



**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT**

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

December 28, 2009

STATE ELECTION NUMBER: E130844

CLAIMANTS: Larry S. and Marilyn E. Landauer
9625 NW Roy Road
Forest Grove, OR 97116

**MEASURE 37 PROPERTY
IDENTIFICATION:** Township 1N, Range 3W, Section 8
Tax lot 300
Washington County

I. ELECTION

The claimants, Larry and Marilyn Landauer, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on November 17, 2006, for property located at 9855 NW Roy Road, near Forest Grove, in Washington 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 not eligible for any relief under Measure 49 because the claimants would not have been lawfully permitted to establish any additional home sites when they acquired the property.

**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 supplemental review under Section 6 of Measure 49. No waiver was issued for this claim. The Measure 37 claim filed with the state describes one home site.

Therefore, the claimants may qualify for a maximum of one home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49.

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, Larry and Marilyn Landauer, filed a Measure 37 claim, M130844, with the state on November 17, 2006. The claimants filed a Measure 37 claim, 37CL0583 with Washington County on November 15, 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 Washington 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 deed submitted by the claimants, Larry and Marilyn Landauer are the owners of fee title to the property as shown in the Washington 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 Washington County, outside the urban growth boundary and outside the city limits of the nearest city, Forest Grove.

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

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

The property is currently zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) by Washington County, in accordance with ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the property is “agricultural land” as defined by Goal 3. Goal 3 requires agricultural land to be zoned exclusive farm use (EFU). Applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, provide standards for the establishment of a dwelling in an EFU zone. In general and subject to some exceptions, those standards require that the property be a minimum of 80 acres in size in an EFU zone and generate a minimum annual income from the sale of farm products.

The combined effect of the standards for the establishment of a dwelling in an EFU zone is to prohibit the claimants from establishing a dwelling on the Measure 37 claim property.

(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 one home site 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.”

Washington County deed records indicate that the claimants acquired the property on November 29, 1985.

On November 29, 1985, the Measure 37 claim property was subject to Washington County’s acknowledged Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zone. Washington County’s EFU zone required 76 acres for the creation of a new lot or parcel on which a dwelling could be established. Washington County’s land development ordinance also included provisions outlining a discretionary review process and discretionary standards under which a property owner could obtain approval for a dwelling on a lot or parcel less than 76 acres. The claimants’ property consists of 10.21 acres. The current record does not establish that the claimants would have been able to satisfy the requirements under such a review. Therefore it appears that the claimants do not qualify for a home site unless the claimants can show that under the discretionary review process and standards described in Washington County’s land development ordinance the claimants would have been lawfully permitted to establish one home site on the Measure 37 claim property when the claimants acquired the property.

2. Preliminary Conclusion

Based on the preliminary analysis, the claimants, Larry and Marilyn Landauer, do not qualify for Measure 49 home site approvals because the claimants were not lawfully permitted to establish the dwellings on the claimants’ date of acquisition.

V. 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.