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 22, 2010

STATE ELECTION NUMBER: E133487

CLAIMANTS: Dean E. and Diane L. Wardle
9869 Evans Creek Road
Rogue River, OR 97537

MEASURE 37 PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 35S, Range 4W, Section 11
Tax lot 313
Jackson County

I. ELECTION

The claimants, Dean and Diane Wardle, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on December 2, 2006, for property located at 9869 Evans Creek Road, near Rogue River, in Jackson 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 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 three home site approvals in the election material. No waiver was issued for this claim. The Measure 37 claim filed with the state describes land division and

development that could have resulted in at least 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, Dean and Diane Wardle, filed a Measure 37 claim, M133487, with the state on December 2, 2006. The claimants filed a Measure 37 claim, M37 2006-00271, with Jackson County on December 1, 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 Jackson 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, Dean and Diane Wardle are the owners of fee title to the property as shown in the Jackson 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 Jackson County, outside the urban growth boundary and outside the city limits of the nearest city, Rogue River.

(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 Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) by Jackson 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. Applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, generally prohibit the establishment of a lot or parcel less than 80 acres in size in an EFU zone, and regulate the establishment of dwellings on new or existing lots or parcels.

The claimants' property consists of 10.24 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."

Jackson County deed records indicate that the claimants acquired the property on April 20, 1978.[1]

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 Jackson County's comprehensive plan and land use regulations to be in compliance with those goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. On April 20, 1978, the Measure 37 claim property was zoned Exclusive Farm (EF) by Jackson County. Jackson County's EF zone included a fixed minimum acreage standard of ten acres. However, the Commission had not acknowledged that zone for compliance with the goals when the claimants acquired the property on April 20, 1978. Accordingly, the statewide planning goals, and in particular Goal 3, and ORS chapter 215 applied directly to the Measure 37 claim property.

On May 16, 1983, the Commission acknowledged the application of Jackson County's Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zone to the Measure 37 claim property. The Commission's acknowledgement of Jackson County's EFU zone confirmed that zone's compliance with Goal 3 and ORS chapter 215. Jackson County's acknowledged EFU zone required 80 irrigated or 160 non-irrigated acres for the creation of a new lot or parcel on which a dwelling could be established. The claimants' property consists of 10.24 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.

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 less than 20 acres were lawfully permitted to establish one home site, including existing development.

The Measure 37 claim property consists of 10.24 acres and is developed with one dwelling. Therefore, based on the analysis under SB 1049 (2010), it appears that the claimants do not qualify for any additional home sites under Measure 49.

[1] Claimants included an unrecorded land sale contract with their claim. Unrecorded documents do not establish ownership for purposes of Measure 49.

2. Preliminary Conclusion

Based on the preliminary analysis, the claimants, Dean and Diane Wardle, do not qualify for Measure 49 home site approvals because the claimants were not lawfully permitted to establish the additional lots, parcels or 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.