Memo Date: April 18, 2007 Hearing Date: May 8, 2007



TO:

Board of County Commissioners

DEPARTMENT:

Public Works Dept./Land Management Division

PRESENTED BY:

BILL VANVACTOR, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

KENT HOWE, PLANNING DIRECTOR

AGENDA ITEM TITLE:

In the Matter of Considering a Ballot Measure 37 Claim and Deciding Whether to Modify, Remove or Not Apply

Restrictive Land Use Regulations in Lieu of Providing Just

Compensation (PA06-7224, Kester)

BACKGROUND

Applicants: Linde G. Kester and Sharon K. Kester

Current Owners: Kester Family Trust, and Linde and Sharon Kester

Agent: Jim Belknap

Map and Tax lot(s): M37 tract 1: 20-04-05, #300, 301, & 302; 20-05-01, #200;

M37 tract 2: 20-04-06, #200; and 20-05-12, #200;

Acreage: approximately 1,248 acres

Current Zoning: E40 (Exclusive Farm Use)

Date Property Acquired: M37 tract 1: Dec. 9, 1981; 20-04-05, #301; (D #00069)

January 8, 1982, 20-04-05, #300 & #302; 20-05-01, #200; (D #02761)

M37 tract 2: June 13, 1983; 20-04-06, #200; (WD #20996); March 1, 1996, 20-

05-12, #200 (WD #9619345)

Date claim submitted: December 1, 2006

180-day deadline: May 30, 2007

Land Use Regulations in Effect at Date of Acquisition: FM (Forest

Management)

Restrictive County land use regulation: Minimum parcel size of forty acres and limitations on new dwellings in the E40 (Exclusive Farm Use) zone (LC 16.212).

ANALYSIS

To have a valid claim against Lane County under Measure 37 and LC 2.700 through 2.770, the applicant must prove:

1. Lane County has enacted or enforced a restrictive land use regulation since the owner acquired the property, and

The claim ownership is presented in two separate groupings. M37 tract 1 is currently owned by the Kester Family Trust. M37 tract 1 dates of acquisition for Linde & Sharon Kester are December 9, 1981 for tax lot # 301 (D #8200069) and January 8, 1982 for tax lots #200, 300, and 302 (D #8202761). The property was zoned FM when acquired by the current owner.

The Trust is considered a new owner. It is a revocable inter vivos trust agreement, and Linde Kester and Sharon Kester are trustees. The trust is revocable to Linde and Sharon as long as Linde is alive. When Linde dies, Sharon's revocability ceases, as a result, the ownership interest of Linde and Sharon is continued while both are living.

M37 tract 2 is currently owned by Linde G. and Sharon K. Kester as tenants by the entirety. M37 tract 2 was acquired by Linde & Sharon Kester on June 13, 1983, (WD #8320996), and March 1, 1996 (WD #9619345) when it was zoned FM.

Currently, the entire property is zoned E40.

2. The restrictive land use regulation has the effect of reducing the fair market value of the property, and

The entire property was zoned FM when it was acquired by the current owners. The current owners allege the requirements for a gross annual income of \$80,000 from the sale of farm products prevent them from developing the property as could have been allowed under the EFU zone applied to the property after they acquired it. The alleged reduction in fair market value is \$1,217,000, based on the submitted comparative market analysis (CMA). The applicant's CMA is considered competent evidence of valuation that the County Commissioners have accepted on previous claims. Because of this, the County Administrator has waived the requirement for an appraisal.

The Kester family intends to divide the property into lots of 80 to 100 acres in size and place a dwelling on each lot. The E40 zone allows for this size of lot division, and this zone has special use permit provisions that allow for dwellings in that zone. The claimant has not demonstrated that the provisions of the E40 zone preclude the use of the property as it could have been used under the FM zone when the claimants acquired the property.

3. The restrictive land use regulation is not an exempt regulation as defined in LC 2.710.

The minimum lot size, gross farm income requirements, and other EFU restrictions on new dwellings in the E40 zone do not appear to be exempt regulations. The Kester family has not, however, identified how any of these restrictive land use regulations that allegedly reduce the fair market value of the property when compared to uses allowed under regulations applicable when they acquired the property.

CONCLUSION

It appears this is not a valid claim.

RECOMMENDATION

If additional information is not submitted at the hearing, the County Administrator recommends the Board direct him to deny the claim.