



**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT**

**ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (MEASURE 49) SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW
OF MEASURE 37 CLAIM
Final Order of Denial**

STATE ELECTION NUMBER: E131161D^{1,2}

CLAIMANTS: Rocky and Letha Younger
15080 S Maple Lane Road
Oregon City, OR 97045

**MEASURE 37 PROPERTY
IDENTIFICATION:** Township 38S, Range 1E, Section 26
Tax lots 101 and 105
Jackson County

AGENT CONTACT INFORMATION: Ken Sandblast
Planning Resources, Inc.
17690 SW Boones Ferry Road
Lake Oswego, OR 97035

The claimants, Rocky and Letha Younger, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on November 24, 2006, for property located near Ashland, in Jackson County. ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (Measure 49) entitles claimants who filed Measure 37 claims to elect supplemental review of their claims. The claimants have elected supplemental review of their Measure 37 claim under Section 6 of Measure 49, which allows the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) to authorize up to three home site approvals to qualified claimants.

This Final Order of Denial is the conclusion of the supplemental review of this claim.

¹ Claim E131161 has been divided due to contiguous property not in the same ownership and non-contiguous property in the same ownership. Claim E131161A addresses claimants Rocky and Letha Younger and their entitlement to relief under Measure 49 on tax lots 102, 107 and 108 (T38S R1E S26). Claim E131161B addresses their relief on tax lot 102 (T38S R1E S35). Claim E131161C addresses their relief on tax lot 102 (T38S R1E S27). Claim E131161D addresses claimant Rocky Younger and his relief on tax lots 101 and 105 (T38S R1E S26). Claim E131161E addresses claimant Letha Younger and her relief on tax lots 106 (T38S R1E S26) and 104 and 103 (T38S R1E S35).

² The claimants' election included tax lots 102 and 103 (T38S R1E S34). These tax lots were not part of the Measure 37 claim property and are therefore not entitled to relief under Measure 49.

I. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM

A. Maximum Number of Home Sites for Which the Claimants May Qualify

Under Section 6 of Measure 49, the number of home site approvals authorized by the department cannot exceed the lesser of the following: three; the number stated by the claimant in the election materials; or the number described in a Measure 37 waiver issued by the state, or if no waiver was issued, the number of home sites described in the Measure 37 claim filed with the state. The claimants have requested three home site approvals in the election material. No waiver was issued for this claim. The Measure 37 claim filed with the state describes 959 home sites.³ Therefore, the claimants may qualify for a maximum of three home site approvals under Section 6 of Measure 49.

B. Qualification Requirements

To qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49, the claimants must meet each of the following requirements:

1. Timeliness of Claim

A claimant must have filed a Measure 37 claim for the property with either the state or the county in which the property is located on or before June 28, 2007, and must have filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and the county before Measure 49 became effective on December 6, 2007. If the state Measure 37 claim was filed after December 4, 2006, the claim must also have been filed in compliance with the provisions of OAR 660-041-0020 then in effect.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions

The claimants, Rocky and Letha Younger, filed a Measure 37 claim, M131161, with the state on November 24, 2006. The claimants filed a Measure 37 claim, M37 2006-00181, with Jackson County on November 27, 2006. The state claim was filed prior to December 4, 2006.

The claimants timely filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and Jackson County.

2. The Claimant Is an Owner of the Property

Measure 49 defines "Owner" as: "(a) The owner of fee title to the property as shown in the deed records of the county where the property is located; (b) The purchaser under a land sale contract, if there is a recorded land sale contract in force for the property; or (c) If the property is owned by the trustee of a revocable trust, the settlor of a revocable trust, except that when the trust becomes irrevocable only the trustee is the owner."

³ The Measure 37 claim described the use for all tax lots included in the claim for M131161.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions:

According to the deeds submitted by the claimants, Rocky Younger is the owner of fee title to the property as shown in the Jackson County deed records and, therefore, is an owner of the property under Measure 49. Jackson County has confirmed that the claimant is the current owner of the property.

According to the information submitted by the claimants, Letha Younger has not established her ownership of the property for the purposes of Measure 49.

3. All Owners of the Property Have Consented in Writing to the Claim

All owners of the property must consent to the claim in writing.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions:

All owners of the property have consented to the claim in writing.

4. The Property Is Located Entirely Outside Any Urban Growth Boundary and Entirely Outside the Boundaries of Any City

The Measure 37 claim property must be located entirely outside any urban growth boundary and entirely outside the boundaries of any city.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions:

The Measure 37 claim property is located in Jackson County, outside the urban growth boundary and outside the city limits of the nearest city, Ashland.

5. One or More Land Use Regulations Prohibit Establishing the Lot, Parcel or Dwelling

One or more land use regulations must prohibit establishing the requested lot, parcel or dwelling.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions:

The property is currently zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) by Jackson County, in accordance with ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the property is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3. Goal 3 requires agricultural land to be zoned exclusive farm use. Applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, generally prohibit the establishment of a lot or parcel less than 80 acres in size in an EFU zone. Those provisions also regulate the establishment of dwellings on new or existing lots or parcels and include restrictions on establishing more than one dwelling on a single tract.

The Measure 37 claim property consists of 279.46 acres. Therefore, state land use regulations prohibit claimant Rocky Younger from establishing on the Measure 37 claim property the three home sites the claimant may qualify for under Section 6 of Measure 49.

6. The Establishment of the Lot, Parcel or Dwelling Is Not Prohibited by a Land Use Regulation Described in ORS 195.305(3)

ORS 195.305(3) exempts from claims under Measure 49 land use regulations:

- (a) Restricting or prohibiting activities commonly and historically recognized as public nuisances under common law;
- (b) Restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety;
- (c) To the extent the land use regulation is required to comply with federal law; or
- (d) Restricting or prohibiting the use of a property for the purpose of selling pornography or performing nude dancing.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions

Based on the documentation submitted by the claimants, it does not appear that the establishment of the three home sites for which claimant Rocky Younger may qualify on the property is prohibited by land use regulations described in ORS 195.305(3).

7. On the Claimant's Acquisition Date, the Claimant Lawfully Was Permitted to Establish at Least the Number of Lots, Parcels or Dwellings on the Property That Are Authorized Under Section 6 of Measure 49

A claimant's acquisition date is "the date the claimant became the owner of the property as shown in the deed records of the county in which the property is located. If there is more than one claimant for the same property under the same claim and the claimants have different acquisition dates, the acquisition date is the earliest of those dates."

Findings of Fact and Conclusions

Jackson County deed records indicate that claimant Rocky Younger acquired the property on May 20, 1998.

The zoning of the Measure 37 claim property has not changed since the claimant acquired it on May 20, 1998. As it is currently, on May 20, 1998, the Measure 37 claim property was zoned EFU by Jackson County in accordance with applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the property is agricultural land as defined by Goal 3.

II. COMMENTS ON THE PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

The department issued its Preliminary Evaluation for this claim on December 30, 2009. Pursuant to OAR 660-041-0090, the department provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. No written comments were received in response to the 28-day notice.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis above, claimant Rocky Younger is not eligible for any relief under Measure 49 because the zoning and lawfully permitted uses of the claimant's property have not changed since he acquired it.

Based on the analysis above, claimant Letha Younger does not qualify for Measure 49 home site approvals because she is not an owner of the Measure 37 claim property.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this Final Order of Denial is entered by the Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development as a final order of the department and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.300 to ORS 195.336 and OAR 660-041-0000 to 660-041-0160.

FOR THE DEPARTMENT AND THE LAND
CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION:



Judith Moore, Division Manager
Dept. of Land Conservation and Development
Dated this 24th day of March 2010

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 is available to anyone who is an owner of the property as defined in Measure 49 that it the subject of this final determination, or a person who timely submitted written evidence or comments to the department concerning this final determination.
2. 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 must be filed in the Circuit Court in the county in which the affected property is located. Upon motion of any party to the proceedings, the proceedings may be transferred to any other county with jurisdiction under ORS 183.484 in the manner provided by law for change of venue.
3. Judicial review of this final determination is limited to the evidence in the record of the department at the time of its final determination. Copies of the documents that comprise the record are available for review at the department's office at 635 Capitol St. NE, Suite 150, Salem, OR 97301-2540. Judicial review is only available for issues that were raised before the department with sufficient specificity to afford the department an opportunity to respond.