Oregon
Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development
635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150
Salem, Oregon 97301-2524
Phone: (503) 373-0050
First Floor/Coastal Fax: (503) 378-6033
Second Floor/Director's Office Fax: (503) 378-5518
Third Floor/Measure 37 Fax: (503) 378-5318
Web Address: http://www.oregon.gov/LCD

April 20, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director

Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130465

Claimant: Darwin Lederer

Enclosed, in regard to the above-referenced claim for compensation under Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352), is the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of the Department of Land Conservation and Development, and the Final Order.

This Final Staff Report and Recommendation and the Final Order constitute the final decision on this claim. No further action will be taken on this matter.

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 COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF Darwin Lederer, CLAIMANT	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M130465

Claimant: Darwin Lederer (the Claimant)

Property: Township 6S, Range 2W, Section 16, Tax lots 200 and 300, Marion County (the Property)

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

Claimant 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 approved as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report, and subject to the following terms:

1. In lieu of compensation under ORS 197.352, the State of Oregon will not apply the following laws to Darwin Lederer's division of the 4.65-acre subject property into one 4.05-acre parcel and one 0.6-acre parcel or to his development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired each of the subject tax lots. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 300 on April 3, 1974, and tax lot 200 on October 19, 1996. The department acknowledges that the relief to which the claimant is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow the claimant to use tax lot 200 in the manner set forth in the claim.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on April 3, 1974, and October 19, 1996. On April 3, 1974, tax lot 300 was subject to the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect, including the interim planning goals set forth in ORS 215.515 (1973 edition). On October 19, 1996, tax lot 200 was subject to compliance with

the provisions of Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 33, as implemented by Marion County's acknowledged EFU zone, and the applicable provisions ORS 215 currently in effect.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the subject property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property unless the claimant first obtains that permit, license or other form of authorization or consent. Such requirements may include, but are not limited to: a building permit, a land use decision, a "permit" as defined in ORS 215.402 or 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies and restrictions on the use of the subject property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the subject property by the claimant under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (1) above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimant to use the subject property, it may be necessary for him to obtain a decision under ORS 197.352 from a city and/or county and/or metropolitan service district that enforces land use regulations applicable to the property. Nothing in this order relieves the claimant from the necessity of obtaining a decision under ORS 197.352 from a local public entity that has jurisdiction to enforce a land use regulation applicable to a use of the subject property by the claimant.

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 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 125, division 145, and ORS 293.

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

Cora R Parker

Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director
DLCD
Dated this 20th day of April, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 20th day of April, 2007.

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL OR OTHER JUDICIAL RELIEF

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

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)

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

The Oregon Department of Justice has advised the Department of Land Conservation and Development that "[i]f the current owner of the real property conveys the property before the new use allowed by the public entity is established, then the entitlement to relief will be lost."

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
Final Staff Report and Recommendation

April 20, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M130465
NAME OF CLAIMANT:	Darwin Lederer
MAILING ADDRESS:	9280 59th Avenue NE Salem, Oregon 97305
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 6S, Range 2W, Section 16 Tax lots 200 and 300 Marion County
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	October 27, 2007
180-DAY DEADLINE:	April 25, 2007

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Darwin Lederer, seeks compensation in the amount of $200,000 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 claimant desires compensation or the right to divide the 4.65-acre subject property[1] into one 4.05-acre parcel and one 0.6-acre parcel and to develop a dwelling on the resulting undeveloped parcel.[2] The subject property is located at 9280 and 9290 59th Avenue, near Salem, 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 valid. Department staff recommends that, in lieu of compensation, the requirements of the following state laws enforced by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) or the department not apply to Darwin Lederer's division of the 4.65-acre subject property into one 4.05-acre parcel and one 0.6-acre parcel and to his development of a dwelling on the resulting undeveloped

[1] The subject property includes two tax lots. Tax lot 200 consists of 4.05 acres, and tax lot 300 consists of 0.6 acre.
[2] The claim also indicates that the claimant desires to transfer the newly created parcels for development. In effect, the claimant request that a decision of the department to "not apply" (waive) certain laws as set forth in this report be transferable with the property. ORS 197.352 only authorizes a state agency to waive a law in order to allow the current owner a use of the property permitted at the time that owner acquired the property. A determination of transferability is beyond the scope of relief that the department may grant under ORS 197.352. The Oregon Department of Justice has advised the department that "[i]f the current owner of the real property conveys the property before a new use allowed by the public entity is established, then the entitlement to relief will be lost."

parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired each of the subject tax lots. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 300 on April 3, 1974, and tax lot 200 on October 19, 1996. The department acknowledges that the relief to which the claimant is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow the claimant to use tax lot 200 in the manner set forth in the claim. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On March 13, 2007, 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, no written comments were received in response to the 10-day notice.

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 October 27, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Marion County's Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zone as the basis for the claim. 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 claimant, Darwin Lederer, acquired tax lot 300 from his parents, Harold and Betty Lederer on April 3, 1974, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim.[3] The claimant first acquired an interest in tax lot 200 from his father on June 20, 1982, as evidenced by a bargain and sale deed included with the claim. However, the deed by which the claimant acquired tax lot 200 was subject to a life estate in favor of Harold Lederer. That life estate reserved in Harold Lederer the exclusive right to use tax lot 200 during his lifetime. The claimant's interest did not provide him with any present right to use tax lot 200 during the term of Harold Lederer's life. Under the terms of the deed, the claimant acquired his present interest and a right to use tax lot 200, an interest that can be restricted by land use regulations, upon the death of Harold Lederer on October 19, 1996, as evidenced by a death certificate provided by Marion County's Planning Department. Harold Lederer acquired tax lot 200 from the claimant's grandfather, Grant Lederer, who acquired tax lot 200 on November 14, 1961, as reflected by a deed included in the claim. The Marion County Assessor's Office confirms the claimant's current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimant, Darwin Lederer, is an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of April 3, 1974, for tax lot 300 and as of October 19, 1996, for tax lot 200. Grant Lederer is a "family member," as defined by ORS 197.352(11)(A), for tax lot 200, and acquired the tax lot on November 14, 1961.

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 claimant's 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 claimant or a family member acquired the property.

---

[3] The claimant asserts a family acquisition of the subject property dating back to 1859. The claim does not include sufficient documentation to substantiate that family acquisition. The claim includes documentation that the claimant's family acquired tax lot 200 in 1961. However, while the claimant acquired tax lot 300 from his parents, the claimant does not include any documentation establishing when the claimant's parents acquired that tax lot. Absent evidence to establish when the claimant's family acquired tax lot 300, the department cannot evaluate the claim for compensation for that tax lot based on family ownership.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimant desires to divide the 4.65-acre subject property into one 4.05-acre parcel and one 0.6-acre parcel and to develop a dwelling on each parcel, and that the desired use is not allowed under current land use regulations.

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning and restrict uses on EFU-zoned land. The claimant's property is zoned EFU by Marion County as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the claimant's property is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3.[4] Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural land as defined by Goal 3 be zoned EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

Current land use regulations, particularly ORS 215.263, 215.284 and 215.780 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, prohibit the division of EFU-zoned land into parcels less than 80 acres and establish standards for development of dwellings on existing or proposed parcels on that land.

ORS 215.780 establishes an 80-acre minimum size for the creation of new lots or parcels in EFU zones and became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). ORS 215.263 (2005 edition) establishes standards for the creation of new parcels for non-farm uses and dwellings allowed in an EFU zone.

OAR 660-033-0135 (applicable to farm dwellings) became effective on March 1, 1994, and interprets the statutory standard for a primary dwelling in an EFU zone under ORS 215.283(1)(f). OAR 660-033-0130(4) (applicable to non-farm dwellings) became effective on August 7, 1993, and was amended to comply with ORS 215.284(4) on March 1, 1994. The Commission subsequently adopted amendments to comply with House Bill 3326 (Chapter 704, Oregon Laws 2001, effective on January 1, 2002), which were effective on May 22, 2002. (See administrative rule history for OAR 660-033-0100, -0130 and -0135.)

The claimant's family first acquired tax lot 200 in 1961, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations. No county zoning applied to tax lot 200 in 1961.

The claimant acquired tax lot 300 on April 3, 1974, after the adoption of Senate Bill 100 (Chapter 80, Oregon Laws 1973) effective on October 5, 1973, but before the adoption of the statewide planning goals, effective on January 25, 1975.

During the period between October 5, 1973, and January 25, 1975, ORS 197.175(1) and 197.280 (1973 editions) required, in addition to any local plan or zoning provisions, that cities and counties exercise their planning responsibilities in accordance with the interim land use planning goals set forth in ORS 215.515 (1973 edition). *Petersen v. Klamath Falls*, 279 Or 249 (1977); *see also*, *Meeker v. Board of Comm'rs*, 287 Or 665 (1979) (review of a subdivision is an exercise of planning responsibilities requiring application of the goals); *State Housing Council v. Lake*

[4] The claimant's property is "agricultural land" because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Class I–IV soils.

Oswego, 48 Or App. 525 (1981) (noting that while "[l]and use planning responsibility is not defined in ORS ch 197, the Supreme Court has interpreted that term as including annexation approvals, *subdivision approvals* [emphasis added] and partition approvals") citing *Petersen*, *Meeker* and *Alexanderson v. Polk County*, 285 Or 427 (1980). The claimant's desired use includes subdivision of his land. If the claimant had sought to create that use in 1974, as a matter of law, the use would have been subject to the interim planning goals at ORS 215.515.[5] The following interim goals are directly applicable to this claim: "To preserve the quality of the air, water and *land* [emphasis added] resources of the state"; "To conserve prime farm lands for the production of crops"; "To provide for the orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use"; "To protect life and property in areas subject to floods, landslides and other natural disasters"; "To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system including all modes of transportation: Air, water, rail, highway and mass transit and recognizing differences in the social costs in the various modes of transportation"; and "To develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development." ORS 215.515 (1973 edition).

No information has been provided establishing whether or to what extent the claimant's desired division of tax lot 300 for residential development complies with the interim planning goals set forth in ORS 215.515 (1973 edition) in effect at the time the claimant acquired that tax lot on April 3, 1974.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were all enacted or adopted after the claimant's family acquired tax lot 200 in 1961 and after the claimant acquired tax lot 300 in 1974 and do not allow the desired division or development of the property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when the claimant's family acquired tax lot 200 and when the claimant acquired tax lot 300. However, the claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimant's desired use of tax lot 300 complies with the interim planning goals in effect when he acquired that tax lot on April 3, 1974.

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the uses that the claimant has identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimant's use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to the claimant's use of the property, that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of the subject property

[5] The "interim" land use goals are set forth in ORS 215.515(1)(a) to (j) (1973 edition) as follows: (a) "To preserve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state," (b) "To conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources," (c) "To provide for the recreational needs of citizens of the state and visitors," (d) "To conserve prime farm lands for the production of crops," (e) "To provide for the orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use," (f) "To protect life and property in areas subject to floods, landslides and other natural disasters," (g) "To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system including all modes of transportation: Air, water, rail, highway and mass transit and recognizing differences in the social costs in the various modes of transportation," (h) "To develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development," (i) "To diversify and improve the economy of the state" and (j) "To ensure that the development of properties within the state is commensurate with the character and the physical limitations of the land." ORS 215.515 (1973 edition).

until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimant seeks a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use.

3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires that the land use regulation(s) (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."

Findings of Fact

The claim includes an estimate of $200,000 as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to the regulations that restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. This amount is based on the claimant's assessment of the subject property's value.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Darwin Lederer whose family member acquired tax lot 200 on November 14, 1961, and who acquired tax lot 300 on April 3, 1974. Under ORS 197.352, the claimant is due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property and have the effect of reducing its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws enacted or adopted since the claimant's family acquired tax lot 200 and the claimant acquired tax lot 300 restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. The claimant estimates that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of $200,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when the claimant's family acquired tax lot 200 and the claimant acquired tax lot 300, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for this claim, the department determines that the fair market value of the subject property has been reduced to some extent as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department.

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.

Findings of Fact

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property, including applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Marion County has implemented through its current EFU zone. With the exception of applicable provisions of ORS 215, including the interim land use planning goals, in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 300 on April 3, 1974, these state land use regulations were not in effect when the claimant's family acquired tax lot 200 and when the claimant acquired tax lot 300

Conclusions

Without a specific development proposal for the subject property, it is not possible for the department to determine all the laws that may apply to a particular use of the property, or whether those laws may fall under one or more of the exemptions under ORS 197.352. It appears that, with the exception of provisions of ORS 215 in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 300 on April 3, 1974, the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on division and development of the claimant's property were not in effect when the claimant's family acquired tax lot 200 and the claimant acquired tax lot 300. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Provisions of ORS 215, including the interim statewide planning goals in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 300 on April 3, 1974, are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Other laws in effect when the claimant or his family acquired the subject property are also exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and do not provide a basis for compensation. In addition, laws enacted or adopted for a purpose set forth in ORS 197.352(1) to (D) are also exempt and would not provide a basis for compensation

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 findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the claimant's desired use of the subject property. The claim asserts that existing state land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department have the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property by $200,000. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other relevant evidence demonstrating that the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. In order to determine a specific amount of compensation due for this claim, it would also be necessary to verify whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when the claimant's family acquired tax lot 200 and when the claimant acquired tax lot 300. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department has determined that the laws on which the claim is based have reduced the fair market value of the subject property to some extent.

No funds have been appropriated at this time for the payment of claims. In lieu of payment of compensation, ORS 197.352 authorizes the department to modify, remove or not apply all or parts of certain land use regulations to allow Darwin Lederer to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired tax lot 300 on April 3, 1974, and for a use permitted at the time he acquired tax lot 200 on October 19, 1996.

At the time the claimant acquired an interest in tax lot 200, it was zoned EFU by Marion County and subject to the current lot size and dwelling standards under Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, and as described in Section V.(2) of this report.

In addition to the provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 200 in 1996, and other laws in effect when the claimant acquired either of the two subject tax lots, there may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimant's use of the subject property that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of the subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimant seeks a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use. In some cases, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D).

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the uses that the claimant has identified. Similarly, this report only addresses the exemptions provided for under ORS 197.352(3) that are clearly applicable, given the information provided to the department in the claim. The claimant should be aware that the less information he has provided to the department in the claim, the greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply to his use of the subject property.

Conclusions

Based on the record, the department recommends that the claim be approved, subject to the following terms:

1. In lieu of compensation under ORS 197.352, the State of Oregon will not apply the following laws to Darwin Lederer's division of the 4.65-acre subject property into one 4.05-acre parcel and one 0.6-acre parcel or to his development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired each of the subject tax lots. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 300 on April 3, 1974, and tax lot 200 on October 19, 1996. The department acknowledges that the relief to which the claimant is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow the claimant to use tax lot 200 in the manner set forth in the claim.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on April 3, 1974, and October 19, 1996. On April 3, 1974, tax lot 300 was subject to the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect, including the interim planning goals set forth in ORS 215.515 (1973 edition). On October 19, 1996, tax lot 200 was subject to compliance with the provisions of Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 33, as implemented by Marion County's acknowledged EFU zone, and the applicable provisions ORS 215 currently in effect.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the subject property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property unless the claimant first obtains that permit, license or other form of authorization or consent.

Such requirements may include, but are not limited to: a building permit, a land use decision, a "permit" as defined in ORS 215.402 or 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies and restrictions on the use of the subject property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the subject property by the claimant under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (1) above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimant to use the subject property, it may be necessary for him to obtain a decision under ORS 197.352 from a city and/or county and/or metropolitan service district that enforces land use regulations applicable to the property. Nothing in this order relieves the claimant from the necessity of obtaining a decision under ORS 197.352 from a local public entity that has jurisdiction to enforce a land use regulation applicable to a use of the subject property by the claimant.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on March 30, 2007. OAR 125-145 0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimant or the claimant's 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.