

1 BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2 OF THE STATE OF OREGON

3
4 JERRY ELLER and BONNIE ELLER,
5 *Petitioners,*

6
7 vs.

8
9 CITY OF GEARHART,
10 *Respondent.*

11
12 LUBA No. 2006-212

13
14 FINAL OPINION
15 AND ORDER

16
17 Appeal from City of Gearhart.

18
19 Jerry Eller and Bonnie Eller, Gearhart, represented themselves.

20
21 Daniel Kearns, Portland, represented respondent.

22
23 RYAN, Board Member; BASSHAM, Board Chair; HOLSTUN, Board Member,
24 participated in the decision.

25
26 DISMISSED

02/08/2007

27
28 You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by the
29 provisions of ORS 197.850.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Opinion by Ryan.

The petition for review in this appeal was due December 29, 2006. The petition for review has not been filed, nor has an extension of time to file the petition for review been granted. Although a motion to take evidence outside of the record was filed by the city, which has the effect of suspending time limits under OAR 661-010-0045(9), the city's motion to take evidence outside of the record was not filed until after the deadline for filing the petition for review expired.

ORS 197.830(11) requires that a petition for review be filed within the deadlines established by Board rule. OAR 661-010-0030(1) provides, in relevant part:

“* * * 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 * * *.”

OAR 661-010-0067(2) provides that the time limit for filing the petition for review may be extended only by written consent of all the parties.

The deadline for filing the petition for review is strictly enforced. *Terrace Lakes Homeowners Assoc. v. City of Salem*, 29 Or LUBA 532, 535, *aff'd* 138 Or App 188, 906 P2d 871 (1995); *Hutmacher v. Marion County*, 15 Or LUBA 514, 515 (1987).

Because a petition for review was not filed within the time required by our rules, and petitioners did not obtain written consent to extend the time for filing the petition for review under OAR-661-010-0067(2) beyond December 29, 2006, ORS 197.830(11) and OAR 661-010-0030(1) require that we dismiss this appeal.

This appeal is dismissed.¹

¹ Because we dismiss this appeal for failure to file a timely petition for review, the city's motion to take evidence and motion to dismiss on jurisdictional grounds are moot.