1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	JOSH PATTINSON
5	Petitioner,
6	
7	and
8	
9	LOU MONTGOMERY,
10	Intervenor-Petitioner,
11	
12	VS.
13	
14	CITY OF PORTLAND,
15	Respondent.
16	
17	
18	LUBA No. 2018-122
19	
20	FINAL OPINION
21	AND ORDER
22	
23	Appeal from City of Portland.
24	L. 1. D. W D. M 1
25	Josh Pattinson, Portland, represented himself.
26	Linky E. Doog Doutland names antod names dont
27 28	Linly F. Rees, Portland, represented respondent.
28 29	Lou Montgomery, Portland, represented himself.
30	Lou Monigomery, Portiana, represented miniseri.
31	RUDD, Board Member; RYAN, Board Chair; ZAMUDIO, Board
32	Member, participated in the decision.
33	iviemoer, participated in the decision.
34	DISMISSED 07/31/2019
35	0//31/2017
36	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is
37	governed by the provisions of ORS 197.850.
- ,	De learne of the Provincial of Oxford 1971.0001

## Opinion by Rudd.

2	Pursuant to ORS 197.830(13)(b) and OAR 661-010-0021, the city
3	withdrew the decision challenged in this appeal for reconsideration on October
4	19, 2018. On December 20, 2018, the Board received the city's decision on
5	reconsideration dated December 18, 2018. Pursuant to OAR 661-010-
6	0021(5)(a), petitioner had until January 10, 2019 to either refile his original notice
7	of intent to appeal in this matter or file an amended notice of intent to appeal.
8	The Board has not received a refiled original notice of intent to appeal or an
9	amended notice of 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).

1