

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. M124606
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc., CLAIMANTS)

Claimants: Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. (the Claimants)

Property: Township 2N, Range 10E, Section 15, Tax lots 400, 401, 500, 700 and 1301¹
Hood River 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.'s development of a dwelling on each of the five subject tax lots: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after June 24, 1981. These land use regulations will not apply to Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. only to the extent necessary to allow it to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when it acquired the property on June 24, 1981.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on June 24, 1981. On that date, the property was subject to the applicable provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 then in effect.

¹ The claim originally requested relief for tax lot 1201 as well as the tax lots addressed in this report. On August 1, 2006, the claimants withdrew their claim as to tax lot 1201.

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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. to use the subject property, it may be necessary for it 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. 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 its use of the subject property.

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 13th day of September, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:



David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division

Dated this 13th 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.”

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. M124606
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
John Scott and Gail Hagee, CLAIMANTS)

Claimant(s): John Scott and Gail Hagee (the Claimants)

Property: Township 2N, Range 10E, Section 15, Tax lots 400, 401, 500, 700 and
1301¹, Hood River 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 denied as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and
Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report.


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 chapter 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 chapter
125, division 145, and ORS chapter 293.

¹ The claim originally requested relief for tax lot 1201 as well as the tax lots addressed in this report. On
August 1, 2006, the claimants withdrew their claim as to tax lot 1201.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND
CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:
Lane Shetterly, Director


Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director
DLCD
Dated this 13th day of September, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:


David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 13th day of September, 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, 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)

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
Final Staff Report and Recommendation

September 13, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M124606

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.
John Scott and Gail Hagee

MAILING ADDRESS: 3890 Acree Drive
Hood River, Oregon 97031

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 2N, Range 10E, Section 15
Tax lots 400, 401, 500, 700 and 1301¹
Hood River County

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: March 24, 2006

180-DAY DEADLINE: September 20, 2006

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. and John Scott Hagee and Gail Hagee, seek compensation in the amount of \$1,088,338 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 develop a dwelling on each of the five tax lots that composes the subject property. The subject property is located on Acree Drive, near Hood River, in Hood River 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 in part. 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.'s development of a dwelling on each of the five subject tax lots: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after June 24, 1981. These laws will not apply to Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. only to the extent necessary to allow it to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when it acquired the property on June 24, 1981.

¹ The claim originally requested relief for tax lot 1201 as well as the tax lots addressed in this report. On August 1, 2006, the claimants withdrew their claim as to tax lot 1201.

The department has further determined that this claim is not valid as to John Scott Hagee and Gail Hagee because these claimants are not owners of the subject property. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On July 19, 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, one written comment was received in response to the 10-day notice.

The comment does not address whether the claim meets the criteria for relief under ORS 197.352. Comments concerning the effects a use of the subject property may have on surrounding areas are generally 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 waive a state law. (See the comment letter 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 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 24, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Hood River County zoning ordinances, ORS 197 and 215 and OAR 660, divisions 23 to 33, 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

Claimant Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. acquired the subject property from claimant John Scott Hagee on June 24, 1981, as reflected by a bargain and sale deed included with the claim. According to the information provided with the claim, John Scott Hagee did not retain any ownership interest in the subject property when he transferred it to Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc., and claimant Gail Hagee has never been an owner of the subject property. The Hood River County Assessor’s Office confirms Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.’s current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

Claimant Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. is an “owner” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of June 24, 1981. John Scott Hagee and Gail Hagee are not “owners” of the subject property as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(C).

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 a 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 a claimant acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to develop a dwelling on each of the five tax lots that composes the subject property and that current land use regulations prohibit the desired use.²

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning and restrict uses on EFU-zoned land. The subject property is zoned EFU (high-value farm land) by Hood River County, as required by Goal 3, in accordance with

² The claimants summarily cited numerous state land use laws as applicable to this claim, but did not establish how the laws either apply to the claimants’ desired use of the subject property or restrict its use with the effect of reducing its fair market value. On their face, most of these regulations either do not apply to the subject property or do not restrict Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.’s desired use of the property with the effect of reducing its fair market value. This report addresses only those regulations that the department finds are applicable to and restrict Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.’s use of the subject property, based on the claimants’ asserted desired use.

ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because it is “agricultural land” as defined by Goal 3.³ Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural lands as defined by Goal 3 be zoned EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

Current land use regulations, particularly ORS 215.284 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, establish standards for the development of dwellings on existing or proposed parcels on EFU-zoned land.

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 -0135.)

Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. acquired the subject property after the adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Hood River County’s land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. Because the Commission had not acknowledged the county’s plan and land use regulations when Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. acquired the subject property on June 24, 1981, the statewide planning goals, and Goal 3 in particular, applied directly to Pheasant Valley Inc.’s property when it acquired the property.⁴ As adopted on January 25, 1975, Goal 3 required that agricultural land be preserved and zoned for EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

Under the Goal 3 standards in effect on June 24, 1981, farm dwellings were allowed if they were determined to be “customarily provided in conjunction with farm use” under ORS 215.213(1)(e) (1973 edition). Non-farm dwellings were subject to compliance with ORS 215.213(3) (1973 edition). No information has been presented in the claim to establish that the claimants’ desired development of five dwellings satisfies the standards for farm or non-farm dwellings under ORS 215.213 (1973 edition).

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements and dwelling standards established by Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, do not allow Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.’s development of the subject property. However, the claim does not establish whether or the extent to which Pheasant Valley

³ The subject property is “agricultural land” because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I–IV soils.

⁴ The statewide planning goals became effective on January 25, 1975, and were applicable to legislative land use decisions and some quasi-judicial land use decisions prior to the Commission’s acknowledgment of each county’s comprehensive plan and implementing regulations. *Perkins v. City of Rajneeshpuram*, 300 Or 1 (1985); *Alexanderson v. Polk County*, 289 Or 427, rev. den 290 Or 137 (1980); *Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn. v. Clackamas County*, 280 Or 3 (1977); *Jurgenson v. Union County*, 42 Or App 505 (1979); and *1000 Friends of Oregon v. Benton County*, 32 Or App 413 (1978). After the county’s plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission, the statewide planning goals and implementing rules no longer applied directly to such local land use decisions. *Byrd v. Stringer*, 295 Or 311 (1983). However, statutory requirements continue to apply, and insofar as the state and local provisions are materially the same, the local provisions must be interpreted consistent with the substance of the goals and implementing rules. *Forster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992) and *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

Orchards, Inc.'s desired use of the subject property complies with the standards for land development under the requirements of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. acquired the subject property on June 24, 1981.

As explained in Section V.(1), claimants John Scott Hagee and Gail Hagee are not "owners" of the subject property. Therefore, no laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict their use of private real property with the effect of reducing the fair market value of 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.'s use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to its 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 Pheasant Valley, Inc. 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 claim includes an estimate of \$1,088,338 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 a comparison of the subject property to similar property sales in the area.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc., which acquired the subject property on June 24, 1981, and John Scott Hagee and Gail Hagee. John Scott Hagee and Gail Hagee are not owners of the subject property and therefore, are not entitled to compensation under ORS 197.352. Under ORS 197.352, Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. acquired the subject property restrict its 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 \$1,088,338.

Without an appraisal or other documentation and without verification of whether or the extent to which Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.'s desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when it 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 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, including applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Hood River County has implemented through its current EFU zone. With the exception of provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. acquired the subject property on June 24, 1981, these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. 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. It appears that with the exception of provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect in 1981, the statutory, goal and rule restrictions on development of the subject property were not in effect when Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. acquired it, and therefore, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. acquired the subject property in 1981 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the property.

Other laws in effect when Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. acquired the subject property are also exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to its use of the property. In addition, Hood River County notes that the subject property is zoned Airport Height (Conical) Overlay. ORS 197.352(3)(B) specifically exempts regulations "restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety. To the extent the county's airport height regulations are based on state law, these regulations would be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(B). There may be other laws that continue to apply to Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.'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 the subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. 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 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 the claim, the

greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply to Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.'s use of the subject property.

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, claimants John Scott Hagee and Gail Hagee are not "owners" of the subject property. Therefore, the issue of whether any laws are exempt from ORS 197.352 is not relevant as to them.

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 record, the department finds that the claim is not valid as to John Scott and Gail Hagee because they are not owners of the subject property.

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.'s 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 \$1,088,338. 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 a fair market 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.'s desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when it 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time it acquired the property on June 24, 1981.

Conclusions

Based on the record, the department recommends that the claim be denied as to John Scott Hagee and Gail Hagee because they have not demonstrated their ownership of the subject property. The department further recommends that the claim be approved as to Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc., 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc.'s development of a dwelling on each of the five subject tax lots: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after June 24, 1981. These land use regulations will not apply to Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. only to the extent necessary to allow it to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when it acquired the property on June 24, 1981.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on June 24, 1981. On that date, the property was subject to the applicable provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 then in effect.
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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. to use the subject property, it may be necessary for it 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 Pheasant Valley Orchards, Inc. 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 its use of the subject property.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on August 30, 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.