```
1
                BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
 2
                       OF THE STATE OF OREGON
 3
   DORIS NEHODA, GEORGE NEHODA,
   JIMMIE RUTH DIXSON, and ELENA
 6
    FLAHERTY,
 7
 8
              Petitioners,
 9
10
         and
11
    EDWARD HARTER and DORTHY HOOTMAN,
12
                                                    )
13
14
              Intervenors-Petitioner,
                                                    )
                                                         LUBA
15
    No. 95-249
16
                                    )
17
                                              FINAL OPINION
        vs.
                                    )
18
                                    )
                                                AND ORDER
19
   COOS COUNTY,
                                    )
20
                                    )
                                         (MEMORANDUM OPINION)
21
              Respondent,
                                            ORS 197.835(16)
                                    )
22
23
         and
24
25
   DUANE HAUGHT,
26
27
              Intervenor-Respondent.
                                                    )
28
29
30
        Appeal from Coos County.
31
32
         Doris Nehoda, George Nehoda, Jimmie Ruth Dixson, and
33
    Elena Flaherty, Coos Bay, filed the petition for review and
    argued on their own behalf.
34
35
36
         Edward H. Harter, Coquille, and Dorthy Hootman, Coos
37
    Bay, represented themselves.
38
39
         No appearance by respondent.
40
41
         Michael H. Fairchild, Portland, filed the response
    brief and argued on behalf of intervenor-respondent.
42
43
44
         HANNA, Referee; GUSTAFSON, Referee, participated in
45
    the decision.
```

1												
2		AFFIRMED			04/24/96							
3												
4	You	are ent	itle	d to	judi	cial	rev	iew	of	this	Or	der.
5	Judicial	review	is	gover	ned	by	the	pro	visi	ons	of	ORS
6	197.850.											

- 1 Opinion by Hanna.
- 2 Petitioners appeal the county's determination that a
- 3 salvage automobile business and wrecking yard is a valid
- 4 nonconforming use. Petitioners have not established any
- 5 basis for remand or reversal of the county's decision. The
- 6 county's decision is affirmed.