

Memo Date: April 12, 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 (PA06-7237, Saunders)

BACKGROUND

Applicant: Ina M. Saunders Living Trust

Current Owner: Ina M. Saunders Living Trust

Agent: Frederick A. Batson and Robert S. Russell

Map and Tax lot(s): 18-02-07, tax lots 400 (16.22 acres) and 700 (2.17 acres);
18-02-18, tax lot 301 (13.96 acres).

Acreage: 32.35 acres

Current Zoning: E25 (Exclusive Farm Use)

Date Property Acquired: Ina M. Saunders (individual):

18-02-07, 400 – July 19, 1956 (Warranty Deed, Reel 108D, No. _____);

18-02-07, 700 – August 9, 1956 (Guardian's Deed, Reel ____, No. 94554); and

18-02-18, 301 – August 31, 1960 (Warranty Deed, Reel 405R, No. _____).

Ina M. Saunders Living Trust: April 30, 1990
(Bargain and Sale Deed, Reel 1631R, No. 9021778).

Note: The quality of the reproduced deeds from the Lane County microfiche records for the referenced properties above make reading some of the reception numbers difficult. The content of the deeds is readable and some of the reception stamps in the margins are obscured through age and photo quality.

Date claim submitted: December 1, 2006

180-day deadline: May 1, 2007

Land Use Regulations in Effect at Date of Acquisition: unzoned

Restrictive County land use regulation: Minimum parcel size of twenty-five acres and limitations on new dwellings in the E25 (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 current owner is Ina M. Saunders, trustee of the Ina M. Saunders Living Trust. Ina acquired an interest in the three properties when they were unzoned:

18-02-07, 400 – July 19, 1956 (Warranty Deed, Reel 108D, No. _____);

18-02-07, 700 – August 9, 1956 (Guardian's Deed, Reel ____, No. 94554); and

18-02-18, 301 – August 31, 1960 (Warranty Deed, Reel 405R, No. _____);

In 1990, the property was placed in the Ina M. Saunders living Trust (April 30, 1990, Bargain and Sale Deed, Reel 1631R, No. 9021778). The Trust is considered a new owner but because it is revocable and Ina is the Trustee, the ownership interest of Ina is continued.

Currently, the properties are zoned E25.

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

The properties were unzoned when they were acquired by the current owner, Ina M. Saunders in 1956 and 1960. The minimum lot size and limitations on new dwellings in the E25 zone prevent the current owner, Ina M. Saunders Living Trust, from developing the properties as could have been allowed when she acquired them.

The alleged reduction in fair market value for map 18-02-18, tax lot 301 (13.96 acres) is \$257,656.00, based on the submitted current market analysis.

The alleged reduction in fair market value for map 18-02-07, tax lot 400 (16.22 acres) is \$1,028,474.00, based on the submitted current market analysis.

The alleged reduction in fair market value for map 18-02-07, tax lot 700 (2.17 acres) is \$159,940.00, based on the submitted current market analysis.

Total alleged reduction in fair market value for all three properties is \$ 1,446,070.00.

The applicant has submitted CMA or other competent evidence of valuation for tax lots

301, 400 and 700 that the County Commissioners have accepted on previous claims. Because of this, the County Administrator has waived the requirement for an appraisal.

The applicant is also claiming that the following sections of Lane Code have restricted the use of the subject properties:

LC Chapter 12 (Comprehensive Plan) – These provisions refer to the authority of the Lane County Planning Commission in recommending code amendments. No evidence has been provided that demonstrates how these regulations have lowered the fair market value of the property.

LC10.104-05 to -95 – These provisions only apply to those F2 (Forest Land District) zoned properties within the Urban Growth Boundaries of a city and are not applicable to the subject property.

LC Chapter 13 – These provisions apply to subdivision and partitioning of property. No evidence has been provided that demonstrates how these regulations have lowered the fair market value of the property.

LC Chapter 14 – These provisions apply to application review and appeal procedures. No evidence has been provided that demonstrates how these regulations have lowered the fair market value of the property.

LC Chapter 15 – These provisions apply to road and driveway approach spacing standards and building setbacks from roads. No evidence has been provided that demonstrates how these regulations have lowered the fair market value of the property.

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

The minimum lot size and restrictions on new dwellings do not appear to be exempt regulations.

CONCLUSION

It appears this is a valid claim.

RECOMMENDATION

The County Administrator recommends the Board adopt the attached order to waive the restrictive land use regulations of the E25 zone for Ina M. Saunders.

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LANE COUNTY,
OREGON**

ORDER No.

) 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 (Saunders, PA 06-7237)

WHEREAS, the voters of the State of Oregon passed Ballot Measure 37 on November 2, 2004, which added provisions to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 197 to require, under certain circumstances, payment to landowner if a government land use regulation restricts the use of private real property and has the effect of reducing the property value; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Lane County enacted Ordinance No. 18-04 on December 1, 2004, to establish a real property compensation claim application process in LC 2.700 through 2.770 for Ballot Measure 37 claims; and

WHEREAS, the County Administrator has reviewed an application for a Measure 37 claim submitted by Ina M. Saunders as trustee for the Ina M. Saunders Living Trust, the owner of real property located in the vicinity of 34645 – 34679 Seavey Way, Eugene, Oregon, south of the Willamette River and Springfield, and more specifically described in the records of the Lane County Assessor as map 18-02-07, tax lots 400 and 700 and map 18-02-18, tax lot 301, and consisting of approximately 32.35 acres in Lane County, Oregon; and

WHEREAS, the County Administrator has determined that the application appears to meet all of the criteria of LC 2.740(1)(a)-(d), appears to be eligible for just compensation and appears to require modification, removal or not applying the restrictive land use regulations in lieu of payment of just compensation and has referred the application to the Board for public hearing and confirmation that the application qualifies for further action under Measure 37 and LC 2.700 through 2.770; and

WHEREAS, the County Administrator has determined under LC 2.740(4) that modification, removal or not applying the restrictive land use regulation is necessary to avoid owner entitlement to just compensation under Ballot Measure 37 and made that recommendation to the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Board has reviewed the evidence and confirmed the application appears to qualify for compensation under Measure 37 but Lane County has not appropriated funds for compensation for Measure 37 claims and has no funds available for this purpose; and

WHEREAS, on May 8, 2007, the Board conducted a public hearing on the Measure 37 claim (PA 06-7237) of Ina M. Saunders and has now determined that the restrictive E25 (Exclusive Farm Use) zone dwelling and land division requirements of LC 16.212 were enforced and made applicable to prevent Ina M. Saunders from developing the property as might have been allowed at the time she acquired an interest in the property, map 18-02-07, tax lot 400, on July 19, 1956; map 18-02-07, tax lot 700, on August 9, 1956; and map 18-02-18, tax lot 301, on August 31,

1960; and that the public benefit from application of the current E25 dwelling and division land use regulations to the applicant's property is outweighed by the public burden of paying just compensation; and

WHEREAS, Ina M. Saunders requests either \$1,446,070 as compensation for the reduction in value of her property, or waiver of all land use regulations that would restrict the division of land into lots containing less than twenty-five acres and placement of a dwelling on each lot, and development uses that could have otherwise been allowed at the time she acquired an interest in the properties; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that under LC 2.760(3) the public interest would be better served by modifying, removing or not applying the challenged land use regulations of the E25 zone to the subject property in the manner and for the reasons stated in the report and recommendation of the County Administrator incorporated here by this reference except as explicitly revised here to reflect Board deliberation and action to allow Ina M. Saunders to make application for development of the subject properties in a manner similar to what she could have been able to do under the regulations in effect when she acquired an interest in the properties; and

WHEREAS, this matter having been fully considered by the Lane County Board of Commissioners.

NOW, THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the applicant Ina M. Saunders made a valid claim under Ballot Measure 37 by describing the use being sought, identifying the county land use regulations prohibiting that use, submitting evidence that those land use regulations have the effect of reducing the value of the property, showing evidence that she acquired an interest in the properties before the restrictive county land use regulations were enacted or enforced and the Board hereby elects not to pay just compensation but in lieu of payment, the request of Ina M. Saunders shall be granted and the restrictive provisions of LC 16.212 that limit the development of dwellings and the division of land in the E25 (Exclusive Farm Use) Zone shall not apply to Ina M. Saunders, so she can make application for approval to develop the property located at 34645 – 34679 Seavey Way, Eugene, Oregon, south of the Willamette River and Springfield, and more specifically described in the records of the Lane County Assessor as map 18-02-07, tax lots 400 and 700 and map 18-02-18, tax lot 301, and consisting of approximately 32.35 acres in Lane County, Oregon, in a manner consistent with the land use regulations in effect when she acquired an interest in the properties on map 18-02-07, tax lot 400, on July 19, 1956; map 18-02-07, tax lot 700, on August 9, 1956; and map 18-02-18, tax lot 301, on August 31, 1960.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that Ina M. Saunders still needs to make application and receive approval of any division of the property or placement of a dwelling under the other land use regulations applicable to dividing the property or placing a dwelling that were not specifically identified or established by her as restricting the division of the property or placement of a dwelling, and it would be premature to not apply those regulations given the available evidence. To the extent necessary to effectuate the Board action to not apply the dwelling or division restrictions of the applicable zone described above, the claimant shall submit appropriate applications for review and approval of a new dwelling to show the specific development proposals and in the event additional county land use regulations result in a restriction of those uses that have the effect of reducing the fair market value of the property, the

County Administrator shall have the authority to determine those restrictive county land use regulations that will not apply to that development proposal to preclude entitlement to just compensation under Measure 37, and return to the Board for action, if necessary. All other Lane Code land use and development regulations shall remain applicable to the subject property until such time as they are shown to be restrictive and that those restrictions reduce the fair market value of the subject property.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that this action making certain Lane Code provisions inapplicable to use of the property by Ina M. Saunders does not constitute a waiver or modification of state land use regulations and does not authorize immediate division of the subject property or immediate construction of a dwelling. The requirements of state law may contain specific standards regulating development of the subject property and the applicant should contact the Department of Administrative Services (DAS - State Services Division, Risk Management - Measure 37 Unit, 1225 Ferry Street SE, U160, Salem, OR 97301-4292; Telephone: (503) 373-7475; website address: <http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/Risk/M37.shtml>) and have the State of Oregon evaluate a Measure 37 claim and provide evidence of final state action before seeking county land use approval.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the other county land use regulations and rules that still apply to the property require that land use, sanitation and building permits be approved by Lane County before any development can proceed. Notice of this decision shall be recorded in the county deed records. This order shall be effective and in effect as described in LC 2.770 and Ballot Measure 37 to the extent permitted by law. This order does not resolve several questions about the effect and application of Measure 37, including the question of whether the right of applicant to divide or build dwellings can be transferred to another owner. If the ruling of the Marion County Circuit Court in *MacPherson v. Dept. of Administrative Services*, (Marion County Circ. Ct. Case No. 00C15769, October 14, 2005) or any other court decision involving Ballot Measure 37 becomes final and that decision or any subsequent court decision has application to Lane County in a manner that affects the authority of this Board to grant relief under Ballot Measure 37 and LC 2.700 through 2.770 then the validity and effectiveness of this Order shall be governed by LC 2.770 and the ruling of the court.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2007.

Faye Stewart, Chair
Lane County Board of County Commissioners

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Date 4-30-2007, Lane County

OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL