



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>

October 11, 2007

To: Claimant and Interested Persons

From: Cora R. Parker, Acting Director



Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M131163


Claimants: Richard and Yolanda Nagel

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

This Draft Staff Report and Recommendation sets forth the department's evaluation of and recommendation on the claim. Oregon Administrative Rule 125-145-0100(3) provides that the claimant (or the claimant's agent) and any third parties who submitted comments on the claim may submit written comments, evidence, and information in response to any third-party comments contained in the report, and to the staff report and recommendation itself. Such response must be filed no more than 15 calendar days after the date of mailing of this report. Any response from you must be delivered to the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS), 1225 Ferry Street SE, U160, Salem, Oregon 97301, and will be deemed timely filed if either postmarked on the 15th day or actually delivered to DAS by the close of business on the 15th day.

This department will review any responses submitted, and a Final Order on the claim will be issued after such review.





ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
Draft Staff Report and Recommendation**

October 11, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M131163

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: Richard and Yolanda Nagel

MAILING ADDRESS: 8707 Yank Gulch Road
Talent, Oregon 97540

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 39S, Range 1W, Section 2
Tax lot 1900
Jackson County

OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION: Christian E. Hearn
Davis, Hearn, Saladoff & Smith, PC
515 E Main Street
Ashland, Oregon 97520

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: November 24, 2006

DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:¹ May 17, 2008

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Richard and Yolanda Nagel, seek compensation in the amount of \$300,000 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 54.10-acre subject property into two parcels of at least 20 acres each and to develop a dwelling on the resulting undeveloped parcel.² The subject property is located at 8707 Yank Gulch Road, near Talent, in Jackson County. (See claim).

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 claim also indicates that the claimants desire to sell or transfer the newly created parcel for development. In effect, the claimants request that a decision of the department to "not apply" (waive) certain laws as set forth in this report be transferable with the property. ORS 197.352 only authorizes a state agency to waive a law in order to allow the current owner a use of the property permitted at the time that owner acquired the property. A determination of transferability is beyond the scope of relief that the department may grant under ORS 197.352. The Oregon Department of Justice has advised the department that "[i]f the current owner of the real property conveys the property before a new use allowed by the public entity is established, then the entitlement to relief will be lost."

II. SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the preliminary 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 Richard and Yolanda Nagel's division of the 54.10-acre subject property into two parcels of at least 20 acres each and to their development of a dwelling on the resulting undeveloped parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 4 (Forest Lands) and 5 (Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, divisions 6, 16, and 23, enacted or adopted after each claimant acquired the subject property. These laws 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 Richard Nagel acquired the property on May 1, 1992, and when Yolanda Nagel acquired the property on September 10, 1993. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report).

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On July 5, 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, one written comment was received in response to the 15-day notice.

The comment does 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 letter 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 24, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Jackson County's zoning, statewide planning goals, ORS 92, 197 and 215, OAR 660 and "all other 'land use regulations' as defined in ORS 197.352(11)(B), wherever codified" 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

Claimant Richard Nagel acquired the subject property on May 1, 1992, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. Richard Nagel conveyed an ownership interest in the property to his wife, claimant Yolanda Nagel, on September 10, 1993, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. The Jackson County Assessor's Office confirms the claimants' current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

Claimant Richard Nagel is an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of May 1, 1992. Claimant Yolanda Nagel is an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of September 10, 1993. Richard Nagel is a "family member" of Yolanda Nagel 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.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to divide the 54.10-acre subject property into two parcels each of at least 20 acres each and to develop a dwelling on the resulting undeveloped parcel, and that current land use regulations prevent the desired use.³

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 Woodland Resource (WR) by Jackson 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.

The claimants' property is also subject to a Wildlife Habitat overlay zone by Jackson County. Jackson County's Wildlife Habitat overlay was adopted in 1983, and has been acknowledged to implement Goal 5.⁴ Under Goal 5, as adopted and effective January 25, 1975, local governments were required to inventory land and adopt programs to protect natural resources and to conserve scenic, historic and open space resources. Prior to adoption of county programs, the requirements of Goal 5 were directly applicable to individual properties through the land use application process. Specifically, Goal 5 required applicants to establish how the natural resources, scenic and historic areas and open space resources on individual properties would be protected through the proposed development. Under OAR 660, division 16, requirements and application procedures for complying with Goal 5 became effective on June 29, 1981. OAR 660,

³ The claimants summarily list numerous state land use laws as applicable to this claim, but do not establish how the laws either apply to the claimants' desired use of the subject property or restrict its use with the effect of reducing its fair market value. On their face, most of the regulations either do not apply to the claimants' property or do not restrict the claimants' desired use of the property with the effect of reducing its fair market value. This report addresses only those regulations that the department finds are applicable to and restrict the claimants' desired use of the subject property, based on the claimants' description of their desired use.

⁴ The Jackson County Wildlife Habitat overlay zone was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 5 on May 16, 1983.

division 23, established additional procedures and requirements for complying with Goal 5, and became effective on September 1, 1996.

When Richard Nagel acquired the subject property on May 1, 1992, and Yolanda Nagel acquired the property on September 10, 1993, the claimants' property was subject to Jackson County's acknowledged comprehensive plan, WR zone and Wildlife Habitat Overlay zones.⁵ The WR zone required a minimum of 20 acres for the creation of new lots or parcels and for dwellings, subject to review standards. The Wildlife Habitat Overlay zone, as it applied to the subject property, allowed the minimum parcel size of the underlying zone, but required that dwellings comply with siting standards intended to minimize impacts to wildlife. At that time, the claimants' desired use of the property would have been subject to compliance with Goals 4 and 5, and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 16, as implemented through the county's acknowledged comprehensive plan, WR zone and Wildlife Habitat Overlay zone.⁶

The claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimants' desired division and development of the subject property were allowed under the standards in effect when Richard Nagel acquired the property on May 1, 1992, or when Yolanda Nagel acquired the property on September 10, 1993.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established pursuant to Goals 4 and 5, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, 16, and 23, were enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired the subject property on May 1, 1992, and September 10, 1993, and do not allow the claimants' desired division and development of the property. However, the claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimants' desired use of the subject property complies with the standards for land divisions and development in Jackson County's acknowledged comprehensive plan and WR and Wildlife Habitat Overlay zones in effect when Richard Nagel acquired the property on May 1, 1992, and when Yolanda Nagel acquired the property on September 10, 1993.

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.

⁵ Jackson County's WR zone was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 4 on May 16, 1983.

⁶ After the county's comprehensive plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission as complying with the statewide planning goals, the goals and implementing rules no longer applied directly to individual local land use decisions. *Byrd v. Stringer*, 295 Or 311 (1983). However, 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. *Forster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992) and *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

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 \$300,000 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 a real estate agent's assessment of the subject property's value included with the claim.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Richard Nagel, who acquired the subject property in 1992, and his wife, Yolanda Nagel. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject 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 Richard Nagel acquired the subject property restrict the claimants' desired use of the property. The claimants estimate that the effect of the land use regulations on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of \$300,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when Richard Nagel acquired the property, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the 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 Richard Nagel 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 Goals 4 and 5, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, 16, and 23, which Jackson County has implemented through its current WR and Wildlife Habitat Overlay zones. With the exception of amendments adopted after the claimants acquired the property in 1992 and 1993, Goals 4 and 5, and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 16, were in effect when the claimants 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 the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on residential division and development of the subject property are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) only to the extent they were enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired the property. Provisions of Goals 4 and 5 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 16, in effect when the claimants acquired the property in 1992 and 1993 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the property.

Other laws in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will also continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property. 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).

There may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimants' use of the subject 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 currently apply to that use and may continue to 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 the 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.

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 \$300,000. 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 property was allowed under the standards in effect when Richard Nagel 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 the claimants to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time Richard Nagel acquired the property on May 1, 1992, and at the time Yolanda Nagel acquired the property on September 10, 1993.

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 Richard and Yolanda Nagel's division of the 54.10-acre subject property into two parcels of at least 20 acres each or to their development of a dwelling on the resulting undeveloped parcel: applicable provisions of Goals 4 and 5, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, 16, and 23, enacted or adopted after each claimant acquired the 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 Richard Nagel acquired the property on May 1, 1992, and when Yolanda Nagel acquired the property on September 10, 1993.
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 on May 1, 1992, for Richard Nagel and September 10, 1993, for Yolanda Nagel. On those dates, the property was subject to compliance with Goals 4 and 5 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 16, as implemented through Jackson County's acknowledged comprehensive plan and WR and Wildlife Habitat Overlay zones.
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.

6. Nothing in this report or the state’s final order for this claim constitutes any determination of ownership by the State of Oregon as to submerged or submersible lands, or as to public rights to the use of waters of the state.

VII. NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT

This staff report is not a final decision by the department and does not authorize any use of the property that is the subject of this report. OAR 125-145-0100 provides 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. Such response must be filed no more than 15 calendar days after the date this report is mailed to the claimants and any third parties. Responses to this draft staff report and recommendation will be considered only as comments related to the claim described in this report. All responses must be delivered to the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS), Measure 37 Unit, Risk Management–State Services Division, 1225 Ferry Street SE, U160, Salem, Oregon 97301-4292 and will be deemed timely filed if either postmarked on the 15th day, or actually delivered to DAS by the close of business on the 15th day. Note: Please reference the claim number, claimant name and clearly mark your comments as “Draft Staff Report comments.” Comments must be submitted in writing only. Those comments submitted electronically or by facsimile will not be accepted.

