1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	DANIELLE NYE and SANDERS NYE,
5	Petitioners,
6	
7	VS.
8	
9	DESCHUTES COUNTY,
10	Respondent,
11	
12	and
13	
14	SCOTT SMALLWOOD and
15	CAROL ANN SMALLWOOD,
16	Intervenors-Respondents.
17	
18	LUBA No. 2021-021
19	
20	FINAL OPINION
21	AND ORDER
22	
23	Appeal from Deschutes County.
24	
25	Michael H. McGean represented petitioners.
26	
27	David Doyle represented respondent.
28	Laver Constru Communicated interner and auto-
29	Laura Craska Cooper represented intervenors-respondents.
30	74MIIDIO Doord Mombon DIIDD Doord Chain DVAN Doord
31	ZAMUDIO, Board Member; RUDD, Board Chair; RYAN, Board
32 33	Member, participated in the decision.
34	DISMISSED 05/17/2021
3 4 35	DISIVIISSED 03/1//2021
36	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is
30 37	governed by the provisions of ORS 197.850.
7 1	EXTYNULISM 178 1.110 1.110.1810.110 01. V. 1.X.O. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.

Zamudio, Board Member.

1

2

NATURE OF THE DECISION

- 3 Petitioners challenge a board of county commissioners decision approving
- 4 two property line adjustments and a 10-lot subdivision.

5 MOTION TO INTERVENE

- 6 Scott Smallwood and Carol Ann Smallwood (intervenors) move to
- 7 intervene on the side of respondent. No party opposes the motion and it is
- 8 allowed.

9

MOTION TO DISMISS

- Petitioners filed the notice of intent to appeal. Before transmitting the
- 11 record, the county withdrew its decision for reconsideration pursuant to ORS
- 12 197.830(13)(b) and OAR 661-010-0021(1). After the county issued its decision
- on reconsideration, petitioners filed an amended notice of intent to appeal
- 14 challenging that decision. See OAR 661-010-0021(5) (providing procedure for
- 15 challenging a decision on reconsideration).
- On April 12, 2021, the Board received the county's record transmittal. No
- party objected to the record and the deadline for filing the petition for review was
- 18 May 3, 2021. OAR 661-010-0030(1). Petitioners did not file a petition for review.
- 19 On May 10, 2021, petitioners mailed LUBA a letter that copied the other parties
- and stated that the parties had reached a settlement and that the appeal may be
- 21 dismissed. We treat that letter as petitioners' motion to voluntarily dismiss this
- 22 appeal for purposes of this decision.

1	That same day, intervenors filed a motion to dismiss the appeal for failure
2	to timely file the petition for review. OAR 661-010-0030(1). In their motion,
3	intervenors dispute petitioners' contention that the parties have settled the matter.
4	Failure to file a petition for review within the time required by OAR 661-
5	010-0030(1) or any extensions of that time under OAR 661-010-0067(2) shall
6	result in dismissal of the appeal. OAR 661-010-0030(1). Petitioners did not file
7	a petition for review. Petitioners' motion to voluntarily dismiss the appeal, which
8	was filed after the deadline for filing the petition for review, is moot. Intervenors'
9	motion to dismiss is granted.
10	The appeal is dismissed.