



**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND  
DEVELOPMENT**

**ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (MEASURE 49) SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW  
OF MEASURE 37 CLAIM  
Final Order and Home Site Authorization**

December 12, 2008

**STATE ELECTION NUMBER:** E129469A

**CLAIMANTS:** Keiko Iseri  
2120 Robins Lane SE #215  
Salem, Oregon 97306

Jodell Field  
4742 Liberty Road S. #176  
Salem, OR 97302

**MEASURE 37 PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:** Township 2 North, Range 10 West,  
Section 4D, tax lot 200, and  
Tax lot 100 north of Highway 101<sup>1</sup>  
Tillamook County

**PRIMARY CONTACT INFORMATION:** Greg and Deb Iseri  
27855 Ridgeview Way  
Nehalem, Oregon 97131

**I. ELECTION**

The claimants, Keiko Iseri and Jodell Field, filed a claim under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on June 7, 2006, for property located on the northern side of Highway 101, near Wheeler, in Tillamook County. ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (Measure 49) entitles claimants who filed Measure 37 claims to elect supplemental review of their claims. The claimants elected supplemental review of their Measure 37 claim under Section 6 of Measure 49, which allows the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) to authorize up to three home site approvals to qualified claimants. This Final Order and Home Site Authorization is the conclusion of the supplemental review of this claim.

---

<sup>1</sup> Measure 37 claim M129469 has been split into two Measure 49 claims, E129469A and E129469B, because the Measure 49 election sought relief for non-contiguous property. Claim E129469A addresses the claimants' eligibility for Measure 49 relief on approximately four acres consisting of tax lot 200 and that portion of tax lot 100 lying north of Highway 101. Claim E129469B addresses the claimants' eligibility for Measure 49 relief on the approximately 30 acres of tax lot 100 lying south of Highway 101.

## I. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM

### A. Maximum Number of Home Sites for Which the Claimants May Qualify

Under Section 6, the number of home site approvals authorized by the department cannot exceed the lesser of the following: three; the number stated by the claimant in the election materials; or the number described in a Measure 37 waiver issued by the state, or if no waiver was issued, the number of home sites described in the Measure 37 claim filed with the state. The claimants have requested two home site approvals in the election material. The Measure 37 waiver issued for this claim describes five<sup>2</sup> home sites. Therefore, the claimants may qualify for a maximum of two home site approvals under Section 6.

### B. Qualification Requirements

To qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49 the claimants must meet each of the following requirements:

#### 1. Timeliness of Claim

A claimant must have filed a Measure 37 claim for the property with either the state or the county in which the property is located on or before June 28, 2007, and must have filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and the county before Measure 49 became effective on December 6, 2007. If the state Measure 37 claim was filed after December 4, 2006, the claim must also have been filed in compliance with the provisions of OAR 660-041-0020 then in effect.

#### Findings of Fact and Conclusions

The claimants, Keiko Iseri and Jodell Field, filed a Measure 37 claim, M129469 with the state on June 7, 2006. The claimants filed a Measure 37 claim, M06-03, with Tillamook County on June 8, 2006. The state claim was filed prior to December 4, 2006. The claimants timely filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and Tillamook County.

#### 2. The Claimant Is an Owner of the Property

Measure 49 defines “Owner” as: “(a) The owner of fee title to the property as shown in the deed records of the county where the property is located; (b) The purchaser under a land sale contract, if there is a recorded land sale contract in force for the property; or (c) If the property is owned by the trustee of a revocable trust, the settlor of a revocable trust, except that when the trust becomes irrevocable only the trustee is the owner.”

---

<sup>2</sup> The Measure 37 waiver addressed all of tax lot 100 and tax lot 200.

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions:**

According to the deed submitted by the claimants, Keiko Iseri is the settlor of a revocable trust into which the Measure 37 property has been conveyed as shown in the Tillamook County deed records and, therefore, is an owner of the property under Measure 49. Tillamook County has confirmed that the claimant is the current owner of the property.

According to the information submitted by the claimants, Jodell Field has not established her ownership of the property under Measure 49. The documentation submitted with the claim shows that Jodell Field is a trustee of the revocable trust into which the Measure 37 claim property has been conveyed. Under Measure 49, only the settlor of a revocable trust is an owner.

**3. All Owners Have Consented in Writing to the Claim**

All owners of the property must consent to the claim in writing.

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions:**

All owners of the property have consented to the claim in writing.

**4. The Property Is Located Entirely Outside Any Urban Growth Boundary and Entirely Outside the Boundaries of Any City**

The Measure 37 claim property must be located entirely outside any urban growth boundary and entirely outside the boundaries of any city.

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions:**

The Measure 37 claim property is located in Tillamook County, outside the urban growth boundary and outside the city limits of the nearest city, Wheeler.

**5. One or More Land Use Regulations Prohibit Establishing the Lot, Parcel or Dwelling**

One or more land use regulations must prohibit establishing the requested lot, parcel or dwelling.

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions:**

The property is currently zoned mixed farm/forest by Tillamook County. State land use regulations, including applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33, generally prohibit the establishment of a dwelling on a lot or parcel less than 80 acres in size in a mixed farm/forest zone.

The claimant's property north of Highway 101 consists of approximately four acres; therefore, state land use regulations prohibit the claimant from establishing on the Measure 37 claim property the two home sites the claimant may qualify for under Section 6 of Measure 49.

**6. The Establishment of the Lot, Parcel or Dwelling Is Not Prohibited by a Land Use Regulation Described in ORS 195.305(3)**

ORS 195.305(3) exempts from claims under Measure 49 land use regulations:

- (a) Restricting or prohibiting activities commonly and historically recognized as public nuisances under common law;
- (b) Restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety;
- (c) To the extent the land use regulation is required to comply with federal law; or
- (d) Restricting or prohibiting the use of a property for the purpose of selling pornography or performing nude dancing.

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

Based on the documentation submitted by the claimants, the establishment of the two home sites for which the claimant may qualify on the property is not prohibited by land use regulations described in ORS 195.305(3).

**7. On the Claimant’s Acquisition Date, the Claimant Lawfully Was Permitted to Establish at Least the Number of Lots, Parcels or Dwellings on the Property That Are Authorized Under Section 6 of Measure 49**

A claimant’s acquisition date is “the date the claimant became the owner of the property as shown in the deed records of the county in which the property is located. If there is more than one claimant for the same property under the same claim and the claimants have different acquisition dates, the acquisition date is the earliest of those dates.”

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

Tillamook County deed records indicate that claimant Keiko Iseri acquired the property on May 7, 1963.

On May 7, 1963, the Measure 37 claim property was not subject to any local or state laws that would have prohibited the claimant, Keiko Iseri from establishing at least two lots or parcels and at least two dwellings. Therefore, claimant Keiko Iseri lawfully could have established the two home sites she qualifies for under Section 6 of Measure 49.

**II. COMMENTS ON THE PRELIMINARY EVALUATION**

The department issued its Preliminary Evaluation for this claim on October 24, 2008. Pursuant to OAR 660-041-0090, the department provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. No written comments were received in response to the 28-day notice.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

Based on the analysis above, the claimant, Jodell Field, does not qualify for Measure 49 home site approval; she has not established her current ownership of the subject property.

Based on the analysis above, the claimant, Keiko Iseri, qualifies for up to two home sites. However, the number of lots, parcels or dwellings that a claimant may establish pursuant to a home site authorization is reduced by the number of lots, parcels or dwellings currently in existence on the Measure 37 claim property and any contiguous property under the same ownership.

Based on the documentation provided by the claimants, the Measure 37 claim property includes one undeveloped lot or parcel. There is no contiguous property under the same ownership. Therefore, the two home site approvals the claimant, Keiko Iseri, qualifies for under Section 6 of Measure 49 will authorize the claimant to establish up to one additional lot or parcel and two dwellings on the Measure 37 claim property. Each dwelling must be on a separate lot or parcel, and must be contained within the Measure 37 claim property. The claimants may alter the configuration of the lots or parcels currently in existence on the Measure 37 claim property and contiguous property so that each additional dwelling established on the Measure 37 claim property, pursuant to the home site approvals, is sited on a separate lot or parcel. A claimant is not eligible for more than 20 home site approvals under Sections 5 to 11 of Measure 49 regardless of how many properties a claimant owns or how many claims a claimant filed. If the claimant, Keiko Iseri, has developed the limit of twenty home sites under Measure 49, she is no longer eligible for the home site approvals that are the subject of this order.

### **IV. HOME SITE AUTHORIZATION**

Based on the analysis set forth above, this claim is approved, and the claimant, Keiko Iseri, qualifies for two home site approvals. As a result, the claimant, Keiko Iseri, is authorized for one additional lot or parcel and two dwellings on the property on which she is eligible for Measure 49 relief, subject to the following terms:

1. Each dwelling must be on a separate lot or parcel, and must be contained within the property on which the claimant, Keiko Iseri, is eligible for Measure 49 relief. The establishment of a land division or dwelling based on this home site authorization must comply with all applicable standards governing the siting or development of the land division or dwelling. However, those standards must not be applied in a manner that prohibits the establishment of the land division or dwelling, unless the standards are reasonably necessary to avoid or abate a nuisance, to protect public health or safety, or to carry out federal law.
2. This home site authorization will not authorize the establishment of a land division or dwelling in violation of a land use regulation described in ORS 195.305(3) or in violation of any other law that is not a land use regulation as defined by ORS 195.300(14).

3. The number of lots, parcels or dwellings a claimant may establish under this home site authorization is reduced by the number of lots, parcels and dwellings currently in existence on the Measure 37 claim property and contiguous property in the same ownership, regardless of whether evidence of their existence has been provided to the department. If lots, parcels or dwellings currently exist on the Measure 37 claim property or on contiguous property under the same ownership and the lots, parcels or dwellings have not been disclosed to the department, then the number of additional lots, parcels or dwellings a claimant may establish pursuant to this home site authorization must be reduced according to the methodology stated in Section 6(2)(b) and 6(3) of Measure 49.
4. Temporary dwellings are not considered in determining the number of existing dwellings currently on the property. The claimant may choose to convert any temporary dwelling currently located on the property on which the claimant, Keiko Iseri, is eligible for Measure 49 relief to an authorized home site pursuant to a home site approval. Otherwise, any temporary dwelling is subject to the terms of the local permit requirements under which it was approved, and is subject to removal at the end of the term for which it is allowed.
5. A home site approval only authorizes the establishment of a new lot, parcel or dwelling on the property on which the claimant, Keiko Iseri, is eligible for Measure 49 relief. No additional development is authorized on contiguous property for which no Measure 37 claim was filed or on Measure 37 claim property on which the claimant, Keiko Iseri, is not eligible for Measure 49 relief. A lot or parcel established pursuant to a home site approval must either be the site of a dwelling that is currently in existence or be the site of a dwelling that may be established pursuant to the home site approval.
6. The claimant, Keiko Iseri, may use a home site approval to convert a lot, parcel or dwelling currently located on the property on which the claimant, Keiko Iseri, is eligible for Measure 49 relief to an authorized home site. If the number of lots parcels or dwellings existing on the property on which the claimant, Keiko Iseri, is eligible for Measure 49 relief exceeds the number of home site approvals the claimant, Keiko Iseri, qualifies for under a home site authorization, the claimant, Keiko Iseri, may select which existing lots, parcels or dwellings to convert to authorized home sites; or may reconfigure existing lots, parcels or dwellings so that the number is equivalent to the number of home site approvals.
7. A home site approval does not authorize the establishment of a new dwelling on a lot or parcel that already contains one or more dwellings. The claimant, Keiko Iseri, may be required to alter the configuration of the lots or parcels currently in existence on the Measure 37 claim property and contiguous property so that each additional dwelling established on the property on which the claimants are eligible for Measure 49 relief, pursuant to this home site authorization, is sited on a separate lot or parcel.
8. If the claimant, Keiko Iseri, transferred her ownership interest in the Measure 37 claim property prior to the date of this order, this order is rendered invalid and authorizes no home site approvals. Provided this order is valid when issued, a home site approval authorized under this order runs with the property and transfers with the property. A home site approval will not expire, except that if a claimant who received this home site authorization later

conveys the property to a party other than the claimant's spouse or the trustee of a revocable trust in which the claimant is the settlor, the subsequent owner of the property must establish the authorized lots, parcels and dwellings within 10 years of the conveyance. A lot or parcel lawfully created based on this home site authorization will remain a discrete lot or parcel, unless the lot or parcel lines are vacated or the lot or parcel is further divided, as provided by law. A dwelling lawfully created based on a home site approval is a permitted use.

9. Because the property is located in a mixed farm and forest zone, the home site authorization does not authorize new lots or parcels that exceed five acres. However, existing lots or parcels may exceed five acres. Before beginning construction, the owner must comply with the requirements of ORS 215.293. Further, the home site authorization will not authorize new lots or parcels that exceed two acres if the new lots or parcels are located on high-value farmland, on high-value forestland or on land within a ground water restricted area. However, existing lots or parcels may exceed two acres.
10. Because the property is located in a mixed farm and forest zone, Measure 49 requires new home sites to be clustered so as to maximize suitability of the remnant lot or parcel for farm or forest use. Further, if an owner of the property is authorized by other home site authorizations to subdivide, partition, or establish dwellings on other Measure 37 claim properties, Measure 49 authorizes the owner to cluster some or all of the authorized lots, parcels or dwellings that would otherwise be located on land in an exclusive farm use zone, a forest zone or a mixed farm and forest zone on a single Measure 37 claim property that is zoned residential use or is located in an exclusive farm use zone, a forest zone or a mixed farm and forest zone but is less suitable for farm or forest use than the other Measure 37 claim properties.
11. 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, this home site authorization will not authorize the use of the property unless the claimant, Keiko Iseri, 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.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this Final Order and Home Site Authorization is entered by the Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development as a final order of the department and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.300 to ORS 195.336 and OAR 660-041-0000 to 660-041-0160.

FOR THE DEPARTMENT AND THE LAND  
CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
COMMISSION:

\_\_\_\_\_/S/\_\_\_\_\_  
Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director  
Dept. of Land Conservation and Development  
Dated this 12<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2008.

**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 is available to anyone who is an owner of the property as defined in Measure 49 that it the subject of this final determination, or a person who timely submitted written evidence or comments to the department concerning this final determination.
2. 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 must be filed in the Circuit Court in the county in which the affected property is located. Upon motion of any party to the proceedings, the proceedings may be transferred to any other county with jurisdiction under ORS 183.484 in the manner provided by law for change of venue.
3. Judicial review of this final determination is limited to the evidence in the record of the department at the time of its final determination. Copies of the documents that comprise the record are available for review at the department's office at 635 Capitol St. NE, Suite 150, Salem, OR 97301-2540. Judicial review is only available for issues that were raised before the department with sufficient specificity to afford the department an opportunity to respond.