1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	LARRY DOTY,
5	Petitioner,
6	
7	VS.
8	
9	YAMHILL COUNTY,
10	Respondent,
11	
12	and
13	
14	WADE MILLER and PATRICIA MILLER,
15	Intervenor-Respondents.
16	
17	LUBA No. 2006-095
18	
19	FINAL OPINION
20	AND ORDER
21	
22	Appeal from Yamhill County.
23	
24	Larry Doty, McMinnville, represented himself.
25	
26	Rick Sanai, Assistant County Counsel, McMinnville, represented respondent.
27	
28	Jessica S. Cain, Newberg, represented intervenor-respondents.
29	
30	BASSHAM, Board Chair; HOLSTUN, Board Member, participated in the decision.
31	DIGMIGGED 09/04/0000
32	DISMISSED 08/24/2006
33	Voy and antitled to indicial navious of this Onder Indicial navious is accounted by the
34 35	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by the
3 3	provisions of ORS 197.850.

1	Opinion by Bassnam.
2	The petition for review in the appeal was due July 21, 2006. The petition for review
3	has not been filed, nor has an extension of time to file the petition for review been granted.
4	ORS 197.830(11) requires that a petition for review be filed within the deadlines
5	established by Board rule. OAR 661-010-0030(1) provides, in relevant part:
6 7 8 9 10	"* * The petition for review together with four copies shall be filed with the Board within 21 days after the date the record is received or settled 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 661-010-0067(2), shall result in dismissal of the appeal * * *."
11	OAR 661-010-0067(2) provides that the time limit for filing the petition for review may be
12	extended only by written consent of all the parties.
13	The deadline for filing the petition for review is strictly enforced. Terrace Lakes
14	Homeowners Assoc. v. City of Salem, 29 Or LUBA 532, 535, aff'd 138 Or App 188, 906 P20
15	871 (1995); Hutmacher v. Marion County, 15 Or LUBA 514, 515 (1987).
16	Because a petition for review was not filed within the time required by our rules, and
17	petitioner did not obtain written consent to extend the time for filing the petition for review
18	under OAR-661-010-0067(2) beyond July 21, 2006, ORS 197.830(11) and OAR
19	661-010-0030(1) require that we dismiss this appeal.
20	This appeal is dismissed. ¹

¹ Because we dismiss the appeal for failure to file a timely petition for review, we do not address the county's alternative basis for dismissing the appeal.