1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	CENTRAL OREGON LANDWATCH,
5	Petitioner,
6	
7	VS.
8	
9	DESCHUTES COUNTY,
10	Respondent,
11	
12	and
13	
14	MICHAEL GEMMET,
15	Intervenor-Respondent.
16	
17	LUBA No. 2022-087
18	
19	FINAL OPINION
20	AND ORDER
21	
22	Appeal on remand from the Court of Appeals.
23	
24	Carol E. Macbeth represented petitioner.
25	ense genove beneg dug glike grederite en stim avjastadi e er e
26	No appearance by Deschutes County.
27	다. 1991년 1997년 - 1997년 1998년 1997년 1997
28	Lisa Andrach represented intervenor-respondent.
29	
30	RUDD, Board Member; RYAN, Board Chair; ZAMUDIO, Board
31	Member, participated in the decision.
32	
33	AFFIRMED 11/13/2023
34	
35	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is
36	governed by the provisions of ORS 197.850.

1

Opinion by Rudd.

2 NATURE OF THE DECISION

3 Petitioner appeals a county hearings officer decision approving an 4 application for a declaratory ruling that a guest ranch previously approved as a 5 conditional use has been initiated on the subject property.

6 BACKGROUND

7 This matter is on remand from the Court of Appeals. Central Oregon Landwatch v. Deschutes County, 326 Or App 439 (2023). We set out the facts in 8 9 our prior decision and do not restate them here. *Central Oregon Landwatch v.* Deschutes County, Or LUBA (LUBA No. 2022-087, Feb 3, 2023). 10

11 THIRD ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR

12 In our decision, we sustained petitioner's third assignment of error and 13 remanded the county's decision to the county with instructions to consider the petitioner's arguments on nonconforming uses and abandonment. Id. at ____ (slip 14 15 op at 16). On judicial review, the Court of Appeals agreed with intervenor-16 respondent that "under the text and context of the applicable law, the declaratory ruling on initiation of use that [petitioner] sought did not involve the 17 18 nonconforming use standards, so the hearings officer correctly declined to 19 consider COLW's arguments on nonconforming use and abandonment," and 20 reversed this portion of our decision." 326 Or App at 448-49. Accordingly, for 21 the reasons set out in the court's decision, the third assignment of error is denied. 22

The county's decision is affirmed.

Page 2