

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
Draft Staff Report and Recommendation

July 28, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M122662

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: George and Alexis Larsen

MAILING ADDRESS: 287 Tanana
Cannon Beach, Oregon 97145

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 5N, Range 10W, Section 31AD
Tax lot 7600
Clatsop County

OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION: Jill Gelineau
Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt
1211 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 1900
Portland, Oregon 97204

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: October 5, 2005

180-DAY DEADLINE: August 20, 2006¹

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, George and Alexis Larsen, seek compensation in the amount of \$250,000 for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimants desire compensation or the right to develop an additional unit on an existing duplex. The 0.12-acre property is located at 287 Tanana, in Cannon Beach, in Clatsop County. (See claim.)

II. SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the preliminary findings and conclusions set forth below, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) has determined that the claim is not valid because neither the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) nor the department has enforced laws that restrict the claimants' use of the private real property. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

¹ This date reflects 180 days from the date the claim was submitted, as extended by the 139 days that all timelines under Measure 37 were suspended during the pendency of *MacPherson v. Dept. of Admin. Svcs.*, 340 Or 117 (2006).

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On October 17, 2005, pursuant to Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 125-145-0080, the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS) provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. According to DAS, one written comment was received in response to the 10-day notice.

The comment does not address whether the claim meets the criteria for relief under ORS 197.352. Comments concerning the effects a use of the subject property may have on surrounding areas are generally not something that the department is able to consider in determining whether to waive a state law. If funds do become available to pay compensation, then such effects may become relevant in determining which claims to pay compensation for instead of waive a state law. (See the comment letter in the department's claim file.)

IV. TIMELINESS OF CLAIM

Requirement

ORS 197.352(5) requires that a written demand for compensation be made:

1. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted prior to the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of that effective date, or the date the public entity applies the land use regulation as an approval criteria to an application submitted by the owner, whichever is later; or
2. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted after the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of the enactment of the land use regulation, or the date the owner of the property submits a land use application in which the land use regulation is an approval criteria, whichever is later.

Findings of Fact

This claim was submitted to DAS on October 5, 2005, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies ORS 197 and 227 and OAR 660 as the basis for the claim. Only laws that were enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, are the basis for this claim.

Conclusions

The claim has been submitted within two years of the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), based on land use regulations enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, and is therefore timely filed.

V. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM

1. Ownership

ORS 197.352 provides for payment of compensation or relief from specific laws for “owners” as that term is defined in ORS 197.352. ORS 197.352(11)(C) defines “owner” as “the present owner of the property, or any interest therein.”

Findings of Fact

Claimant George Larsen acquired the subject property from his parents on December 31, 1974, as reflected by a deed included with the claim. His parents, L.G. and Alverta V. Larsen, acquired the subject property on November 4, 1960, also as reflected by a deed included with the claim. George Larsen transferred the subject property to the Larsen Living Trust, with himself and Alexis Larsen as trustees, on April 23, 1996. The Clatsop County Assessor’s Office confirms the claimants’ current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, George and Alexis Larsen, are “owners” of the subject property as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(C). George Larsen has been an owner of the subject property since December 31, 1974, and Alexis Larsen has been an owner since April 23, 1996. George Larsen’s parents are “family members” as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(A) and acquired the subject property on November 4, 1960.

2. The Laws That are the Basis for This Claim

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires, in part, that a law must restrict the claimants’ use of private real property in a manner that reduces the fair market value of the property relative to how the property could have been used at the time the claimants or a family member acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to add a third dwelling unit to the existing duplex.

The subject property is currently zoned R-1 by the City of Cannon Beach. The subject property is located within the City of Cannon Beach’s Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).

In general, the zoning of a particular property within a UGB is determined by the city or county with land use jurisdiction over the property. In some circumstances, the Commission’s rules or state statutes may apply to a local government decision regarding zoning, but usually, within a UGB, state laws require or encourage a higher intensity of development rather than restrict the use of real property. In this case, the claimants have not alleged how a specific state land use regulation restricts the use of real property and has the effect of reducing the fair market value of that real property.

