

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES,  
THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF  
THE STATE OF OREGON

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM FOR	)	FINAL ORDER
COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352	)	CLAIM NO. M118596
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF	)	
Jean Claude Hook and	)	
Carol L. Hook, CLAIMANTS	)	

Claimants: Jean Claude Hook and Carol L. Hook (the Claimants)

Property: Township 28S, Range 13W, Section 4, Tax lot 600, Coos County (the Property)

Claim: The demand for compensation and any supporting information received from the Claimants by the State of Oregon (the Claim).

Claimants submitted the Claim to the State of Oregon under ORS 197.352. Under OAR 125-145-0010 *et seq.*, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) referred the Claim to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) as the regulating entity. This order is based on the record herein, including the Findings and Conclusions set forth in the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of DLCD (the DLCD Report) attached to and by this reference incorporated into this order.

ORDER

The Claim is approved as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report, and subject to the following terms:

1. In lieu of compensation under ORS 197.352, the State of Oregon will not apply the following laws to the claimants' division of the 34-acre subject property into three parcels or to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, enacted or adopted each of the claimants acquired the subject property. These land use regulations will not apply to Jean Claude Hook only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired the property on October 1, 1976, and will not apply to Carol Hook only to the extent necessary to allow her to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when she acquired the property on January 24, 1992.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Jean Claude Hook to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on October 1, 1976. On that date, the property was subject to compliance with Goal 4. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Carol Hook to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on January 24, 1992. On that date, the property was subject to compliance with Coos County's

acknowledged (F) Zone and the applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the subject property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property unless the claimants first obtain that permit, license or other form of authorization or consent. Such requirements may include, but are not limited to: a building permit, a land use decision, a "permit" as defined in ORS 215.402 or 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies and restrictions on the use of the subject property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the subject property by the claimants under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (1) above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimants to use the subject property, it may be necessary for them to obtain a decision under ORS 197.352 from a city and/or county and/or metropolitan service district that enforces land use regulations applicable to the property. Nothing in this order relieves the claimants from the necessity of obtaining a decision under ORS 197.352 from a local public entity that has jurisdiction to enforce a land use regulation applicable to a use of the subject property by the claimants.

This Order is entered by the Director of the DLCD as a final order of DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.352, OAR 660-002-0010(8), and OAR 125, division 145, and by the Administrator for the State Services Division of the DAS as a final order of DAS under ORS 197.352, OAR 125, division 145, and ORS 293.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND CONSERVATION  
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lane Shetterly, Director  
DLCD  
Dated this 24<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE  
SERVICES:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David Hartwig, Administrator  
DAS, State Services Division  
Dated this 24<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2006.

## NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL OR OTHER JUDICIAL RELIEF

You are entitled, or may be entitled, to judicial remedies including the following:

1. Judicial review under ORS 183.484: Judicial review under ORS 183.484 may be obtained by filing a petition for review within 60 days from the service of this order. A petition for judicial review under ORS 183.484 may be filed in the Circuit Court for Marion County or the Circuit Court in the county in which you reside.
2. A cause of action under ORS 197.352 (Measure 37 (2004)): If a land use regulation continues to apply to the subject property more than 180 days after the present owner of the property has made written demand for compensation under ORS 197.352<sup>1</sup>, the present owner of the property, or any interest therein, shall have a cause of action in the circuit court in which the real property is located.

(Copies of the documents that comprise the record are available for review at the Department's office at 635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150, Salem, Oregon 97301-2540)

### FOR INFORMATION ONLY

The Oregon Department of Justice has advised the Department of Land Conservation and Development that "[i]f the current owner of the real property conveys the property before the new use allowed by the public entity is established, then the entitlement to relief will be lost."

---

<sup>1</sup> By order of the Marion County Circuit Court, "all time lines under Measure 37 [were] suspended indefinitely" on October 25, 2005. This suspension was lifted on March 13, 2006 by the court. As a result, a period of 139 days (the number of days the time lines were suspended) has been added to the 180-day time period under ORS 197.352(6) for claims that were pending with the state on October 25, 2005.

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

April 24, 2006

**STATE CLAIM NUMBER:** M118596

**NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:** Jean Claude Hook and  
Carol L. Hook

**MAILING ADDRESS:** 57182 Harlocker Hill Road  
Coquille, Oregon 97423

**PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:** Township 28S, Range 13W, Section 4  
Tax lot 600  
Coos County

**DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:** June 13, 2005

**180-DAY DEADLINE:** April 28, 2006<sup>1</sup>

**I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM**

The claimants, Jean Claude Hook and Carol L. Hook, seek compensation in the amount of \$300,000 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 divide the 34-acre property into three parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel. The subject property is located at 57182 Harlocker Hill Road, near Coquille, in Coos County. (See claim.)

**II. SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth below, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) has determined that the claim is valid. Department staff recommends that, in lieu of compensation, the requirements of the following state laws enforced by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) or the department not apply to the claimants' division of the 34-acre property into three parcels and to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 4 (Forest Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 6, enacted or adopted after each of the claimants acquired the subject property. These laws will not apply to Jean Claude Hook only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired the property in 1976, and will not apply to Carol Hook only to the extent necessary to allow her to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when she acquired the property in 1992. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

### **III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM**

#### **Comments Received**

On August 26, 2005, pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080, the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS) provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. According to DAS, no written comments were received in response to the 10-day notice.

### **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 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 criterion 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 criterion, whichever is later.

#### **Findings of Fact**

This claim was submitted to DAS on June 13, 2005, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies the property's forest zoning 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 Jean Claude Hook acquired the subject property on October 1, 1976, as reflected by a land sale contract included with the claim. Claimant Carol Hook acquired her interest in the subject project on January 24, 1992, as reflected by a copy of a deed included with the claim. A June 2005 title report submitted with the claim establishes the claimants’ current ownership.

### Conclusions

The claimants, Jean Claude Hook and Carol Hook, are the “owners” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of October 1, 1976, for Jean Claude Hook and as of January 24, 1992, for Carol Hook. Jean Claude Hook is a “family member” of Carol Hook as that term is defined under ORS 197.352(11)(A).

### 2. The Laws That are the Basis for This Claim

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(3) 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 divide the 34-acre property into three parcels for residential development, which is not allowed under the property’s current Forest (F) zoning.

The claim is based generally on Coos County’s current F zone and the applicable provisions of state law that require such zoning. The claimants’ property is zoned F as required by Goal 4 in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, because the claimants’ property is “forest land” under Goal 4. Goal 4 became effective on January 25, 1975, and requires that forest land be zoned for forest use (see statutory and rule history under OAR 660-015-0000(4)). The forest land administrative rules (OAR 660, division 6) became effective on September 1, 1982, and ORS 215.705 to 215.755 and 215.780 became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). OAR 660-006-0026 and 660-006-0027 were amended on March 1, 1994, to implement those statutes.

Jean Claude Hook acquired the subject property after the adoption of the statewide planning goals but before the Commission acknowledged the Coos County’s land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. Because the Commission had not acknowledged the county’s plan and land use regulations when Jean

Claude Hook acquired the subject property on October 1, 1976, the statewide planning goals, and Goal 4 in particular, applied directly to the claimants' property when Mr. Hook acquired it.<sup>2</sup> Goal 4 went into effect on January 25, 1975, "to conserve forest lands for forest uses" and required, "Lands suitable for forest uses shall be inventoried and designated as forest lands. Existing forest land uses shall be protected unless proposed changes are in conformance with the comprehensive plan." Those forest uses were defined as follows: "(1) the production of trees and the processing of forest products; (2) open space, buffers from noise, and visual separation of conflicting uses; (3) watershed protection and wildlife and fisheries habitat; (4) soil protection from wind and water; (5) maintenance of clean air and water; (6) outdoor recreational activities and related support services and wilderness values compatible with these uses; and (7) grazing land for livestock."

No information has been presented in the claim to establish that the claimants' desired division of the 34-acre property into three parcels complies with the Goal 4 standards in place when the Hook family acquired the subject property in 1976.

### **Conclusions**

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, were all enacted or adopted after the Hook family acquired the subject property in 1976 and do not allow the claimants' desired division or development of the property. However, the claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimants' desired use of the subject property complies with the standards for land divisions and development under Goal 4 in effect when the Hook family acquired the property on October 1, 1976.

### **3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value**

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires that any land use regulation described in Section V.(2) of this report must have "the effect of reducing the fair market value of the property, or any interest therein."

### **Findings of Fact**

The claim includes an estimate of \$300,000 as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to current regulations. The claim includes copies of real estate sales information for comparable properties to substantiate the base value of the desired parcels.

---

<sup>2</sup> The statewide planning goals became effective on January 25, 1975, and were applicable to legislative land use decisions and some quasi-judicial land use decisions prior to the Commission's acknowledgment of each county's land use regulations. *Perkins v. City of Rajneeshpuram*, 300 Or 1 (1985); *Alexanderson v. Polk County*, 289 Or 427, rev den 290 Or 137 (1980); *Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn. v. Clackamas County*, 280 Or 3 (1977); *Jurgenson v. Union County*, 42 Or App 505 (1979); and *1000 Friends of Oregon v. Benton County*, 32 Or App 413 (1978). After the county's plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission, the statewide planning goals and implementing rules no longer directly applied to such local land use decisions. *Byrd v. Stringer*, 295 Or 311 (1983). However, statutory requirements continue to apply, and insofar as the state and local provisions are materially the same, the local provisions must be interpreted consistent with the substance of the goals and implementing rules. *Foster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992); *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

## **Conclusions**

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Jean Claude Hook and Carol Hook. Jean Claude Hook acquired the subject property on October 1, 1976. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws enacted or adopted since the claimants' family acquired the subject property restrict the desired division and development of the property. The claimants estimate the reduction in value due to the restrictions to be \$300,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when they acquired the property, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount the claimants demand for compensation. Nevertheless, based on the submitted information, the department determines that it is more likely than not that the fair market value of the subject property has been reduced to some extent as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department.

### **4. Exemptions Under ORS 197.352(3)**

ORS 197.352 does not apply to certain land use regulations. In addition, under ORS 197.352(3), certain types of laws are exempt from ORS 197.352.

## **Findings of Fact**

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property, including applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, which Coos County has implemented through its current F zone. With the exception of Goal 4, adopted on January 25, 1975, all of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimants' family acquired the subject property.

## **Conclusions**

It appears that the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on residential division and development of the subject property are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) to the extent they were enacted or adopted after the claimants' family acquired the property. Provisions of Goal 4 in effect when claimants' family acquired the subject property in 1976 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and do not provide a basis for compensation. In addition, other land use laws enacted or adopted for a purpose set forth in ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D) are also exempt, and would not provide a basis for compensation.

## **VI. FORM OF RELIEF**

ORS 197.352(1) provides for payment of compensation to an owner of private real property if the Commission or the department has enforced one or more laws that restrict the use of the property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. In lieu of compensation, the department may choose to not apply the law in order to allow the present owner to carry out a use of the property permitted at the time the current owner acquired the property. The Commission, by

rule, has directed that if the department determines a claim is valid, the Director of the department must provide only non-monetary relief unless and until funds are appropriated by the legislature to pay claims.

### **Findings of Fact**

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the claimants' ability to divide the 34-acre property into three parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel. The claim asserts that the laws enforced by the Commission or the department reduce the fair market value of the subject property by \$300,000. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other specific documentation establishing how the specified restrictions reduce the fair market value of the subject property, and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the property was allowed under the standards in effect when they acquired the property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department acknowledges that the laws on which the claim is based likely have reduced the fair market value of the subject property to some extent.

No funds have been appropriated at this time for the payment of claims. In lieu of payment of compensation, ORS 197.352 authorizes the department to modify, remove or not apply all or parts of certain land use regulations to allow Jean Claude Hook to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on October 1, 1976 (discussed in Section V.2 of this report) and to allow Carol Hook to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time she acquired the property on January 24, 1992.

When Carol Hook acquired the subject property on January 24, 1992, it was subject to Coos County's (F) Zone, which was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 4 on August 29, 1985. Her desired division and development of the property would have been subject the county's F zone and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, then in effect.

Without a specific development proposal for the subject property, it is not possible for the department to determine all the laws that may apply to a particular use of the property, or whether those laws may fall under one or more of the exemptions under ORS 197.352. In addition to the applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, and other laws in effect when each of the claimants acquired the property, there may be other laws that apply to the claimants' use of the property that have not been identified in the claim. In addition, the department notes that ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, include standards for siting dwellings in forest zones. These provisions include fire protection standards for dwellings and for surrounding forest lands. ORS 197.352(3)(B) specifically exempts regulations "restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety, such as fire and building codes. . . ." Accordingly, siting standards for dwellings in forest zones in ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(B).

In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of the subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimants seek a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to the use and depending on when they were enacted or adopted, may continue to apply to the claimants'

property. In addition, some of those laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D), and will continue to apply to the subject property on that basis.

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the uses that the claimants have identified. Similarly, this report only addresses the exemptions provided for under ORS 197.352(3) that are clearly applicable given the information provided to the department in the claim. The claimants should be aware that the less information they have provided to the department in their claim, the greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply to their use of the subject property.

### **Conclusions**

Based on the record, the department recommends that the claim be approved, subject to the following terms:

1. In lieu of compensation under ORS 197.352, the State of Oregon will not apply the following laws to the claimants' division of the 34-acre subject property into three parcels or to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, enacted or adopted each of the claimants acquired the subject property. These land use regulations will not apply to Jean Claude Hook only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired the property on October 1, 1976, and will not apply to Carol Hook only to the extent necessary to allow her to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when she acquired the property on January 24, 1992.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Jean Claude Hook to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on October 1, 1976. On that date, the property was subject to compliance with Goal 4. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Carol Hook to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on January 24, 1992. On that date, the property was subject to compliance with Coos County's acknowledged (F) Zone and the applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6.
3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the subject property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property unless the claimants first obtain that permit, license or other form of authorization or consent. Such requirements may include, but are not limited to: a building permit, a land use decision, a "permit" as defined in ORS 215.402 or 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies and restrictions on the use of the subject property imposed by private parties.
4. Any use of the subject property by the claimants under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (1) above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimants to use the subject property, it may be necessary for them to obtain a decision under ORS 197.352 from a city and/or county and/or metropolitan service district that enforces land use regulations applicable to the property. Nothing in this order relieves the claimants from the necessity of obtaining a decision under ORS 197.352 from a local public entity that has jurisdiction to enforce a land use regulation applicable to a use of the subject property by the claimants.

## **VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT**

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on April 4, 2006. OAR 125-145-0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimants or the claimants' authorized agent and any third parties who submitted comments under OAR 125-145-0080 to submit written comments, evidence and information in response to the draft staff report and recommendation. Comments received have been taken into account by the department in the issuance of this final report.