1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	MAURY SANCHEZ,)
5)
6	Petitioner,) LUBA No. 93-184
7)
8	vs.) FINAL OPINION
9) AND ORDER
10	CLATSOP COUNTY,)
11)
12	Respondent.)
13	
14	Appeal from Clatsop County.
15	
16	Jeffrey L. Kleinman, Portland, represented petitioner.
17	
18	Kenneth S. Eiler, Seaside, represented respondent.
19	
20	Holstun, Referee; SHERTON, Referee, participated in the
21	decision.
22	
23	REMANDED 03/22/94
24	
25	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order.
26	Judicial review is governed by the provisions of ORS
27	197.850.

- 1 Opinion by Holstun.
- 2 Respondent moves for a voluntary remand of the
- 3 challenged decision for further proceedings, and for return
- 4 of petitioner's deposit for costs. Petitioner objects, but
- 5 offers no reason why the motion should be denied. See
- 6 Hastings Bulb Growers, Inc. v. Curry County, 25 Or LUBA 558,
- 7 aff'd 123 Or App 642 (1993).
- 8 The motion is granted.
- 9 The county's decision is remanded, and the Board shall
- 10 return petitioner's deposit for costs.