

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS  
OF THE STATE OF OREGON

SANDRA L. REA, )  
 )  
Petitioner, )  
 ) LUBA No. 94-200  
vs. )  
 ) FINAL OPINION  
CITY OF SEASIDE, ) AND ORDER  
 )  
Respondent. )

Appeal from City of Seaside.

Sandra L. Rea, Seaside, represented herself.

Dan Van Thiel, City Attorney, Astoria, respresented respondent.

SHERTON, Referee; HOLSTUN, Chief Referee, participated in the decision.

DISMISSED 12/27/94

You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by the provisions of ORS 197.850.

1 Opinion by Sherton.

2 Under OAR 661-10-030(1), the petition for review in  
3 this appeal was due on November 21, 1994. On November 18,  
4 1994, petitioner filed an unstipulated motion for an  
5 extension of time, to December 20, 1994, to file the  
6 petition for review. As of this date, respondent has not  
7 consented, in writing or otherwise, to petitioner's request  
8 for an extension of time, and no petition for review has  
9 been filed.

10 Under OAR 661-10-067(2), LUBA may not extend the  
11 deadline for filing a petition for review, unless all  
12 parties consent to the extension. Zippel v. Josephine  
13 County, 26 Or LUBA 626, 628 (1994). Accordingly,  
14 petitioner's motion for an extension of time is denied.  
15 Because petitioner did not file a petition for review within  
16 the time required by our rules, ORS 197.830(10) and  
17 OAR 661-10-030(1) require that we dismiss this appeal.  
18 McCauley v. Jackson County, 20 Or LUBA 176 (1990); Piquette  
19 v. City of Springfield, 16 Or LUBA 47 (1987); Hutmacher v.  
20 Marion County, 15 Or LUBA 514 (1987).

21 This appeal is dismissed.