

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

3  
4 RONALD L. DOYLE,  
5 *Petitioner,*

6  
7 vs.

8  
9 CITY OF ASHLAND,  
10 *Respondent.*

11  
12 LUBA No. 2009-001

13  
14 FINAL OPINION  
15 AND ORDER

16  
17 Appeal from City of Ashland.

18  
19 Ronald L. Doyle, Ashland, represented himself.

20  
21 Richard Appicello, City Attorney, Ashland, represented respondent.

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

25  
26 DISMISSED

02/26/2009

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

1 Opinion by Ryan.

2 The petition for review in the appeal was due February 5, 2009. The petition for  
3 review has not been filed, nor has an extension of time to file the petition for review been  
4 granted.

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

7 “\* \* \* The petition for review together with four copies shall be filed with the  
8 Board within 21 days after the date the record is received or settled by the  
9 Board. \* \* \* Failure to file a petition for review within the time required by  
10 this section, and any extensions of that time under \* \* \* OAR 661-010-  
11 0067(2), shall result in dismissal of the appeal \* \* \*.”

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

14 The deadline for filing the petition for review is strictly enforced. *Terrace Lakes*  
15 *Homeowners Assoc. v. City of Salem*, 29 Or LUBA 532, 535, *aff'd* 138 Or App 188, 906 P2d  
16 871 (1995); *Hutmacher v. Marion County*, 15 Or LUBA 514, 515 (1987).

17 Because a petition for review was not filed within the time required by our rules, and  
18 petitioner did not obtain written consent to extend the time for filing the petition for review  
19 under OAR-661-010-0067(2) beyond February 5, 2009, ORS 197.830(11) and OAR  
20 661-010-0030(1) require that we dismiss this appeal.

21 This appeal is dismissed.