

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. M118597
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)	
Clement and Phyllis Hunter, CLAIMANTS)	

Claimants: Clement and Phyllis Hunter (the Claimants)

Property: Township 4S, Range 3E, Section 11, Tax lots 1100, 1200, Clackamas 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

Based on the record before the department, the claimants, Clement and Phyllis Hunter, have not established that they are entitled to relief under ORS 197.352(1), as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department as to tax lot 1200 because the claimants do not own that tax lot. Therefore, the department recommends that this claim be denied as to tax lot 1200.

The Claim is approved with regard to tax lot 1100 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 Clement and Phyllis Hunter's development of a rural residential dwelling on tax lot 1100: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property on September 25, 1963.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on September 25, 1963.

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 Condition 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 Deputy 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 Deputy 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



George Naughton, Deputy Director
DLCD

Dated this 28th day of April, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE
SERVICES:



Dugan Petty, Deputy Administrator
DAS, State Services Division

Dated this 28th 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 197.352¹, 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.”

¹ 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: M118597

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: Clement and Phyllis Hunter

MAILING ADDRESS: 22086 South Lewellen Road
Beavercreek, Oregon 97004

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 4S, Range 3E, Section 11
Tax lots 1100,1200
Clackamas County

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: June 14, 2005

180-DAY DEADLINE: April 29, 2006¹

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Clement and Phyllis Hunter, 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 appear to desire compensation or the right to divide tax lot 1100 from tax lot 1200, and to develop a dwelling on tax lot 1100.² The subject property is located at 22086 S. Lewellen Road, near Beavercreek, in Clackamas 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 in part. 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 claimants Clement and Phyllis Hunter's development of a rural residential dwelling on tax lot 1100: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 4 (Forest Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, divisions 6 and 33. These laws will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use tax

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).

² The claim does not indicate the claimants' intended use of the property. The department received information from the claimants through a March 21, 2005, telephone conversation that the request is to allow for rural residential development on tax lot 1100.

lot 1100 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property in 1963.

Based on the preliminary findings and conclusions set forth below, the department has determined that the claim is not valid with regard to tax lot 1200 because the claimants no longer own that tax lot. (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, two written comments were received in response to the 10-day notice.

The comments do not address whether the claim meets the criteria for relief (compensation or waiver) 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 letters 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 criterion, whichever is later.

Findings of Fact

This claim was submitted to DAS on June 14, 2005, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies the county's "AG/Forest Dist Section 407 ZDO," 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

The claimants, Clement and Phyllis Hunter, acquired the subject property on September 25, 1963, as reflected by warranty deed included with the claim. A property account summary tax statement received from Clackamas County and dated March 14, 2006, establishes the claimants’ current ownership of tax lot 1100. A quitclaim deed and property account summary tax statement provided by Clackamas County show that the claimants are no longer the owners of tax lot 1200, as of December 21, 2005.

Conclusions

The claimants, Clement and Phyllis Hunter, are “owners” of tax lot 1100 as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of September 25, 1963. The claimants are not owners of tax lot 1200.

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

Information from the claimants indicates that the claimants desire compensation or the right to develop tax lot 1100 for rural residential use.³

The claim is based generally on Clackamas County’s current AG/F zone and the applicable provisions of state law that require such zoning. The claimants’ property is zoned AG/F, which is a mixed agricultural and forest land zone, as required by Goal 4 and the implementing provisions of OAR 660-006-0050 (effective on February 5, 1990), subsequently amended on

³ It appears that the claimants may have desired to divide tax lot 1100 from tax lot 1200. However, because the claimants no longer own tax lot 1200, the claimants are not entitled to relief under ORS 197.352 as to that tax lot.

March 1, 1994, to comply with the provisions of House Bill 3661 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993).

Under OAR 660-006-0050, all the uses permitted under Goals 3 and 4 are allowed in mixed agriculture and forest zones except that for dwellings, either the Goal 3 or 4 standards are applicable based on the predominant use of the tract on January 1, 1993.⁴ Depending on the predominant use on that date, the property is subject to either the requirements for dwellings applicable under Exclusive Farm Use zoning required by Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 33, or forest zone provisions required by Goal 4 and OAR 660, division 6.

The claimants acquired the subject property on September 25, 1963, prior to the adoption of statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established under Goal 4 for lands zoned for mixed farm-forest use and the statutory and rule restrictions under applicable provisions of ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33, were enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired the subject property in 1963, and do not allow the desired development of tax lot 1100.

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 use that the claimants have identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimants' use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property, that have not been identified in the claim. 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 that use.

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. This amount is based on an appraisal report for tax lot 1200 and the claimants' estimate of the value of the subject property.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.1 of this report, the claimants are Clement and Phyllis Hunter who acquired the subject property on September 25, 1963. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property in a manner

⁴ No information was provided to the department regarding the predominant use of the property on January 1, 1993.

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 acquired the subject property restrict the desired development of the property. The claimants estimate the reduction in value due to the restrictions to be \$300,000.

The claim includes an appraisal for tax lot 1200, which the claimants do not own. Without an appraisal or other documentation as to tax lot 1100, based on the claimants' intended use of 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 tax lot 1100 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 Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33, which Clackamas County has implemented through its AG/F zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired the subject property.

Conclusions

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. It appears that none of the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on the development of the subject property were in effect when the claimants acquired tax lot 1100 in 1963. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

Laws in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E), and will continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property. In addition, the department notes that ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, include standards for siting dwellings in forest zones. The provisions include fire protection standards for dwellings and for surrounding forest zones. 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. . . ." To the extent they are applicable to the claimants property, the siting standards for dwellings in forest zones in ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, are exempt under ORS 197.352(3).

There may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimants' use of the subject property that have not been identified in the claim. 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 that use. In some cases, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D).

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 use 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 the 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.

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 develop a rural residential dwelling on tax lot 1100. 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 for how the specified restrictions reduce the fair market value of tax lot 1100, 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 claimants Clement and Phyllis Hunter to use tax lot 1100 for a use permitted at the time they acquired that tax lot on September 25, 1963.

Based on the record, the department finds that the claim is not valid as to tax lot 1200 because the claimants are not owners of tax lot 1200.

Conclusions

Based on the record before the department, the claimants, Clement and Phyllis Hunter, have not established that they are entitled to relief under ORS 197.352(1), as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department as to tax lot 1200 because the

claimants do not own that tax lot. Therefore, the department recommends that this claim be denied as to tax lot 1200.

Based on the record, the department recommends that the claim be approved with regard to tax lot 1100, 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 Clement and Phyllis Hunter's development of a rural residential dwelling on tax lot 1100: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property on September 25, 1963.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on September 25, 1963.
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 Condition 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 6, 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.