1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	SEWCO INVESTMENTS, INC.,)
5)
6	Petitioner,)
7) LUBA No. 93-180
8	vs.)
9) FINAL OPINION
10	CLACKAMAS COUNTY,) AND ORDER
11)
12	Respondent.)
13	
14	
15	Appeal from Clackamas County.
16	
17	Stark Ackerman, Portland, represented petitioner.
18	
19	Michael E. Judd, Chief Assistant County Counsel, Oregon
20	City, represented respondent.
21	HOLOGODA DE CERTA MOTOR GIR LE DECENTRA GUIDON
22	HOLSTUN, Referee; KELLINGTON, Chief Referee; SHERTON,
23	Referee, participated in the decision.
24 25	DISMISSED 04/13/94
26	DISMISSED 04/13/94
	You are entitled to judicial region of this Order
	-
27 28 29	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order Judicial review is governed by the provisions of OR 197.850.

- 1 Opinion by Holstun.
- 2 Pursuant to ORS 197.830(12)(b) and OAR 661-10-021, the
- 3 county withdrew the decision challenged in this appeal for
- 4 reconsideration on November 24, 1993. On March 14, 1994,
- 5 the Board received the county's decision on reconsideration.
- 6 Pursuant to OAR 661-10-021(5)(a), petitioner had until April
- 7 4, 1994 to (1) refile its original notice of intent to
- 8 appeal in this matter, or (2) file an amended notice of
- 9 intent to appeal. The Board has not received a refiled
- 10 original notice of intent to appeal or an amended notice of
- intent to appeal in accordance with OAR 661-10-021(5)(a).
- 12 OAR 661-10-021(5)(d) provides "[i]f no amended notice
- 13 of intent to appeal is filed or no original notice of intent
- 14 to appeal is refiled, as provided in [OAR 661-10-021(5)(a)],
- 15 the appeal will be dismissed."
- 16 This appeal is dismissed. Matrix Development v. City
- 17 of Tigard, 25 Or LUBA 557 (1993).