BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES,
THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF
THE STATE OF OREGON

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM FOR<br>COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352<br>(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF<br>Sam Pecorilla, CLAIMANT | )<br>)<br>)<br>) | FINAL ORDER<br>CLAIM NO. M118451 |

Claimant: Sam Pecorilla (the Claimant)

Property: Tax lot 800, Township 14S, Range 6W, Section 26, Benton County (the Property)

Claim: The demand for compensation and any supporting information received from the Claimant by the State of Oregon (the Claim).

Claimant submitted the Claim to the State of Oregon under ORS 197.352. Under OAR 125-145-0010 *et seq.*, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) referred the Claim to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) as the regulating entity. This order is based on the record herein, including the Findings and Conclusions set forth in the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of DLCD (the DLCD Report) attached to and by this reference incorporated into this order.

## ORDER

The Claim is approved as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report, and 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 Sam Pecorilla's development of a single-family dwelling on the subject property: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3, ORS 215, and OAR 660, division 33. These land use regulations will not apply to Mr. Pecorilla's use of his property only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the property for the use described in this report, to the extent that use was permitted at the time he acquired the property on October 2, 1967.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use his property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on October 2, 1967.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the 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 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 ORS 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies, and restrictions on the use of the property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the property by the claimant under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in Condition 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 claimant to use the property, it may be necessary for him 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 claimant 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 property by the claimant.

This Order is entered by the Director of the DLCD as a final order of DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.352, OAR 660-002-0010(8), and OAR 125, division 145, and by the Deputy Administrator for the State Services Division of the DAS as a final order of DAS under ORS 197.352, OAR 125, division 145, and ORS 293.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

Lane Shetterly, Director
DLCD
Dated this 27th day of March, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Dugan Petty, Deputy Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 27th day of March, 2006.

## NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL OR OTHER JUDICIAL RELIEF

You are entitled, or may be entitled, to the following judicial remedies:

1. Judicial review under ORS 183.484: 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 may be filed in the Circuit Court for Marion County or the Circuit Court in the county in which you reside.

2. A cause of action under ORS 197.352 (Measure 37 (2004)): If a land use regulation continues to apply to the subject property more than 180 days after the present owner of the property has made written demand for compensation under ORS 197.352[1], the present owner of the property, or any interest therein, shall have a cause of action in the circuit court in which the real property is located.

(Copies of the documents that comprise the record are available for review at the Department's office at 635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150, Salem, Oregon 97301-2540)

## FOR INFORMATION ONLY

The Oregon Department of Justice has advised the Department of Land Conservation and Development that "[i]f the current owner of the real property conveys the property before the new use allowed by the public entity is established, then the entitlement to relief will be lost."

---

[1] By order of the Marion County Circuit Court, "all time lines under Measure 37 [were] suspended indefinitely" on October 25, 2005. This suspension was lifted on March 13, 2006 by the court. As a result, a period of 139 days (the number of days the time lines were suspended) has been added to the 180-day time period under ORS 197.352(6) for claims that were pending with the state on October 25, 2005.

**BALLOT MEASURE 37 (ORS 197.352)**
**CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION**

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

March 27, 2006

| | |
|---|---|
| **STATE CLAIM NUMBER:** | M118451 |
| **NAME OF CLAIMANT:** | Sam Pecorilla |
| **MAILING ADDRESS:** | 24704 Alpine Road<br>Monroe, Oregon 97456 |
| **PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:** | Township 14S, Range 6W, Section 26<br>Tax lot 800<br>Benton County |
| **OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:** | George Heilig<br>P.O. Box 546<br>Corvallis, Oregon 97339 |
| **DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:** | May 17, 2005 |
| **180-DAY DEADLINE:** | April 1, 2006[1] |

## I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Sam Pecorilla, seeks compensation of $50,000 for the reduction in fair market value as a result of certain land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimant desires compensation or the right to develop one single-family dwelling on the 34-acre property. The property is located at 24704 Alpine Road, near Monroe, in Benton County. (See claim.)

## II. SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the 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 Mr. Pecorilla's development of one single-family dwelling on his property: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215, and

[1] This date reflects 180 days from the date the claim was submitted as extended by the 139 days enforcement of Measure 37 was suspended during the pendency of the appeal of *Macpherson v. Dep't of Admin. Servs.*, 340 Or __, 2006 Ore. LEXIS 104 (February 21, 2006).

OAR 660, division 33. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow Mr. Pecorilla to use the property for the use described in this report, to the extent that use was permitted at the time he acquired the property in 1967. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

## III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

**Comments Received**

On August 11, 2005, 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, two written comments, evidence or information were received in response to the 10-day notice.[2]

The comments do not address whether the claim meets the criteria for relief (compensation or waiver) under ORS 197.352. Comments concerning the effects a use of the property may have on surrounding areas generally are 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 waiving a state law. (See comment letters 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 the measure (December 2, 2004), within two years of that effective date or the date the public entity applies the land use regulation as an approval criterion 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 the measure (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 criterion, whichever is later.

**Findings of Fact**

This claim was submitted to DAS on May 17, 2005, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies a provisions of ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, related to residential development of farm land as the laws that restrict the use of the property and are the basis for the claim. Only laws that were enacted prior to December 2, 2004, the effective date of

[2] The 10-day notice period was suspended for 139 days during the pendency of the *Macpherson v. Dep't of Admin. Servs.*, 340 Or __, 2006 Ore. LEXIS 104 (February 21, 2006), which suspended all Measure 37 deadlines.

Measure 37, are the basis for this claim. (See citations of statutory and administrative rule history of the Oregon Revised Statutes and Oregon Administrative Rules.)

**Conclusions**

The claim has been submitted within two years of December 2, 2004; the effective date of Measure 37, based on land use regulations 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**

The claimant, Sam Pecorilla, acquired the subject property with Mary Pecorilla on October 2, 1967, as reflected by a Land Sales Contract filed in Benton County April 3, 1981, and a fulfillment deed filed October 25, 1989, included with the claim. A copy of a title report dated March 25, 2005, indicates that Sam Pecorilla is the current owner of the subject property. Mary Pecorilla conveyed her interest in the property to Sam Pecorilla on February 1, 2000. Benton County staff sustained that M. Pecorilla acquired 100% interest in the property in 2000 per county deed records M-279895-00.

**Conclusions**

The claimant, Sam Pecorilla, is an "owner" of the subject property, as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of October 2, 1967.

**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 claimant's 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 claimant or a family member acquired the property.

**Findings of Fact**

The claim states that land use regulations enacted after he acquired the property have restricted him from development of a single-family dwelling on his property, which would have been permitted at the time he acquired it in 1967.

The claim is based, generally, on Benton County's current Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zone and the applicable provisions of state law that require such zoning. The claimant's property is zoned EFU as required by Goal 3, in accord with OAR 660, division 33, and ORS 215 because the claimant's property is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3. Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural lands as defined by the Goal be zoned EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

Current land use regulations, particularly ORS 215.263 and 215.284, and OAR 660, division 33 as applied by Goal 3, establish standards for development of farm or non-farm dwellings on EFU-zoned property.

OAR 660-033-0135 (applicable to farm dwellings) became effective on March 1, 1994, and interprets the statutory standard for a primary dwelling in an EFU zone under ORS 215.283(1)(f).

OAR 660-033-0130(4) (applicable to non-farm dwellings) became effective on August 7, 1993, and was amended to comply with ORS 215.284(4) on March 1, 1994. Subsequent amendments to comply with HB 3326, (Chapter 704, Oregon Laws 2001, and effective January 1, 2002,) were adopted by the Commission effective May 22, 2002. (See citations of administrative rule history for OAR 660-033-0100, 0130 and 0135.)

The claimant acquired the subject property on October 2, 1967, prior to the establishment of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and rules, and prior to local planning and zoning. At that time, the property was not zoned by Benton County.

**Conclusions**

The dwelling standards established by Goal 3 and provisions applicable to land zoned EFU in ORS 215 and OAR 660 division 33 were all enacted after Sam Pecorilla acquired the subject property in October 1967, and do not allow development of an additional dwelling on the property, thereby restricting the use of the property relative to the uses that would have been allowed when he acquired the property. Benton County File No. M37-05-014 dated October 4, 2005 concludes: " When the claimant first acquired an interest in the property on October 2, 1967, there were no land use regulations governing the establishment of a dwelling on the property, ... The land use regulations adopted since 1967, and now contained in Benton County code Chapter 55, restrict the use of private real property and were not in effect at the time the claimant acquired the property."

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the property based on the uses that the claimant has identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimant's use of the property, and that may continue to apply to the claimant's use of the property, that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know what laws apply to a use of property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimant seeks a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use.

## 3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires that any land use regulation 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 approximately $50,000 as the reduction in the property's fair market value as a result of current regulations. This amount is based on the claimant's estimate of the market value comparative properties in the area provided for the claimant by a realtor.

### Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the current owner is Sam Pecorilla who acquired the property on October 2, 1967. Under ORS 197.352, Sam Pecorilla is due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws adopted since the claimant acquired the property restrict division of the subject property. The claimant estimates the reduction in value due to the restrictions to be not less than $50,000.

The information submitted is insufficient to substantiate the specific dollar amount the claimant demands for compensation. Nevertheless, the department determines that it is more likely than not that there has been some reduction in the fair market value of the subject property as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department.

## 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 property relative to what would have been allowed in 1967, when the property was acquired by Sam Pecorilla. These provisions include Goal 3 and applicable provisions of ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Benton County has implemented through its EFU zone. None of these laws are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E), which exempts laws in effect when the claimant acquired the property.

### Conclusions

Without a specific development proposal for the property, it is not possible for the department to determine what laws 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 does appear that the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on residential development and use of farm land apply to

the claimant's use of the property, and for the most part these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

Laws in effect when the claimant acquired the property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the claimant's use of the property. There may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimant's use of the property that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know what laws apply to a use of property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimant seeks a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use. And, 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 property based on the use that the claimant has 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 claimant should be aware that the less information he has provided to the department in his claim, the greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply to his use of the 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 a law that restricts 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 current owner acquired the property. The Commission, by rule, has directed that if the department determines a claim is valid, the Director 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 claimant's development of a single-family dwelling on the subject property. The claim asserts the laws enforced by the Commission or department reduce the fair market value of the subject property by approximately $50,000. However, because the claim does not provide a formal appraisal or other documentation to establish how the specified restrictions reduce the fair market value of the property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department acknowledges that the laws on which the claim is based likely have reduced the fair market value of the 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 Sam Pecorilla to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on October 2, 1967.

**Conclusion**

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 Sam Pecorilla's development of a single-family dwelling on the subject property: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3, ORS 215, and OAR 660, division 33. These land use regulations will not apply to Mr. Pecorilla's use of his property only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the property for the use described in this report, to the extent that use was permitted at the time he acquired the property on October 2, 1967.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use his property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on October 2, 1967.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the 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 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 ORS 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies, and restrictions on the use of the property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the property by the claimant under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in Condition 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 claimant to use the property, it may be necessary for him 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 claimant 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 property by the claimant.

## VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on October 21, 2005. OAR 125-145-0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimant or the claimant's 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. Comments received have been taken into account by the department in the issuance of this final report.