OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (MEASURE 49) SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW
OF MEASURE 37 CLAIM
Final Order and Authorization

STATE ELECTION NUMBER: D133585

CLAIMANTS: Eldwin Sorensen and Rebecca Ruddell
8620 Booth Road
Klamath Falls, OR 97603

MEASURE 37 PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 39S, Range 10E, Section 7
Tax lot 200
Klamath County

The claimants, Eldwin Sorensen and Rebecca Ruddell, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on December 2, 2006, for property located at 8620 Booth Road, near Klamath Falls, in Klamath County. ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (Measure 49) entitled claimants who filed Measure 37 claims to elect supplemental review of their claims. The claimants elected supplemental review of their Measure 37 claim under Section 7 of Measure 49. However, the claimants did not submit an appraisal consistent with the requirements in Section 8(5) of Measure 49 and did not change their election to request relief under Section 6 of Measure 49. Therefore, they were not entitled to any relief under Measure 49. ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (Measure 49), as amended by Senate Bill 1049 (SB 1049) now entitles claimants who elected review under Section 7 but did not submit an appraisal consistent with the requirements in Section 8(5) of Measure 49 to elect supplemental state review of their claims; and allows the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) to authorize one dwelling approval to qualified claimants and, if the property does not include a vacant parcel for that dwelling, a parcel on which to site the dwelling.

The claimants have elected supplemental review of their Klamath County Measure 37 claim under SB 1049, and have submitted the $2500 fee required by Section 7(2) of SB 1049 for that review.

This Final Order and Authorization is the conclusion of the supplemental review of this claim.
I. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM

A. Maximum Relief for Which the Claimants May Qualify

Under Measure 49, as amended by SB 1049, the department may authorize one dwelling approval and, if the property does not include a vacant parcel for that dwelling, a parcel on which to site the dwelling.

B. Qualification Requirements

To qualify for a dwelling approval under Measure 49, as amended by SB 1049, the claimants must meet each of the following requirements:

1. Timeliness of Claim

To qualify for approval of a dwelling under Measure 49, as amended by SB 1049, 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 6, 2007, 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, Eldwin Sorensen and Rebecca Ruddell, filed a Measure 37 claim, M133585, with the state on December 2, 2006. The claimants filed a Measure 37 claim, 108-06, with Klamath County on December 1, 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, Rebecca Ruddell is an owner of fee title to an undivided interest in the property as shown in the Klamath County deed records and Eldwin Sorensen is the settlor of a revocable trust into which he conveyed an undivided interest in the Measure 37 claim property and, therefore, claimants 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:

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

4. The Majority of the Measure 37 Claim Property Is Located Outside Any Urban Growth Boundary and Outside the Boundaries of Any City or the Measure 37 Claim Property Is Located within the Boundaries of A City and Entirely Outside Any Urban Growth Boundary

Either the majority of the Measure 37 claim property must be located outside any urban growth boundary and outside the boundaries of any city or the Measure 37 claim property must be located within the boundaries of a city and entirely outside any urban growth boundary.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions:

The Measure 37 claim property is located in Klamath County, outside any urban growth boundary and outside the city boundary 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 Exclusive Farm Use (EFU-C) by Klamath 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, and regulate the establishment of dwellings on new or existing lots or parcels.

The claimants’ property consists of 21.43 acres in one parcel and is developed with one dwelling. Therefore, state land use regulations prohibit the claimants from establishing one additional dwelling on the Measure 37 claim property and a parcel on which to site that dwelling.

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 an additional dwelling and a lot or parcel for that dwelling for which the claimants may qualify 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 October 20, 1983.

The claimants acquired the Measure 37 claim property after adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the commission) acknowledged Klamath County’s comprehensive plan and land use regulations to be in compliance with those goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. On October 20, 1983, the Measure 37 claim property was zoned Suburban Residential (RS) by Klamath County. Klamath County’s RS zone required a minimum of 10,000 square feet for the establishment of a new lot or parcel. However, the Commission had not acknowledged that zone for compliance with the goals when the claimants acquired the property on October 20, 1983. Accordingly, the statewide planning goals, and in particular Goal 3 and ORS chapter 215 applied directly to the Measure 37 claim property when the claimants acquired it.

On August 6, 1984, the Commission acknowledged the application of Klamath County’s Exclusive Farm Use-Cropland (EFU-C) zone to the Measure 37 claim property. The Commission’s acknowledgement of Klamath County’s EFU-C zone confirmed that zone’s compliance with Goal 3 and ORS chapter 215. Although the Commission acknowledged Klamath County’s EFU-C zone to comply with the goals, it did not include a fixed minimum acreage standard for the creation of a lot or parcel on which a dwelling could be established. Rather, the county reviewed applications for land division and development on a case-by-case basis in order to ensure compliance with the county’s farm use policies, the statewide planning goals and ORS chapter 215. The claimants’ property consists of 21.43 acres and is developed.
with one dwelling. Therefore, on the claimants’ acquisition date, they could not have established any home sites in the zone that was ultimately acknowledged to comply with the statewide planning goals and implementing regulations, absent compliance with the applicable review criteria.

However, because of uncertainty during the time period between adoption of the statewide planning goals in 1975 and each county’s acknowledgment of its plan and land use regulations regarding the factual and legal requirements for establishing compliance with the statewide planning goals, the 2010 Legislative Assembly amended Measure 49. SB 1049 (2010) specifies the number of home sites considered lawfully permitted, for purposes of Measure 49, for property acquired during this period unless the record for the claim otherwise demonstrates the number of home sites that a claimant would have been lawfully permitted to establish. Those amendments provide, in relevant part, that subject to consistency with local land use regulations in effect when they acquired the Measure 37 claim property, claimants whose property consists of 20 or more acres but less than 40 were lawfully permitted to establish up to two home sites.

The Measure 37 claim property consists of 21.43 acres and is developed with one dwelling. Therefore, based on the analysis under SB 1049 (2010), the claimants were lawfully permitted to establish one additional dwelling on a separate parcel on the Measure 37 claim property on their date of acquisition.

II. COMMENTS ON THE PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

The department issued its Preliminary Evaluation for this claim on November 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 qualify for one dwelling. Because the Measure 37 claim property includes only one parcel that is already developed with one dwelling, the claimants also qualify to divide the claim property to create one additional lot or parcel on which to establish the dwelling. Therefore, the one dwelling approval the claimants qualify for under Measure 49, as amended by SB 1049, will authorize the claimants to establish one additional dwelling and one additional lot or parcel on which to site the dwelling on the Measure 37 claim property.

IV. AUTHORIZATION

Based on the analysis set forth above, this claim is approved, and the claimants qualify for one dwelling approval. As explained in section III above, the claimants are authorized for one additional dwelling and one additional lot or parcel on which to site the dwelling on the property on which the claimants are eligible for Measure 49 relief, subject to the following terms:

1. The establishment of a dwelling and a lot or parcel for that dwelling based on a Measure 49 authorization must comply with all applicable standards governing siting or development. However, those standards must not be applied in a manner that prohibits the establishment of
the dwelling, and the lot or parcel for that dwelling, unless the standards are reasonably necessary to avoid or abate a nuisance, to protect public health or safety, or to carry out federal law.

2. An authorization under Measure 49 does not allow the establishment of a dwelling, and lot or parcel for that dwelling, in violation of a land use regulation described in ORS 195.305(3) or in violation of any other law that is not a land use regulation as defined by ORS 195.300(14).

3. A claimant is not eligible for more than 20 home site approvals under Sections 5 to 11 of Measure 49 regardless of how many properties a claimant owns or how many claims a claimant filed.

4. Temporary dwellings are not considered in determining the number of existing dwellings currently on the property. The claimants may choose to convert a temporary dwelling currently located on the property on which the claimants are eligible for Measure 49 relief to an authorized home site pursuant to a Measure 49 dwelling approval. Otherwise, any temporary dwelling is subject to the terms of the local permit requirements under which it was approved, and is subject to removal at the end of the term for which it is allowed.

5. An authorization under Measure 49 only allows the establishment of a new dwelling, and lot or parcel for that dwelling, on property on which the claimants are eligible for Measure 49 relief. No additional development is authorized on contiguous property for which no Measure 37 claim was filed, or on Measure 37 claim property on which a claimant is not eligible for Measure 49 relief. A lot or parcel established pursuant to this authorization must site the dwelling that may be established pursuant to this authorization.

6. The claimants may use an authorization to convert an unauthorized or nonconforming dwelling currently located on the claim property into an allowed use.

7. The claimants may not implement the relief described in a Measure 49 authorization if a claimant has been determined to have a common law vested right to a use described in a Measure 37 waiver for the property. Therefore, if a claimant has been determined in a final judgment or final order that is not subject to further appeal to have a common law vested right as described in Section 5(3) of Measure 49 to any use on the Measure 37 claim property, then any Measure 49 authorization for the property will be void. However, so long as no claimant has been determined in such a final judgment or final order to have a common law vested right to a use described in a Measure 37 waiver for the property, a use that has been completed on the property pursuant to a Measure 37 waiver may be authorized using this approval.

8. An authorization under Measure 49 does not allow the establishment of a new dwelling on a lot or parcel that already contains one or more dwellings. The claimants may be required to partition a lot or parcel currently in existence on the Measure 37 claim property so that the authorized dwelling established on the property is sited on a separate lot or parcel.
9. If the property described in a claim is divided by an urban growth boundary, any new
dwelling, and the lot or parcel for that dwelling that is established on the property pursuant to
this authorization must be located on the portion of the property outside the urban growth
boundary.

10. Because the property is located in an exclusive farm use zone, the new lot or parcel created
for the authorized dwelling cannot exceed five acres. However, existing or remnant lots or
parcels may exceed five acres. Before beginning construction in one of these zones, the
owner must comply with the requirements of ORS 215.293. Further, this authorization will
not allow a new lot or parcel that exceeds two acres if the new lot or parcel is located on
high-value farmland, on high-value forestland or on land within a ground water restricted
area. However, existing or remnant lots or parcels may exceed two acres.

11. Because the property is located in an exclusive farm use zone, Measure 49 requires the new
lot or parcel to be positioned so as to maximize suitability of the remnant lot or parcel for
farm or forest use. Further, if an owner of the property is authorized by other home site
approvals to subdivide, partition, or establish dwellings on other Measure 37 claim
properties, Measure 49 authorizes the owner to cluster some or all of the authorized lots,
parcels or dwellings that would otherwise be located on land in an exclusive farm use zone, a
forest zone or a mixed farm and forest zone on a single Measure 37 claim property that is
zoned residential use or is located in an exclusive farm use zone, a forest zone or a mixed
farm and forest zone but is less suitable for farm or forest use than the other Measure 37
claim properties.

12. If an owner of the property is authorized by other home site approvals to subdivide, partition,
or establish dwellings on other Measure 37 claim properties, Measure 49 authorizes the
owner to cluster some or all of the authorized lots, parcels or dwellings that would otherwise
be located on land in an exclusive farm use zone, a forest zone or a mixed farm and forest
zone on a single Measure 37 claim property that is zoned residential use or is located in an
exclusive farm use zone, a forest zone or a mixed farm and forest zone but is less suitable for
farm or forest use than the other Measure 37 claim properties.
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this Final Order and Authorization 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:

[Signature]

Kristin May, Division Manager
Dept. of Land Conservation and Development
Dated this 5th day of December, 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.