

P3:30

53

H

## BEFORE 1' HE HEARLINGS OFFICER KLAIAA' H COUNT'', OREGON

ORDER

Vol.<u>M96 Page</u> 19209

## IN THE MATTER OF CUP (3-95 FOR LESTER LORADITCH TO RE-ESTABLISH A RESIDENCE ON PROPERTY ZONED FOR STRY

#### 1. NATURE OF THE REQUEST:

The applicant wishes to re-t stat lish a single amily residence on 20.27 acres west of the Kirk Rd., 2 1/2 miles north of Hwy 62. This rect est was heard by the Hearings Officer JUNE 21, 1996 pursuant to Of DINANCE 44.39 which has been adopted in response to HB 3661, effective November 4, 193. The rect est was reviewed for conformance with Land Development Code Article 35.

## 2. NAVIES OF THOSE VIHO PARTICI ATED:

The Hearings Officer in review of this application was MICHAEL L. BRANT. The applicant appeared and offered testimony in support of the application. The Planning Department was represented by HBH Karen Bulg, Flanning Assistant.

#### 3. LOCATION:

The subject property is located west of Hwy 97, east of Hwy 62. Located in Section 6, T 34S R 7E, T.A. 3407-6-300.

#### 4. RELEVANT FACTS:

A. ACCESS: The projectly is accessed via USFS Road 6210, a Federal maintained graded road improved to a  $1-v_1$  ather specification.

B. FIRE PROTECTICN: The property is within the area covered by the Chiloquin/Agency Lake  $RI^{2}D$ . The applicant has proposed fuel breaks around the residence to reduce the potential of a structural fire of reading to adjacent resource lands.

C. LAND USE: 'The property is 2).27 acres. The applicant states a residence existed there from 1989 to 1993, when it burnt. As the timeframe for replacement expired, this permitting process expired, a new permit process is required.

This is NOT a "TEMPLATE' Application, but a "LOT OF RECORD" application and proof of pre 1985 ownership has been submitted.

1

D. SEWERAGE: The applicant in icates the property HAS BEEN evaluated for septic suitability.

E. SLOPE: Available topographic napping and site inspection indicates slopes of 0-15% predominate the site

F. SOILS: The property is located on soils with a LCC of Class VI.

G. WATER: Proposed well

H. PLAN/ZONIN(): 'The plan/zor t designation of the project site and properties is Forestry.

## 5. RELEVANT CRITERIA:

The standards and criteria relevant to this application are found in the Klamath County Comprehensive Plan (Goal 4) at d amendments to the Klamath County Land Development Code, Crd 44.39 pertaining to 4 rticle 55.

#### 6. FINDINGS:

All evidence submitted as the staff report, exhibits b-d, and offered testimony were considered in this Order.

6.1 With regard to the Statewile Planning Goals and the Klamath County Comprehensive Plan, the Hearings Officer make: the followin; findings:

A. The goal of the Fores: Lands Elern int is to conserve forest lands for the production of wood fiber and other forest uses, protect forest lands from incompatible uses, and to ensure a continued yield  $\alpha$  forest products and values.

B. Forest Uses are defined by Statewice Planning Goal 4 and the Comprehensive plan to include:

1. The production of trees and forest 5 oducts;

2. watershed protection and wildlife and fisheries habita;

- 3. soil protection from wind and water
- 4. grazing of livestocl;
- 5. maintenance of clean a r and water:
- 6. outdoor recreational as ivities
- 7. open space, buffers fro n noise, and visual separation of conflicting uses.

FINDING: The Hearing: Of icer finds that dwellings are not included in the list of forest uses. The Land D velopment () de does, however, permit residences subject to conditional use findings set out in Sections 55.050 and General Review Criteria set out in Section 55.060.

192

C. Policy 4 of the Kla nath County Forest Lands Goal states "The County shall regulate development of nonforest uses in forest areas".

The "rationale" for such policy is "to protect the health, safety and welfare of County Citizens "and" to reduce fire danger to mannade structures and forest resources."

FINDING: The Hearings Officer finds that active resource management HAS NOT occurred on the subject property. The proposed residence is within a structural fire protection district, and, with the provision of required fuelbreaks, and structural fire protection provided by the C/AL RFD, and the readily available wildler d fire protection provided by the ODF, along with access provided, there is a missignificant risk of fire and risk to the adjacent uses.

6.2 With regard to the Klaunath County Land Development Code, the Hearings Officer makes the following findings:

A. Goal 4, Policy #1 states: The following lands shall be designated forestry and subject to the regulations of the Forestry and Forestry/Range zones contained in the Land Development Code:

1. Public of private industry forest lands located contiguously in large blocks, i.e. Forest Service, BLM, Weyerhaeuser, Crown Pacific;

2. Significant wildlife and fiel ery habitat areas;

3. Land having : predominant timber site productivity rating of I-VI;

4. Isolated pockt ts of land within forest areas which do not meet the above criteria;

5. Lands needed for watershee protection or recreation;

6. Other lants it eded to protect farm or forest uses on surrounding designated agricultural ci forest lands.

Rationale: To preserve the maxi num area of productive forest land.

FINDING: The site is found not devoted to commercial resource use.

FINDING: The subject property is site inclused 67 for timber productivity and the site chosen for the homesite is not in forest production. There are few trees on the property.

3

**FINDING:** The small site is t of large end gh for legitimate commercial forestry use, but does have secondary forest growth and is rait of fair for this purpose. There is property adjacent to the site which is presently in a preferestry use. With the signing of a restrictive covenant will prchibit the permit holder from interfering with accepted resource management practices on nearby lands.

Goal 4, Policy #4 states: "The County shall ) egulate development of nonforest uses in forested areas".

Rationale: To protect the health, safety, and welfare of county citizens. And to reduce the fire danger to man-made structures and fore a resources.

FINDING: The proposed residence is with n an established structural fire protection district. Access to the property to fight fire is excellent, being off of an all-weather road. Further, the applicant has proposed fuelbreaks around the house to prevent the spread of fire to the adjacent properties.

The threat of fire spreading to it source properties is found to be mitigated.

B. As the property is not under farm c eferral status Klamath County Land Development Code Article 55.2 refers the art lication to Article 55 for review criteria:

The uses conditionally permitted shall be subject to review in accordance with the following criteria as set out in section (5.0) 50:

1. The location, size, design and operating characteristics of the proposed use will not force a significant change in, or significantly increase the cost of, accepted resource uses on nearby resource lands;

FINDING: Rural-residential and noncommercial resource use dominates in all compass directions.

FINDING: The adjacent lands are found devoted to the permitted uses as set out in state and local goals/zoning regulations. The location of a non-resource home will not conflict with management practices on these lands. The permit holder will be required to file a restrictive covenant which will prohibit the permit holder and successors in interest from filing complaints concerning valid resource management practices on adjacent lands.

FINDING: The subject parcel  $\gamma$  as legally created per local ordinance. The location of a forest residence on the property  $\gamma$  ill not destabilize the existing land use pattern of the area as use similar to that proposed has been established in the immediate vicinity.

FINDING: The proposal is to ated on get raily unsuitable 1 and for the production of forest products and livestock, contridering the terrain, adverse soil or land conditions, drainage and flooding, vegetation, location and size of the tract;

FINDING: The project is on a parcel, 20.27 acres m/l, with a poor rating for this purpose. The site is found to be pocily 1 cated for for st management activities as it has a soil rating which would result in minimal value for rescurce use.

**FINDING:** Site productivity for noncommercial forest uses is found to be minimal considering the size and aspect of the parce. No loss of productive resource lands will result. The Hearings Officer finds the commercial Forestry land base of the County will not be compromised by the permitting of a home of this 20.27 acres.

2. The proposed use will not significantly increase fire hazards or significantly increase fire suppression costs or significantly increase ris to fire suppression personnel.

**FINDING:** Structural fire projection is provided by the Chiloquin/Agency Lake RFD. The owner shall adhere to the requirements outlined in Article 69, Rural/Wildland Fire Safety Standards. Other rural services will be minimally impacted by the addition of another residence.

3. The proposed use is in confermance with all standards and criteria of Article 57 of the Land Development Code.

FINDING: Article 57 is found not applicable as the ODFW considers this a "Lot of Record" per their definition.

4. A written statement will be recorded with the deed which recognizes the rights of adjacent and nearby land owners to conduct forest operations consistent with the Forest Practices Act, ORS 30.090 and uses allowed by this Code.

FINDING: A document setting out agreement with the above shall be filed with the County Clerk as a condition of this approval.

C. Also required is consideration of the review criteria and conditions set out in proposed Section 55.060 A-H.

a. The tract on which the proposed civelling will be sited does not contain a dwelling and no other dwelling has been approved for the tract.

5

FINDING: No other dwelling xists or is approved for the property under review.

b. Approval of the live ling will no : exceed the facilities and service capabilities of the area. The proposed dwelling site:

1. shall obtain a proval for connection to the on-site sewage disposal.

1921

FINDING: The normal permitting procedule for a residence requires approval/permit from the Environmental Health Services Division prior to Building Permit clearance.

2. will be a fequitely served by road access.

FINDENG: The existing readest is a well developed/maintained road accessing the property under review.

3. shall be developed pursuan to Article 69, Rural/Wildland Fire Safety Standards.

FINDENG: A condition of approval requiring compliance is set out as a condition of approval.

4. must be served by an approved water system other than from a Class II stream.

FIND ING: The applicant proposes an on si e well which must be approved by the Watermaster.

c. Approval of the dwe ling will nor materially alter the stability of the overall land use pattern of the area.

**FINDMNG:** The adjacent kinds are found *c* t voted to the permitted uses as set out in state and local goal/zoning regulations. The location *c* f another home will not conflict with management practices on n early resource properties. The permit holder is required to record a restrictive covenant which will protect restrict management activities from interference.

d & e. Approval of the dwelling, in conformance with all required standards and criteria, will not create conditions or circum stances the County determines would be contrary to the purposes or intent of its acknowledged comprehensive plan or land use regulations.

FIND ING: The Hearing Officer finds that a dherence to the various Code requirements discussed in this Order will result in a land use not conflicting with the purposes/intent of the acknowledged plan/regulations.

6

f. Conformance with M tional Weth ds Inventory Maps/Policy.

FINDING: The Hearings Officer finds the property under review is not within a designated wetlands area.

g. The lot or parcel upon which the a welling will be placed was legally created.

FINDING: The Hearings Offi er finds the information submitted with the application demonstrates the property under review is a legal parcel per the definition set out in Article 11 of the Code.

h. Siting Requirements; 1-3

FINDING: The Hearings Officer finds a site plan, prepared per Article 41, and reviewed by the Planning Director, will satisfy the criteria.

D. This is a "LOT OF RECOLD" application. As such, consideration pursuant to the criteria set out in section 55.080 need not be demonstrated.

FINDING: The Hearings Officer, upon review of the submitted documentation finds conformance with the required criteria in that the Loraditch family has continuously owned this tract since before January, 1985.

#### 7. ORDER:

Therefore, it is ordered the request of LOR ADITCH for approval of CUP 43-96 is approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicants shall file a restrictive core nant with the County Clerk prohibiting the permit grantee and successors in interest from dividing the property or filing complaint concerning accepted resource management practices that may occur on nearby lands devoted to commercial resource use.

2. The applicant must  $comp_{M}$  with the first safety and other siting standards of the land use code as set out in Article 59.

3. The applicant shall not fy the County  $A_{\pm}$  sessor this property is to excluded from Farm or Forest Deferral programs, if presently included. Any penalties due shall be paid and proof of payment presented prior to development permit approval.

4. The applicant shall deduce trate this property is within an area protected by a structural fire protection district, or under contract, with same prior to final clearance.

5. The applicant shall denors trate that access is available to them over the USFS roadnet for the purposes of residential construction/oc cupancy.

6. The applicant must provide proof of clear ince from the Environmental Health Services Division and Building Dept, within two years following the date of this order, or obtain an extension of time, or this approval will become null and void.

DATED this 21th day of JUNE, 1996

Michael Brant

Michael L. Brant, Hearing; Cificer

## NOT CE OF APPEAL RIGHTS

You are hereby notified that it is decision may be appealed to the Klamath County Board of Commissioners by filing with the Planning Department a NCTICE OF APPEAL as set out in Article 33 of the Code, togeth r with the required fee within SEVEN DAYS of the date of mailing of this decision.

# STATE OF OR EGON: COUNTY OF LIAL AATH : SS.

	Klamath	(ounty	the 27th day
Hiled for record at requ	A.D., 15 96at3:30	io'clock	P M., and duly recorded in Vol. M96
of June	of Diec	08	Page 19209 Bernetha G. Letsch, County Clerk
			Bernetina U. Leisen County Change
FEE No Fae	Return: Commissioners J	ournal By	

8