1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	KELLY DOHERTY and JIM DOHERTY,
5	Petitioners,
6	
7	VS.
8	reconsiderations for some so CAAS bit by 100-200. [Cutus, colid., sorgend on holy
9	MORROW COUNTY,
10	Respondent.
11	and a contract of the contract
12	LUBA No. 2025-038
13	edignical nocice of intent to gapeal or at appended in the or antent to appeal to
14	FINAL OPINION
15	AND ORDER
16	or more to solve his record on the relation of the solve of the solve of the control of the cont
17	Appeal from Morrow County.
18	ni bebinesa sa distillo di kepapapat tastai la editori tario ira na to bellit di topago ".
19	Petitioners represented themselves.
20	[O.A.R. 661-010-0021(2)(A)], the appeal will be Burneped "
21	Daniel Kearns represented respondent.
22	tins depoil a dispussable Marke Americanenia a cipi of Egipet, 2010
23	BASSHAM, Board Member; ZAMUDIO, Board Chair; WILSON, Board
24	Member, participated in the decision.
25	
26	DISMISSED 07/18/2025
27	
28	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is
29	governed by the provisions of ORS 197.850.

Opinion by Bassham.

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 May 29,
4	2025. On June 16, 2025, the Board received the county's decision on
5	reconsideration. Pursuant to OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a), petitioners had until July
6	7, 2025, 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 "[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