecision. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v.
3	City of Oregon City, 50 Or LUBA 87 (2005). The city appe	ealed our decision to the Court of
4	Appeals, which reversed and remanded our decision. V	Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. City of
5	Oregon City, 204 Or App 359, 129 P3d 702 (2006). T	The Supreme Court subsequently
6	denied review. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. City of Oregon, 34	1 Or 80 (2006).

The city denied petitioner's application below on several grounds. The Court of Appeals reversed a number of our bases for remanding the decision back to the city. Because any of the Court of Appeals' bases for reversing our decision are sufficient to affirm the city's decision, we accordingly affirm the city's decision. *See Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Hood River County*, 47 Or LUBA 256, 266, *aff'd* 195 Or App 762 (2004) (to prevail before LUBA, a local government need only establish one adequate basis for denial).

The city's decision is affirmed.