

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. M130038
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF	)	
Glenn H. Gregg, Diane Gregg, Donald E. Gregg and	)	
Sharlene L. Gregg, CLAIMANTS	)	

Claimants: Glenn H. Gregg, Diane Gregg, Donald E. Gregg and Sharlene L. Gregg  
(the Claimants)

Property: Township 3S, Range 2W, Section 24, Tax lot 200, Yamhill 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 78.26-acre subject property into thirteen 2- to 9.5-acre parcels, to their development of a dwelling on each parcel and to their development of equestrian facilities on the remainder of the property: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after each claimant acquired the subject property. 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 Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg acquired the property on April 26, 1966, and when Sharlene Gregg acquired the property on March 17, 1995. The department acknowledges that that the relief to which Sharlene Gregg is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow her to use the property for the claimants' desired use.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on April 26, 1966, for Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg and on March 17, 1995, for Sharlene Gregg. On

March 17, 1995, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, currently in effect.

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 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 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

  
Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director  
DLCD  
Dated this 9<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

  
David Hartwig, Administrator  
DAS, State Services Division  
Dated this 9<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2007.

## **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, 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."

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

March 9, 2007

**STATE CLAIM NUMBER:** M130038

**NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:** Glenn H. Gregg  
Diane Gregg  
Donald E. Gregg  
Sharlene L. Gregg

**MAILING ADDRESS:** Glenn H. Gregg  
Diane Gregg  
10415 SW Terwilliger Place  
Portland, Oregon 97219

Donald E. Gregg  
Sharlene L. Gregg  
8330 SW Carmel Court  
Portland, Oregon 97223

**PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:** Township 3S, Range 2W, Section 24  
Tax lot 200  
Yamhill County

**DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:** September 13, 2006

**180-DAY DEADLINE:** March 12, 2007

**I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM**

The claimants, Glenn, Diane, Donald and Sharlene Gregg, seek compensation in the amount of \$2,776,951 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.<sup>1</sup> The claimants desire compensation or the right to divide the 78.26-acre subject property into thirteen 2- to 9.5-acre parcels, to develop a dwelling on each parcel and to develop equestrian facilities on the remainder of the subject property.<sup>2</sup> The subject property is located at the intersection of Parrett Mountain Road and Smith Road, near Newberg, in Yamhill County. (See claim.)

---

<sup>1</sup> This ORS 197.352 claim is the second filed for the subject property by these claimants. In M124343, the department's report and order were based on the claimants' desire to divide the subject property into twelve 6.5-acre parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel. The claimants submitted this second claim in order to modify their desired use of the subject property.

<sup>2</sup> The claimants also request that the department remove the subject property's Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning and reinstate the property's unregulated status as of the date the property was acquired in 1966. In addition, the

## 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 78.26-acre subject property into thirteen 2- to 9.5-acre parcels; to their development of a dwelling on each parcel and to their development of equestrian facilities on the remainder of the property: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after each claimant acquired the subject property. These laws 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 Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg acquired the property on April 26, 1966, and when Sharlene Gregg acquired the property on March 17, 1995. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Sharlene Gregg is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow her to use the subject property for the claimants' desired use. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

## III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

### Comments Received

On December 15, 2006, 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 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.

---

claimants request that the property's prior unregulated status be made the property's new legal zoning so that they can sell the thirteen new parcels without their being subject to land use regulations. However, ORS 197.352 does not allow what the claimants request. By its terms, ORS 197.352 does not remove zoning or eliminate land use regulations. Rather, it provides that "the governing body responsible for enacting the land use regulation may modify, remove, or not to apply [*sic*] the land use regulation or land use regulations to allow the owner to use the property for a use permitted at the time the owner acquired the property."

## **Findings of Fact**

This claim was submitted to DAS on September 13, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies ORS 197 and 215 and OAR 660 and refers to other state and local land use regulations, generally, 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**

Claimants Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg acquired the subject property on April 26, 1966, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. On March 17, 1995, Donald Gregg transferred his interest in the subject property to the Donald E. Gregg, DMD and Sharlene L. Gregg Family Trust, a revocable trust, with himself and his wife Sharlene Gregg as trustees, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim.<sup>3</sup> The Yamhill County Assessor’s Office confirms the claimants’ current ownership of the subject property.

## **Conclusions**

The claimants, Glenn, Diane, Donald and Sharlene Gregg, are “owners” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). Glenn, Dianne and Donald Gregg acquired the subject property on April 26, 1966. Sharlene Gregg acquired the subject property on March 17, 1995. Donald Gregg is a “family member” of Sharlene Gregg as that term is defined by 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(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.

---

<sup>3</sup> Transfer to a revocable trust did not change Donald Gregg’s ownership for the purposes of ORS 197.352.

## **Findings of Fact**

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to divide the 78.26-acre subject property into thirteen 2- to 9.5-acre parcels, to develop a dwelling on each parcel and to develop equestrian facilities on the remainder of the property, and that the use is not allowed under current land use regulations.<sup>4</sup>

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning and restrict uses in EFU zones. The claimants' property is zoned EF-40 by Yamhill County as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the claimants' property is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3.<sup>5</sup> Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural lands as defined by Goal 3 be zoned EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

Current land use regulations, particularly ORS 215.263, 215.284 and 215.780 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, generally prohibit the division of EFU-zoned land into parcels smaller than 80 acres and establish standards for development of dwellings on existing or proposed parcels on that land.

ORS 215.780 establishes an 80-acre minimum size for the creation of new lots or parcels in EFU zones and became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). ORS 215.780 (2)(a) authorizes the creation of lots or parcels less than 80 acres, subject to acknowledgement by the Commission. The Commission has acknowledged Yamhill County's EF-40 zone, which allows a minimum lot or parcel size of 40 acres. ORS 215.263 (2005 edition) establishes standards for the creation of new parcels for non-farm uses and dwellings allowed in an EFU zone.

OAR 660-033-0135 (applicable to farm dwellings) became effective on March 1, 1994, and interprets the statutory standard for a primary dwelling in an EFU zone under ORS 215.283(1)(f). OAR 660-033-0130(4) (applicable to non-farm dwellings) became effective on August 7, 1993, and was amended to comply with ORS 215.284(4) on March 1, 1994. The Commission subsequently adopted amendments to comply with House Bill 3326 (Chapter 704, Oregon Laws 2001, effective on January 1, 2002), which were effective on May 22, 2002. (See administrative rule history for OAR 660-033-0100, -0130 and -0135.)

Claimants Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg acquired the subject property on April 26, 1966, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

---

<sup>4</sup> The claimants summarily refer to numerous state land use laws as applicable to this claim, but do not establish how the laws either apply to the claimants' desired use of the subject property or restrict its use with the effect of reducing its fair market value. On their face, most of the regulations either do not apply to the claimants' property or do not restrict the use of the claimants' property with the effect of reducing its fair market value. This report addresses only those regulations that the department finds are applicable to and restrict the claimants' desired use of the subject property, based on the claimants' description of their desired use.

<sup>5</sup> The claimants' property is "agricultural land" because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I-IV soils.

## **Conclusions**

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were all enacted or adopted after Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg acquired the subject property in 1966 and do not allow the desired division or residential development of the property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg acquired the property.

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 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 the land use regulation(s) (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 \$2,776,951 as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to the regulations that restrict the claimants' desired use of the property. This amount is based on the opinion of a real estate broker included with the claim.

## **Conclusions**

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg who acquired the subject property on April 26, 1966, and Donald's wife Sharlene Gregg. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property and have the effect of reducing its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws enacted or adopted since Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg acquired the subject property restrict the claimants' desired use of the property. The claimants estimate that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of \$2,776,951.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the subject property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in record for this claim, the department determines 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 since Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg acquired the property.

#### **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 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Yamhill County has implemented through its current EF-40 zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg 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 division and development of the claimants' property were in effect when Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg acquired it in 1966. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Laws in effect when Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg acquired the property 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 laws that restrict the use of the subject 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 subject property permitted at the time the present 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' desired use of the subject property. The claim asserts that existing state land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department have the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property by \$2,776,951. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other relevant evidence demonstrating that the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. In order to determine a specific amount of compensation due for this claim, it would also be necessary to verify whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg acquired the property. Nevertheless,

based on the record for this claim, the department has determined that the laws on which the claim is based 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 Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time they acquired the property on April 26, 1966, and to allow Sharlene Gregg to use the property for a use permitted at the time she acquired the property on March 17, 1995.

At the time Sharlene Gregg acquired an interest in the subject property, it was zoned EF-40 by Yamhill County and subject to the current lot size and dwelling standards under Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, and as described in Section V.(2) of this report.

In addition to the provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, in effect when the Sharlene Gregg acquired the property on March 17, 1995, and other laws in effect when any of the claimants acquired the property, there may be other laws that 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 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 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 78.26-acre subject property into thirteen 2- to 9.5-acre parcels, to their development of a dwelling on each parcel and to their development of equestrian facilities on the remainder of the property: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after each claimant acquired the subject property. 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 Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg acquired the property on April 26, 1966, and when Sharlene Gregg acquired the property on March 17, 1995. The department acknowledges that that the relief to which Sharlene Gregg is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow her to use the property for the claimants' desired use.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on April 26, 1966, for Glenn, Diane and Donald Gregg and on March 17, 1995, for Sharlene Gregg. On March 17, 1995, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, currently in effect.

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 February 14, 2007. 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.