1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	JEANNE BIGGERSTAFF and CARR BIGGERSTAFF,
5	Petitioners,
6	
7	VS.
8	
9	YAMHILL COUNTY,
10	Respondent,
11	
12	and
13	
14	RALPH JOHNSON and NORMA JOHNSON,
15	Intervenors-Respondents.
16	7.7.D.1.3.7.
17	LUBA No. 2008-059
18	EDIAL ORDION
19	FINAL OPINION
20	AND ORDER
21	Appeal from Verskill County
22 23	Appeal from Yamhill County.
23 24	Charles Swindells, Portland, represented petitioners.
2 4 25	Charles Swindens, Fortiand, represented petitioners.
24 25 26	Fredric Sanai, Assistant County Counsel, McMinnville, represented respondent.
27 27	Treatic Sanat, Assistant County Counsel, McMinivine, represented respondent.
28	Edward H. Trompke, Portland, represented intervenors-respondents.
29	Edward II. 110mpke, 1 ortified, represented intervenors respondents.
30	HOLSTUN, Board Member; RYAN, Board Chair; BASSHAM, Board Member
31	participated in the decision.
32	participated in the decision
33	TRANSFERRED 07/02/2008
34	
35	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by the
36	provisions of ORS 197.850.

1 Opinion by Holstun.

NATURE OF THE DECISION

- 3 Petitioners appeal a county vested rights determination that intervenors-respondents
- 4 were entitled to proceed with development authorized under a Measure 37 waiver.

MOTION TO INTERVENE

- Ralph Johnson and Norma Johnson (intervenors), the applicants below, move to
- 7 intervene on the side of respondent in this appeal. There is no opposition to the motion, and
- 8 it is granted.

9 FACTS

2

5

- A lengthy recitation of the facts is not necessary given our disposition of this appeal.
- In sum, intervenors obtained a vested rights determination from the county that they may
- 12 continue and complete development of their property based on waivers obtained under
- 13 Measure 37.

14 MOTION TO DISMISS

- The county and intervenors move to dismiss this appeal on the grounds that the
- 16 challenged decision is not a land use decision subject to our jurisdiction. For the reasons
- 17 expressed in our final order and opinion issued this day in Friends of Yamhill County v.
- 18 Yamhill County, ___ Or LUBA ___ (LUBA No. 2008-060), LUBA does not have
- 19 jurisdiction to hear this appeal. Pursuant to petitioners' conditional motion to transfer to
- 20 Yamhill County Circuit Court under OAR 661-010-0075(11), this appeal is transferred.