



**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT**

**ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (MEASURE 49) SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW
OF MEASURE 37 CLAIM
Amended Final Order and Home Site Authorization on Reconsideration¹**

STATE ELECTION NUMBER: E133689²

CLAIMANTS:

Roland A. Hendricks
13384 Picard Place SE
Turner, OR 97392

C. Diane Kent
15108 SE 24th Street
Vancouver, WA 98683

Jerry R. and Judith K. Kinney
PO Box 38
Siletz, OR 97380

Kurt and Kimberlee Cochran
PO Box 290
Siletz, OR 97380

**MEASURE 37 PROPERTY
IDENTIFICATION:** Township 11S, Range 10W, Section 7A
Tax lot 1300
Lincoln County

AGENT CONTACT INFORMATION: Dennis L. Bartoldus, Attorney at Law
PO Box 1510
Newport, OR 97365

The claimants, Ronald Hendricks, Diane Kent, Jerry and Judith Kinney, and Kurt and Kimberlee Cochran, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on December 4, 2006, for property located at the intersection of Highways 20 and 229, near Toledo, in Lincoln 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

¹ A final order of denial was issued for this claim on January 25, 2010. That final order is withdrawn and replaced by this final order.

² Claimants Jerry and Judith Kinney also have submitted a claim for property not contiguous to and not in the same ownership as the subject property which is identified as E122832.

of Land Conservation and Development (the department) to authorize up to three home site approvals to qualified claimants.

This Amended Final Order and Home Site Authorization on Reconsideration 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 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 claimants have requested supplemental review under Section 6. No waiver was issued for this claim. The Measure 37 claim filed with the state describes one home site. Therefore, the claimants 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 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, Ronald Hendricks, Diane Kent, Jerry and Judith Kinney, and Kurt and Kimberlee Cochran, filed a Measure 37 claim, M133689, with the state on December 4, 2006. The claimants filed a Measure 37 claim, 144-LURCC-06-1372, with Lincoln County on December 4, 2006. The state claim was filed on December 4, 2006.

The claimants timely filed a Measure 37 claim with both the state and Lincoln 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:

In an opinion issued on September 27, 2012, in *Burke v. DLCD* the Oregon Supreme Court held that the seller in a land sale contract can qualify as an owner for purposes of Section 6 of Measure 49. According to a deed submitted by the claimants Roland and Diane Hendricks acquired the property on July 15, 1974. Although they later transferred the property under a land sale contract, according to *Burke v. DLCD* they remain owners for purposes of Measure 49.

According to the information submitted by the claimants, Kurt and Kimberlee Cochran have not established their ownership of the property for the purposes of Measure 49. The claimants have not submitted any documentation that supports Kurt and Kimberlee Cochran's ownership of the Measure 37 property.

Because this requirement has not been met, claimants Kurt and Kimberlee Cochran are not entitled to any relief under Measure 49, and, therefore, the remaining approval criteria will not be evaluated for those claimants.

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 Lincoln County, outside the urban growth boundary and outside the city limits of the nearest city, Toledo.

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 Agricultural Conservation (A-C) by Lincoln 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 claimants 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 claimants, it does not appear that the establishment of the one home site 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

Lincoln County deed records indicate that claimants Jerry and Judith Kinney acquired the property on June 11, 1998, and claimants Ronald Hendricks and Diane Kent acquired the property on July 15, 1974. Therefore, for purposes of Measure 49, the claimants' acquisition date is July 15, 1974.

On July 15, 1974, the Measure 37 claim property was subject to state statutes and Lincoln County's Rural Residential (A-2) zone.

Lincoln County's A-2 zone required at least one acre for the establishment of a dwelling on a vacant lot or parcel. The claimants' property consists of 3.2 acres. Therefore, under the local zoning then in effect, the claimants lawfully could have established one home site on the Measure 37 claim property on their date of acquisition.

State law in effect when the claimant acquired the property, specifically ORS 197.175(1) and 197.280 (1973 edition), required that counties exercise their planning responsibilities in accordance with the interim land use planning goals set forth in ORS 215.515 (1973 edition).

Those interim land use planning goals included: “To preserve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state”; “To conserve prime farm lands for the production of crops”; “To provide for the orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use”; “To protect life and property in areas subject to floods, landslides and other natural disasters”; and “To develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.” ORS 215.515 (1973 edition)

The applicable provisions of the interim goals are furthered by provisions of Section 6 of Measure 49, which limits the number of home sites authorized, and by Section 11(3), which regulates the size and location of lots or parcels on high value farm or forest land. Measure 49 Section 11(3) requires new parcels on high-value farm or forest land to be no larger than two acres and “clustered so as to maximize suitability of the remnant lot or parcel for farm or forest use.”

The claimants seek to develop a dwelling on a previously existing vacant lot or parcel. The relevant provisions of ORS chapter 197 and ORS 215.515 would not have prohibited the county from approving development of one dwelling on the Measure 37 claim property on the claimants’ acquisition date.

II. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis above, the claimants qualify for up to 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 claimants and information from Lincoln County, the Measure 37 claim property includes one lot or parcel and no dwellings. There is no contiguous property under the same ownership. Therefore, the one home site approval the claimants qualify for under Section 6 of Measure 49 will authorize the claimants to establish one dwelling on the Measure 37 claim property.

III. HOME SITE AUTHORIZATION

Based on the analysis set forth above, this claim is approved, and the claimants qualify for one home site approval. As explained in section III above, after taking into account the number of existing lots, parcels or dwellings the claimants are 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 claimants are 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 claimants have developed the limit of twenty home sites under Measure 49, the claimants are no longer eligible for the home site approval that is 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 claimants may choose to convert any 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 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 claimants are eligible for Measure 49 relief. No additional development is authorized on contiguous property for which no Measure 37 claim was filed.
7. The claimants may use a home site approval to convert a dwelling currently located on the property on which the claimants are eligible for Measure 49 relief to an authorized home site. If the number of dwellings existing on the property on which the claimants are eligible for Measure 49 relief exceeds the number of home site approvals the claimants qualify for under a home site authorization, the claimants may select which existing dwellings to convert to authorized home sites.
8. The claimants 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 claimants 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 claimants 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 Amended Final Order and Home Site Authorization on Reconsideration 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:



Matthew Crall, Division Manager
Dept. of Land Conservation and Development
Dated this 20th day of December 2012.

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.