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 COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF Benjamin Bunn, CLAIMANT	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. 122858 and M122859[1]

Claimant: Benjamin Bunn (the Claimant)

Property: Township 4S, Range 3W, Section 18, Tax lot 200
Township 4S, Range 3W, Section 7, Tax lot 2300
Yamhill County (the Property)

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

Claimants 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 Benjamin Bunn's division of 55.8-acre property tax lot 200 into three parcels, his division of 29.9-acre property tax lot 2300 into two 1-acre parcels, one 8-acre parcel and one 19.9-acre parcel, and his development of a dwelling on each parcel created from tax lot 2300: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 200 on December 18, 1946, and tax lot 2300 on November 18, 1952.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on December 18, 1946, and November 18, 1952.

[1] The claimant filed two claims for relief under ORS 197.352 for two separate tax lots: M122858 (for tax lot 200) and M122859 (for tax lot 2300). The two claims were consolidated, and both tax lots are addressed in this order.

3. 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, 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 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.

4. Any use of the subject property by the claimant under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (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 subject 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 subject 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

Lane Shetterly, Director
DLCD
Dated this 28th day of August, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Dugan Petty

Dugan Petty, Deputy Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 28th day of August, 2006.

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 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[2], 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."

---

[2] 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.

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

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

August 21, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M122858 and M122859[1]
NAME OF CLAIMANT:	Benjamin Bunn
MAILING ADDRESS:	2900 Southeast Locks Road Dayton, Oregon 97114
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 4S, Range 3W, Section 18 Tax lot 200 Township 4S, Range 3W, Section 7 Tax lot 2300 Yamhill County
OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:	Stan Bunn 301 West Illinois Street Newberg, Oregon 97132
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	October 19, 2005
180-DAY DEADLINE:	September 3, 2006[2]

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Benjamin Bunn, seeks compensation in the amount of $72,000 for tax lot 200 and $234,000 for tax lot 2300 for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimant desires compensation or the right to divide 55.8-acre tax lot 200 into three parcels, to divide the 29.9-arce tax lot 2300 into two 1-acre parcels, one 8-acre parcel and one 19.9-acre parcel, and to develop a dwelling on each parcel created from tax lot 2300.[3] The subject property, consisting of

[1] The claimant filed two claims for relief under ORS 197.352 for two separate tax lots: M122858 (for tax lot 200) and M122859 (for tax lot 2300). The two claims were consolidated, and both tax lots are addressed in this report.
[2] This date reflects 180 days from the date the claims were submitted, as extended by the 139 days that all timelines under Measure 37 were suspended during the pendency of *MacPherson v. Dept. of Admin. Srvcs.*, 340 Or 117 (2006).
[3] The claims also indicate that the claimant desires to divide the subject property "in order to be able to convey 2 parcels [of tax lot 200] to other parties and "to sell 2 one-acre site and one 8-acre site [of tax lot 2300] as homesites." In effect, the claimant requests that a decision of the department to "not apply" (waive) certain laws as set forth in this report be transferable with the property. ORS 197.352 only authorizes a state agency to waive a law in order to allow the current owner a use of the property permitted at the time that owner acquired the property. A determination of transferability is beyond the scope of relief that the department may grant under ORS 197.352. The Oregon Department of Justice has advised the department that "[i]f the current owner of the real property

tax lots 200 and 2300, is located at the geographic coordinates listed above, near Dayton, in Yamhill County. (See claims.)

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 this 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 Benjamin Bunn's division of 55.8-acre tax lot 200 into three parcels, his division of 29.9-acre tax lot 2900 into two 1-acre parcels, one 8-acre parcel and one 19.9-acre parcel, and his development of a dwelling on each parcel created from tax lot 2300: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 14 (Urbanization), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 200 on December 18, 1946, and tax lot 2300 on November 18, 1952. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On June 12, 2006, 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, no written comments were received in response to the 10-day notice.

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 Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of that effective date, or the date the public entity applies the land use regulation as an approval criteria 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 Measure 37 (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 criteria, whichever is later.

---

conveys the property before a new use allowed by the public entity is established, then the entitlement to relief will be lost." Therefore, the relief granted in this report cannot and does not create a transferable waiver.

Findings of Fact

The claims were submitted to DAS on October 19, 2005, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claims identify House Bill 3661 and Yamhill County zoning and land division ordinances as the basis for the claims. Only laws that were enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, are the basis for these claims.

Conclusions

The claims have been submitted within two years of the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), based on land use regulations enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, and are 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, Benjamin Bunn, acquired tax lot 200 on December 18, 1946, and tax lot 2300 on November 18, 1952, as reflected by warranty deeds included with the claims. The Yamhill County Assessor's Office confirms the claimant's current ownership of the subject tax lots.

Conclusions

The claimant, Benjamin Bunn, is an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). He acquired tax lot 200 on December 18, 1946, and tax lot 2300 on November 18, 1952.

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 claims indicate that the claimant desires to divide 55.8-acre tax lot 200 into three parcels, to divide 29.9-acre tax lot 2300 into two 1-acre parcels, one 8-acre parcel and one 19.9-acre parcel, and to develop dwellings on the parcels created from tax lot 2300. They indicate that current land use regulations prevent the desired use.

The claims are based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning and restrict uses on EFU-zoned land. The claimant's property is zoned EF-80 (EFU) by Yamhill County as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the claimant's property is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3.[4] 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 215.780 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, prohibit the division of EFU-zoned land into parcels smaller than 80 acres.

ORS 215.780 establishes an 80-acre minimum size for the creation of new lots or parcels in EFU zones and became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). ORS 215.263 (2005 edition) establishes standards for the creation of new parcels for non-farm uses and dwellings allowed in an EFU zone.

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. The Commission subsequently adopted amendments to comply with House Bill 3326 (Chapter 704, Oregon Laws 2001), effective on January 1, 2002), which were effective on May 22, 2002. (See administrative rule history for OAR 660-033-0100, -0130 and -1035.)

Goal 14, which also became effective on January 25, 1975, would likely apply to the division of tax lot 2300 into parcels smaller than two acres. Goal 14 generally requires that land outside of urban growth boundaries be used for rural uses.

The claimant acquired tax lot 200 on December 18, 1946, and tax lot 2300 on November 18, 1952, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, and minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were all enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the subject property in 1946 and 1952 and do not allow the desired division or residential development of the property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when 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 subject property based on the use that the claimant has identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimant's use of the subject 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 which laws apply to a use of subject property until

[4] The claimant's property is "agricultural land" because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I–IV soils.

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 the land use regulation(s) (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 claims include an estimate of $72,000 for tax lot 200 and $234,000 for tax lot 2300 as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to the regulations that restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. This amount is based on the claimant's assessment of the subject property's value.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Benjamin Bunn, who acquired tax lot 200 on December 18, 1946, and tax lot 2300 on November 18, 1952. Under ORS 197.352, the claimant is due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property and have the effect of reducing its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws enacted or adopted since the claimant acquired the subject property restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. The claimant estimates that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the subject property is a total reduction of $306,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for these claims, the department determines that the fair market value of the subject property has been reduced to some extent 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

This claim based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property, including applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Yamhill County has implemented through its current EF-80 zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the subject property.

Conclusions

Without a specific development proposal for the subject property, it is not possible for the department to determine all the laws that 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 appears that none of the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on division of the claimant's property were in effect when the claimant acquired it in 1946 and 1952. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

Laws in effect when the claimant acquired the subject 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 subject property that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of subject 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. 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 subject 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, the greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply to his use of the subject 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 laws that restrict the use of the subject 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 subject property permitted at the time the present owner acquired the property. The Commission, by rule, has directed that if the department determines a claim is valid, the Director of the department 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 desired use of the subject property. The claims assert that existing land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department have the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property by $306,000. However, because the claims do not provide an appraisal or other relevant evidence demonstrating that the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) of this report reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. In order to determine a specific amount of compensation due for this claim, it would also be necessary to verify whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of the subject property was allowed under the

standards in effect when he acquired the property. Nevertheless, based on the record for these claims, the department has determined that the laws on which the claims are based have reduced the fair market value of the subject 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 Benjamin Bunn to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired tax lot 200 on December 18, 1946, and tax lot 2300 on November 18, 1952.

Conclusions

Based on the record, the department recommends that this 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 Benjamin Bunn's division of 55.8-acre property tax lot 200 into three parcels, his division of 29.9-acre property tax lot 2300 into two 1-acre parcels, one 8-acre parcel and one 19.9-acre parcel, and his development of a dwelling on each parcel created from tax lot 2300: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 200 on December 18, 1946, and tax lot 2300 on November 18, 1952.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on December 18, 1946, and November 18, 1952.

3. 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, 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 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.

4. Any use of the subject property by the claimant under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (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 subject 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 subject property by the claimant.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on August 11, 2006. 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.