1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3 4	MARILYN DOVE, DEWEY GIBSON
5	and PAT RICHARDSON,
<i>5</i>	Petitioners,
7	rennoners,
8	N/C
9	VS.
10	CROOK COUNTY,
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
11 12	Respondent.
13	LUBA No. 2003-172
13	LUBA No. 2005-172
15	FINAL OPINION
16	AND ORDER
17	Annual from Creak County
18	Appeal from Crook County.
19 20	Daniel Voorma Dortland represented natitioner
21	Daniel Kearns, Portland, represented petitioner.
22	Leff M. Wilson, County Council Dringville, represented respondent
23	Jeff M. Wilson, County Counsel, Prineville, represented respondent.
23 24	BRIGGS, Board Member; BASSHAM, Board Chair; HOLSTUN, Board Member,
25	participated in the decision.
26	DISMISSED 03/18/2004
27	DISMISSED 03/18/2004
28	Voy and auditled to indicial navious of this Orden. Indicial navious is accommed by the
29	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by the
30	provisions of ORS 197.850.

1

9

10

11

- Pursuant to ORS 197.830(13)(b) and OAR 661-010-0021, Crook County withdrew the decision challenged in this appeal for reconsideration on October 30, 2003. On February 2, 2004, the Board received Crook County's decision on reconsideration. Pursuant to OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a), petitioner had until February 23, 2004 to either refile its original notice of intent to appeal in this matter, or file an amended notice of intent to appeal. The Board has not received a refiled original notice of intent to appeal or an amended notice of intent to appeal in accordance with OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a).
  - OAR 661-010-0021(5)(e) provides "[i]f no amended notice of intent to appeal is filed or no original notice of intent to appeal is refiled, as provided in [OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a)], the appeal will be dismissed."
- This appeal is dismissed. *Matrix Development v. City of Tigard*, 25 Or LUBA 557 (1993).