1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	BHAGWATI P. PODDAR and SARADELL )
5	PODDAR, )
6	
7	Petitioners, ) LUBA No. 96-128
8	)
9 10	vs. ) FINAL OPINION
11	CLATSOP COUNTY, ) AND ORDER
12	) (MEMORANDUM OPINION)
13	Respondent. ) (ORS 197.835(16))
14	respondence.
15	
16	
17	Appeal from Clatsop County.
18	
19	Bhagwati P. Poddar and Saradell Poddar, Astoria, filed
20	the petition for review and represented themselves.
21	
22	Blair J. Henningsgaard, County Counsel, Astoria,
23	represented respondent.
24	
25 26	GUSTAFSON, Referee; HANNA, Chief Referee; LIVINGSTON,
20 27	Referee, participated in the decision.
28	AFFIRMED 10/07/96
29	AFF INNED IO/OI/JO
30	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order.
31	Judicial review is governed by the provisions of ORS
32	197.850.

- 1 Gustafson, Referee.
- 2 Petitioners appeal the county's enforcement of a
- 3 condition of approval of a 1992 development permit. The
- 4 development permit, for a replacement dwelling, required as
- 5 a condition of approval that "applicant agrees to remove
- 6 existing house within 6 months (six) of occupancy of new
- 7 house or completion of new house, whichever is first."
- 8 Record 33. Petitioners have not complied with that
- 9 condition.
- 10 Petitioners appeal on the grounds that (1) the 1992
- 11 condition was not legal; (2) the condition has not been
- 12 violated since the existing house is no longer being used as
- 13 a residence; (3) the county waived the condition by offering
- 14 petitioners the opportunity to apply for a permit to
- 15 legalize the existing house as a storage building; and (4)
- 16 enforcement of the condition constitutes an unconstitutional
- 17 taking of petitioners' property.
- We find no error in the county's enforcement of the
- 19 condition to which petitioners agreed in 1992. Petitioners
- 20 have provided no basis for remand or reversal of the
- 21 county's decision.
- The county's decision is affirmed.