



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 17, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director



Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130731

Claimant: Rita Durrell

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. M130731
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
Rita Durrell, CLAIMANT)

Claimant: Rita Durrell (the Claimant)

Property: Township 12S, Range 6W, Section 25: tax lot 1000
Township 12S, Range 6W, Section 26: tax lot 100
Benton 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 denied as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report.

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 chapter 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 chapter 125, division 145, and ORS chapter 293.


FOR DLCD AND THE LAND
CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:



Lane Shetterly, Director
DLCD

Dated this 17th day of July, 2007.

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:



Janice K. Dean, SSD Administrator
DAS, State Services Division

Dated this 17th day of July, 2007.

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL OR OTHER JUDICIAL RELIEF

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

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)

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

July 17, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M130731

NAME OF CLAIMANT: Rita Durrell

MAILING ADDRESS: 25081 SW Airport Avenue
Philomath, Oregon 97370

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 12S, Range 6W
Section 25: tax lot 1000
Section 26: tax lot 100
Benton County

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: November 14, 2006

DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:¹ May 7, 2008

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Rita Durrell, seeks compensation in the amount of \$1,243,971 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 (1) to divide the 68.89-acre tax lot 100 into 12 parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel; and (2) to divide the 77.74-acre tax lot 1000 into 13 parcels, to develop a dwelling on each parcel and to develop a dog kennel and dog sports facility.² The subject property is located on the west side of Fern Road, north of the intersection with Fern Road and Airport Avenue, near Philomath, in Benton 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 not valid because Rita Durrell's desired use of the subject property was prohibited under the laws in effect when the claimant's

¹ 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.

² The subject property includes two tax lots. Tax lot 1000 consists of 68.89 acres, and tax lot 100 consists of 77.74 acres. The intended use is based on the original demand made for compensation filed with the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS) on November 14, 2006.

family member acquired the property in 2004. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On May 22, 2007, pursuant to Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 125-145-0080, 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 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 criteria, whichever is later.

Findings of Fact

This claim was submitted to DAS on November 14, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Statewide Planning Goals 2 (Land Use Planning) and 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 197 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33, 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, Rita Durrell, first acquired the subject property on June 7, 1948, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. However, she subsequently conveyed the subject property to the East Seventy LLC and the West Eighty LLC on June 23, 2004, as reflected by quitclaim deeds provided by Benton County.³ On September 7, 2006, East Seventy LLC and West Eighty LLC conveyed the subject property to the Kenneth H. and Rita M. Durrell Family Living Trust, as reflected by quitclaim deeds provided by Benton County.⁴ The Benton County Assessor’s Office confirms the claimant’s current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimant, Rita Durrell, is an “owner” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of September 7, 2006. East Seventy LLC and West Eighty LLC are “family members” of the claimant, as defined by ORS 197.352(11)(A), and acquired the subject property on June 23, 2004.

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 146.63-acre subject property into 12 parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel, and that the use is not allowed under the current state land use regulations.

The claim is based on the applicable provisions of state law that require Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning and restrict uses on land zoned EFU. The claimant’s property is zoned EFU by Benton County as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the claimant’s property is “agricultural land” as defined by Goal 3. Goal 3 became

³ In response to the draft staff report dated June 11, 2007, pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080 on June 20, 2007, the claimant submitted a letter. The department has considered the comments.

⁴ Under ORS 197.352(11)(A), legal entities can be “family members” of individuals who are owners of property under ORS 197.352(11)(C). However, legal entities cannot have family members under the statute. Therefore, individuals who transferred property to the LLC are not considered family members under the definition of family member in ORS 197.352(11)(A).

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, prohibit the division of EFU-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 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 215.263 (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, 1994.⁵

The claimant's family member acquired the subject property on June 23, 2004, after the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations, as described above.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by Goal 3 and provisions applicable to land zoned EFU in ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were all enacted or adopted before the claimant's family member acquired the subject property on June 23, 2004. These land use regulations do not allow the division and development on the subject property. Laws enacted or adopted since the claimant's family member acquired the subject property in 2004 do not restrict the claimant's desired use of the property relative to when the claimant's family member acquired it in 2004.

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 \$1,243,971 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 a real estate broker's opinion letter and market analysis, included with the claim.

⁵The Commission adopted amendments to OAR 660-033-0130 et seq. to comply with House Bill 3326 (Chapter 704, Oregon Laws 2001, effective on January 1, 2002), which were effective on May 22, 2002. These amendments clarified but did not further restrict the OAR 660, division 33, development standards.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Rita Durrell, whose family member acquired the subject property on June 23, 2004. No state laws enacted or adopted since the claimant's family member acquired the subject property restrict the use of the property relative to the uses allowed when her family member acquired the property in 2004. Therefore, the fair market value of the subject property has not been reduced as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (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 claimant's desired use of the property, including Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Benton County has implemented through its EFU zone. As set forth in Section V.(2) of this report, all of the state land use regulations restricting the claimant's desired use of the subject property were in effect when the claimant's family member acquired the property in 2004.

Conclusions

All of the state land use regulations that restrict the claimant's desired use of the subject property were in effect when the claimant's family member acquired the property. Therefore, these state land use regulations are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E), which exempts laws in effect when the claimant's family member acquired 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 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 do not restrict the claimant's desired use of the subject property relative to what was permitted when the claimant's family member acquired it in 2004 and do not reduce the fair market value of the property. All state laws restricting the use of the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

Conclusions

Based on the record and the foregoing findings and conclusions, the claimant has not established that she is entitled to relief under ORS 197.352(1) as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department because the claimant's desired use of the property was prohibited under the laws in effect when her family member acquired the property in 2004. Therefore, the department recommends that this claim be denied.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on June 11, 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.