

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)	FINAL ORDER
COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352)	CLAIM NO. M124548
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)	
John and Anna Hoskins, CLAIMANTS)	

Claimants: John and Anna Hoskins (the Claimants)

Property: Township 3S, Range 3W, Section 21, Tax lot 101, Yamhill County (the Property)

Claim: The demand for compensation and any supporting information received from the Claimants 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 the claimants' division of the 13.22-acre subject property into three parcels or to their development of a dwelling on each of the two resulting undeveloped parcels: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33, enacted or adopted after each claimant acquired the subject property. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when John Hoskins acquired the property on August 11, 1972, and only to the extent that use was permitted when Anna Hoskins acquired the property on May 28, 1974.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect when John Hoskins acquired the property on August 11, 1972, and when Anna Hoskins acquired the property on May 28, 1974. On August 11, 1972, the property was subject to the applicable provisions of ORS 215.213(6) (1971 edition). On May 28, 1974, the property was subject to the applicable provisions of ORS 215.213(1)(e) and 215.515 (1973 editions).

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 claimants first obtain 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 claimants 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 claimants to use the subject property, it may be necessary for them 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 claimants 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 claimants.


This Order is entered by the Deputy 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 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



Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director
DLCD
Dated this 12th day of September, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:



David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 12th day of September, 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, 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."

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

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

September 12, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M124548

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: John and Anna Hoskins

MAILING ADDRESS: 11400 Northeast Dudley Road
Newberg, Oregon 97132

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 3S, Range 3W, Section 21
Tax lot 101
Yamhill County

OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION: John Bridges
515 East 1st Street
Newberg, Oregon 97132

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: March 22, 2006

180-DAY DEADLINE: September 18, 2006

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, John and Anna Hoskins, seek compensation in the amount of \$300,000 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 claimants desire compensation or the right to divide the 13.22-acre subject property into three parcels and to develop a dwelling on each of the two resulting undeveloped parcels. The subject property is located at 11400 Northeast Dudley Road, near Newberg, in Yamhill 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 John and Anna Hoskins' division of the 13.22-acre subject property into three parcels and to their development of a dwelling on each of the two resulting undeveloped parcels: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 4 (Forest lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, divisions 6, and 33, enacted or adopted after each claimant acquired the subject property. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when John Hoskins

acquired the property in 1972, and only to the extent that use was permitted when Anna Hoskins acquired the property in 1974. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On August 8, 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.

Findings of Fact

This claim was submitted to DAS on March 22, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies the county's AF-40 zone as the basis for the claim. Only laws that were enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, are the basis for this claim.

Conclusions

The claim has 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 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

John Hoskins acquired the subject property on August 11, 1972, as reflected by the probate document included with the claim. John Hoskins conveyed an interest in the subject property to his wife Anna Hoskins on May 28, 1974, as evidenced by a warranty deed included with the claim. A November 2005 title report submitted with the claim establishes the claimants' current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, John and Anna Hoskins, are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). John Hoskins has been an owner since August 11, 1972. Anna Hoskins has been an owner since May 28, 1974. John Hoskins is a "family member" of Anna Hoskins as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(A).

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 claimants' 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 claimants or a family member acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to divide the 13.22-acre subject property into three parcels and to develop a dwelling on each of the two resulting undeveloped parcels. It indicates that the desired use is not permitted by the county's current AF-40 zone.

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require mixed farm-forest zoning and restrict uses on land zoned mixed farm-forest. The claimants' property is zoned AF-40, which is a mixed agricultural and forest land zone, as permitted by Goal 4 and the implementing provisions of OAR 660-006-0050 (effective on February 5, 1990), subsequently amended on March 1, 1994, to comply with the provisions of House Bill 3661 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993).

Under OAR 660-006-0050, all the uses permitted under Goals 3 and 4 are allowed in mixed agriculture and forest zones except that for dwellings, either the Goal 3 or 4 standards are applicable based on the predominant use of the tract on January 1, 1993.¹ Depending on the predominant use on that date, the property is subject to either the requirements for dwellings applicable under exclusive farm use zoning required by Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 33, or forest zone provisions required by Goal 4 and OAR 660, division 6.

For land divisions, OAR 660-006-0055 authorizes the creation of new parcels based on the standards applicable to farm or forest zones that implement the 80-acre minimum lot size specified in ORS 215.780. Under ORS 215.780(2)(a), the minimum lot size in Yamhill County's

¹ No information was provided to the department regarding the predominant use of the property on January 1, 1993.

AF-40 zone is 40 acres. The claimants' property cannot be divided into parcels smaller than 40 acres.

John Hoskins acquired the subject property in 1972, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations. In 1972, the subject property was zoned by Yamhill County as A-1, a qualified farm use zone under ORS 308. In the A-1 zone, farm dwellings could be approved if they were "customarily provided in conjunction with farm use" under ORS 215.213(6).

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33, were enacted or adopted after John Hoskins acquired the subject property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when John Hoskins acquired the property. However, the claim does not establish whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use was permitted under the provisions of ORS 215 in effect when John Hoskins 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 claimants have identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimants' use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to the claimants' 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 the subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimants seek 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 claim includes an estimate of \$300,000 as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to the regulations that restrict the claimants' desired use of the property. This amount is based on the "owner's opinion."

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are John Hoskins who acquired the subject property in 1972 and his wife Anna Hoskins. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the 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 John Hoskins acquired the subject property restrict the

claimants' desired use of the property. The claimants estimate that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of \$300,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the property was allowed under the standards in effect when John Hoskins acquired the property, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the subject property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for this claim, 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

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses permitted when John Hoskins acquired the property, including applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33, which Yamhill County has implemented through its current AF-40 zone. With the exception of applicable provisions of ORS 215 in effect when John Hoskins acquired the property in 1972, these laws were enacted or adopted after John Hoskins acquired the 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. With the exception of provisions of ORS 215 in effect in 1972, it appears that none of the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on division and development of the claimants' property were in effect when John Hoskins acquired the subject property in 1972. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

Laws in effect when John Hoskins acquired the subject property, including applicable provisions of ORS 215, are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and do not provide a basis for compensation. In addition, other land use laws enacted or adopted for a purpose set forth in ORS 197.352(3)(A) are also exempt and would not provide a basis for compensation.

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 one or more laws that restrict 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 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 claimants' desired use of the subject property. The claim asserts that existing state land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department have the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property by \$300,000. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other relevant evidence demonstrating that the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) 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 claimants' desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when John Hoskins acquired the property. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department has determined that the laws on which the claim is 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 John Hoskins to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on August 11, 1972, and to allow Anna Hoskins to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time she acquired the property on May 28, 1974.

Anna Hoskins acquired the subject property on May 28, 1974, after the adoption of Senate Bill 100 (Chapter 80, Oregon Laws 1973) effective on October 5, 1973, but before the adoption of the statewide planning goals effective on January 25, 1975.

During the period between October 5, 1973, and January 25, 1975, ORS 197.175(1) and 197.280 (1973 editions) required, in addition to any local plan or zoning provisions, that cities and counties exercise their planning responsibilities in accordance with the interim land use planning goals set forth in ORS 215.515 (1973 edition). *Petersen v. Klamath Falls*, 279 Or 249 (1977); *see also, Meeker v. Board of Comm'rs*, 287 Or 665 (1979) (review of a subdivision is an exercise of planning responsibilities requiring application of the goals); *State Housing Council v. Lake Oswego*, 48 Or App. 525 (1981) (noting that while "[I]and use planning responsibility is not defined in ORS ch 197, the Supreme Court has interpreted that term as including annexation approvals, *subdivision approvals* [emphasis added] and partition approvals") citing *Petersen*, *Meeker* and *Alexanderson v. Polk County*, 285 Or 427 (1980). The claimants' desired use includes subdivision of their land. If claimant Anna Hoskins had sought to create that use in 1974, as a matter of law, the use would have been subject to the interim planning goals at ORS 215.515.²

² The "interim" land use goals are set forth in ORS 215.515(1)(a) to (j) (1973 edition) as follows: (a) "To preserve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state," (b) "To conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources," (c) "To provide for the recreational needs of citizens of the state and visitors," (d) "To conserve prime farm lands for the production of crops," (e) "To provide for the orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use," (f) "To protect life and property in areas subject to floods, landslides and other natural disasters," (g) "To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system including all modes of

In 1974, farm dwellings under ORS 215.213(1)(e) were required to be “customarily provided in conjunction with farm use.”

The claim does not establish whether or the extent to which the claimants’ desired use of the property satisfies the requirements of the interim planning goals or the requirements for farm dwellings in effect when Anna Hoskins acquired the property in 1974.

In addition to the applicable provisions of ORS 215.213(1)(e) and 215.515 (1973 edition) in effect when Anna Hoskins acquired the property on May 28, 1974, there may be other laws that apply to the claimants’ 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 the subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimants seek a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use, and depending on when they were enacted or adopted, may continue to apply to the claimants’ property. In addition, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D) and will continue to apply to the subject property on that basis.

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 claimants have 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 claimants should be aware that the less information they have provided to the department in their claim, the greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply to their use of the subject property.

Conclusions

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 the claimants’ division of the 13.22-acre subject property into three parcels or to their development of a dwelling on each of the two resulting undeveloped parcels: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33, enacted or adopted after each claimant acquired the subject property. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when John Hoskins acquired the property on August 11, 1972, and only to the extent that use was permitted when Anna Hoskins acquired the property on May 28, 1974.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state’s authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect when

transportation: Air, water, rail, highway and mass transit and recognizing differences in the social costs in the various modes of transportation,” (h) “To develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development,” (i) “To diversify and improve the economy of the state” and (j) “To ensure that the development of properties within the state is commensurate with the character and the physical limitations of the land.” ORS 215.515 (1973 edition).

John Hoskins acquired the property on August 11, 1972, and when Anna Hoskins acquired the property on May 28, 1974. On August 11, 1972, the property was subject to the applicable provisions of ORS 215.213(6) (1971 edition). On May 28, 1974, the property was subject to the applicable provisions of ORS 215.213(1)(e) and 215.515 (1973 editions).

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 claimants first obtain 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 claimants 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 claimants to use the subject property, it may be necessary for them 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 claimants 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 claimants.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on August 28, 2006. OAR 125-145-0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimants or the claimants' 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.