1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	FRIENDS OF YAMHILL COUNTY,
5	Petitioner,
6	
7	vs.
8	
9	YAMHILL COUNTY,
10	Respondent.
11	
12	LUBA No. 2021-030
13	
14	FINAL OPINION
15	AND ORDER
16	
17	Appeal from Yamhill County.
18	
19	Andrew Mulkey represented petitioner.
20	Time they C. Codle appropriated assume deat
21	Timothy S. Sadlo represented respondent.
22	ZAMUDIO, Board Chair; RUDD, Board Member; RYAN, Board
23 24	Member, participated in the decision.
2 4 25	iviember, participated in the decision.
26	DISMISSED 07/28/2021
27 27	DISINISSED 07/20/2021
28	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is
29	governed by the provisions of ORS 197.850.
	O

Opinion by Zamudio.

2	Pursuant to ORS 197.830(13)(b) and OAR 661-010-0021, the county
3	withdrew the decision challenged in this appeal for reconsideration on March 12,
4	2021. On June 28, 2021, the Board received the county's decision on
5	reconsideration. Pursuant to OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a), petitioner had until July
6	19, 2021, to either refile its original notice of intent to appeal in this matter or file
7	an amended notice of intent to appeal. The Board has not received a refiled
8	original notice of intent to appeal or an amended notice of intent to appeal in
9	accordance with OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a).
10	OAR 661-010-0021(5)(e) provides that, "[i]f no amended notice of intent
11	to 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