1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	CHARLES WOODS, )
5	)
6	Petitioner, ) LUBA No. 93-130
7	)
8	vs. ) FINAL OPINION
9	) AND ORDER
10	MARION COUNTY, )
11	)
12	Respondent. )
13	
14	
15	Appeal from Marion County.
16	
17	Charles Woods, Salem, represented himself.
18	
19	Jane Ellen Stonecipher, Assistant County Counsel,
20	Salem, represented respondent.
21	
22	SHERTON, Referee; KELLINGTON, Chief Referee; HOLSTUN,
23	Referee, participated in the decision.
24	
25	DISMISSED 12/08/93
26	
27	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order.
28	Judicial review is governed by the provisions of ORS
29	197.850.

- 1 Opinion by Sherton.
- ORS 197.830(10) provides that a petition for review
- 3 must be filed within the deadlines established by Board
- 4 rule. OAR 661-10-030(1) provides, in relevant part:
- 5 "\* \* \* The petition for review shall be filed with
- 6 the Board within 21 days after the date the record
- 7 is received by the Board. \* \* \* Failure to file a
- 8 petition for review within the time required by
- 9 this section, and any extensions of that time
- 10 under \* \* \* OAR 661-10-067(2), shall result i:
- dismissal of the appeal \* \* \*."
- 12 OAR 661-10-067(2) provides that the time limit for filing
- 13 the petition for review may be extended only with the
- 14 written consent of all parties.
- Under OAR 661-10-030(1), the petition for review in
- 16 this appeal was originally due on October 11, 1993. Based
- 17 on a stipulation of the parties, the Board extended the time
- 18 for filing the petition for review to November 8, 1993.
- 19 OAR 661-10-067(2). No additional extension of time for
- 20 filing the petition for review has been requested or
- 21 granted. As of this date, no petition for review has been
- 22 filed. Respondent moves that this appeal be dismissed.
- Because petitioner has not filed a petition for review
- 24 within the time required under our rules, ORS 197.830(10)
- 25 and OAR 661-10-030(1) require that we dismiss this appeal.
- 26 McCauley v. Jackson County, 20 Or LUBA 176 (1990); Piquette
- 27 v. City of Springfield, 16 Or LUBA 47 (1987); Hutmacher v.
- 28 <u>Marion County</u>, 15 Or LUBA 514 (1987).
- 29 This appeal is dismissed.