```
1
                BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
 2.
                       OF THE STATE OF OREGON
 3
 4
   DAVID L. DAVIS,
                                    )
 5
                                    )
 6
             Petitioner,
                                    )
 7
                                    )
                                            LUBA No. 90-086
 8
         VS.
 9
10
   CITY OF BANDON,
                                    )
11
                                    )
12
             Respondent.
                                    )
                                             FINAL OPINION
13
                                               AND ORDER
14
15
    INDUSTRIAL SUPPLIES CO. PROFIT )
16
    SHARING TRUST, CHARLES F. LARSON,
                                                    )
17
    and REX ROBERTS,
18
                                    )
19
             Petitioners,
                                    )
20
                                    )
21
                                    )
                                            LUBA No. 90-087
         VS.
22
                                    )
23
   CITY OF BANDON,
24
                                    )
25
             Respondent.
26
27
28
        Appeal from City of Bandon.
29
30
         Fern Eng, Eugene, filed a petition for review on behalf
31
    of petitioner Davis.
32
33
         Bill Kloos, Eugene, filed a petition for review and
34
    argued on behalf of petitioners Industrial Supplies Co.
35
    Profit Sharing Trust, et al. With him on the brief was
36
    Johnson & Kloos.
37
         Mark J. Greenfield and Edward J. Sullivan, Portland,
38
39
    filed a response brief and Mark J. Greenfield argued on
    behalf of respondent. With them on the brief was Preston,
40
41
    Thorgrimson, Schidler, Gates & Ellis.
42
         HOLSTUN, Chief Referee; SHERTON, Referee; KELLINGTON,
43
44
    Referee, participated in the decision.
45
```

1		DISMISSE	D	04/06/92			
2							
3	You	are enti	itled to	judicial	revi	ew of this	order.
4	Judicial	review	is gover	rned by	the	provisions	of ORS
5	197.850.						

- 1 Opinion by Holstun.
- 2 Respondent moves to dismiss this appeal, and
- 3 petitioners do not object.
- 4 Accordingly, this appeal is dismissed.