



# 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>

July 11, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director



*Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130727*

*Claimants: Robert E. Schlegel, Dorothy Schlegel and Robert D. Schlegel*

---

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. M130727
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF	)	
Robert E. Schlegel, Dorothy Schlegel and	)	
Robert G. Schlegel, CLAIMANTS	)	

Claimants: Robert E. Schlegel, Dorothy Schlegel and Robert G. Schlegel (the Claimants)

Property: Township 2N, Range 3W, Section 21, Tax lot 602, Washington 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 40-acre subject property into four parcels and to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, 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 Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel acquired the property on March 7, 1953, and when Robert G. Schlegel acquired the property on January 12, 2004. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Robert G. Schlegel is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow him to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim.
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 when Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel acquired the property on March 7, 1953, and when Robert G. Schlegel acquired the property on January 12, 2004. On January 12, 2004, the property was

subject to applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, 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 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 10<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Janice K. Dean, SSD Administrator  
DAS, State Services Division  
Dated this 10<sup>th</sup> day of July, 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**

July 10, 2007

**STATE CLAIM NUMBER:** M130727

**NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:** Robert E. Schlegel  
Dorothy Schlegel  
Robert G. Schlegel

**MAILING ADDRESSES:** Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel  
3344 Lavina Drive  
Forest Grove, Oregon 97116

Robert G. Schlegel  
38911 NW Harrison Road  
Banks, Oregon 97106

**OTHER INTEREST IN PROPERTY:** Margaret Schlegel  
38911 NW Harrison Road  
Banks, Oregon 97106

**PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:** Township 2N, Range 3W, Section 21  
Tax lot 602  
Washington County

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

**DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:<sup>1</sup>** May 6, 2008

**I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM**

The claimants, Robert E., Dorothy and Robert G. Schlegel, seek compensation in the amount of \$1 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 claimants desire compensation or the right to divide the 40-acre subject property into four parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel. The subject property is located at the intersection of Davidson Road and Hahn Road in Washington County. (See claim.)

---

<sup>1</sup> ORS 197.352, as originally enacted, required that final action on claims made under Measure 37 be made within 180 days of the date the claim was filed. In response to the large volume of claims filed in late 2006, the Oregon legislature passed House Bill 3546, which became effective on May 10, 2007. This legislation increased the amount of time state and local governments have to take final action on Measure 37 claims filed on or after November 1, 2006, by 360 days, to a total of 540 days.

## 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 40-acre subject property into four 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 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 Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel acquired the property on March 7, 1953, and when Robert G. Schlegel acquired the property on January 12, 2004. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Robert G. Schlegel is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow him to use the subject property 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 May 17, 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 13, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Washington County 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**

Claimants Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel acquired the subject property on March 7, 1953, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. The claimants transferred the subject property to a revocable trust, the Robert E. Schlegel Living Trust, with themselves as trustees, as evidenced by a trust certification dated September 22, 1998, included with the claim.<sup>2</sup> On January 12, 2004, Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel conveyed an undivided one-half interest in the subject property to their son, Robert G. Schlegel, as evidenced by a statutory warranty deed included with the claim.<sup>3</sup> The Washington County Assessor’s Office confirms the claimants’ current ownership of the subject property.

### **Conclusions**

The claimants, Robert E., Dorothy and Robert G. Schlegel, are “owners” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel have been “owners” since March 7, 1953. Robert G. Schlegel has been an “owner” since January 12, 2004. Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel are “family members” of Robert G. Schlegel 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>2</sup> Transfer of property to a revocable trust does not result in a change in ownership for purposes of ORS 197.352.

<sup>3</sup> The claimants assert that they acquired the subject property on April 14, 1950. However, the claimants did not include documentation to support that acquisition date. Absent documentation from the claimants to establish an earlier acquisition date, the department must rely on the available documentation to establish the date of acquisition.

## **Findings of Fact**

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to divide the 40-acre subject property into four parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel, and that the current zoning prohibits the desired use.

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require forest zoning and restrict uses on forest-zoned land. The claimants' 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 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.

Current land use regulations, including ORS 215.705 to 215.755 and 215.780 and OAR 660, division 6, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 4, generally prohibit the division of forest-zoned land into parcels less than 80 acres and establish standards for development of dwellings on existing or proposed parcels on that land.

ORS 215.780 generally establishes an 80-acre minimum size for the creation of new lots or parcels on forest-zoned land and became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). ORS 215.705 to 215.755 establish standards for the creation of new parcels and dwellings allowed in forest zones.

OAR 660, division 6, became effective on September 1, 1982, to implement Goal 4 and establish standards for divisions and development of land zoned for forest use, and was amended on March 1, 1994, to implement ORS 215.705 to 215.755 and 215.780. OAR 660-006-0025 interprets the goal and statutory standard for uses allowed in forest zones. OAR 660-006-0026 interprets land division requirements in forest zones, and 660-006-0027 and 660-006-0029 interpret the standards for dwellings in forest zones.

Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel acquired the subject property on March 7, 1953, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations. No county zoning applied to the subject property in 1953.

## **Conclusions**

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, were enacted or adopted after Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel acquired the subject property in 1953. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when they 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 uses 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 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 \$1 million 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 claimants’ assessment of the subject property’s value.

#### **Conclusions**

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel who acquired the subject property on March 7, 1953, and their son, Robert G. Schlegel. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are 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 Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel 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 \$1 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 Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel 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 Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel 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 Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel acquired the subject property in 1953. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352. Laws in effect when Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and do not provide a basis for compensation. In addition, 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 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 \$1 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 claimants' desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel 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 Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time they acquired the property on March 7, 1953, and to allow Robert G. Schlegel to use the property for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on January 12, 2004.

At the time Robert G. Schlegel acquired an interest in the subject property, 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, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, in effect when Robert G. Schlegel acquired the property, and other laws in effect when any of the claimants acquired the subject 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 addition, the department notes that ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, particularly OAR 660-006-0027, -0029 and -0035, include fire protection standards for dwellings and structures in 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. . . .” Accordingly, the siting standards for dwellings and structures 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 that 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 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 40-acre subject property into four parcels and to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, 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 Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel acquired the property on March 7, 1953, and when Robert G. Schlegel acquired the property on January 12, 2004. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Robert G. Schlegel is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow him to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim.
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 when Robert E. and Dorothy Schlegel acquired the property on March 7, 1953, and when Robert G. Schlegel acquired the property on January 12, 2004. On January 12, 2004, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, 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 June 6, 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.