

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES,
THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF
THE STATE OF OREGON

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM FOR)FINAL ORDER
COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352)CLAIM NO. M129894
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
George R. Duncan Jr. and Mary F. Duncan, CLAIMANTS)

Claimants: George R. Duncan Jr. and Mary F. Duncan (the Claimants)

Property: Township 9S, Range 1W, Section 11D, Tax lot 100
Marion County (the property)

Claim: The demand for compensation and any supporting information received
from the Claimants by the State of Oregon (the Claim).

Claimants submitted the Claim to the State of Oregon under ORS 197.352. Under OAR 125-145-0010 *et seq.*, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) referred the Claim to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) as the regulating entity. This order is based on the record herein, including the Findings and Conclusions set forth in the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of DLCD (the DLCD Report) attached to and by this reference incorporated into this order.

ORDER

The Claim is denied as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report.


This Order is entered by the Deputy Director of the DLCD as a final order of DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.352, OAR 660-002-0010(8), and OAR chapter 125, division 145, and by the Administrator for the State Services Division of the DAS as a final order of DAS under ORS 197.352, OAR chapter 125, division 145, and ORS chapter 293.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND
CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:
Lane Shetterly, Director



Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director
DLCD
Dated this 14th day of February, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:



David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 14th day of February, 2007.

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL OR OTHER JUDICIAL RELIEF

You are entitled, or may be entitled, to the following judicial remedies:

1. Judicial review under ORS 183.484: Judicial review under ORS 183.484 may be obtained by filing a petition for review within 60 days from the service of this order. A petition for judicial review under ORS 183.484 may be filed in the Circuit Court for Marion County or the Circuit Court in the county in which you reside.
2. A cause of action under ORS 197.352 (Measure 37 (2004)): If a land use regulation continues to apply to the subject property more than 180 days after the present owner of the property has made written demand for compensation under ORS 197.352, the present owner of the property, or any interest therein, shall have a cause of action in the circuit court in which the real property is located.

(Copies of the documents that comprise the record are available for review at the Department's office at 635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150, Salem, Oregon 97301-2540)

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
Final Staff Report and Recommendation

February 14, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M129894

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: George R. Duncan Jr.
Mary F. Duncan

MAILING ADDRESS: 582 E. Washington Street
Stayton, Oregon 97383

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 9S, Range 1W, Section 11D
Tax lot 100
Marion County

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: August 21, 2006

180-DAY DEADLINE: February 17, 2007

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, George and Mary Duncan, seek compensation in the amount of \$510,650 for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimants desire compensation or the right to divide and develop 9.83 acres of the 10.62-acre subject property.¹ The subject property is located at 14492 Old Mehama Road SE, near Stayton, in Marion County. (See claim.)

II. SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth below, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) has determined that the claim is not valid because neither the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) nor the department has enforced laws that restrict the claimants' use of the private real property. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

¹ The claimants state that tax lot 100 is 11.43 acres and has a southern boundary extending approximately 200 feet into the Santiam River. The claimants further state that the portion extending into the river is zoned Public (P) by Marion County. The current Marion County Assessor's map (91W11D), dated November 7, 2005, and accessed online on January 16, 2007, indicates that the subject property is 10.62 acres, all of which is zoned Urban Transition Farm (UTF) and entirely located within the City of Stayton's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). See <http://apps.co.marion.or.us/mapbook/assessorimages/091W11D.pdf>. This report relies upon the map provided by the Marion County Assessor's Office.

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On November 28, 2006, pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080, the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS) provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. According to DAS, one written comment was received in response to the 10-day notice.

The comment does not address whether the claim meets the criteria for relief under ORS 197.352. Comments concerning the effects a use of the subject property may have on surrounding areas are generally not something that the department is able to consider in determining whether to waive a state law. If funds do become available to pay compensation, then such effects may become relevant in determining which claims to pay compensation for instead of waive a state law. (See the comment letter in the department's claim file.)

IV. TIMELINESS OF CLAIM

Requirement

ORS 197.352(5) requires that a written demand for compensation be made:

1. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted prior to the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of that effective date, or the date the public entity applies the land use regulation as an approval criteria to an application submitted by the owner, whichever is later; or
2. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted after the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of the enactment of the land use regulation, or the date the owner of the property submits a land use application in which the land use regulation is an approval criteria, whichever is later.

Findings of Fact

This claim was submitted to DAS on August 21, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies the following as the basis for the claim: all statewide planning goals; ORS chapters 197 and 215; OAR 660; Marion County's rural zoning and subdivision and partitioning ordinances; and Marion County's comprehensive plan and "UTF" and "P" zoning. Only laws that were enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, are the basis for this claim.

Conclusions

The claim has been submitted within two years of the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), based on land use regulations enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, and is therefore timely filed.

V. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM

1. Ownership

ORS 197.352 provides for payment of compensation or relief from specific laws for “owners” as that term is defined in ORS 197.352. ORS 197.352(11)(C) defines “owner” as “the present owner of the property, or any interest therein.”

Findings of Fact

The claimants, George and Mary Duncan, acquired the subject property on May 12, 1955, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. The Marion County Assessor’s Office confirms the claimants’ current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, George and Mary Duncan, are “owners” of the subject property as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of May 12, 1955.

2. The Laws That are the Basis for This Claim

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires, in part, that a law must restrict the claimants’ use of private real property in a manner that reduces the fair market value of the property relative to how the property could have been used at the time the claimants or a family member acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to divide and develop 9.83 acres of the 10.62-acre subject property, and that current land use regulations prohibit the desired use.²

The subject property is currently zoned Urban Transition Farm (UTF) by Marion County. The UTF zone is a farm zone for areas planned for future urban development and has a minimum lot size of 20 acres, with some exceptions. The subject property is within the City of Stayton’s Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).

In general, the zoning of a particular property within a UGB is determined by the city or county with land use jurisdiction over the property. In some circumstances, the Commission’s rules or state statutes may apply to a local government decision regarding zoning, but usually, within a UGB, state laws require or encourage a higher intensity of development rather than restrict the

² The claimants summarily cite numerous state land use laws as applicable to this claim, but do not establish how the laws either apply to the claimants’ desired use of the subject property or restrict its use with the effect of reducing its fair market value. On their face, most of the regulations either do not apply to the claimants’ desired use of the property or do not restrict the claimants’ desired use of the property with the effect of reducing its fair market value. In particular, the claimants generally cite ORS 197. However, they have not established how this regulation applies to or restricts their desired use of the property. This report addresses only those regulations that the department finds are applicable to and restrict the claimants’ desired use of the subject property, based on the claimants’ description of their desired use.

use of real property. In this case, the claimants have not alleged how a specific state land use regulation restricts the use of real property and has the effect of reducing the fair market value of that real property.

Based on the information in the claim, the department has not identified any state laws that restrict the claimants' use of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claim does not establish any state laws that currently restrict the use of the claimants' property. Because the subject property is located within the City of Stayton's UGB, neither the Commission nor the department enforces laws that require specific zoning of the property. Based on the record before the department, neither the Commission nor the department enforces any laws that restrict the use of the claimants' real property.

3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires that the land use regulations (described in Section V.(2) of this report) must have "the effect of reducing the fair market value of the property, or any interest therein."

As explained in Section V.(2) of this report, the claimants, George and Mary Duncan, have not established that any state land use regulations restrict the use of the subject property. Accordingly, the department cannot determine that any laws enforced by the Commission or the department have had the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property.

4. Exemptions Under ORS 197.352(3)

ORS 197.352 does not apply to certain land use regulations. In addition, under ORS 197.352(3), certain types of laws are exempt from ORS 197.352.

As explained in Section V.(2) of this report, the claimants, George and Mary Duncan, have not established that any state land use regulations restrict the use of the subject property. Accordingly, the department cannot determine that any exemptions under ORS 197.352(3) apply to this claim.

VI. FORM OF RELIEF

ORS 197.352(1) provides for payment of compensation to an owner of private real property if the Commission or the department has enforced one or more laws that restrict the use of the property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. In lieu of compensation, the department may choose to not apply the law in order to allow the present owner to carry out a use of the property permitted at the time the present owner acquired the property. The Commission, by rule, has directed that if the department determines a claim is valid, the Director of the department must provide only non-monetary relief unless and until funds are appropriated by the legislature to pay claims.

Findings of Fact

Based on the record for this claim, the claimants have not established that any state laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the use of the subject property, and have the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property. Because the subject property is located within the City of Stayton's UGB, neither the Commission nor the department enforces laws that require specific zoning of the property.

Conclusions

Based on the record before the department, the claimants, George and Mary Duncan, have not established that they are entitled to relief under ORS 197.352(1) as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department. Therefore, the department recommends that this claim be denied.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on January 22, 2007. OAR 125-145 0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimants or the claimants' authorized agent and any third parties who submitted comments under OAR 125-145-0080 to submit written comments, evidence and information in response to the draft staff report and recommendation.