#### BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR COLUMBIA COUNTY, OREGON

In the Matter of Claim No. CL 07-05	)	
for Compensation under Measure 37	)	
submitted by David Thorvald Erickson &	)	Order No. 22-2007
Virginia Carol Erickson	)	

WHEREAS, on August 22, 2006, Columbia County received a claim under Measure 37 (codified at ORS 197.352) and Order No. 84-2004 from David Thorvald Erickson and Virginia Carol Erickson, for property having Tax Account Number 4119-021-00102; and

WHEREAS, according to the information presented with the Claim, David Thorvald Erickson and Virginia Carol Erickson have continuously had an interest in the property subject to CL 07-05 since August 11, 1988, and

WHEREAS, the 6.18-acre property has been zoned Rural Residential-5 (RR-5) since 1985; and

WHEREAS, in 1988 Columbia County permitted lot sizes as small as two acres in the RR-5 zone under certain circumstances; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Columbia County Zoning Ordinance (CCZO) provisions that were adopted in 1999, the minimum parcel size in the RR-5 zone is now five acres; and

WHEREAS, David Thorvald Erickson and Virginia Carol Erickson claim that CCZO 201, 210 and 604.1 have restricted the use of the property and has reduced the value of the property by \$310,000.00; and

WHEREAS, David Thorvald Erickson and Virginia Carol Erickson desire to divide the properties to create more residential homesites, an action that could have been achieved under the land use regulations in place at the time they acquired their property; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Measure 37, in lieu of compensation the Board may opt to not apply (hereinafter referred to as "waive" or "waiver") any land use regulation that restricts the use of the Claimants' property and reduces the fair market value of the property to allow a use which was allowed at the time the Claimants acquired the property;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. The Board of County Commissioners adopts the findings of fact set forth in the Staff Report for Claim Number CL 07-05, dated February 7, 2007, which is attached hereto as Attachment 1, and is incorporated herein by this reference.

Order No. 22-2007

Page 1

- 2. In lieu of compensation, the County waives CCZO 202, 210 and 604.1 to the extent necessary to allow the Claimants to divide the property into two approximately three acre parcels.
- 3. This waiver is subject to the following limitations:
  - A. This waiver does not affect any land use regulations promulgated by the State of Oregon. If the use allowed herein remains prohibited by a State of Oregon land use regulation, the County will not approve an application for land division, other required land use permits, or building permits for development of the property until the State has modified, amended or agreed not to apply any prohibitive regulation, or the prohibitive regulations are otherwise deemed not to apply pursuant to the provisions of Measure 37.
  - B. In approving this waiver, the County is relying on the accuracy, veracity, and completeness of information provided by the Claimants. If it is later determined that Claimants are not entitled to relief under Measure 37 due to the presentation of inaccurate information, or the omission of relevant information, the County may revoke this waiver.
  - C. Except as expressly waived herein, Claimants are required to meet all local laws, rules and regulations, including but not limited to laws, rules and regulations related to subdivision and partitioning, dwellings in the forest zone, and the building code.
  - D. This waiver is personal to the Claimants, does not run with the land, and is not transferable except as may otherwise be required by law.
  - E. By developing the parcel in reliance on this waiver, Claimants do so at their own risk and expense. The County makes no representations about the legal effect of this waiver on the sale of lots resulting from any land division, on the rights of future land owners, or on any other person or property of any sort. By accepting this waiver, and developing the property in reliance thereof, Claimants agree to indemnify and hold the County harmless from and against any claims arising out of the division of property, the sale or development thereof, or any other claim arising from or related to this waiver.

Order No.22-2007

/

/

4. This Order shall be recorded in the Columbia County Deed Records, referencing the legal description which is attached hereto as Attachment 2, and is incorporated herein by this reference, without cost.

Dated this <u>215t</u> day of <u>February</u>, 2007.

Approved as to form

By:

Office of the County Counsel

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR COLUMBIA COUNTY, ØREGON tà I By: a Rita Bornhard, Chair By: Anthony Hyde, Commissioner By: Jog Corsiglia, Commissioner

Order No. 22-2007

# Attachment 1 COLUMBIA COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

### Measure 37 Claim

# **Staff Report**

- DATE: February 7, 2007
- FILE NUMBER: CL 07-5

CLAIMANTS/OWNERS: David Thorvald Erickson Virginia Carol Erickson 34591 Church Road Warren, OR 97053

#### SUBJECT PROPERTY

PROPERTY LOCATION:	34591 Church Road Warren, OR 97053
TAX ACCOUNT NUMBER:	4119-021-00102
ZONING:	Rural Residential-5 (RR-5)
SIZE:	6.18 acres
REQUEST:	To divide the parcel into two parcels for residential development
CLAIM RECEIVED:	August 22, 2006
180-DAY DEADLINE:	March 1, 2007
NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF CLAIM:	December 15, 2006. As of February 6, 2007, no requests for hearing have been received.
BOC REVIEW DATE:	February 14, 2007

#### I. BACKGROUND:

The subject property includes 6.18 acres developed with a single-family dwelling. Claimants acquired the property in August 1988.

#### II. APPLICABLE CRITERIA AND STAFF FINDINGS:

#### **MEASURE 37**

)) If a public entity enacts or enforces a new land use regulation or enforces a land use egulation enacted prior to the effective date of this amendment that restricts the use of

<u>private real property</u> or any interest therein and <u>has the effect of reducing the fair market value</u> <u>of the property</u>, or any interest therein, then the owner of the property shall be paid just compensation.

(2) Just compensation shall be equal to the reduction in the fair market value of the affected property interest resulting from enactment or enforcement of the land use regulation as of the date the owner makes written demand for compensation under this act.

## A. PROPERTY OWNER AND OWNERSHIP INTERESTS:

1. **Current Ownership**: The claimants supplied information supporting their claim that David Thorvald Erickson and Virginia Carol Erickson are the fee title owners of the subject property.

2. **Date of Acquisition**: Claimants acquired the property via deed on August 11, 1988. (Columbia County Deed Records 88-3419). Staff used this deed conveyance date (August 1988) to evaluate the claim.

#### B. LAND USE REGULATIONS IN EFFECT AT THE TIME OF ACQUISITION

The property was zoned RR-5 in 1984. At the time the RR-5 zoning designation was applied, property with access to a community water system could be divided into parcels as small as two acres. The subject property has access to Warren Water, and accordingly, could have been divided into two acre parcels/lots.

#### C. LAND USE REGULATION(S) APPLICABLE TO SUBJECT PROPERTY ALLEGED TO HAVE REDUCED FAIR MARKET VALUE/EFFECTIVE DATES/CLAIMANTS ELIGIBILITY

In 1999, the county amended the provisions of the RR-5 zone to prohibit the creation of new lots or parcels smaller than five acres in size. The claimants assert that the rural residential zoning designation reduced the fair market value of the property by eliminating the ability to divide their parcel into smaller than five acre arcels. Accordingly, based on the claim, it appears that the county standards that clearly prevent the laimants from developing the property as desired are:

CCZO 604.1 Establishing the five acre minimum parcel size standard in the RR-5 zone

#### D. <u>CLAIMANTS'S ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER REVIEW</u>

Claimants acquired an interest in the property before the current provisions of the RR-5 zone became effective. Therefore the Claimants may be eligible for compensation and/or waiver of the cited regulations under Measure 37.

#### E. STATEMENT AS TO HOW THE REGULATIONS RESTRICT USE

The Claimants state that they cannot divide the property as proposed due to the county's 5-acre minimum parcel size standard. Staff concedes that CCZO 604.1 as amended by Ordinance 98-4 can be read and applied to "restrict" the use of claimants' property within the meaning of Measure 37.

#### F. EVIDENCE OF REDUCED FAIR MARKET VALUE

1. Value of the Property As Regulated.

The claimants submitted copies of county assessor's records that estimate the 2006 value the properties as \$425,300 (\$146,700 for the land and \$278,600 for improvements). In addition, claimants submitted an appraisal report that estimates the value of the property as \$600,000. Staff uses the appraisal value for the purposes of estimating the value of the property as regulated.

#### 2. Value of Property Not Subject To Cited Regulations.

Claimants submitted copies of real estate listings showing that sales prices for undeveloped rural residential nd are between \$43,800 and \$112,000 per acre. Claimants appear to allege that if their property is divided, the property would be worth approximately \$910,000. 3. Loss of value indicated in the submitted documents is:

The claim alleges a total reduction in value of \$310,000.

While staff does not agree that the information provided by the claimants is adequate to fully establish the current value of the property or the value of the property if it was not subject to the cited regulations, staff concedes that it is more likely than not that the property would have a higher value if divided into parcels developed with single family dwellings than a 6.18-acre parcel developed with a single family dwelling.

Staff notes that this value assumes that the resulting lots will be developed with dwellings prior to sale to third parties. If the subject property is merely subdivided and then sold as undeveloped parcels, there is a significantly lower value, as the attorney general opinion concludes that while the claimants themselves may avail themselves of the benefits of Measure 37 and develop the property according to the regulations in place at the time of acquisition, that benefit is not transferable.

#### G. COMPENSATION DEMANDED

\$310,000 per page 1 of claimants' Measure 37 Claim form.

(3) Subsection (1) of this act shall not apply to land use regulations:

(A) Restricting or prohibiting activities commonly and historically recognized as public nuisances under common law. This subsection shall be construed narrowly in favor of a finding of compensation under this act;

(B) Restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety, such as fire and building codes, health and sanitation regulations, solid or hazardous waste regulations, and pollution control regulations;

C) To the extent the land use regulation is required to comply with federal law;

(D) Restricting or prohibiting the use of a property for the purpose of selling pornography or performing nude dancing. Nothing in this subsection, however, is intended to affect or alter rights provided by the Oregon or United States Constitutions; or

(E) Enacted prior to the date of acquisition of the property by the owner or a family member of the owner who owned the subject property prior to acquisition or inheritance by the owner, whichever occurred first.

CCZO Section 604.1 does not qualify for any of the exclusions listed.

Staff notes that other siting standards, including fire suppression requirements, access requirements and requirements for adequate domestic water and subsurface sewage, continue to apply as they are exempt from compensation or waiver under Subsection 3(B), above.

# (4) Just compensation under subsection (1) of this act shall be due the owner of the property if the land use regulation continues to be enforced against the property 180 days after the owner of the property makes written demand for compensation under this section to the public entity enacting or enforcing the land use regulation.

Should the Board determine that the that the Claimants have demonstrated a reduction in fair market value of the property due to the cited regulations, the Board may pay compensation in the amount of the reduction in fair market value caused by said regulation or in lieu of compensation, modify, remove, or not apply CCZO Section 604.1.

(5) For claims arising from land use regulations enacted prior to the effective date of this act, written demand for compensation under subsection (4) shall be made within two years of the effective date of this act, or the date the public entity applies the land use regulation as an approval criteria to an application submitted by the owner of the property, whichever is later. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted after the effective date of this act, written demand for compensation under subsection (4) shall be made 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.

The subject claim arises from the minimum lot size provisions of the RR-5 zoning regulations which were enacted prior to the effective date of Measure 37 on December 2, 2004. The subject claim was filed on August 22, 2006, which is within two years of the effective date of Measure 37.

(8) Notwithstanding any other state statute or the availability of funds under subsection (10) of this act, in lieu of payment of just compensation under this act, the governing body responsible

for enacting the land use regulation may modify, remove, or not to apply the land use regulation or land use regulations to allow the owner to use the property for a use permitted at the time the owner acquired the property.

Should the Board determine that the that the Claimants have demonstrated a reduction in fair market value of ne property due to the cited regulations, the Board may pay compensation in the amount of the reduction in rair market value caused by said regulation or in lieu of compensation, modify, remove, or not apply CCZO Section 604.1.

#### III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the above findings, staff concludes that the claimants have met the threshold requirements for proving a Measure 37 claim.

The following table summarizes staff findings concerning the land use regulations cited by the Claimants as a basis for its claim. In order to meet the requirements of Measure 37 for a valid claim the cited land use regulation must be found to restrict use, reduce fair market value, and not be one of the land use regulations exempted from Measure 37. The highlighted regulations below have been found to meet these requirements of a valid Measure 37 claim:

LAND USE CRITERION	DESCRIPTION	RESTRICTS USE?	REDUCES VALUE?	EXEMPT?
CCZO 604.1	Establishing the five acre minimum parcel size standard in the RR-5 zone	Yes	Yes	No

Staff recommends the Board of County Commissioners take action to determine the amount, if any, by which the cited regulations reduced the value of the Claimants' property, and act accordingly to pay just compensation in that amount, or, in the alternative, to not apply CCZO Section 604.1.

#### ATTACHMENT 2

#### LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A tract of land in Section 19, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, Columbia County, Oregon, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of the Leslie Thomas Brady and Ella Irene Brady tract as described in Deed Book 124, Page 372, said point being North 89°51' East 1752.99 feet and North 0°12'02" East 30.00 feet from the most Southerly Southwest corner of the J. G. Martin Donation Land Claim; said point also being on the Northerly right of way line of Martin County Road No. 8; thence North 0°12'02" East along the East line of said Brady tract a distance of 1041.85 feet to the Northeast corner thereof; thence North 60°49' West along the Northeasterly line of said Brady tract a distance of 307.43 feet to the most Easterly corner of the Donald U. Leader and Iris I. Leader tract as described in Deed Book 167, Page 178; thence South 33°56'00" West along the Southeasterly line of said Leader tract a distance of 504.17 feet to the most Northerly corner of the Clarence Kuhn and Carolyn Kuhn tract as described in Deed Book 220, Page 588; thence South 0°09' East along the East line of said Clarence Kuhn and Carolyn Kuhn tract a distance of 160.19 feet; thence North 89°51' East a distance of 497.93 feet to a point which is 50 feet Westerly from (when measured at right angles) said East line of the Brady tract; thence South 0°12'02" West 50 feet Westerly from and parallel to said East line of said Brady tract a distance of 614.70 feet to said Northerly right of way line of Martin County Road; thence North 89°51' East a distance of 50.00 feet to the point of beginning.

> Page 3 Report No. 07-56495

> > Serving Oregon Since 1908

