```
1
               BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
 2
                      OF THE STATE OF OREGON
 3
 4
   STEVE ENNIS,
                                   )
 5
                                   )
 6
             Petitioner,
 7
 8
        vs.
                                           LUBA No. 97-059
9
10
   KLAMATH COUNTY,
11
                                   )
                                           FINAL OPINION
12
                                             AND ORDER
             Respondent,
                                   )
13
14
        and
15
16
   PAUL RITTER and CAROL RITTER,
17
18
             Intervenors-Respondent.
                                                  )
19
20
21
        Appeal from Klamath County.
22
23
        James H. Bean, Portland, represented petitioner.
24
25
        Reginald
                  Davis, County Counsel, Klamath Falls,
26
    represented respondent.
27
28
        Michael P.
                        Rudd, Klamath Falls, represented
29
    intervenors-respondent.
30
31
        HANNA,
                Judge; GUSTAFSON, Chief Judge; LIVINGSTON,
    Judge, participated in the decision.
32
33
34
                                   10/07/97
             DISMISSED
35
36
        You are entitled to judicial review of this Order.
37
    Judicial review is governed by the provisions of ORS
38
   197.850.
```

- 1 Hanna, Judge.
- 2 The petition for review in the appeal was due September
- 3 12, 1997. The petition for review has not been filed, nor
- 4 has an extension of time to file the petition for review
- 5 been granted.
- ORS 197.830(10) requires that a petition for review be
- 7 filed within the deadlines established by Board rule. OAR
- 8 661-10-030(1) provides, in relevant part:
- 9 "\* \* \* The petition for review together with four
- 10 copies shall be filed with the Board within 21
- 11 days after the date the record is received by the
- Board. \* \* \* Failure to file a petition for review
- within the time required by this section, and any
- extensions of that time under \* \* \* OAR 661-10-
- 15 067(2), shall result in dismissal of the appeal \*
- 16 \* \*."
- 17 OAR 661-10-067(2) provides that the time limit for filing
- 18 the petition for review may be extended only by written
- 19 consent of all the parties.
- The deadline for filing the petition for review is
- 21 strictly enforced. See Terrace Lakes Homeowners Assn. v.
- 22 City of Salem, 29 Or LUBA 532, aff'd 138 Or App 188 (1995);
- 23 Bongiovanni v. Klamath County, 29 Or LUBA 351 (1995).
- 24 Because a petition for review was not filed within the
- 25 time required by our rules, and petitioner did not obtain
- 26 written consent to extend the time for filing the petition
- 27 for review under OAR-661-10-067(2) beyond September 12,
- 28 ORS 197.830(10) and OAR 661-10-030(1) require that we
- 29 dismiss this appeal.

1 This appeal is dismissed.