



**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT**

**ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (MEASURE 49) SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW
OF MEASURE 37 CLAIM
Preliminary Evaluation**

February 3, 2009

STATE ELECTION NUMBER: E130437

CLAIMANTS: John F. and Deborah J. Wilson
34201 Cedar Valley Road
Gold Beach, Oregon 97444

**MEASURE 37 PROPERTY
IDENTIFICATION:** Township 32S, Range 15W, Section 10
Tax lots 2001 and 2002¹
Curry County

I. ELECTION

The claimants, John and Deborah Wilson, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on October 26, 2006 for property located near the intersection of State Highway 101 and Sixes River Road, near Sixes, in Curry 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 have 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.

II. SUMMARY OF PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

Based on the department's preliminary analysis, it appears that the claimants are qualified for two home site approvals on tax lots 2001 and 2002. The claimants' property, including both the Measure 37 claim property and all contiguous property in the same ownership, currently appears to consist of four lots or parcels, which are developed with one dwelling. After taking into account the number of lots, parcels and dwellings currently located on the Measure 37 claim property and the contiguous property under the same ownership, it appears that the home site

¹ The Measure 37 claim property consists of tax lots 2000, 2001 and 2002. The claimants were denied relief on tax lot 2000 under Measure 37 because laws enacted or adopted since the claimants acquired tax lot 2000 in 2001 do not restrict the claimants' desired use of that tax lot relative to when the claimants acquired it. The claimants did not indicate that they would like the department to review their eligibility for relief under Measure 49 for tax lot 2000. Therefore, this Preliminary Evaluation addresses only the claimants' eligibility for relief for tax lots 2001 and 2002 and all references to Measure 37 claim property refer only to tax lots 2001 and 2002.

approvals will allow the claimants to establish one dwelling on each of the tax lots 2001 and 2002.

III. THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF HOME SITE APPROVALS FOR WHICH THE CLAIMANTS MAY QUALIFY

Under Section 6 of Measure 49, 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 material; 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 three home site approvals in the election material. The Measure 37 waiver issued for this claim describes two home sites. Therefore, the claimants may qualify for a maximum of two home site approvals under Section 6.

IV. PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF QUALIFICATION FOR HOME SITE APPROVAL

1. Preliminary Analysis

To qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49, 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.

The claimants, John and Deborah Wilson, filed a Measure 37 claim, M130437, with the state on October 26, 2006. The claimants filed a Measure 37 claim, M37-0615 with Curry County on October 23, 2006. The state claim was filed prior to December 4, 2006.

It appears that the claimants timely filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and Curry County.

In addition to filing a claim with both the state and the county in which the property is located, to qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49 the claimants must establish each of the following:

(a) 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."

According to the deeds submitted by the claimants, John and Deborah Wilson are the owners of fee title to the property as shown in the Curry County deed records and, therefore, are owners of the property under Measure 49.

(b) All Owners of the Property Have Consented in Writing to the Claim

It appears that the claimants are the sole owners of the property. Therefore, no additional consent is required.

(c) The Measure 37 Claim Property Is Located Entirely Outside Any Urban Growth Boundary and Entirely Outside the Boundaries of Any City

The Measure 37 claim property is located in Curry County, outside the urban growth boundary and outside of any city near the community of Sixes.

(d) One or More Land Use Regulations Prohibit Establishing the Dwelling

As stated in Section III above, the claimant may qualify for up to two home site approvals.

The property is currently zoned Forest Grazing (FG) by Curry County, in accordance with Goals 3 and 4, as implemented by OAR 660-006-0050. State land use regulations, including applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33, provide standards for the establishment of a dwelling in a mixed farm/forest zone. In general and subject to some exceptions, those standards require that the property be a minimum of 80 acres and generate a minimum annual income from the sale of farm or forest products.

The combined effect of the standards for the establishment of a dwelling in a mixed farm/forest zone is to prohibit the claimants from establishing a dwelling on each of tax lots 2001 and 2002.

(e) The Establishment of the 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.

Based on the documentation submitted by the claimants, it does not appear that the establishment of the two home sites for which the claimants may qualify on the property would be prohibited by land use regulations described in ORS 195.305(3).

(f) On the Claimant's Acquisition Date, the Claimant Lawfully Was Permitted to Establish at Least the Number of 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."

Curry County deed records indicate that the claimants acquired tax lots 2001 (40 acres) and tax lot 2002 (80 acres) on February 9, 1979.

The claimants acquired the Measure 37 claim property after adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Curry County's comprehensive plan and land use regulations to be in compliance with those goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. At that time, the Measure 37 claim property was zoned Forestry Grazing by Curry County. However, because the Commission had not acknowledged that zone for compliance with the goals, when the claimants acquired the property on February 9, 1979, the statewide planning goals, and in particular Goals 3 and 4, and ORS ch. 215 applied directly to the Measure 37 claim property when the claimants acquired it.

On May 6, 1987, the Commission acknowledged the application of Curry County's FG zone to tax lots 2001 and 2002. The Commission's acknowledgement of Curry County's FG zone confirmed that zone's compliance with Goals 3 and 4 and ORS chapter 215. Curry County's acknowledged FG zone did not require a specific minimum number of acres for the establishment of a dwelling on an established vacant lot or parcel. Therefore, the claimants lawfully could have established a home site on each of tax lots 2001 and 2002 on the claimants' date of acquisition.

2. Preliminary Conclusion

Based on the preliminary analysis, it appears that the claimants, John and Deborah Wilson, qualify for two home site approvals under Section 6 of Measure 49, one on each of tax lots 2001 and 2002.

V. NUMBER OF LOTS, PARCELS OR DWELLINGS ON OR CONTAINED WITHIN THE PROPERTY

The number of dwellings that a claimant is authorized to establish pursuant to a home site authorization is reduced by the number of dwellings currently in existence on the Measure 37 claim property and any contiguous property under the same ownership according to the methodology stated in Section 6(2)(b) and 6(3) of Measure 49. However, if a claimant otherwise qualifies for relief under Section 6 of Measure 49, the claimant will be able to establish one additional dwelling, regardless of the number of dwellings currently in existence.

Based on the documentation provided by the claimants and Curry County, the Measure 37 claim property appears to currently include two lots or parcels and no dwellings. As demonstrated by the supplemental information submitted by the claimants and Curry County Assessor records, the claimants also own tax lots 2000 and 2100 (Township 32S, Range 15W, Section 10) which are contiguous to the Measure 37 claim property. The contiguous property under the same ownership appears to include two lots or parcels and one dwelling. Together, it appears that the Measure 37 claim property and the contiguous property in the same ownership include four lots or parcels and one dwelling. The number of dwellings the claimants may be able to establish on the Measure 37 claim property pursuant to the two home site approvals is not reduced by the contiguous dwelling in the same ownership because it appears that if the claimants established two additional dwellings on the Measure 37 claim property, the total number of lots or parcels with a dwelling that would exist on the Measure 37 claim property and the contiguous property in the same ownership would add up to three, and therefore would not exceed three. .Therefore, the two home site approvals the claimants appear to qualify for under Section 6 of Measure 49 will allow the claimants to establish one dwelling on each of the following tax lots: 2001 and 2002.

VI. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF PROPOSED LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS ON THE NUMBER AND SCOPE OF HOME SITE APPROVALS

The department has identified the following limitations and conditions that may affect the number or scope of the home site approvals that the claimants would otherwise be entitled to under Section 6 of Measure 49. This list may not be comprehensive and does not preclude the possibility that other considerations, not yet identified by the department, may affect the establishment of a dwelling authorized by a home site approval.

1. The establishment of a dwelling based on a Measure 49 home site authorization must comply with all applicable standards governing the siting or development of the dwelling. However, those standards must not be applied in a manner that prohibits the establishment of the 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. A home site authorization will not authorize the establishment of a 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. 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.
4. The number of dwellings a claimant may be eligible to establish under a Measure 49 home site authorization is reduced by the number of 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 dwellings currently exist on the Measure 37 claim property or on contiguous property under the same ownership and the dwellings have not been disclosed to the department, then the number of

additional dwellings a claimant may establish pursuant to the home site authorization must be further reduced so that the total number of dwellings that will exist if the claimants established the maximum number of additional dwellings authorized under the home site authorization would not exceed the number recognized as that total number of dwellings in section V. above.

5. Temporary dwellings are not considered in determining the number of existing dwellings currently on the property. The claimants may choose to convert any temporary dwelling currently located on the property on which the claimants are eligible for Measure 49 relief to an authorized home site pursuant to a Measure 49 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.
6. A home site approval only authorizes the establishment of a new dwelling on the property on which the claimants are eligible for Measure 49 relief. No additional development is authorized on contiguous property for which no Measure 37 claim was filed.
7. The claimants may use a home site approval to convert a dwelling currently located on the property on which the claimants are eligible for Measure 49 relief to an authorized home site. If the number of dwellings existing on the property on which the claimants are eligible for Measure 49 relief exceeds the number of home site approvals the claimants qualify for under a home site authorization, the claimants may select which existing dwellings to convert to authorized home sites.
8. 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.
9. Once the department issues a final home site authorization, a home site approval granted under that authorization will run with the property and will transfer with the property. A home site approval will not expire, except that if a claimant who received a 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 dwellings within 10 years of the conveyance. A dwelling lawfully created based on a home site approval is a permitted use.
10. Because the property is located in a mixed farm and forest zone, the owner must comply with the requirements of ORS 215.293 before beginning construction.
11. If an owner of the property is authorized by other home site approvals 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.

VII. NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT

A claimant or a claimant's authorized agent, a county and any third party may submit written comments, evidence and information in response to the preliminary evaluation. The comments, evidence and information must be filed with the department no more than twenty-eight (28) calendar days after the date this evaluation is mailed to the claimants and the claimants' agent and notice of this evaluation is mailed to third parties.

The department will mail a copy of all materials timely filed by a county or a third party with the department to the claimants and the claimants' agent. A claimant or a claimant's authorized agent may then file written comments, evidence or information in response to the materials filed by the third party or county. That response must be filed no more than twenty-one (21) calendar days after the date the department mails the materials to the claimants and the claimants' authorized agent.

All comments, evidence and information in response to the preliminary evaluation and all responses to materials filed by a third party or a county shall be delivered to Supplemental Measure 49 Claim Review, 635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150, Salem, Oregon 97301-2540 and will be deemed timely filed either (1) if actually delivered to the department before the close of business on the final eligible calendar day, or (2) if mailed on or before the final eligible calendar day.

Note: Please reference the claim number and claimant name and clearly mark your comments as "Preliminary Evaluation Comments." Comments must be submitted in original written form only. Comments submitted electronically or by facsimile will not be accepted.