1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	ANTHONY BOUTARD,
5	Petitioner,
6	
7	VS.
8	
9	YAMHILL COUNTY,
10	Respondent.
11	
12	LUBA No. 2020-105
13	
14	FINAL OPINION
15	AND ORDER
16	
17	Appeal from Yamhill County.
18	
19	Doug Hageman represented petitioner.
20	
21	Todd Sadlo represented respondent.
22	
23	ZAMUDIO, Board Member; RUDD, Board Chair; RYAN, Board
24	Member, participated in the decision.
25	
26	DISMISSED 04/27/2021
27	
28	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is
29	governed by the provisions of ORS 197.850.

2 On November 19, 2020, respondent withdrew the decision challenged in 3 this appeal for reconsideration pursuant to ORS 197.830(13)(b) and OAR 661-4 010-0021. On March 29, 2021, the Board received respondent's decision on 5 reconsideration. Petitioner had until April 19, 2021 to either refile the original notice of intent to appeal in this matter or file an amended notice of intent to 6 appeal. OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a). The Board has not received a refiled original 7 8 notice of intent to appeal or an amended notice of intent to appeal. OAR 661-9 010-0021(5)(e) provides that, "[i]f no amended notice of intent to appeal is filed 10 or no original notice of intent to appeal is refiled, as provided in [OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a)], the appeal will be dismissed." 11 This appeal is dismissed. Matrix Development v. City of Tigard, 25 Or

¹² LUBA 557 (1993).¹ 13

¹ On April 5, 2021, the county filed a motion to dismiss this appeal. Petitioner did not respond in opposition to that motion.