**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT**

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

March 29, 2010

**STATE ELECTION NUMBER:** E131014E[1, 2]

**CLAIMANTS:**
William V. Crook
Mary J. Crook
Ronnie J. Crook
Kathleen L. D. Crook
94727 S Bank Pistol River Road
Brookings, OR 97415

**MEASURE 37 PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:**
Township 38S, Range 14W
Sections 33 and 34, Tax lot 8701
Curry County

---

[1] Claims E131014 and E131015 have been combined, and evaluated under E131014, because of contiguity and ownership. Per OAR 660-041-0150 the Department of Land Conservation and Development will combine multiple claims into one claim if the Measure 37 claim property contains multiple contiguous lots or parcels that are in the same ownership.

[2] Claim E131014 has been split into twelve claims, E131014A-L, because the Measure 37 claim sought relief for multiple non-contiguous parcels in the same ownership and multiple contiguous parcels not in the same ownership. Claim E131014A addresses claimants William V. Crook, Mary J. Crook (aka M. Jacqueline Crook), Ronnie J. Crook, James A. Crook, David W. Crook and Kathleen L. D. Crook (aka Kathleen L. D. Crook-O'Donnell) and their entitlement to Measure 49 relief for tax lots 6400, 1600 and 8200. Claim E131014B addresses claimants William V. Crook and Mary J. Crook and their entitlement to relief on tax lots 1450, 300 (Section 33) and 300 (Section 9). Claim E131014C addresses claimants William V. Crook, Mary J. Crook, Ronnie J. Crook, James A. Crook and their entitlement to relief on tax lot 6300. Claim E131014D addresses claimants William V. Crook, Mary J. Crook, Ronnie J. Crook, James A. Crook, and Kathleen L. D. Crook and their entitlement to relief on tax lot 6600. Claim E131014E addresses claimants William V. Crook, Mary J. Crook, Ronnie J. Crook, and Kathleen L. D. Crook and their entitlement to relief on tax lot 8701. Claim E131014F address claimants James A. Crook, David W. Crook and Kathleen L. D. Crook and their entitlement to relief on tax lot 600. Claim E131014G addresses claimants William V. Crook and Ronnie J. Crook and their entitlement to relief on tax lot 100 (Section 31). Claim E131014H addresses claimants William V. Crook, Mary J. Crook, and Ronnie J. Crook and their entitlement to relief on tax lot 200. Claim E131014I addresses claimants William V. Crook, Mary J. Crook, Ronnie J. Crook, David Crook, James A. Crook and Kathleen L.D. Crook and their entitlement to relief on tax lot 1601. Claim E131014J addresses claimants William V. Crook, Mary J. Crook, and Ronnie J. Crook and their entitlement to relief on tax lot 6200. Claim E131014K addresses claimants William V. Crook, Mary J. Crook, and Ronnie J. Crook and their entitlement to relief on tax lot 7800. Claim E131014L addresses claimants William V. Crook and Mary J. Crook and their entitlement to relief on tax lot 100 (Section 33).

**PRIMARY CONTACT INFORMATION:** James A. Crook
94727 S Bank Pistol River Road
Brookings, OR 97415

## I. ELECTION

The claimants, William Crook, Mary Crook, Ronnie Crook and Kathleen Crook, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on November 21, 2006, for property located near Brookings, 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 up to three home site approvals on the Measure 37 claim property. The claimants' property, including both the Measure 37 claim property and all contiguous property in the same ownership, currently appears to consist of one undeveloped lot or parcel. 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 approvals will allow the claimants to establish up to two additional lots or parcels and three dwellings on the Measure 37 claim 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 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 supplemental review under Section 6 of Measure 49 in the election material. No waiver was issued for this claim. The Measure 37 claim filed with the state describes more than three home sites. Therefore, the claimants may qualify for a maximum of three home site approvals 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, William Crook, Mary Crook, Ronnie Crook and Kathleen Crook, filed Measure 37 claim, M131014, with the state on November 21, 2006. The claimants filed Measure 37 claim, M37-0636, with Curry County on November 27, 2006. The state claim was filed prior to December 4, 2006.

It appears that the claimants timely filed Measure 37 claims 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, William Crook, Mary Crook, Ronnie Crook and Kathleen Crook 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 the city limits of the nearest city, Brookings.

**(d) One or More Land Use Regulations Prohibit Establishing the Lot, Parcel or Dwelling**

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

The property is currently zoned Forestry-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, generally prohibit

the establishment of a lot or parcel less than 80 acres in size in a mixed farm/forest zone and regulate the establishment of dwellings on new or existing lots or parcels.

The claimants' property consists of 120 acres. Therefore, state land use regulations prohibit the claimants from establishing on the Measure 37 claim property the three home sites the claimants may qualify for under Section 6 of Measure 49.

**(e) 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.

Based on the documentation submitted by the claimants, it does not appear that the establishment of the three 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 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."

Curry County deed records indicate that claimants William Crook, Mary Crook and Ronnie Crook acquired the property on December 31, 1979, and claimant Kathleen Crook acquired the property on January 9, 1997. Therefore, for purposes of Measure 49, the claimants' acquisition date is December 31, 1979.

The claimants acquired the Measure 37 claim property after adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Land Conservation and Development Commission (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. On December 31, 1979, the Measure 37 claim property was zoned Forestry-Grazing (FG) by Curry County. Curry County's FG zone included a fixed minimum acreage standard of 40 acres. However, the Commission had not acknowledged that zone for compliance with the goals when the claimants acquired the property on December 31, 1979. Accordingly, the statewide planning goals, and in particular Goals 3 and

4, and ORS chapter 215 applied directly to the Measure 37 claim property when the claimants acquired it.

On November 22, 1989, the Commission acknowledged the application of Curry County's Forestry-Grazing (FG) zone to the Measure 37 claim property. The Commission's acknowledgement of Curry County's FG zone confirmed that zone's compliance with Goals 3 and 4 and ORS chapter 215. Although Curry County's FG zone was acknowledged to comply with the statewide planning goals, that zone did not establish a fixed minimum acreage standard for the creation of a lot or parcel on which a dwelling could be established. Rather, applications for division and development were evaluated on a case-by-case basis to ensure compliance with the county's farm and forest use policies, the statewide planning goals and the applicable requirements of ORS chapter 215. The claimants' property consists of 120 acres. Therefore, on the claimants' acquisition date, they could not have established any home sites in the zone that was ultimately acknowledged to comply with the statewide planning goals and implementing regulations, absent compliance with the applicable review criteria and standards.

However, because of uncertainty during the time period between adoption of the statewide planning goals in 1975 and each county's acknowledgment of its plan and land use regulations regarding the factual and legal requirements for establishing compliance with the statewide planning goals, the 2010 Legislative Assembly amended Measure 49. Senate Bill (SB) 1049 (2010) specifies the number of home sites considered lawfully permitted, for purposes of Measure 49, for property acquired during this period unless the record for the claim otherwise demonstrates the number of home sites that a claimant would have been lawfully permitted to establish. Those amendments provide, in relevant part, that subject to consistency with local land use regulations in effect when they acquired the Measure 37 claim property, claimants whose property consists of at least 40 acres were lawfully permitted to establish up to three home sites.

The Measure 37 claim property consists of 120 acres. Therefore, based on the analysis under SB 1049, the claimants were lawfully permitted to establish three home sites on the Measure 37 claim property on their date of acquisition

**2. Preliminary Conclusion**

Based on the preliminary analysis, it appears that the claimants, William Crook, Mary Crook, Ronnie Crook and Kathleen Crook, qualify for three home site approvals under Section 6 of Measure 49.

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

The number of lots, parcels or dwellings that a claimant is authorized to 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 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 at least one additional lot, parcel or dwelling, regardless of the number of lots, parcels or dwellings currently in existence.

Based on the documentation provided by the claimants and information from Curry County, the Measure 37 claim property appears to currently include one lot or parcel and no dwellings. There is no contiguous property under the same ownership. Therefore, the three home site approvals the claimants appear to qualify for under Section 6 of Measure 49 will allow the claimants to establish up to two additional lots or parcels and three 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.

## 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 land division or dwelling authorized by a home site approval.

1. The establishment of a land division or dwelling based on a Measure 49 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. A 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. 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 lots, parcels or dwellings a claimant may establish under a Measure 49 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, based on the information available to the department, the department has calculated the number of currently existing lots, parcels or dwellings to be either greater than or less than the number of lots, parcels or dwellings actually in existence on the Measure 37 claim property or contiguous property under the same ownership, then the number of additional lots, parcels or dwellings a claimant may establish pursuant to this home site authorization must be adjusted according to the methodology stated in Section 6(2)(b) and 6(3) of Measure 49. Statements in this preliminary evaluation regarding the number of lots, parcels

or dwellings currently existing on the Measure 37 claim property and contiguous property are not a determination on the current legal status of those lots, parcels or dwellings.

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 lot, parcel or dwelling on 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 or on Measure 37 claim property on which a claimant 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 future site of a dwelling that may be established pursuant to the home site approval.

7. The claimants may use a home site approval to convert a lot, parcel or 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 lots, parcels or 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 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.

8. The claimants may not implement the relief described in a Measure 49 home site authorization if a claimant has been determined to have a common law vested right to a use described in a Measure 37 waiver for the property. Therefore, if a claimant has been determined in a final judgment or final order that is not subject to further appeal to have a common law vested right as described in Section 5(3) of Measure 49 to any use on the Measure 37 claim property, then any Measure 49 Home Site Authorization for the property will be void. However, so long as no claimant has been determined in such a final judgment or final order to have a common law vested right to a use described in a Measure 37 waiver for the property, a use that has been completed on the property pursuant to a Measure 37 waiver may be converted to an authorized home site.

9. 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 claimants 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 a home site approval, is sited on a separate lot or parcel.

10. Because the property is located in a mixed farm and forest zone, the home site authorization will not authorize new lots or parcels that exceed five acres. However, existing or remnant lots or parcels may exceed five acres. Before beginning construction in one of these zones, 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 or remnant lots or parcels may exceed two acres.

11. 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 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.

12. 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 lots, parcels and dwellings within 10 years of the conveyance. A lot or parcel lawfully created based on the 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.

## 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.**