1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	CELINA PATTERSON, HAWLEY MATTHIESON,
5	DEANNE FOSTER and MARY LOU KLEIN,
6	Petitioners,
7	
8	VS.
9	
10	CITY OF PORTLAND,
11	Respondent,
12	
13	and
14	
15	HARRY SCHUMACHER
16	and SHERI SCHUMACHER,
17	Intervenors-Respondent.
18	LUDANI 2004 170
19	LUBA No. 2004-178
20	FINIAL ODINION
21	FINAL OPINION
22 23 24	AND ORDER
23 24	Appeal from City of Portland.
	Appear from City of Fortiand.
25 26	Celina Patterson, Hawley Matthieson, Deanne Foster and Mary Lou Klein, Portland,
20 27	represented themselves.
28	represented themserves.
29	Linly F. Rees, Deputy City Attorney, Portland, represented respondent.
30	Emily 1. Reess, Beputy City 1 monney, 1 ordana, represented respondent.
31	Harry Schumacher and Sheri Schumacher, Portland, represented themselves.
32	
33	HOLSTUN, Board Chair; BASSHAM, Board Member; DAVIES, Board Member,
34	participated in the decision.
35	
36	DISMISSED 02/22/2005
36 37	
38	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by the
39	provisions of ORS 197.850.

Opinion by Holstun.

MOTION TO INTERVENE

Harry Schumacher and Sheri Schumacher, the applicants below, move to intervene on the side of respondent. There is no opposition to the motion, and it is allowed.

DECISION

1

2

5

- 6 Pursuant to ORS 197.830(13)(b) and OAR 661-010-0021, the City of Portland
- 7 withdrew the decision challenged in this appeal for reconsideration on November 8, 2004.
- 8 On January 6, 2005, the Board received the City of Portland's decision on reconsideration.
- 9 Pursuant to OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a), petitioner had until January 27, 2005 to either refile its
- original notice of intent to appeal in this matter, or file an amended notice of intent to appeal.
- 11 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
- 17 (1993).