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 Home Site Authorization

STATE ELECTION NUMBER: E121423

CLAIMANT: Dawn Robanske
PO Box 1589
Trout Creek, Montana 56847

MEASURE 37 PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 4S, Range 1W, Section 16C
Tax lot 7002
Marion County

AGENT CONTACT INFORMATION: Jill S. Gelineau
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt
1211 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1900
Portland, Oregon 97204

The claimant, Dawn Robanske, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on July 15, 2005, for property located on Donald Road just east of the Interstate 5 overpass, near Donald, in Marion 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 claimant has elected supplemental review of her 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 and Home Site Authorization is the conclusion of the supplemental review of this claim.

1 David Robanske was also a Measure 37 claimant; however, he passed away since the filing of the Measure 37 claim.
2 The Measure 37 claim property consists of tax lots 500, 700 and 800. Claimant Dawn Robanske was denied relief on tax lots 500 and 800 under Measure 37 because she did not establish her ownership of those tax lots. The claimant did not indicate that she would like the department to review her eligibility for relief under Measure 49 for tax lots 500 and 800. Therefore, this final order addresses only the claimant’s eligibility for relief for tax lot 700 and all references to Measure 37 claim property refer only to tax lot 700.
I. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM

A. Maximum Number of Home Sites for Which the Claimant 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 material; 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 claimant has requested one home site approval in the election material. The Measure 37 waiver issued for this claim describes three home sites. Therefore, the claimant may qualify for a maximum of one home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49.

B. Qualification Requirements

To qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49, the claimant 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 claimant, Dawn Robanske, filed a Measure 37 claim, M121423, with the state on July 15, 2005. The claimant filed a Measure 37 claim, M05-87, with Marion County on June 18, 2005. The state claim was filed prior to December 4, 2006.

The claimant timely filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and Marion 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 deed submitted by the claimant, Dawn Robanske is the owner of fee title to the property as shown in the Marion County deed records and, therefore, is an owner of the property under Measure 49.

Marion County has confirmed that the claimant is the current owner 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 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 Marion County, outside the urban growth boundary and outside the city limits of the nearest city, Donald.

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 Marion 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 (EFU).

Applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, provide standards for the establishment of a dwelling in an EFU zone. In general and subject to some exceptions, those standards require that the property be a minimum of 80 acres in size in an EFU zone and generate a minimum annual income from the sale of farm products.

The combined effect of the standards for the establishment of a dwelling in an EFU zone is to prohibit the claimant from establishing a dwelling on the Measure 37 claim property.
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 claimant, it does not appear that the establishment of the one home site for which the claimant 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

Marion County deed records indicate that the claimant acquired the property on August 24, 1976.

The claimant acquired the Measure 37 claim property after adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) acknowledged Marion County’s comprehensive plan and land use regulations to be in compliance with those goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. At that time, the Measure 37 claim property was zoned Residential Agriculture (RA) by Marion County. Marion County’s RA zone included a fixed minimum acreage standard of 6,000 square feet. However, the Commission had not acknowledged that zone for compliance with the goals when the claimant acquired the property on August 24, 1976. Accordingly, the statewide planning goals, and in particular Goal 3 and ORS chapter 215, applied directly to the Measure 37 claim property when the claimant acquired it.

On October 18, 1981, the Commission acknowledged the application of Marion County’s Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zone to the Measure 37 claim property. The Commission’s acknowledgement of Marion County’s EFU zone confirmed that zone’s compliance with Goal 3
and ORS chapter 215. Marion County’s acknowledged EFU zone required 60 acres for the
establishment of a dwelling on a vacant lot or parcel on land consisting of predominately Class II
and III soils. The Measure 37 claim property consists of 2.31 acres of Class II soils. Therefore,
on the claimant’s acquisition date, she could not have established a home site on the Measure 37
claim property in the zone that was ultimately acknowledged to comply with the statewide
planning goals and implementing regulations.

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. Senate Bill (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 less than 20 acres were lawfully permitted to establish one home site.

The Measure 37 claim property consists of 2.31 acres. Therefore, based on the analysis under SB
1049 (2010), the claimant was lawfully permitted to establish one home site on the Measure 37
claim property on her date of acquisition.

II. COMMENTS ON THE PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

The department issued its Preliminary Evaluation for this claim on March 23, 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 claimant qualifies for one home site. However, the number of
lots, parcels or dwellings that a claimant may establish pursuant to a home site authorization is
reduced by the number of lots, parcels or dwellings currently in existence on the Measure 37
claim property and any contiguous property under the same ownership according to the
methodology stated in Section 6(2)(b) and 6(3) of Measure 49.

Based on the documentation provided by the claimant and information from Marion County, the
Measure 37 claim property currently includes one lot or parcel and no dwellings. Information
from Marion County demonstrates that the claimant also owns tax lots 500 and 800 (T4S R1W
S16C) which are contiguous to the Measure 37 claim property. The contiguous property under
the same ownership includes two lots or parcels and no dwellings. Together, the Measure 37
claim property and contiguous property under the same ownership includes three lots or parcels
and no dwellings. The number of lots, parcels or dwellings the claimant will be able to establish
on the Measure 37 claim property pursuant to the one home site approval is not reduced by the
contiguous lots or parcels in the same ownership because the total number of lots, parcels or
dwellings that would exist on the Measure 37 claim property and the contiguous property in the
same ownership would not exceed three if the claimants established one dwelling on the Measure 37 claim property. Therefore, the one home site approval the claimant qualifies for under Section 6 of Measure 49 will authorize the claimant to establish one dwelling on the Measure 37 claim property.

IV. HOME SITE AUTHORIZATION

Based on the analysis set forth above, this claim is approved, and the claimant qualifies for one home site approval. As explained in section III above, after taking into account the number of existing lots, parcels or dwellings the claimant is authorized for one dwelling on the property on which the claimants are eligible for Measure 49 relief, subject to the following terms:

1. Each dwelling must be on a separate lot or parcel, and must be contained within the property on which the claimant is eligible for Measure 49 relief. The establishment of a dwelling based on this home site authorization must comply with all applicable standards governing the siting or development of the dwelling. However, those standards must not be applied in a manner that prohibits the establishment of the 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. This home site authorization will not authorize the establishment of a 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. If the claimant has developed the limit of twenty home sites under Measure 49, the claimant is no longer eligible for the home site approvals that are the subject of this order.

4. The number of dwellings a claimant may establish under this home site authorization is reduced by the number of dwellings currently in existence on the Measure 37 claim property and contiguous property in the same ownership, regardless of whether evidence of their existence has been provided to the department. If, based on the information available to the department, the department has calculated the number of currently existing dwellings to be either greater than or less than the number of dwellings actually in existence on the Measure 37 claim property or contiguous property under the same ownership, then the number of additional dwellings a claimant may establish pursuant to this home site authorization must be adjusted according to the methodology stated in Section 6(2)(b) and 6(3) of Measure 49. Statements in this final order regarding the number of lots, parcels or dwellings currently existing on the Measure 37 claim property and contiguous property are not a determination on the current legal status of those lots, parcels or dwellings.

5. Temporary dwellings are not considered in determining the number of existing dwellings currently on the property. The claimant may choose to convert any temporary dwelling currently located on the property on which the claimant is eligible for Measure 49 relief to an authorized home site pursuant to a home site 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.

6. A home site approval only authorizes the establishment of a new dwelling on the property on which the claimant is eligible for Measure 49 relief. No additional development is authorized on contiguous property for which no Measure 37 claim was filed.

7. The claimant may use a home site approval to convert a dwelling currently located on the property on which the claimant is eligible for Measure 49 relief to an authorized home site. If the number of dwellings existing on the property on which the claimant is eligible for Measure 49 relief exceeds the number of home site approvals the claimant qualifies for under a home site authorization, the claimant may select which existing dwellings to convert to authorized home sites.

8. The claimant may not implement the relief described in this Measure 49 home site 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 this Measure 49 Home Site Authorization is 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 converted to an authorized home site.

9. A home site approval does not authorize the establishment of a new dwelling on a lot or parcel that already contains one or more dwellings.

10. Because the property is located in an exclusive farm use zone, the owner must comply with the requirements of ORS 215.293 before beginning construction.

11. If an owner of the property is authorized by other home site authorizations 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 the claimant transferred ownership interest in the Measure 37 claim property prior to the date of this order, this order is rendered invalid and authorizes no home site approvals. Provided this order is valid when issued, a home site approval authorized under this order runs with the property and transfers with the property. A home site approval will not expire, except that if a claimant who received this home site authorization later conveys the property to a party other than the claimant’s spouse or the trustee of a revocable trust in which the claimant is the settlor, the subsequent owner of the property must establish the authorized
dwellings within 10 years of the conveyance. A dwelling lawfully created based on a home site approval is a permitted use.

13. 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, this home site authorization will not authorize the use of the property unless the claimant first obtains 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.
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this Final Order and Home Site 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]
Judith Moore, Division Manager
Dept. of Land Conservation and Development
Dated this 10th day of May 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.