1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	JOHN COURT and LUANN COURT,
5	Petitioners,
6	
7	VS.
8	
9	WASHINGTON COUNTY,
10	Respondent.
11	
12	LUBA No. 2000-175
13	
14	FINAL OPINION
15	AND ORDER
16	
17	Appeal from Washington County.
18	
19	Jack L. Orchard, Portland, represented petitioner.
20	
21	Alan A Rappleyea, Senior County Counsel, Hillsboro, represented respondent.
22	
23	HOLSTUN, Board Member; BRIGGS, Board Chair; BASSHAM, Board Member,
24	participated in the decision.
25	
26	DISMISSED 12/10/01
27	
28	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by the
29	provisions of ORS 197.850.
30	

## Opinion by Holstun

2	Pursuant to ORS 197.830(13)(b) and OAR 661-010-0021, Washington County
3	withdrew the decision challenged in this appeal for reconsideration on August 8 <sup>th</sup> 2001. On
4	November 5 <sup>th</sup> 2001, the Board received the Washington County's decision on
5	reconsideration. Pursuant to OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a), petitioner had until November 26 <sup>th</sup>
6	2001, to either refile its original notice of intent to appeal in this matter, or file an amended
7	notice of intent to appeal. The Board has not received a refiled original notice of intent to
8	appeal or an amended notice of intent to appeal in accordance with
9	OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a).
10	OAR 661-010-0021(5)(e) provides "[i]f no amended notice of intent to appeal is filed
11	or no original notice of intent to appeal is refiled, as provided in [OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a)],
12	the appeal will be dismissed."
13	This appeal is dismissed. Matrix Development v. City of Tigard, 25 Or LUBA 557
14	(1993).

1