1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	DON GRAHAM and JULIE GRAHAM,
5	Petitioners,
6	
7	VS.
8	
9	COOS COUNTY,
10	Respondent.
11	
12	LUBA No. 2014-064
13	
14	FINAL OPINION
15	AND ORDER
16	
17	Appeal from Coos County.
18	
19	Nick Klingensmith, Eugene, represented petitioners.
20	
21	Josh Soper, County Counsel, Coquille, represented respondent.
22	
23	BASSHAM, Board Member; RYAN, Board Chair; HOLSTUN, Board
24	Member, participated in the decision.
25	DICMICCED 02/12/2015
26	DISMISSED 03/12/2015
27	Vou are entitled to judicial review of this Order Judicial review is
28 29	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is
ムブ	governed by the provisions of ORS 197.850.

1	Opinion by Bassham.
2	Pursuant to ORS 197.830(13)(b) and OAR 661-010-0021, Coos County
3	withdrew the decision challenged in this appeal for reconsideration on August
4	1, 2014. On September 22, 2014, the Board received Coos County's decision
5	on reconsideration. Pursuant to OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a), petitioner had until
6	October 13, 2014, to either refile its original notice of intent to appeal in this
7	matter, or file an amended notice of intent to appeal. The Board has not
8	received a refiled original notice of intent to appeal or an amended notice of
9	intent to appeal in accordance with OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a).
10	OAR 661-010-0021(5)(e) provides "[i]f no amended notice of intent to
11	appeal is filed or no original notice of intent to appeal is refiled, as provided in
12	[OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a)], the appeal will be dismissed."
13	This appeal is dismissed. Matrix Development v. City of Tigard, 25 Or
14	LUBA 557 (1993).