

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
FOR MARION COUNTY, OREGON**

In the Matter of the	)	Case No.25-004
Application of:	)	Zone Change/Comprehensive
Jubitz Corporation	)	Plan Change

AN ADMINISTRATIVE ORDINANCE

ORDINANCE NO. 1493

THE MARION COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS HEREBY ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION I. Purpose

This matter comes before the Marion County Board of Commissioners ("Board") on the application of Jubitz Corporation for a zone change and comprehensive plan change to change the zone from EFU (Exclusive Farm Use) to ID (Interchange District) zone and to change the comprehensive plan designation from Primary Agriculture to Commercial, with an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands) on a 3.12 acre parcel located in the 12000 block of Ehlen Rd NE, Aurora (T4S; Range 1W; Section 10; Tax lot 1700).

SECTION II. Procedural History

The Marion County Hearings Officer held a duly noticed public hearing on March 19, 2026, and on April 22, 2026, issued a decision to approve the application. Official notice was taken of the Planning Division file and the Hearings Officer's decision. The Board has considered all the evidence in the record, all arguments of the parties and is otherwise fully advised in the premises.

SECTION III. Adoption of Findings and Conclusion

After careful consideration of all facts and evidence in the record, the Board adopts as its own the Findings of Fact and Additional Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in Section V and VI of the Hearings Officer's decision dated April 22, 2026, contained in Exhibit A, attached hereto, and by this reference incorporated herein.

SECTION IV. Action

The requested zone change from EFU (Exclusive Farm Use) to ID (Interchange District) and to change the comprehensive plan designation from Primary Agriculture to Commercial, with an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands) on a 3.12-acre parcel is hereby **GRANTED**, subject to conditions identified in Exhibit A, attached hereto, and by this reference incorporated herein.

The property rezoned by this Ordinance is identified on a map in Exhibit B, attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein. The Official Marion County Zoning Map shall be changed pursuant to Marion County Code Section 17.110.660 to reflect the new zoning subject to conditions identified in Exhibit A, attached hereto, and by this reference incorporated herein.

SECTION V. Effective Date

Pursuant to Chapter 1.10 of the Marion County Code, this is an Administrative Ordinance and shall take effect 21 days after the adoption and final signatures of the Marion County Board of Commissioners.

SIGNED and FINALIZED this 23rd day of September, 2026, at Salem, Oregon.

MARION COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS


Chair


Commissioner

Not Present At Meeting

Commissioner


Recording Secretary

JUDICIAL NOTICE

Oregon Revised Statutes, Chapter 197.830, provides that land use decisions may be reviewed by the Land Use Board of Appeals by filing a notice of intent to appeal within 21 days from the date this Ordinance becomes final.

BEFORE THE MARION COUNTY HEARINGS OFFICER

In the Matter of the Application of) Case No. 25-004
)
JUBITZ CORPORATION) **ZONE CHANGE AND COMPREHENSIVE**
PLAN CHANGE (Corrected ¹)

RECOMMENDATION

I. Nature of the Application

This matter is before the Marion County Hearings Officer on the Application the Jubitz Corporation for a zone change and comprehensive plan change to change the zone from EFU (Exclusive Farm Use) to ID (Interchange District) zone and to change the comprehensive plan designation from Primary Agriculture to Commercial, with an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands) on a 3.12 acre parcel located in the 12000 block of Ehlen Rd NE, Aurora.

II. Relevant Criteria

The standards and criteria relevant to this Application are found in the Marion County Comprehensive Plan (Rural Development Policies, Rural Service Centers, Agricultural Lands Policy), and the Marion County Code (MCC) Title 17, especially MCC 17.123 (Zone Change), MCC 17.136 (Exclusive Farm Use), and MCC 17.150 (Interchange District Zone). Policies relevant to this Application are also found in the State of Oregon Statewide Planning Goals (particularly Goal 3), and Oregon Administrative Rules 660, Division 4 (Goal Exception Process).

III. Public Hearing

A public hearing was held on this matter on March 19, 2026. The Planning Division file was made part of the record. The following persons appeared and provided testimony on the Application:

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. | Austin Barnes | Marion County Planning Division |
| 2. | Britany Randall (BRAND Land Use) | Representative for Applicant |

No documents were presented, marked, or entered into the record as exhibits. No objections were raised as to notice, jurisdiction, conflicts of interest, or to evidence or testimony presented at the hearing.

¹ This is a corrected version of ZC CP 25-004 originally issued on April 14, 2026. All prior versions of this Recommendation are void.
ZC CP 25-004 – RECOMMENDATION
Jubitz Corporation
Page 1

IV. Executive Summary

The matter before the hearings officer is the application of Jubitz Corporation for a zone change and comprehensive plan change to change the zone from EFU (Exclusive Farm Use) to ID (Interchange District) zone and to change the comprehensive plan designation from Primary Agriculture to Commercial, with an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands) on a 3.12 acre parcel located in the 12000 block of Ehlen Rd NE, Aurora, Oregon.

Applicant submitted the application based upon the site's physical configuration that has been permanently altered by public transportation infrastructure which has created a remnant parcel that is no longer capable of functioning as agricultural land. The parcel was created through an approved Property Line Adjustment to accommodate the Oregon Department of Transportation's planned realignment of Dolores Way NE as part of the Aurora Donald Interchange improvement project. The parcel is bounded and impacted by permanent roadway infrastructure associated with the interchange, and is encumbered by a communication tower, associated easements, and an ODOT drainage easement. As a result of the public infrastructure project and the approved boundary adjustment, the subject property is now physically and functionally separated from surrounding agricultural land. Access to the parcel is provided by a driveway designed for limited non-farm access and does not accommodate agricultural equipment.

Applicant has established that the parcel is irrevocably committed to nonfarm uses, and Applicant has met the burden of proving the applicable standards and criteria for approval to change the zone from EFU (Exclusive Farm Use) to C (Commercial) and to change the comprehensive plan designation from Primary Agriculture to Commercial, with an exception to statewide planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Land).

Therefore, the Hearing Officer recommends that the Marion County Board of Commissioners GRANT the Application subject to certain conditions that are necessary for public health, safety, and welfare.

V. Findings of Fact

The Hearings Officer, after careful consideration of the testimony and evidence in the record, issues the following finding of fact:

1. Application of Jubitz Corporation for a zone change and comprehensive plan change to change the zone from EFU (Exclusive Farm Use) to ID (Interchange District) zone and to change the comprehensive plan designation from Primary Agriculture to Commercial, with an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands) on a 3.12 acre parcel located in the 12000 block of Ehlen Rd NE, Aurora (T4S; Range 1W; Section 10; Tax lot 1700).

2. The property is located on the southern side of Ehlen Rd NE, directly east of its intersection with Interstate 5. The property is currently vacant other than a telecommunications tower. The property was created in its current configuration through PLA 24-003 and is therefore considered legal for land use purposes.
3. Properties in all directions except west are zoned EFU and are in various levels of farm production. The area is characterized by filbert orchards and grass seed/hay fields. To west is the Fargo Interchange, which is a collection of parcels zoned ID and developed with various highway related uses, such as restaurants, gas stations and mechanic businesses.
4. Marion County Planning Division requested comments on the proposal from various governmental agencies. The following comments were received:

Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) commented:

“The foregoing (application) assumes that no more than 14 pumping stations would ultimately be developed, or mitigation may be required in association with the land-use action. Transportation impacts of the proposed land-use action proximate to the I-5 Interchange (Aurora-Donald Interchange), and operations of its on/off ramps, would be the main concern (recognizing Alternative Mobility Targets in the IAMP). Our staff would be happy to review any quantitative analysis you could provide related to trip-generation potential of the proposed land-use action.

There is no need for any additional reports on the comp-plan/zone-change, though depending on the scale of *any future site-plans – a TIA may be needed* if the proposed site will either increase peak hour trips by 50, daily trips by 300, or result in an increase of total-entering-vehicles (TEV) in excess of 10% at any access point onto a state highway.

At the comp-plan/zone-change phase, I compare most-intensive use allowed under current and proposed comp-plan/zoning. Based on my planning-level assessment of best uses under your ID-zoning, it appeared a most intensive-use scenario *might be* a gas and market station, with approximately 14 pumping stations. It is my opinion that anything larger than that may generate enough new trips to surpass thresholds for trips-generated, then requiring mitigation at the comp-plan/zone-change phase.

Applicant is welcome to provide their own trip-generation estimates, though I do not think it is necessary at this phase *if* the above “most intensive” scenario sounds reasonable.”

Marion County Building Department commented:

“No Building Inspection concerns. Permit(s) are required to be obtained prior to development and/or utilities installation on private property.”

Marion County Septic commented:

“A site evaluation was conducted in 2024 to establish septic viability for an automotive shop with 15 employees. Any change in proposed gallons per day will require that the system be stake out to verify an initial and repair area fits within the approved area from SE 555-25-001446-EVAL. If the proposed daily flow exceeds 2500 gallons per day, a WPCF permit and additional test pits may be required by the DEQ. This will not be required at this time for the zone change but will be required prior to development.”

All other contacted agencies contacted either failed to respond or stated no objection to the proposal.

V. Additional Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law

1. This is a recommendation to the Marion County Board of Commissioners (BOC). The BOC is the final decision-making authority.
2. Applicant has the burden of proving compliance with all applicable criteria as explained in *Riley Hill General Contractor, Inc. v. Tandy Corporation*, 303 Or 390, 394-395(1987).

“Preponderance of the evidence” means the greater weight of evidence. It is such evidence that when weighed with that opposed to it, has more convincing force and is more probably true and accurate. If, upon any question in the case, the evidence appears to be equally balanced, or if you cannot say upon which side it weighs heavier, you must resolve that question against the party upon whom the burden of proof rests. (Citation omitted).

Applicant must prove, by substantial evidence in the record, it is more likely than not that each criterion is met. If the evidence for any criterion is equal or less, Applicant has not met its burden and the application must be denied. If the evidence for every criterion is even slightly in Applicant’s favor, the burden of proof is met and the application is approved.

3. MCC 17.123.020 provides that a quasi-judicial zone change may be initiated by a property owner consistent with the application requirements of MCC 17.119.020 and 17.119.025.

The proposed zone change has been initiated by the legal property owner. The application includes the required ownership information, completed application materials, and written findings addressing the applicable approval criteria. The request has been properly initiated and is before the County for review through the quasi-judicial process.

ZC CP 25-004 – RECOMMENDATION

Jubitz Corporation

Page 4

GOAL EXCEPTION

4. Land use applications of this nature must be consistent with Statewide Planning Goals. In this specific case, the subject parcel is covered by Statewide Goal 3 (Agriculture Lands). There is a mechanism, however, for not applying the Goal to areas with certain characteristics. This mechanism is the Goal exception process that requires specific findings justifying why such lands are not available for resource use. There are three types of exceptions to Statewide Goals that may be granted. The first two are based on the concept that the subject property is “physically developed” or “irrevocably committed” to a certain use. The third is a “reasons” exception where there is a demonstrated need for the proposed use or activity. In this case, Applicant states that the proposal qualifies for an irrevocably committed exception.

STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS

5. Proposals to amend the comprehensive plan must be consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals:

Goal 1: Citizen Involvement. The notice and hearings process provides an opportunity for citizen involvement. The goal is satisfied.

Goal 2: Land use Planning. The subject application would change the zoning. The Hearings Officer makes a recommendation to the Marion County Board of Commissioners who will make the decision on behalf of the County. Marion County Planning division requested comments from various governmental agencies, and their comments are included. The goal is satisfied.

Goal 3: Agricultural Lands. Applicant seeks an exception, which is addressed in detail herein.

Goal 4: Forest Lands. The subject property has not been determined to be forest land. This goal does not apply.

Goal 5: Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas and Natural Resources. The Marion County Comprehensive Plan does not identify any significant open spaces, scenic and historic areas and natural resources on the subject property.

Goal 6: Air, Water and Land Resources Quality. The subject property is not within an identified air quality area. The property is not located in the Sensitive Groundwater Overlay Zone. No activities have been proposed on the property that would use significant amounts of groundwater. Any single commercial use of water using less than 5,000 gallons per day is exempt from water right permitting requirements of the Oregon Department of Water Resources, as long as the water is used for a “beneficial purpose without waste” and may be subject to regulation in times of water shortage.

ZC CP 25-004 – RECOMMENDATION

Jubitz Corporation

Page 5

Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards. The subject property is not within an identified floodplain or geologic hazards area. This goal is not applicable.

Goal 8: Recreation Needs. No Goal 8 resources are identified on the property. This goal does not apply.

Goal 9: Economic Development. Because the proposal is a rural commercial designation supported by a Goal 3 exception and does not involve urbanization or expansion of urban services, it is consistent with Goal 9.

Goal 10: Housing. This goal applies to housing within an urban growth boundary and, thus, does not apply to this proposal.

Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services. The subject parcels do not require an extension of services with a C (Commercial) zone use, this goal is satisfied.

Goal 12: Transportation. If the zone is changed to Commercial, the existing development will not have a significant impact on the roadway system in this area because of the minimal number of trips associated with the existing uses and the adequacy of the roadway to accommodate the probable level of additional traffic. ODOT did not identify any concerns with the proposal.

Goal 13: Energy Conservation. There is no indication of energy use increase or decrease based on the proposed zone change and comprehensive plan change. This goal does not apply.

Goal 14: Urbanization. Applicant proposes to rezone rural residential land to Commercial outside of the urban growth boundary. The Commercial (C) zone as applied here is a rural commercial designation acknowledged as consistent with Goal 14. The proposal does not extend urban services or create urban densities. Therefore, no Goal 14 exception is required.

Goals 15-19 are not applicable because the subject property is not within the Willamette River Greenway, or near any ocean or coastal-related resources.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT

6. All Comprehensive Plan changes are subject to review by the State Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). DLCD was notified as required by State Law and did not provide additional comments or express concerns.
7. The Marion County Comprehensive Plan (MCCP) establishes procedures to be used when considering plan amendments. Plan changes directly involving 5 or fewer property owners will be considered a quasi-judicial amendment. The amendment will be reviewed by the zone change procedures established in MCC 17.123. A plan amendment of this type may be processed simultaneously with a zone change request with the zone change procedure

ZC CP 25-004 – RECOMMENDATION

Jubitz Corporation

Page 6

outlined in Chapter 17.123 of the MCRZO. The subject property is comprised of one tax lot with one owner, all having an existing use, the proposal can therefore be considered under the quasi-judicial amendment process.

8. The MCCP does not contain specific review criteria for plan amendments; however, any amendment must be consistent with its applicable goals and policies. The goals and policies that apply in this case are located in the Rural Development Chapter and include policies for areas designated Commercial, the Rural Service Policies, Rural Service Center Development Policies and the Agricultural Lands Policies which are located in the Agricultural Lands section of the comprehensive plan.
9. Rural Service Policies:

A. "Strip-type" commercial or residential development along roads in rural areas shall be discouraged.

B. Rural industrial, commercial, and public uses should be limited primarily to those activities that are best suited to a rural location and are compatible with existing rural developments and agricultural goals and policies.

No strip-type development is proposed. The majority of the parcels in the area are currently developed with commercial uses or farm uses and any additional development would not be expected to have any additional impact on surrounding agricultural and rural residential lands. This zone change would extend the ID zoning to the extent possible allowed by vacant lands in the area, this would make the land more compatible with existing uses as there is already ID zoning to the west. The area already sees commercial traffic on Interstate 5 along with the commercial farm businesses in the area. The applicant did not show any proposed development on the site plan but indicated that the proposal will expand an existing interchange district node rather than create a "strip type" development. This proposal would be compatible with existing uses in the area. The policy is met.

10. Rural Service Center Development Policies:

1. Where there is a demonstrated need for additional commercial uses in rural Marion County they should be located in designated unincorporated communities.

The subject property is not located within an unincorporated community, but much of those lands are already developed and do not have vacant parcels for development. Applicant acknowledges this policy and notes that the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Zone Change are not based on demonstrating a need for additional commercial uses in rural Marion County generally, nor on locating new rural commercial development in an unincorporated community.

ZC CP 25-004 – RECOMMENDATION

Jubitz Corporation

Page 7

Instead, the subject property is a small remnant parcel that is irrevocably committed to non-resource use as a result of permanent public transportation improvements and associated site constraints. The parcel was created as a consequence of the Oregon Department of Transportation's I-5 interchange improvements and is physically and functionally defined by interchange infrastructure, roadway access, and surrounding non-resource development. These conditions distinguish the site from typical rural lands where Policy 1 is intended to direct the siting of new commercial uses based on demonstrated need.

The proposed redesignation does not establish a new rural commercial area or encourage dispersed commercial development in rural Marion County. Rather, it recognizes the existing condition of a parcel that has already been removed from the agricultural land base and is functionally integrated into an interchange environment. The proposal is consistent with this policy.

2. The boundaries of identified unincorporated communities shall not be expanded to accommodate additional development.

The subject property is a remnant parcel and no boundaries are being expanded. This policy does not apply.

3. Service districts within unincorporated communities may be created and expanded to serve the entire designated rural community; however, services shall not be extended outside of the community unless necessary to correct a health hazard.

The subject property is not located within an identified unincorporated community. It is within a rural service area. No boundaries are being expanded and the proposal does not seek to extend of water, sewer or other service infrastructure. This policy does not apply.

4. Public facilities in rural communities and rural service centers should be designed to service low density rural development and not encourage urbanization.

This proposal is not within a rural community and is just outside of a rural service center and does not encourage urbanization. The parcel will continue to rely on on-site water and wastewater systems. Transportation access is provided by existing and planned roadway infrastructure associated with the I-5 interchange. The policy is met.

5. Additional residential development should be discouraged within Interchange District zones at rural service centers. Only rural service businesses and related uses should be located at these centers.

This proposal does not involve residential development. The goal does not apply.

6. Zoning ordinance provisions shall ensure that new uses permitted in unincorporated communities will not adversely affect agricultural and forestry uses.

The use is not within an unincorporated community and will not adversely affect farm or forest lands. The policy is met.

7. Multifamily zoning shall not be permitted in rural communities or rural service centers.

No multi-family zoning is proposed. The policy is met.

8. The Fargo Road, Brooks, Sunnyside-Delaney, North Jefferson, Ankeny and Talbot interchanges along I-5 and the Santiam interchange on Highway 22 are appropriate locations for highway-related services. Other types of commercial or industrial uses shall not be permitted at these locations.

This proposal is directly adjacent to the Fargo Interchange and complies with this policy.

9. Expansion of Interchange District zoning at any particular interchange shall only be considered when:

(a) Adequate services to support freeway-related uses are available;

Applicants state their use can be served by well and septic which have already been reviewed and approved. The policy is met.

(b) All designated lands at the interchange are committed to development, or vacant designated lands are unsuitable for the proposed use; or

(c) The zoning is needed to allow expansion of an existing use allowed in the Interchange District zone, and it is not economically practical to expand the use on noncontiguous lands designated for interchange development at the same interchange.

All lands in the Fargo Interchange are already developed with highway uses and this is the only practical property to further develop with those uses. The policy is met.

11. Agricultural Lands Policies:

1. Preserve lands designated as Primary Agriculture by zoning them EFU (Exclusive Farm Use). Lands designated as Special Agriculture should be protected by the corresponding SA zone and farmland in the Farm/Timber designation should be protected by the Farm/Timber zone.

While the property is currently zoned EFU, it is not able to be preserved as farmland due to the existing development of roadways and an intermittent stream that runs through the western edge of the property and also creates a gully. A new road was constructed that essentially orphaned the subject property away from the larger farm parcel. Before the road was built, only 1.77 acres of the subject property was in farm production. The loss of 1.77 acres is not significant enough to not meet this goal. The property is better used in commercial development rather than being left vacant. Agricultural Lands Policy 1 has been met.

2. Maintain primary agricultural lands in the largest areas with large tract to encourage larger scale commercial agricultural production.

The property is a small, remnant parcel of a larger, 135.23-acre farm parcel. The parcel is physically separated from surrounding agricultural land by permanent roadway infrastructure, and is burdened by drainage facilities, utility easements, and site configuration. These conditions prevent the parcel from being incorporated into a larger tract suitable for commercial agricultural production. The rest of that parcel is being preserved as agricultural land and meets this policy. The proposal is consistent with Agricultural Lands Policy 2.

3. Discourage development of non-farm uses on high-value farmland and ensure that if such uses are allowed that they do not cause adverse impacts on farm uses.

The future non-farm uses of the parcel should not have any adverse impact on the adjacent farmlands as they are all divided by rights-of-way and long existing development patterns and access points. This area has many commercial uses that have existed in conjunction with farm uses in the area and this zone change will not create any new adverse impacts. As stated, the parcel is a small remnant created by public

transportation improvements. The parcel does not and cannot function as high-value farmland. Agricultural Lands Policy 3 is satisfied.

4. Limit residential uses on high-value lands to those dwellings where past income from the sale of farm products demonstrate that the dwelling will be in conjunction with the farm use. Non-farm dwellings should be limited to existing parcels where the dwelling will be compatible with the surrounding farm area. The approval of non-farm residences shall be based upon findings that the proposed dwelling meets the applicable criteria in OAR 660-033. Approval of a dwelling in the Farm/Timber designation shall be based on the applicable criteria in OAR 660-033 or 660-006.

No dwellings or residential development are proposed in this application. This policy does not apply.

5. Divisions of agricultural lands shall be reviewed by the County and comply with the applicable minimum parcel size and the criteria for the intended use of the property.

The parcel was created through a Property Line Adjustment, PLA 24-003. Applicant does not propose any divisions of agricultural lands. The goal does not apply.

6. Farmland should be taxed at agricultural use value.

The land is being changed to ID zoning, the goal does not apply.

7. Additional housing allowed on farmlands shall be necessary for farm management purposes. These dwellings should be manufactured homes so they can be removed when not needed, or be occupied by a relative of the farm operator and sited on the same parcel as the principal dwelling. A deed restriction shall be recorded requiring removal of the dwelling when the occupancy or use no longer complies with the criteria or standards under which the dwelling was originally approved.

No dwellings are proposed in this application. This goal does not apply.

8. The location of new dwellings must comply with density limitations intended to protect major and peripheral big game habitat.

No dwellings are proposed in this application. This goal does not apply.

9. When creation of a non-farm parcel is warranted, the size of the parcel shall be as small as possible to preserve the maximum amount of farmland in the farm parcel. Requirements may need to be imposed when non-farm parcels are allowed in farm use areas to minimize the potential for conflicts with accepted farm management practices on nearby land. These may include special setbacks, deed restrictions and vegetative screening.

The subject property represents the minimum parcel area that could reasonably remain after accommodating the permanent public transportation infrastructure and associated constraints. This parcel was created as small as possible when it was involved in a property line adjustment (PLA 24-003) that created its configuration. The goal is met.

12. OAR 660-004-0018 (2) requires that “physically developed” and “irrevocably committed” exceptions to goals, plan, and zone designations shall authorize a single numeric minimum lot size and shall limit uses, density, and public facilities and services to those:
- A. That are the same as the existing land uses on the exception site;*
 - B. That meet the following requirements:*
 - i. The rural uses, density, and public facilities and services will maintain the land as “Rural Land” as defined by the goals and are consistent with all other applicable Goal requirements; and*
 - ii. The rural uses, density, and public facilities and services will not commit adjacent or nearby resource uses to nonresource use as defined in OAR 660-004-0028; and*
 - iii. The rural uses, density, and public facilities and services are compatible with adjacent or nearby resource uses;*
 - C. For which the uses, density, and public facilities and services are consistent with OAR 660-022-0030, ‘Planning and Zoning of Unincorporated Communities’, if applicable, or*
 - D. That are industrial development uses, and accessory uses subordinate to the industrial development, in buildings of any size and type, provided the exception area was planned and zoned for industrial use on January 1, 2004, subject to the territorial limits and other requirements of ORS 197.713 and 197.714.*

The parcel is not within an unincorporated community and is not in industrial use, C and D do not apply. Marion County has adopted a rural Interchange District zone and rural

Comprehensive Plan designation which has been acknowledged as complying with Goal 14, Urbanization. The zone ensures that rural uses will not exceed density limitations on rural land and will not commit rural uses to requiring an urban level of public facilities. The commercial uses which would be allowed under the county's ID zone would be able to be supported on solely a rural level of public services, including rural septic service, and would be similar to the types of uses found in the surrounding land to the west and at other interchanges in the County, which are zoned ID. The property cannot be farmed in conjunction with any other parcels in the area. No urban public services will be needed to serve the site. The parcels in the area already consist of properties in commercial or highway use. Based on the evidence and findings provided by the applicant and summarized here, the proposal appears to meet the criteria for a goal three exception.

13. OAR 660-004-028 specifies that a local government may adopt an exception to a goal when the land subject to the exception is irrevocably committed to uses not allowed by the applicable goal because existing adjacent uses and other relevant factors make the uses allowed by the applicable goal impracticable. It further stipulates that whether land is irrevocably committed depends on the relationship between the exception area and the adjacent land. The findings for a committed exception, therefore, must address the following:

A. The characteristics of the exception area;

B. The characteristics of the adjacent area and the lands adjacent to it; and

C. The relationship between the exception area and the lands adjacent to it; and

D. The other relevant factors set forth in OAR 660-04-028(6).

OAR 660-004-028(6) referenced above indicates that findings of fact for a committed exception shall address the following factors:

A. Existing adjacent uses;

B. Existing public facilities and services (water and sewer lines, etc.);

C. Parcel size and ownership patterns of the exception area and adjacent lands:

- (i) Consideration of parcel size and ownership patterns shall include an analysis of how the existing development pattern came about and whether findings against the Goals were made at the time of partitioning or subdivision. Past land divisions made without application of the Goals do not in themselves demonstrate irrevocable commitment of the exception area. Only if development (e.g., physical improvements*

such as roads and underground utilities) on the resulting parcels or other factors makes unsuitable their resource use or the resource use of nearby lands can the parcels be considered to be irrevocably committed. Resource and non-resource parcels created pursuant to the applicable goals shall not be used to justify a committed exception. For example, the presence of several parcels created for non-farm dwellings or an intensive commercial agricultural operation under the provisions of an exclusive farm use zone cannot be used to justify a committed exception for land adjoining those parcels.

- (ii) Existing parcel sizes and contiguous ownership shall be considered together in relation to the land's actual use. For example, several contiguous undeveloped parcels (including parcels separated only by a road or highway) under one ownership shall be considered as one farm or forest operation. The mere fact that small parcels exist does not in itself constitute irrevocable commitment. Small parcels in separate ownerships are not likely to be irrevocably committed if they stand alone amidst larger farm or forest operations, or are buffered from such operations.*

D. Neighborhood and regional characteristics;

E. Natural or manmade features or other impediments separating the exception area from adjacent resource land. Such features or impediments include but are not limited to roads, watercourses, utility lines, easements, or rights-of-way that effectively impede practicable resource use of all or part of the exception area;

F. Physical Development according to OAR 660-004-025; and

G. Other relevant factors.

Applicant has addressed the characteristics and relationship of the exception area and the lands adjacent to it, consistent with OAR 660-004-028, as shown in 12 (A), (B), (C) and (D) above. The land is segmented and broken off from the lands around it, due to the existence of Dolores Way, right-of-way to the east and south and Ehlen RD to the north. To the west lies more lands zoned ID and developed with a gas station, mini-mart and RV park. If this zone change were to be approved, the subject property would be consistent with this zoning and create a harmonious area of ID zoned land, appropriately buffered and separated from EFU lands in the area such that, no adverse impacts would be expected.

The subject property's relationship with other lands in the area is that it does not have any. Due to its separation from the original parcel, it has been left as wasteland, bordered on three sides by roads and a fourth is developed with a gas station.

The rural ID zone permits uses that do not require public facilities such as sewer or water.

Additionally, Ehlen Rd and Dolores Way have split off this segment of EFU land from its larger, farmable parent parcel. It is now an island constrained on all sides and too small for practicable farm use. (i) above explains how roads may be used to demonstrate that a parcel is irrevocably committed to a non-resource use, this applies here. Much of this development occurred due to ODOT completely re-building this interchange in a multi-year project.

Applicant states:

“After accounting for permanent infrastructure, easements, drainage facilities, and access limitations, the remaining area theoretically available for cultivation is approximately 1.14 acres. This isolated and constrained area does not support commercial agricultural production, does not meaningfully contribute to Oregon’s agricultural economy, and cannot be practically farmed using modern agricultural practices. The parcel cannot be reintegrated into adjacent farm operations and no longer functions as agricultural land in any practical or economic sense. The relationship between the subject property and adjacent lands further demonstrates irrevocable commitment. Surrounding development to the south and west consists of long- established highway-oriented commercial uses, including fueling stations, trucking services, and an RV park. These uses generate traffic volumes, lighting, noise, and operational characteristics that are incompatible with farm use and reflect an interchange service environment rather than an agricultural setting. While agricultural lands remain to the north and east, the subject parcel is permanently separated from those lands by public infrastructure and does not function in coordination with ongoing farm operations.

Considering the characteristics of the exception area, the characteristics of adjacent lands, and the relationship between them, continued application of Goal 3 to the subject property no longer advances the purpose of protecting agricultural land. The parcel has been permanently committed to non-resource use by public infrastructure investment and surrounding development patterns, and it is impracticable for uses allowed under Goal 3.

The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Zone Change recognize the parcel’s irrevocable commitment to non-resource use while preserving surrounding agricultural lands that remain viable and productive. The exception complies with Goal 2 and OAR 660-004-0028 and represents a logical, limited application of non-resource zoning to land that has already been removed from the agricultural land base through public action.”

To address (ii) above, Applicant owns land adjacent to this parcel, but the land is already developed with a gas station.

The proposal meets the criteria for an irrevocably committed exception to Goal 3.

ZC CP 25-004 – RECOMMENDATION

Jubitz Corporation

Page 15

ZONE CHANGE

14. The requirements for zone changes are found in MCC (Marion County Code) 17.123.060 and include:

A. The proposed zone is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan land use designation on the property and is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and the description and policies for the applicable land use classification in the Comprehensive Plan; and

The subject property consists of approximately 3.12 acres and is a remnant parcel created through a previously approved Property Line Adjustment to accommodate the Oregon Department of Transportation's Aurora Donald Interchange improvement project. The project included the realignment of Delores Way NE and related interchange infrastructure. The parcel is encumbered by permanent transportation facilities, an established communication tower and associated easements, a ravine, and drainage facilities associated with the interchange project. These features substantially limit the usable area of the site and have permanently altered its relationship to surrounding agricultural lands. The approved interchange plans demonstrate that the site is now bounded and influenced by roadway infrastructure that separates it from the larger agricultural land base and defines its functional context as part of an interchange area rather than a farm unit.

The property no longer possesses the characteristics necessary to support long-term commercial agricultural use. The remaining unconstrained area is limited in size, irregularly shaped, and lacks practical access for modern farm equipment. The site does not function as part of a contiguous agricultural operation and does not meaningfully contribute to Marion County's agricultural land base. The continued application of the Primary Agriculture designation no longer reflects the realities of the site.

The proposed Commercial Comprehensive Plan designation is appropriate given the property's location within an established interchange area that includes existing highway-oriented commercial uses and Interchange District zoning on adjacent and nearby properties including truck stops and gas stations. The designation recognizes that the site is irrevocably committed to non-resource use due to surrounding development, public infrastructure investments, and site-specific constraints that make agricultural use impracticable, consistent with OAR 660-004-0028.

The proposed zone is appropriate for the amended Comprehensive Plan land use designation and is consistent with the applicable goals and policies of the Marion County Comprehensive Plan. MCC 17.123.060(A) is satisfied.

B. The proposed change is appropriate considering the surrounding land uses and the density and pattern of development in the area; and

The subject property consists of approximately 3.12 acres and is constrained by permanent features including public roadways on multiple sides, an established communication tower and associated access easement, an ODOT drainage easement, and a ravine that fragments the site. These conditions isolate the parcel from surrounding agricultural lands and prevent it from functioning as part of a contiguous farm unit. The resulting development pattern places the site within an interchange environment characterized by high traffic volumes, signalized intersections, and roadway geometry that is incompatible with farm operations.

Surrounding land uses reinforce this commitment. Properties to the south and west are developed or zoned for highway-oriented commercial uses that serve Interstate 5 traffic, including an RV park, trucking facilities, and fueling stations. These uses establish the prevailing development pattern and intensity in the immediate area. While agricultural uses remain to the north and east, they are separated from the subject property by public roadways, infrastructure improvements, and topographic features that eliminate any functional agricultural relationship between the parcels.

The proposed Commercial and Interchange District zoning recognizes the site's irrevocable commitment to non-resource use and aligns the zoning designation with the existing density, pattern, and functional character of development in this interchange area. The criterion is met.

C. Adequate public facilities, services, and transportation networks are in place, or are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property;

Adequate public facilities, services, and transportation networks are in place, or are planned to be provided concurrently with future development of the subject property, consistent with its irrevocable commitment to non-resource use. The parcel was created through an approved Property Line Adjustment to accommodate the Oregon Department of Transportation's Aurora Donald Interchange improvement project, including the realignment of Dolores Way NE and related interchange infrastructure.

The property is directly accessed from Ehlen Road NE and is integrated into the interchange circulation system formed by the realigned Dolores Way NE, new intersections, and associated roadway and signal improvements constructed as part of the ODOT project. These transportation improvements define the site's long-term functional context and exist independently of this application. The roadway network serving the parcel is designed to support interchange-related activity and further reinforces that the site is no longer suitable for agricultural use.

The subject property is located within a rural service area and will be served by on-site water and wastewater systems. Septic suitability for the parcel has already been evaluated and approved by Marion County as part of the partition and property line adjustment process, demonstrating that on-site wastewater disposal is feasible and compliant with applicable County standards.

The proposed zone change does not require the extension of urban services. Any future development of the property will be subject to separate land use and development review to ensure compliance with County standards for access, utilities, and site services. Given the existence of permanent transportation infrastructure, approved septic suitability, and the parcel's creation and configuration within an interchange environment, adequate public facilities, services, and transportation networks are in place or can be provided concurrently with future development of the property. The criterion is met.

D. The other lands in the county already designated for the proposed use are either unavailable or not as well suited for the anticipated uses due to location, size or other factors; and

The parcel was created as a result of the Oregon Department of Transportation's I-5 interchange improvements, including the realignment of Dolores Way NE, and now exists as a remnant parcel defined by roadway infrastructure and surrounding non-resource development.

The subject property is physically and functionally disconnected from the surrounding agricultural land base and is constrained by permanent features, including roadway frontage on multiple sides, an established communication tower and associated easements, drainage facilities, and topographic limitations. These conditions render the parcel impracticable for agricultural use and distinguish it from other lands-designated for commercial use that were planned and zoned without similar constraints or infrastructure impacts.

Other lands designated for commercial use in Marion County do not share the same combination of site-specific factors that define this parcel, including its formation as a remnant of a public transportation improvement, its isolation from farm operations, and its integration into an interchange circulation system. The appropriateness of commercial and Interchange District zoning on this site is therefore tied to the parcel's existing condition and context, not to the siting of a particular commercial use that could reasonably be located elsewhere.

This specific parcel has already been removed from the agricultural land base by permanent public infrastructure improvements and is irrevocably committed to non-resource use. The criterion is met.

- E. If the proposed zone allows uses more intensive than uses in other zones appropriate for the land use designation, the new zone will not allow uses that would significantly adversely affect allowed uses on adjacent properties zoned for less intensive uses.*

The proposed zone change will not allow uses that would significantly adversely affect allowed uses on adjacent properties zoned for less intensive uses. Accepted and expected intensive agricultural activities establish an operational intensity that is present in the surrounding area.

The subject property is physically and functionally separated from adjacent agricultural lands to the north and east by permanent features, including public roadway infrastructure associated with the I-5 interchange, a drainage ravine, and a communications tower site. To the south and west, the surrounding land use pattern is defined by existing highway-oriented commercial development, including fueling stations, a trucking operation, and an RV park. These uses generate traffic, noise and activity levels that are comparable to or greater than those typically associated with EFU uses. The subject parcel functions as a transition area between this established commercial interchange and remaining agricultural lands beyond the roadway and drainage features.

Given the intensity of uses permitted within the EFU zone, the permanent physical separation created by public infrastructure and drainage facilities, and the existing commercial activity in the interchange area, the application of Commercial and Interchange District zoning to the subject parcel will not significantly adversely affect allowed farm uses on adjacent properties. The parcel's irrevocable commitment to non-resource use ensures that future development will occur within a context where agricultural and non-agricultural intensities already coexist. Any future development of the site will remain subject to applicable development standards and review procedures designed to address compatibility

This proposal makes the best use of the Applicant's vacant land. The proposal is consistent with surrounding uses that comprise commercial, residential, and quasi-public uses on surrounding lands. Applicant has shown how the parcel can be served by well and septic and that uses allowed will not be too intensive for the area.

Based on the information submitted by Applicant, the criteria for a zone change from Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) to Commercial (C) are satisfied.

VII. Recommendation

It is hereby found that Applicant has met the burden of proving the applicable standards and criteria for a zone change and comprehensive plan change to change the zone from EFU (Exclusive Farm Use) to ID (Interchange District) zone and to change the comprehensive plan designation from Primary Agriculture to Commercial, with an exception to Statewide Planning

ZC CP 25-004 – RECOMMENDATION

Jubitz Corporation

Page 19

Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands) on a 3.12 acre parcel located in the 12000 block of Ehlen Rd NE, Aurora. The Hearings Officer recommends that the Marion County Board of Commissioners GRANT the Application subject to the following conditions that are necessary for the public health, safety, and welfare:

1. Applicant shall obtain all permits required by the Marion County Building Inspection Division.
2. All future development on the property must satisfy the specific development standards in the ID zone, chapter 17.150 and the general development standards found in chapter 17.112, 17.113 and 17.118 of the Marion County Code.

VIII. Referral

This document is a recommendation to the Marion County Board of Commissioners. The Board will make the final determination on this Application after holding a public hearing. The Planning Division will notify all parties of the hearing date.


DATED at Salem, Oregon, this 22nd day of April, 2026.



Jill F. Foster


Marion County Hearings Officer

Land Use Planning Web Map



8/26/2026, 12:48:20 PM

Roadways				City Roads		Commercial		Industrial/Commercial		Urban Development
	State Roads			Federal Roads		Commercial General		Multi Residential		Urban Transition
	County Roads			Private Roads		Commercial Office		Public		UGBs
	NCR, Limited Maintenance			Parcels		EFU		Single Residential		County Boundary
	Non County Roads			MC Zoning		Farm Timber		Special Agriculture		City Boundaries
	County Owned, City Maintained			Acreage Residential		Industrial		Timber Conservation		



MC IT-GIS, MC PW, MC-ASR, MC-IT GIS, MC-Planning, MC-IT GIS, MC IT-GIS, MC Planning, Oregon Metro, Bureau of Land Management, State of

Public Works Planning

Oregon Water Resources Department | MC IT-GIS, MC Planning | MC-Planning, MC-IT GIS | MC-ASR, MC-IT GIS | MC IT-GIS, MC PW | National Interagency Fire Center | Planning, MarionGIS | Marion County Oregon | IT-GIS, Public Works | Marion County



MARION COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Board Session Agenda Review Form

Meeting date: September 23, 2026

Department: Public Works

Title:

Consider adoption of an ordinance granting Zone Change/Comprehensive Plan Change 25-004/Jubitz Corporation

Management Update/Work Session Date: N/A Audio/Visual aids ☐

Time Required: 5 min Contact: Austin Barnes Phone: 503-566-4174

Requested Action:

Staff recommended motion: Approve the administrative ordinance approving Zone Change/Comprehensive Plan Change 25-004/Jubitz Corporation.
Other motion options for consideration are:
1. Direct staff to make changes and approve a modified ordinance.
2. Not approve the ordinance.

Issue, Description
& Background:

The Marion County Hearings Officer held a duly noticed hearing on the application on March 19, 2026. On April 22, 2026, the Hearings Officer issued a recommendation to approve Zone Change/Comprehensive Plan Change 25-004/Jubitz Corporation. The Board held a duly noticed hearing on the application on August 26th, 2026 and approved the application.

The ordinance and findings have been prepared and notice of adoption was given on September 16, 2026.

Financial Impacts:

None

Impacts to Department
& External Agencies:

None

List of attachments:

Ordinance

Presenter:

Austin Barnes

Department Head
Signature:

for Brian Ryck