**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:** | E132621 |
| **CLAIMANTS:** | Dorothea G. Yellott[1]<br>839 Canyon View Drive<br>Laguna Beach, CA 92651<br><br>Susan G. Boehner<br>2219 Heights Drive<br>Boise, ID 83702 |
| **MEASURE 37 PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:** | Township 38S, Range 8E, Section 8<br>Tax lot 400<br>Klamath County |
| **AGENT CONTACT INFORMATION:** | William M. Ganong<br>514 Walnut Avenue<br>Klamath Falls, OR 97601 |

The claimants, Dorothea Yellott and Susan Boehner, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on December 1, 2006, for property located at 12981 Highway 140W, near Klamath Falls, in Klamath 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.

## 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

[1] The claimants also submitted claims for properties that are not in identical ownership, which are identified as E132622 and E132623.

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 more than three home sites. 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, Dorothea Yellott and Susan Boehner, filed a Measure 37 claim, M132621, with the state on December 1, 2006. The claimants filed a Measure 37 claim, 75-06, with Klamath County on November 30, 2006. The state claim was filed prior to December 4, 2006.

The claimants timely filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and Klamath 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."

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions:**

According to the deeds submitted by the claimants, Dorothea Yellott is the settlor of a revocable trust into which she conveyed the Measure 37 claim property and Susan Boehner is an owner of fee title to the property as shown in the Klamath County deed records and, therefore, they are owners of the property under Measure 49.

Klamath County has confirmed that the claimants are the current owners of the property.

**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:**

The deeds by which the claimants acquired the property indicate that there is a non-claimant owner. The claimants have submitted a consent form signed by the non-claimant owner.

**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 Klamath County, outside the urban growth boundary and outside the city limits of the nearest city, Klamath Falls.

**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 Forestry/Range (FR) by Klamath County, in accordance with ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 6, because the property is "forest land" under Goal 4. Applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660 division 6, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 4, generally prohibit the establishment of a lot or parcel less than 80 acres in size in a forest zone and regulate the establishment of dwellings on new or existing lots or parcels.

The claimants' property consists of 7.5 acres. Therefore, state land use regulations prohibit the claimants from establishing on the Measure 37 claim property the three home sites the claimants 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 the claimants 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**

Klamath County deed records indicate that the claimants acquired the property on July 28, 1998.

On July 28, 1998, the Measure 37 claim property was subject to Klamath County's acknowledged Forestry/Range (FR) zone. Klamath County's FR zone required 80 acres for the creation of a new lot or parcel on which a dwelling could be established. The claimants' property consists of 7.5 acres and is developed with a dwelling. Therefore, the claimants lawfully could not have established any additional home sites on their date of acquisition.

## II. COMMENTS ON THE PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

The department issued its Preliminary Evaluation for this claim on January 12, 2010. 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, the claimants do not qualify for Measure 49 home site approvals because the claimants were not lawfully permitted to establish the lots, parcels or dwellings on the claimants' date of acquisition.

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

Judith Moore, Division Manager
Dept. of Land Conservation and Development
Dated this 7th day of April 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 is 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.