

1 BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2 OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3
4 PHYLLIS LEPPANEN,)
5)
6 Petitioner,)
7)
8 vs.)
9) LUBA No. 96-204
10 YAMHILL COUNTY,)
11) FINAL OPINION
12 Respondent,) AND ORDER
13)
14 and)
15)
16 RANDY PETERSON and KARLA PETERSON,)
17)
18 Intervenors-Respondent.)

21 Appeal from Yamhill County.

23 Phyllis Leppanen, Amity, represented herself.

25 John C. Pinkstaff, Assistant County Counsel,
26 McMinnville, represented respondent.

28 David J. Hunnicutt, Tigard, represented intervenors-
29 respondent.

31 GUSTAFSON, Referee; LIVINGSTON, Referee, participated
32 in the decision.

34 DISMISSED 12/31/96

36 You are entitled to judicial review of this Order.
37 Judicial review is governed by the provisions of ORS
38 197.850.

1 Gustafson, Referee.

2 The petition for review in this appeal was due
3 December 11, 1996. The petition for review has not been
4 filed, nor has an extension of time to file the petition for
5 review been granted beyond December 11, 1996. ORS
6 197.830(10) requires that a petition for review be filed
7 within the deadlines established by Board rule. OAR 661-10-
8 030(1) provides, in relevant part:

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

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

20 The deadline for filing the petition for review is
21 strictly enforced. See Terrace Lakes Homeowners Assn. v.
22 City of Salem, 29 Or LUBA 532, aff'd 138 Or App 188 (1995);
23 Bongiovanni v. Klamath County, 29 Or LUBA 351 (1995);
24 McCauley v. Jackson County, 20 Or LUBA 176 (1990).

25 Because a petition for review was not filed within the
26 time required by our rules, and petitioner did not obtain
27 consent to extend the time for filing the petition for
28 review under OAR-661-10-067(2) beyond December 11, 1996,
29 ORS 197.830(10) and OAR 661-10-030(1) require that we

1 dismiss this appeal.

2 This appeal is dismissed.