

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NATURE OF THE DECISION

Petitioner appeals a decision by the city denying his application for a comprehensive plan map amendment and zone map amendment, and conditional use, design review and partition approval.

REPLY BRIEF

Petitioner moves for permission to file a reply brief to respond to new matters raised in the response brief. The motion is granted and the reply brief is allowed.

FACTS

The subject property is a rectangular shaped approximately 8-acre parcel located south of W. Main Street (State Highway 211) between Hart Avenue and Shaver Street. Molalla Avenue is located approximately 500 feet east of the property. A truck repair business and storage units are located on a portion of the property and the remainder of the parcel is vacant. The properties to the east of the subject property along Shaver Street are currently zoned General Commercial, Central Commercial and Medium-High Density Residential and contain a mix of commercial and residential uses. The properties to the west of the subject property are zoned Light Industrial and Heavy Industrial. The property to the southwest of the subject property is developed with a fertilizer plant, storage and parking lot.

In May, 2010, petitioner applied to change the comprehensive plan map designation of the property from Light Industrial to Central Commercial, change the zoning map designation from Light Industrial to Central Business District (CBD/C-1) and for conditional use approval for a proposed 164-unit apartment building. The planning commission held two public hearings on the applications, and at its May 17, 2011 hearing, voted to recommend approval of the applications to the city council. The city council held five public hearings on the applications on July 27, August 24, October 26, and December 14, 2011 and January 25,

1 2012. At the conclusion of the December 14, 2011 hearing, the city council voted to deny
2 the applications. This appeal followed.

3 **FIRST ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR**

4 Resolving petitioner’s assignments of error requires a brief background and summary
5 of an ordinance that the city adopted in March, 2010, Ordinance 2010-03, and a summary of
6 the proceedings on petitioner’s applications.¹

7 **A. Ordinance 2010-03**

8 The city adopted Ordinance 2010-03 on March 10, 2010. Ordinance 2010-03
9 repealed the city’s existing comprehensive plan that was adopted in 1980 and replaced it with
10 a new comprehensive plan that incorporated several documents into the newly adopted
11 comprehensive plan. One of those documents was the “E. Downtown Molalla & OR 211
12 Streetscape Plan (XX, 2008)” (Downtown Plan). Response Brief App. 2. According to
13 petitioner, the subject property is within the Downtown Plan study area, and a section of the
14 Downtown Plan recommended that the subject property be rezoned to the CBD/C-1 that he is
15 seeking here and redeveloped.²

16 Ordinance 2010-03 also adopted an urban reserve area for the city. Response Brief
17 App. 1-2. Because the statutes and rules governing the city’s designation of an urban reserve
18 area require the county in which the city is located to approve the urban reserve area
19 designation, Ordinance 2010-03 contained a delayed effective date provision, as follows:

20 “Section 6. This Ordinance shall be effective on the same date Clackamas
21 County approves an order amending its Comprehensive Plan to reflect the
22 urban reserve designation included in the City of Molalla Comprehensive Plan
23 adopted hereunder.” Response Brief App. 3.

¹ The city attaches a copy of a portion of Ordinance 2010-03 to its brief at Appendix 1-3 and moves for LUBA to take official notice of the ordinance. The motion is granted. Oregon Evidence Code (OEC) 202(7).

² The Downtown Plan is not included in the Record, but petitioner attaches nine pages from the plan to the petition for review. Petition for Review Appendix 11-20.

1 In March, 2011, the county planning commission voted to recommend to the county board of
2 commissioners that the city's urban reserve designation be denied. Record 174. In
3 December, 2011, the board of county commissioners adopted an order denying the city's
4 urban reserve designation.³

5 **B. City Proceedings on the Application**

6 As noted, petitioner submitted its consolidated applications in May, 2010,
7 approximately two months after the city adopted Ordinance 2010-03. The city's notice of
8 public hearing for the first planning commission meeting on the applications that was held on
9 March 14, 2011 did not list any provisions of the city's comprehensive plan or the
10 Downtown Plan as applicable approval criteria. Record 597-612. However, the staff report
11 issued by the city's planning staff for the April 28, 2011 continued planning commission
12 hearing identified the Downtown Plan as an applicable approval criterion and concluded that
13 the applications satisfied the Downtown Plan. Record 452, 557-58. As noted, the planning
14 commission recommended approval of the applications to the city council.

15 The notice of the first city council hearing on the applications on July 27, 2011 did
16 not list any applicable approval criteria. Record 391-92. The minutes of the second city
17 council hearing on the applications held on August 24, 2011 reflect that the city's attorney
18 explained that the applications were required to be reviewed for compliance with applicable
19 provisions of the previous version of the city's comprehensive plan. Record 261. An
20 October 24, 2011 letter from the attorney for an opponent of the applications took the
21 position that Ordinance 2010-03 had not yet taken effect, and that the applications should be
22 reviewed for compliance with the city's 1980 comprehensive plan. Record 129. At the
23 conclusion of the December 14, 2011 city council hearing, the council voted to deny the

³ The city attaches the county's December 1, 2011 order denying the city's urban reserve designation to its brief and moves for LUBA to take official notice of the order. Response Brief App. 4-5. The motion is granted. OEC 202(7).

1 applications. The findings adopted in support of the city council’s decision conclude that the
2 applications failed to satisfy Statewide Planning Goal 9 (Economic Development), Statewide
3 Planning Goal 12 (Transportation Planning), as well as various provisions of the Molalla
4 Development Code (MDC) discussed below.

5 **C. Assignment of Error**

6 In his first assignment of error, petitioner argues that the city council’s decision is not
7 supported by adequate findings because the findings fail to explain why the Downtown Plan
8 is not an applicable approval criterion and why the applications fail to satisfy the Downtown
9 Plan. We understand petitioner to argue that the only evidence in the record supports the
10 conclusion that the applications are consistent with the Downtown Plan and that the city was
11 required to explain its decision why the Downtown Plan is not an applicable approval
12 criterion.

13 The city responds by pointing to the delayed effective date clause of Ordinance 2010-
14 03 and the county’s December 1, 2011 order that denied the city’s urban reserve designation
15 that is attached to the response brief. The city argues that the city council is not required in
16 its findings to either explain why the Downtown Plan is not an applicable approval criterion,
17 or determine whether the applications are consistent with the Downtown Plan. Citing ORS
18 197.175(2)(d), the city argues that it is impermissible for the city to consider the Downtown
19 Plan as an applicable approval criterion where the Downtown Plan is not part of the city’s
20 comprehensive plan.⁴

21 In his reply brief, petitioner renews his argument that the city’s findings must explain
22 why the Downtown Plan is not an applicable approval criterion, and argues that it is
23 impermissible for the city to supply in the response brief the justification for the decision that

⁴ ORS 197.175(2)(d) requires the city to make land use decisions in compliance with the city’s acknowledged plan and land use regulations.

1 petitioner argues should be included in the findings in support of the decision. Finally,
2 petitioner argues in his reply brief that the city's position set forth in its response brief is
3 inconsistent with its processing of the applications in accordance with the 2010 version of the
4 MDC, because the 2010 version of the MDC implements the version of the city's
5 comprehensive plan that was adopted in Ordinance 2010-03.⁵

6 If the city had consistently taken the position throughout the proceedings to their
7 culmination in the city council's decision that the Downtown Plan was an applicable
8 approval criterion, but reversed that position for the first time in the city's response brief, and
9 there was some uncertainty over whether the Downtown plan is effective, we would likely
10 agree with petitioner that remand is necessary for the city to adopt findings addressing
11 whether the Downtown Plan is effective and thus potentially a source of approval criteria.
12 *Norvell v. Portland Area LGBC*, 43 Or App 849, 853, 604 P2d 896 (1979) (findings must
13 address and respond to specific issues relevant to compliance with applicable approval
14 standards that were raised in the proceedings below). However, that is not what occurred.
15 Although during the hearings before the planning commission the city's planning staff took
16 the position that the Downtown Plan was an applicable approval criterion and that the
17 applications were consistent with the Downtown Plan, during the proceedings before the city
18 council the city confirmed that the Downtown Plan is not an applicable approval criterion.
19 The city council proceedings spanned a six month time period, and by the second of five city
20 council hearings on the applications the issue of the status of the Downtown Plan as an
21 applicable approval criterion had been raised. Record 261; DVD Recording of August 24,
22 2011 city council hearing at 55:00. Thus, petitioner was on notice well before the city filed

⁵ The city adopted Ordinance 2010-04, the 2010 version of the MDC, on the same date that it adopted Ordinance 2010-03. Ordinance 2010-04 does not contain a delayed effective date provision. Reply Brief Appendix 1-2.

1 its response brief that the city considered the Downtown Plan not to be an applicable
2 approval criterion.

3 Petitioner filed a reply to the city’s response brief, and in that reply brief petitioner
4 does not take the position that the Downtown Plan is effective and provides no legal theory
5 for why the Downtown Plan applies to his applications. Absent any argument that the
6 Downtown Plan is effective, we do not think that remand is necessary for the city to adopt as
7 findings the explanation regarding the status of Ordinance 2010-03 and its effect on the
8 applicability of the Downtown Plan to the applications that was provided during the
9 proceedings below and included in the response brief. The explanation that the city provides
10 in its response brief is not a post hoc justification for the city’s decision to deny the
11 applications, but rather is an appropriate response to petitioner’s first assignment of error that
12 only assigns error to the adequacy of the city’s findings but does not argue that the
13 Downtown Plan is effective.

14 Further, we do not think that the city’s processing of the applications in accordance
15 with the 2010 MDC changes the outcome of our resolution of petitioner’s first assignment of
16 error. *See* n 3. There appears to be no dispute that the 2010 MDC took effect when adopted
17 and we do not understand petitioner to argue that the city erred in processing his application
18 in accordance with the 2010 MDC.

19 The first assignment of error is denied.

20 **FOURTH ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR**

21 One of the bases on which the city denied the applications is that the applications
22 failed to satisfy MDC 19.28.030(B)(4), which provides:

23 “A recommendation or a decision to approve, approve with conditions or deny
24 an application for a quasi-judicial amendment shall be based on the following
25 criteria:

26 “* * * * *

1 “(4) The change is in the public interest with regard to neighborhood or
2 community conditions * * *[,]”

3 The owner of an industrial site adjacent to the subject property’s western boundary and the
4 owner of a vacant industrial site located near the subject property provided testimony and
5 evidence that industrial businesses use both Shaver Street and Hart Avenue for truck access
6 and that Clackamas County has designated the use of Shaver Street an alternate truck route
7 connection to N. Mollalla Avenue for truck traffic travelling north from S. Molalla Avenue.
8 That testimony took the position that siting high-density residential uses adjacent to a truck
9 route that has been used for more than 25 years is not in the public interest due to safety
10 concerns. Record 124-25, 433-34, 440. The city found:

11 “The * * criterion is * * * subjective. The Council did consider potential
12 conflicts when locating residential use adjacent to industrial activities, existing
13 or possible. Testimony was submitted by the County Weighmaster indicating
14 both Shaver and Hart Streets, are, in fact used by large vehicles entering and
15 exiting industrial lands adjacent to the subject [property]. Based solely on this
16 finding, the Council can conclude the change is not in the public interest with
17 regard to neighborhood or community conditions due to potential conflicts.”
18 Record 87.

19 In his fourth assignment of error, petitioner challenges the city’s public interest
20 findings. Petitioner argues that the evidence in the record demonstrates that the Downtown
21 Plan identified the subject property for redevelopment and infill, and that the city in adopting
22 the Downtown Plan has already concluded that redevelopment and infill on the property is in
23 the public interest and may not now conclude otherwise. The problem with that argument is
24 that, as we explain above, the Downtown Plan is not effective, and therefore neither
25 petitioner nor the city may rely on the Downtown Plan to take the position that the question
26 of whether the proposed change is in the public interest has been answered already. *See 1000*
27 *Friends of Oregon v. City of Dundee*, 203 Or App 207, 216, 124 P3d 1249 (2005) (city erred
28 in relying on a buildable lands inventory that was not incorporated into its comprehensive
29 plan at the time it made its decision).

1 Also according to petitioner, there is no evidence in the record that there are existing
2 conflicts between the nearby existing residential uses and the existing truck traffic, and the
3 city’s reliance on potential conflicts between the proposed multi-unit residential building and
4 truck traffic generated by existing industrial uses is inconsistent with existing residential
5 zoning and uses in the area. The city responds that the evidence in the record that trucks use
6 the streets adjacent to the subject property for truck access and testimony from the owners of
7 industrial property in the vicinity that expressed concern over potential safety issues due to
8 conflicts between high-density residential development and truck access is evidence a
9 reasonable decision maker could rely on to support the city’s conclusion that the
10 comprehensive plan map amendment is not in the “public interest with regard to
11 neighborhood or community concerns.” Petitioner does not point to any evidence in the
12 record that responds to those concerns or otherwise addresses them in any way except to
13 point out that petitioner verified with the city that the affected streets are not officially-
14 designated truck routes.

15 We do not think the absence of evidence in the record of previous conflicts between
16 residential uses of nearby property and truck traffic calls into question the testimonial
17 evidence regarding the existing truck traffic and concerns about future high-density
18 residential development of the subject property, where there is no evidence about the type or
19 density of the existing residential development or existing traffic management measures that
20 clarifies that existing residential development is similar to the higher-density development
21 that petitioner proposes. Given the subjectivity of a criterion requiring that the proposed
22 comprehensive plan map amendment be “in the public interest with regard to neighborhood
23 or community concerns,” we agree with the city that a reasonable person could rely on the
24 testimony of industrial businesses that a proposed mixed-use apartment building located
25 along a heavily used truck route could create conflicts between the residents and truck traffic
26 to support the city’s finding of that the proposed change is not in the public interest. *See*

1 *Corporation Presiding Bishop v. City of West Linn*, 45 Or LUBA 77 (2003), *rev'd on other*
2 *grounds* 192 Or App 567, 86 P3d 1140 (2004), *aff'd* 338 Or 453, 111 P3d 1123 (2005)
3 (testimony of neighbors is adequate to support a city's finding of noncompliance with a
4 criterion requiring that a building be compatible in scale and mass with adjoining structures,
5 given the subjectivity of the criterion).

6 The fourth assignment of error is denied.

7 **SECOND, THIRD AND FIFTH ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR**

8 The challenged decision is a denial, and the city need only adopt a single adequate
9 basis for denying petitioner's request for a comprehensive plan and zoning map amendment.
10 *Duck Delivery Produce v. Deschutes County*, 28 Or LUBA 614, 616 (1995). We conclude
11 above that the city's denial of the applications on the basis that they fail to satisfy MDC
12 19.28.030(B)(4) is adequate, and we need not address petitioner's challenges to the city's
13 additional bases for denial of the applications.

14 The city's decision is affirmed.