

1 Opinion by Hanna.

2 Petitioners appeal the county's decision to interpret
3 its zoning ordinance to prohibit raising or keeping pot-
4 bellied pigs in an R-10 zone. After the county filed the
5 record, petitioners filed objections to the record. We
6 entered an order resolving those objections on February 26,
7 1996, and stated that the "petition for review is due 21
8 days after the date of this order." Petitioners mailed the
9 petition for review on March 20, 1996, 23 days after the
10 date of our order.¹

11 ORS 197.830(10) requires that a petition for review be
12 filed within the deadlines established by Board rule. OAR
13 661-10-030(1) provides, in relevant part:

14 "* * * The petition for review together with four
15 copies shall be filed with the Board within 21
16 days after the date the record is received by the
17 Board. * * * Failure to file a petition for review
18 within the time required by this section, and any
19 extensions of that time under * * * OAR 661-10-
20 067(2), shall result in dismissal of the appeal *
21 * *." (Emphasis added.)

22 OAR 661-10-067(2) provides that the time limit for filing
23 the petition for review may be extended only by written
24 consent of all the parties.

25 The deadline for filing the petition for review is
26 strictly enforced. See Terrace Lakes Homeowners Assn. v.
27 City of Salem, 29 Or LUBA 532, aff'd 138 Or App 188 (1995);

¹Under OAR 661-10-075(2)(a)(B) a petition for review is deemed filed on the date it is postmarked.

1 Bongiovanni v. Klamath County, 29 Or LUBA 351 (1995);
2 McCauley v. Jackson County, 20 Or LUBA 176 (1990).
3 Petitioners did not file the petition for review within 21
4 days of the date the record was settled, or obtain a written
5 extension of time for filing the petition for review under
6 OAR 661-10-067(2). The petition for review was not timely
7 filed.

8 This appeal is dismissed.