



# Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

## Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150

Salem, Oregon 97301-2524

Phone: (503) 373-0050

First Floor/Coastal Fax: (503) 378-6033

Second Floor/Director's Office Fax: (503) 378-5518

Third Floor/Measure 37 Fax: (503) 378-5318

Web Address: <http://www.oregon.gov/LCD>

April 26, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director



*Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130537*

*Claimant: Darrel Sheets*

Enclosed, in regard to the above-referenced claim for compensation under Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352), is the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of the Department of Land Conservation and Development, and the Final Order.

This Final Staff Report and Recommendation and the Final Order constitute the final decision on this claim. No further action will be taken on this matter.

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. M130537  
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF )  
Darrel Sheets, CLAIMANT )

Claimant: Darrel Sheets (the Claimant)

Property: Township 2N, Range 2W, Section 17, Tax lots 6400, 6402 and 6403,  
Washington County (the Property)

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

Claimant 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 Darrel Sheets' division of the 120-acre subject property into one 40-acre parcel and one 80-acre parcel, and to his development of a dwelling on the resulting 80-acre parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired each tax lot. These laws will not apply to the claimant 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 tax lots 6402 and 6403 on November 16, 1979, and tax lot 6400 on February 15, 2005. The department acknowledges that the relief to which the claimant is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow the claimant to use tax lot 6400 in the manner set forth in the claim.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on November 16, 1979, for tax lots 6402 and 6403, and on February 15, 2005, for tax lot 6400. On November 16, 1979, tax lots 6402 and 6403 were subject to compliance

with Goal 4. On February 15, 2005, tax lot 6400 was subject to compliance with Goal 4 and OAR 660, division 6, as implemented through Washington County's acknowledged forest zone, and the provisions of ORS 215 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 claimant first obtains 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 claimant 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 claimant to use the subject property, it may be necessary for him 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 claimant 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 claimant.

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 26<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:



David Hartwig, Administrator  
DAS, State Services Division

Dated this 26<sup>th</sup> day of April, 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**

April 26, 2007

**STATE CLAIM NUMBER:** M130537

**NAME OF CLAIMANT:** Darrel Sheets

**MAILING ADDRESS:** PO Box 888  
North Plains, Oregon 97133

**PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:** Township 2N, Range 2W, Section 17  
Tax lots 6400, 6402 and 6403  
Washington County

**DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:** November 2, 2006

**180-DAY DEADLINE:** May 1, 2007

**I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM**

The claimant, Darrel Sheets, seeks compensation in the amount of \$1.7 million 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 claimant desires compensation or the right to divide the 120-acre subject property<sup>1</sup> into one 40-acre parcel and one 80-acre parcel, and to develop a dwelling on the resulting 80-acre parcel. The subject property is located at 26525 NW Dorland, near North Plains, in Washington 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 Darrel Sheets' division of the 120-acre subject property into one 40-acre parcel and one 80-acre parcel, and to his development of a dwelling on the resulting 80-acre parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 4 (Forest Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 6, enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired each tax lot. These laws will not apply to the claimant 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 tax lots 6402 and 6403 on November 16, 1979, and tax lot 6400 on

---

<sup>1</sup> The subject property includes three contiguous tax lots. Tax lot 6400 consists of 40 acres; tax lot 6402 consists of 40 acres; and tax lot 6403 consists of 40 acres.

February 15, 2005. The department acknowledges that the relief to which the claimant is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow the claimant to use tax lot 6400 in the manner set forth in the claim. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

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

#### **Comments Received**

On March 20, 2007, 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.

#### **Findings of Fact**

This claim was submitted to DAS on November 2, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies ORS 215 and provisions of OAR 660, division 6, 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 claimant, Darrel Sheets, acquired tax lots 6402 and 6403 on November 16, 1979, as reflected by real estate contracts and fulfillment warranty deeds included with the claim. The claimant acquired an interest in tax lot 6400 on February 15, 2005, as evidenced by a real estate contract included in the claim. The claimant's mother, Mildred M. Sheets, acquired the subject property on November 6, 1958, as evidenced by a warranty deed and deed card included with the claim. The Washington County Assessor's Office confirms the claimant's current ownership of the subject property.

## **Conclusions**

The claimant, Darrel Sheets, is an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of November 16, 1979, for tax lots 6402 and 6403, and as of February 15, 2005, for tax lot 6400. Mildred Sheets is a "family member" of the claimant as defined by ORS 197.352(11)(A) and acquired the subject property on November 6, 1958.

## **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 claimant's 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 claimant or a family member acquired the property.

## **Findings of Fact**

The claim indicates that the claimant desires to divide the 120-acre subject property into one 40-acre parcel and one 80-acre parcel and to develop a dwelling on the resulting 80-acre parcel, and that the desired use is prohibited by current land use regulations.

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require forest zoning and restrict uses on forest-zoned land. The claimant's property is zoned Exclusive Forest and Conservation (EFC) by Washington County, as required by Goal 4, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, because the claimant's 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.

Together, ORS 215.705 to 215.755 and 215.780 and OAR 660, division 6, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 4, prohibit the division of forest land into parcels less than 80 acres and establish standards for development of dwellings on existing or proposed parcels on those lands.

The claimant's family first acquired the subject property in 1958, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and rules. No county zoning applied to the subject property in 1958.

## **Conclusions**

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by Goal 4 and provisions applicable to land zoned for forest use in ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, were all enacted or adopted after the claimant's family acquired the subject property in 1958 and do not allow the desired division or development of the property. These laws restrict the use of the property relative to the uses allowed when the claimant's family acquired the property.

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

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires that the land use regulations (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 \$1.7 million as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to the regulations that restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. This amount is based on the claimant's assessment of the value of the subject property.

## **Conclusions**

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Darrel Sheets whose family member acquired the subject property in 1958. Under ORS 197.352, the claimant is due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the 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 the claimant's family acquired the subject property restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. The claimant estimates that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of \$1.7 million.

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 the 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 the claimant's family 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 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, which Washington County has implemented through its current EFC zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimant's family acquired the subject property.

## **Conclusions**

It appears that none of the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on residential division and development of the subject property were in effect when the claimant's family acquired the property on November 6, 1958. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Laws in effect when the claimant's family acquired the subject 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 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 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 claimant's 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 \$1.7 million. 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 claimant's desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when he 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 Darrel Sheets to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired tax lots 6402 and 6403 on November 16, 1979, and tax lot 6400 on February 15, 2005.

The claimant acquired tax lots 6402 and 6403 after the adoption of the statewide planning goals but before the Commission acknowledged the Washington County's land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. At that time, tax lots 6402 and 6403 were zoned by Washington County as Forest Resource Conservation (FRC), which required 38 acres for the creation of a new parcel. Because the Commission had not acknowledged the county's plan and land use regulations when the claimant

acquired tax lots 6402 and 6403 on November 16, 1979, the statewide planning goals, and Goal 4 in particular, applied directly to tax lots 6402 and 6403 when he acquired those tax lots.<sup>2</sup>

Goal 4 went into effect on January 25, 1975, and was intended 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.” Specifically, Goal 4 only allowed land divisions that would protect commercial forest lands for commercial forest uses. Dwellings in forest zones could only be allowed if found to be “necessary and accessory” to one of the enumerated forest uses listed in Goal 4.<sup>3</sup>

No information has been presented in the claim to establish that the claimant’s desired division of tax lots 6402 and 6403 and his development of a dwelling comply with the Goal 4 standards in effect when the claimant acquired tax lots 6402 and 6403 in 1979.

When the claimant acquired an interest in tax lot 6400 in 2005, it was zoned EFC by Washington County, and subject to the current lot size and dwelling standards under Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, and as described in Section V.(2) of this report.

In addition to the provisions of Goal 4 and ORS 215 in effect when the claimant acquired tax lots 6402 and 6403 in 1979 and the provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, in effect when he acquired tax lot 6400 in 2005 and other laws in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property, there may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimant’s use of the subject property that have not been identified in the claim. The department notes that ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, particularly OAR 660-006-0029, include standards for siting

---

<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).

<sup>3</sup> Goal 4 prohibited uses that were not enumerated by Goal 4 as permissible uses for forest lands as well as those that were not necessary and accessory to an enumerated forest use. *Lamb v. Lane County*, 7 Or LUBA 137 (1983). Dwellings in forest lands were required to be “necessary and accessory” to show that such dwellings complied with the Goal 4 requirement that local land use regulations must “conserve forest lands for forest uses.” *1000 Friends v. LCDC (Curry County)*, 301 Or 447 (1986). A dwelling that may “enhance” forest uses is not “necessary and accessory” to a forest use to the extent required by Goal 4. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. LCDC (Lane County)*, 305 Or 384 (1988). For additional guidance, the Goal 4 provisions were interpreted under OAR 660, division 6, effective on September 1, 1982, in *1000 Friends of Oregon v. LCDC (Lane County)* and in *1000 Friends v. LCDC (Curry County)*.

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 claimant seeks a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use, and depending on when they were enacted or adopted, may continue to apply to the claimant’s property. In addition, some of these 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 claimant has 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 claimant should be aware that the less information he has 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 his 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 Darrel Sheets’ division of the 120-acre subject property into one 40-acre parcel and one 80-acre parcel, and to his development of a dwelling on the resulting 80-acre parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired each tax lot. These laws will not apply to the claimant 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 tax lots 6402 and 6403 on November 16, 1979, and tax lot 6400 on February 15, 2005. The department acknowledges that the relief to which the claimant is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow the claimant to use tax lot 6400 in the manner set forth in the claim.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state’s authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on November 16, 1979, for tax lots 6402 and 6403, and on February 15, 2005, for tax lot 6400. On November 16, 1979, tax lots 6402 and 6403 were subject to compliance with Goal 4. On February 15, 2005, tax lot 6400 was subject to compliance with Goal 4 and OAR 660, division 6, as implemented through Washington County’s acknowledged forest zone, and the provisions of ORS 215 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 claimant first obtains 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 claimant 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 claimant to use the subject property, it may be necessary for him 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 claimant 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 claimant.

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

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on April 4, 2007. OAR 125-145 0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimant or the claimant's 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. Subsequent to the filing of this claim and after notification was provided pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080, the claimants submitted a comment to the draft staff report dated April 12, 2007, requesting to change the intended use of the property. The department cannot accept substantive amendments to previously filed claims.