LAND USE BUARD OF APPEALS

```
BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS SEP 2 2 32 PM '87
 1
 2
                            OF THE STATE OF OREGON
 3
      FRED PIQUETTE and SUSAN
      PIQUETTE,
 4
                                                 LUBA NO. 87-041
               Petitioners,
 5
                                                  FINAL OPINION
          vs.
                                             AND ORDER OF DISMISSAL
 6
      CITY OF SPRINGFIELD,
 7
               Respondent.
                                       )
 8
 9
          Appeal from City of Springfield.
10
          Michael Farthing
                                       Joseph J. Leahy
          Gleaves, Swearingen
                                       City Attorney
            Larsen & Potter
                                       223 North "A" St.
11
          975 Oak St., Suite 800
                                       Springfield, OR 97477
12
          Eugene, OR 97401
13
          Attorney for
                                       Attorney for
            Petitioners
                                         Respondent City
14
                          Timothy J. Sercombe
15
                          Harrang, Long, Watkinson
                             and Arnold, P.C.
                          400 S. Park Building
16
                          101 E. Broadway
                          Eugene, OR
                                       97401
17
                          Attorney for
18
                            Applicants
19
          HOLSTUN, Referee; DuBay, Chief Referee; BAGG, Referee,
     participated in the decision.
20
          DISMISSED
                                      09/02/87
21
          You are entitled to judicial review of this Order.
22
     Judicial review is governed by the provisions of ORS 197.850.
23
24
25
26
```

1

Page

```
Holstun, Referee.
2
          This matter is before the Board on a motion to dismiss
3
      filed by respondent, City of Springfield. Respondent states
      that the record in this case was settled on July 7, 1987, and a
5
      petition for review, therefore, was due not later than July 28,
6
      1987. OAR 661-10-030(1) provides the petition for review must
7
     be filed within 21 days after the record is received by the
8
     Board.
             Because no petition for review was filed in this case,
9
     and the 21 day period for filing the petition expired,
10
     respondent argues the appeal should be dismissed.
11
         Petitioner's motion to dismiss was received by the Board on
12
     August 10, 1987. Under our rules, petitioner is entitled to 10
13
     days following receipt of a motion, to serve and file a
14
     response. OAR 661-10-065(2). No response has been received by
15
     the Board.
16
         The Board has consistently held that failure to file a
17
     petition for review within the required time limit, will result
18
     in dismissal of the appeal. Gordon v. City of Beaverton, 292
19
     Or 228, 637 P2d 125 (1981); Elliott v. Lane County, 6 Or LUBA
20
     423 (1982). ORS 197.830(9) provides that a petition for review
21
     must be filed with the Board within the deadlines established
22
     by the Board. Our rules provide that the petition for review
23
     shall be filed within 21 days after the record is received by
24
     the Board. OAR 661-10-030(1). The Board's rule for extending
25
     deadlines, OAR 661-10-075(1)(a)(b), provides in part:
26
         "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this
       2
Page
```

1

section, any time deadline established by these rules for the filing of documents with the Board, other than the notice of intent to appeal and the petition for review, may be extended by the Board upon motion by the party seeking the extension. * * * extension. "(b) A motion which seeks to extend the time for filing the petition for review or respondent's brief must be accompanied by written stipulation, signed by all the parties to the appeal consenting to the extension. Because petitioner has neither filed a petition for review within the time required by our rules, nor obtained an extension of time for the filing of the petition for review, respondent's motion to dismiss is allowed. This case is dismissed.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

•	
2 3 4	I hereby certify that I served the foregoing Final Opinion and Order of Dismissal for LUBA No. 87-041, on September 2, 1987, by mailing to said parties or their attorney a true copy thereof contained in a sealed envelope with postage prepaid addressed to said parties or their attorney as follows:
5	Michael Farthing Gleaves, Swearingen Larsen & Potter 975 Oak St., Suite 800
6	
7	Joseph J. Leahy City Attorney 223 North "A" St. Springfield, OR 97477
9	
10	Timothy J. Sercombe Harrang, Long, Watkinson and Arnold, P.C. 400 S. Park Building
11	
12	101 E. Broadway Eugene, OR 97401
13	Dated this 2nd day of September, 1987.
14 15	ania Constru
16	Angle Crosby Administrative Assistant
17	
18	
19	
20 21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

Page 4