

## 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:

H130117B1

**CLAIMANT:** 

D & P Orchards, Inc.

PO Box 166 Odell, OR 97044

MEASURE 37 PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:

Township 2N, Range 10E, Section 26C

Tax lot 6000

Hood River County

AGENT CONTACT INFORMATION:

Steven B. Andersen

Cascade Planning Associates

571 NW Spring Street White Salmon, WA 98672

Kristen S. David

Bowerman & David, PC

PO Box 100

Oregon City, OR 97045

The claimant, D & P Orchards, Inc., filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on September 25, 2006, for property located at 3530 Davis Drive, near Odell, in Hood River 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 elected supplemental review of its 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. However, as initially enacted in 2007, a claimant was not eligible for relief under Measure 49 if the claimant did not file a Measure 49 election within 90 days of the department mailing the election packet. D & P Orchards, Inc. was not entitled to Measure 49 relief on that basis.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Claim H130117 has been split into two claims, H130117A and H130117B, because the Measure 37 claim sought relief for two non-contiguous parcels. Claim H130117A addresses the claimant's eligibility for Measure 49 relief on tax lots 1100, 1500, 1600 (T2N R10E S35) and 3000 (T2N R10E S26C). H130117B addresses the claimant's relief on tax lot 6000 (T2N, R10E, S26C).

However, the Oregon State Legislative Assembly subsequently amended this Measure 49 requirement through the passage of House Bill 3225 (Chapter 855 (2009 Laws)) (HB 3225). As a result, this requirement no longer prevents the claimant, D & P Orchards, Inc., from obtaining Measure 49 relief. The claimant elected to seek relief under Measure 49, as amended by HB 3225, and submitted the \$175 fee required by Section 18 of HB 3225 in order to have the claim reviewed.

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 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 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 claimant has 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 36 home sites. Therefore, the claimant may qualify for a maximum of three home sites under Section 6 of Measure 49.

#### **B.** Qualification Requirements

To qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49, as amended by HB 3225, 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 the state before Measure 49 became effective on December 6, 2007. If the claimant filed their state Measure 37 claim after December 4, 2006, the claimant must also have either (a) filed the claim in compliance with the provisions of OAR 660-041-0020 then in effect; (b) submitted a land use application as described in OAR 660-041-0020 then in effect prior to June 28, 2007; or (c) filed a Measure 37 claim with the county on or before December 4, 2006.

#### **Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

The claimant, D & P Orchards, Inc., filed a Measure 37 claim, M130117, with the state on September 25, 2006. The claimant filed a Measure 37 claim, 06-M056, with Hood River County on September 21, 2006. The state claim was filed prior to December 4, 2006.

The claimant filed a timely Measure 37 claim with the state along with any additional claims or applications that the claimant had to have filed in order to be eligible for review under Measure 49, as amended by HB 3225.

#### 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, D & P Orchards, Inc. is the owner of fee title to the property as shown in the Hood River County deed records and, therefore, is an owner of the property under Measure 49.

Hood River 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 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 Hood River County and the property is located outside any urban growth boundary and outside any city boundary, near the community of Odell.

#### 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 designated as non-resource land and zoned Light Industrial (M-2) and Commercial (C-1) by Hood River County. The M-2 and C-1 zones prohibit the establishment of

dwellings. Therefore, state land use regulations prohibit the claimant from establishing on the Measure 37 claim property the three home sites the claimant 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 claimant, it does not appear that the establishment of the three home sites 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

Hood River County deed records indicate that the claimant acquired the property on March 16, 1966.

On March 16, 1966, the Measure 37 claim property was subject to Hood River County's Industrial (M-1) zone. With a limited exception, Hood River County's M-1 zone prohibited residential development. Therefore, the claimant lawfully could not have established any home sites on its date of acquisition.

#### II. COMMENTS ON THE PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

The department issued its Preliminary Evaluation for this claim on July 22, 2010. Pursuant to OAR 660-041-0090, the department provided written notice to the owners of surrounding

properties. Comments received have been taken into account by the department in the issuance of this Final Order of Denial. Specifically, claimant's attorney correctly identifies that in 1966, Section 36 of the Hood River Zoning ordinance provided an exception to the prohibition on residential dwellings in the Industrial (M-1) zone. Specifically, a dwelling or trailer house was permitted "when exclusively connected with the business involved." The attorney argues that because a "dwelling could be allowed in certain instances" the claimant should be construed to have been lawfully permitted to establish a dwelling in the industrial zone when it acquired the property. That the zone, that otherwise prohibited residential use, included an exception to that prohibition does not establish that residential uses were lawfully permitted. The County's Measure 37 report for the subject property indicates that the property is currently vacant. There is no evidence in the record that when the claimant acquired the property in 1966 it was established with an industrial use with which a dwelling could have been "exclusively connected."

#### III. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis above, the claimant, D & P Orchards, Inc. does not qualify for Measure 49 home site approvals because the claimant was not lawfully permitted to establish the lots, parcels or dwellings on the claimant's 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:

Kristin May, Division Manager

Dept. of Land Conservation and Development Dated this 22 day of September, 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.