



COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Carolina Mejia-Barahona
District One

Gary Edwards
District Two

Tye Menser
District Three

HEARING EXAMINER

Creating Solutions for Our Future

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER FOR THURSTON COUNTY

In the Matter of the Application of)	NO. 2022101211
)	
Brianna Lee)	FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
)	AND DECISION
For a Reasonable Use Exception)	
_____)	

SUMMARY OF DECISION

The request for a reasonable use exception to construct a 936 square foot single-family residence and appurtenances within a Category III wetland buffer is **GRANTED** with conditions.

SUMMARY OF RECORD

Request

Brianna Lee (Applicant) requested a reasonable use exception (RUE) to construct a 936 square foot single-family residence and appurtenances within a Category III wetland buffer. The proposal would reduce the buffer from 200 feet to a minimum of 120 feet. The subject property, which is currently unaddressed, is located on North Clearlake Boulevard in Yelm, Washington and is identified as Tax Parcel Number 41170015800.

Hearing Date

The Thurston County Hearing Examiner conducted a virtual open record public hearing on the application on July 11, 2023. The record was held open through July 13, 2023 to allow members of the public who may have had difficulty joining the virtual hearing due to technology reasons to submit written post-hearing comment, with time scheduled for responses from the parties. No post-hearing public comments were submitted. The Hearing Examiner also allowed the Applicant until July 13, 2023 to submit a memo correcting/clarifying data in the project narrative. The Applicant timely submitted the requested memo, and the record closed on July 13, 2023.

Testimony

At the open record public hearing, the following individuals presented testimony under oath:

Sharon Lumbantobing, Senior Planner, Thurston County Community Planning & Economic Development Department

Arthur Saint, Civil Engineer, Thurston County Public Works Department

Dawn Peebles, Environmental Health Program Manager, Thurston County Public Health and Social Services Department

Brianna Lee, Applicant

Bryan Peck, Wetland Consultant, Habitat Technologies

Susan Ferber

Exhibits

At the open record public hearing, the following exhibits were admitted into the record:

Exhibit 1 Community Planning and Economic Development Report including the following attachments:

- A. Notice of Public Hearing, dated June 26, 2022
- B. Master Application and Reasonable Use Exception application, received December 15, 2021
- C. Project Narrative, received March 30, 2023
- D. Site plan, received December 15, 2021 and revised on March 30, 2023 and May 16, 2023
- E. [none offered]
- F. Wetland Delineation and Mitigation Report, received December 15, 2021 and revised on March 30, 2023
- G. Impervious surface worksheet
- H. Comments from the Nisqually Indian and Squaxin Island Tribes
- I. Notice of application for reasonable use exception, dated May 18, 2022
- J. Public comment email from John Goodspeed and Susan Ferber, dated June 7, 2022
- K. Communications matrix, dated March 30, 2023
- L. Critical area determination, dated January 25, 2023
- M. Second communications matrix, dated May 10, 2023
- N. Third communications matrix, dated May 16, 2023
- O. Thurston County Environmental Health approval memo, dated June 9, 2023

Exhibit 2 Memo from Brianna Lee dated July 13, 2023 re: Correct total of square footage for the improvements to Lee Parcel #41170015800, with revised Project Narrative

Based on the record developed through the open record hearing process, the Hearing Examiner enters the following findings and conclusions.

FINDINGS

1. Brianna Lee (Applicant) requested a reasonable use exception (RUE) to construct a 936 square foot single-family residence and appurtenances within a Category III wetland buffer. The proposal would reduce the buffer from 200 feet to a minimum of 120 feet. The subject property, which is currently unaddressed, is located on North Clearlake Boulevard in Yelm, Washington and is identified as Tax Parcel Number 41170015800.¹ *Exhibits 1, 1.B, 1.D, and 2.*
2. The RUE application was received on March 8, 2022 and deemed complete for purposes of commencing project review on April 12, 2022. *Exhibits 1.B and 1.H.*
3. The subject property is 0.25 acres in area and is located near the north shore of Clear Lake within the Clear Lake residential community. The relatively rectangular parcel is bounded by Clear Lake Boulevard to the north, a vacant parcel to the west, and community-owned land to the south (between the subject property and Clear Lake) and east. Although the lot immediately adjacent to the subject property is undeveloped, aerial photographs indicate that many lots within the neighborhood have been developed with single-family residences. With respect to parcel size, the subject property is generally comparable to other lots within the community. *Exhibits 1, 1.D, and 1.F.*
4. The subject property is within the rural portion of the County and is zoned Residential LAMIRD Two Dwelling Units per Acre (RL 2/1). One of the purposes of the RL 2/1 zone is to provide for infill residential development at a maximum density of two dwelling units per acre, consistent with the development pattern established before July 1, 1990. *Thurston County Code (TCC) 20.13A.010.2.* Primary permitted uses in the RL 2/1 zone include single-family and two-family residences, agriculture, and home occupations. *Exhibit 1; TCC 20.13A.020.*
5. Based on evaluation by a qualified wetland biologist, there is a Category III lake fringe wetland associated with Clear Lake to the south and southwest of the subject property. The Category III wetland has a habitat score of 6, requiring a standard buffer width of 200 feet. *Exhibit 1.F; TCC Table 24.30-1.* The 200-foot buffer encumbers virtually the entire parcel. By visual estimate in comparison to the proposed driveway, only a small irregularly shaped portion of the property less than 200 square feet immediately adjacent to the road is outside the standard buffer. *Exhibits 1.D and 1.F.* Although TCC 24.30.050 allows wetland buffers to be reduced by 25% with mitigation without requiring an RUE, in this case a 25% buffer reduction to 150 feet would not result in sufficient area in the northern portion of the property to develop a residence meeting the standards of the homeowners association (which require a minimum ground floor area of 600 square feet) while providing for the 15-foot critical area building setback required by TCC 24.01.035.G and complying with zoning building setback standards. In addition, the

¹ The legal description of the property is Lot 158 of Clearwood Division 3. *Exhibit 1.*

northeast corner of the subject property (to a width of 25 feet and a depth of 20 feet from the northeast property corner) is encumbered by a walking trail easement. *Exhibits 1.D and 2.*

6. The Applicant proposes to place the residence as far north as possible while maintaining a minimum setback of 20 feet from Clear Lake Boulevard as required by TCC 20.07.030 and avoiding the walking trail easement. A covered walking path and paved parking pad would be placed along the west side of the residence, and the septic drainfields would be placed to the west of the parking pad, a few feet from the western property line. While the RUE criteria suggest that a zoning variance should be considered as a means of reducing critical area impacts (see TCC 24.45.030.B), in this case it does not appear that a zoning variance would allow the residence to be placed closer to Clear Lake Boulevard because the walking trail easement encumbers the northeast corner of the property to a depth of 20 feet. It does not appear that the residence and parking area could be shifted west while allowing sufficient area for the septic system. *Exhibit 1.D.*

7. The total area of development would be 2,936.5 square feet, based on the following project elements:

Residence:	936 square feet
Patio:	395 square feet
Gravel Driveway:	708 square feet
Parking Pad:	230 square feet
Covered Walkway:	130 square feet
Septic Drainfield:	237.5 square feet
Reserve Drainfields:	300 square feet

Exhibits 2 and 1.D. The maximum impervious surface coverage in the RL 2/1 zone is 60% of the lot area or 20,000 square feet, whichever is less. *TCC 20.13A.030.6.*

Proposed impervious surface coverage would be 2,399 square feet, or 22% of the lot area, consistent with the impervious surface limitation of the RL 2/1 zone. *Exhibit 1.G.*

8. The proposed site design would allow for an undisturbed buffer from the wetland edge of 120 feet at the narrowest point; the remaining buffer would be wider than 120 feet because the residence would be built at an angle to the wetland boundary. The proposed septic drainfields would be at least 150 feet from the wetland edge. *Exhibit 1.D.*
9. The total buffer impact of the project (including construction setback/yard areas) would be 5,223 square feet. The impact area roughly coincides with the northern half of the property. As mitigation for this impact, the Applicant proposes to enhance 5,227 square feet of buffer in the southern half of the property by removing invasive species and planting 55 native trees and 100 native shrubs. The 1:1 ratio of mitigation to buffer impact is consistent with Thurston County requirements. A split rail fence and critical area signage would be installed along the reduced buffer edge to reduce the chances of

future encroachment. The Applicant's wetland consultant submitted that with this mitigation, along with proposed stormwater improvements (including use of a spreader trench to disperse stormwater at the buffer edge, to avoid the formation of defined channels), use of best management practices to control erosion during construction, and use of directional lighting, there would be no net loss of wetland functions and values as a result of the project. *Exhibits 1.D and 1.F.*

10. No evidence was submitted that the project would adversely impact any species of concern. The subject property does not contain documented habitat for federal or state listed endangered, threatened, or sensitive species. *Exhibit 1.F.*
11. The proposed residence would be served by the Clearwood Group A public water system and a proposed on-site septic system. The Applicant has not yet obtained approval of a septic design or submitted a soil study, and Thurston County Environmental Health staff cautioned that, due to mapped soil types, the septic system might require a larger area than depicted on the submitted site plan. Environmental Health recommended that the RUE include a condition specifying that future development must meet the requirements of Article IV of the Thurston County Sanitary Code without the benefit of a waiver, and that approval of the RUE does not represent suitability of site development as proposed. *Exhibit 1.O; Dawn Peebles Testimony.*
12. Thurston County Public Works Staff submitted that the proposed spreader trench, which would be installed just north of the reduced buffer edge, is allowed under the County's Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual and is appropriate based on the site design. *Arthur Saint Testimony; see also Exhibit 1.D.*
13. The proposed development is categorically exempt from review under the State Environmental Policy Act. *Exhibit 1; WAC 197-11-800; TCC 17.09.055(B).*
14. The Nisqually Indian Tribe and the Squaxin Island Tribe requested to be notified if there are any inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources or human burials. County Planning Staff incorporated the request into the recommended conditions of RUE approval. *Exhibits 1 and 1.H.*
15. Notice of the open record hearing was mailed to property owners within 500 feet of the site on June 26, 2023 and published in *The Olympian* on June 30, 2023. *Exhibits 1 and 1.A.*
16. In public comment on the application, concern was raised by a nearby property owner that the project would impact the community trail and the lake. *Susan Ferber Testimony; Exhibit 1.J.* In speaking to these concerns, Applicant representatives confirmed that no part of the proposal would extend beyond the boundaries of the subject parcel, and the portion of the trail that is within an easement on the subject property would be delineated from the proposed residential development by the placement of landscaping including shrubs, as depicted on the site plan. *Testimony of Bryan Peck and Brianna Lee; Exhibit 1.D.*

17. Having heard all testimony, Planning Staff maintained their recommendation that if RUE approval is granted, the conditions recommended in the staff report should be imposed. *Exhibit 1; Sharon Lumbantobing Testimony.* The Applicant waived objection to the recommended conditions. *Testimony of Bryan Peck and Brianna Lee.*

CONCLUSIONS

Jurisdiction

The Hearing Examiner is granted jurisdiction to hear and decide applications for Reasonable Use Exceptions pursuant to TCC 2.06.010(F) and TCC 24.45.030.

Criteria for Review

Pursuant to TCC 24.45.030, the Hearing Examiner shall grant the reasonable use exception if:

- A. No other reasonable use of the property as a whole is permitted by this title; and
- B. No reasonable use with less impact on the critical area or buffer is possible. At a minimum, the alternatives reviewed shall include a change in use, reduction in the size of the use, a change in the timing of the activity, a revision in the project design. This may include a variance for yard and setback standards required pursuant to Titles 20, 21, 22, and 23 TCC; and
- C. The requested use or activity will not result in any damage to other property and will not threaten the public health, safety or welfare on or off the development proposal site, or increase public safety risks on or off the subject property; and
- D. The proposed reasonable use is limited to the minimum encroachment into the critical area and/or buffer necessary to prevent the denial of all reasonable use of the property; and
- E. The proposed reasonable use shall result in minimal alteration of the critical area including but not limited to impacts on vegetation, fish and wildlife resources, hydrological conditions, and geologic conditions; and
- F. A proposal for a reasonable use exception shall ensure no net loss of critical area functions and values. The proposal shall include a mitigation plan consistent with this title and best available science. Mitigation measures shall address unavoidable impacts and shall occur on-site first, or if necessary, off-site; and
- G. The reasonable use shall not result in the unmitigated adverse impacts to species of concern; and
- H. The location and scale of existing development on surrounding properties shall not be the sole basis for granting or determining a reasonable use exception.

Conclusions Based on Findings

1. No other reasonable use of the property as a whole is permitted by the County's critical areas ordinance. Considering the zoning and size of the subject property and the character of surrounding development, single-family residential use is the only reasonable use of the property. The proposed appurtenances to the residential use are

typical and are reasonable in scale; the size of the residence itself is very modest.
Findings 3, 4, and 7.

2. As conditioned, no reasonable use with less impact on the critical area is possible. Virtually the entire parcel is encumbered by wetland buffer. The proposed building footprint is modest in scale and would be placed as far north on the property as possible considering setback requirements and the walking trail easement. The site plan provides for the widest buffer (150 feet) where it is needed most, adjacent to the septic drainfields. The conditions of approval require erosion and stormwater control best management practices to be implemented on the site during construction and disturbed areas to be revegetated after construction is complete. The conditions also require critical area fencing and signage to be installed along the reduced buffer boundary prior to building permit issuance. *Findings 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.*
3. As conditioned, the proposal would not threaten the public health, safety, or welfare on or off the development site, or increase public safety risks on or off the subject property. The conditions of approval incorporate the condition recommended by Environmental Health Staff, which requires the septic system to meet County requirements without a waiver. The conditions also require the Applicant to implement an inadvertent discovery plan during development to prevent potential impacts to cultural resources. The proposed storm drainage improvements would be protective of the wetland buffer. No development would occur within the walking trail easement. *Findings 9, 11, 12, 14, and 16.*
4. As described in Conclusion 2, the proposal is the minimum encroachment necessary to prevent denial of all reasonable use of the property. Due to the extent of wetland buffer on site, it would not be possible to construct a residence without some kind of encroachment. The proposed encroachment is the minimum necessary due to the modest scale of the residence and its placement in the northern portion of the parcel. *Findings 7, 8, and 9.*
5. As conditioned, the proposal would result in minimal alteration of the critical area. The wetland is wholly offsite, and no direct impacts to the wetland are proposed. The proposed mitigation plan includes 5,227 square feet of native plantings within the reduced buffer, satisfying the 1:1 ratio required. The conditions of approval require use of erosion control measures during construction and require construction debris to be removed to an approved site outside of critical areas and buffers. *Findings 5, 6, and 9.*
6. As conditioned to require installation of the proposed enhancement plantings (with bonding required if not completed prior to building permit issuance), the proposal ensures no net loss of critical area functions and values. *Finding 9.*
7. The use would not result in unmitigated adverse impacts to known species of concern. *Finding 10.*

8. This decision is not based on the location and scale of existing development. As described in Conclusions 2 and 4, the decision to approve the RUE is based on the Applicant's inability to make reasonable use of the parcel without intrusion into minimum required standard wetland buffer. *Finding 5.*

DECISION

Based on the preceding findings and conclusions, the request for a reasonable use exception to construct a 936 square foot single-family residence and appurtenances within a Category III wetland buffer, no closer than 120 feet from the wetland edge at the closest point, consistent with the site plan in the record at Exhibit 1.D is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to building permit issuance, either proposed mitigation plantings per the mitigation plan (submitted by Habitat Technologies, November 23, 2021, and revised January 23, 2023 and in the record at Exhibit 1.F) shall be installed or a bond or irrevocable assignment of savings in the amount of 125% of the cost of mitigation plantings shall be submitted and shall be retained by Thurston County until the plantings are installed (TCC 24.70).
2. Prior to building permit issuance, the Applicant shall record with the Thurston County Auditor a critical area and buffer notice and a site plan showing the critical areas and associated buffers, indicating that the property is within a critical area and setting out the mitigating conditions imposed upon the subject property.
3. Prior to building permit issuance, permanent critical area signs shall be installed along the boundary of the critical area buffer per TCC 24.60. The Applicant shall contact Community Planning and Economic Development Staff for a site inspection upon completion of the wetland buffer fencing and signage or submit photos to the assigned planner.
4. All future development must meet all requirements of Article IV of the Thurston County Sanitary Code without the benefit of a waiver. Approval of the reasonable use exception in no way represents suitability of site development as proposed.
5. Erosion and stormwater control best management practices (BMPs) meeting Thurston County standards; TCC Chapter 15.05 shall be implemented during all phases of the project. Proper erosion and sediment control practices shall be used on the construction site and adjacent areas to prevent upland sediments from entering waters of the state. All areas disturbed or newly created by construction activities shall be seeded, vegetated, or given some other equivalent type of protection against erosion.
6. A construction stormwater permit from Washington State Department of Ecology may be required. Information about the permit and the application can be found at: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/construction/permit.html>. It is the Applicant's responsibility to obtain this permit if required.

7. All development on the site shall be in substantial compliance with the approved reasonable use exception, as conditioned. Any alteration to the proposal will require approval of a new or amended reasonable use exception. The Community Planning and Economic Development Department will determine if any proposed amendment is substantial enough to require Hearing Examiner approval.
8. The Applicant shall remove all construction related debris to an approved site (landfill or recycling center) outside of critical areas and their buffers.
9. If archaeological artifacts are observed during any phase of the project, all work shall be immediately halted. The State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, the Thurston County Community Planning & Economic Development Department and affected Tribes shall be contacted to assess the situation prior to resumption of work. An Inadvertent Discovery Plan shall be implemented for the project.
10. All applicable regulations and requirements of the Thurston County Public Health and Social Services Department, Public Works Department, Fire Marshal, and Thurston County Community Planning and Economic Development Department shall be met.
11. The proposed project is subject to compliance with the following policies and regulations, including any applicable mitigation requirements: Thurston County Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance (TCC Title 20), Critical Areas Ordinance (TCC Title 24), Stormwater Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual (TCC Chapter 15.05), Uniform Building Code (TCC Title 14), State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Ordinance (TCC Chapter 17.09).
12. Best management practices (BMPs) such as completing work during the dry season and maintaining proper working order of equipment, as well as temporary erosion and sediment control (TESC) methods including silt fencing and/or coir logs shall be implemented. All disturbed areas will be promptly reseeded following installation, and TESC measures will remain in place until site conditions are restored.
13. At time of building permit, the application will be reviewed for connection to the existing well and septic system. All requirements must be met including verification of any waterline and sewer line crossing and installing a septic tank to serve the new residence if proper fall to the existing septic tank cannot be achieved.

DECIDED July 24, 2024.



Sharon A. Rice
Thurston County Hearing Examiner

NOTE: Pursuant to TCC 22.62.020(C)10, affected property owners may request a change in valuation for property tax purposes.

THURSTON COUNTY
PROCEDURE FOR RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL
OF HEARING EXAMINER DECISION TO THE BOARD

NOTE: THERE MAY BE NO EX PARTE (ONE-SIDED) CONTACT OUTSIDE A PUBLIC HEARING WITH EITHER THE HEARING EXAMINER OR WITH THE BOARD OF THURSTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ON APPEALS (Thurston County Code, Section 2.06.030).

If you do not agree with the decision of the Hearing Examiner, there are two (2) ways to seek review of the decision. They are described in A and B below. Unless reconsidered or appealed, decisions of the Hearing Examiner become final on the 15th day after the date of the decision.* The Hearing Examiner renders decisions within five (5) working days following a Request for Reconsideration unless a longer period is mutually agreed to by the Hearing Examiner, applicant, and requester.

The decision of the Hearing Examiner on an appeal of a SEPA threshold determination for a project action is final. The Hearing Examiner shall not entertain motions for reconsideration for such decisions. The decision of the Hearing Examiner regarding a SEPA threshold determination may only be appealed to Superior Court in conjunction with an appeal of the underlying action in accordance with RCW 43.21C.075 and TCC 17.09.160. TCC 17.09.160(K).

A. RECONSIDERATION BY THE HEARING EXAMINER (Not permitted for a decision on a SEPA threshold determination)

1. Any aggrieved person or agency that disagrees with the decision of the Examiner may request Reconsideration. All Reconsideration requests must include a legal citation and reason for the request. The Examiner shall have the discretion to either deny the motion without comment or to provide additional Findings and Conclusions based on the record.
2. Written Request for Reconsideration and the appropriate fee must be filed with the Resource Stewardship Department **within ten (10) days of the written decision**. The form is provided for this purpose on the opposite side of this notification.

B. APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF THURSTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS (Not permitted for a decision on a SEPA threshold determination for a project action)

1. Appeals may be filed by any aggrieved person or agency directly affected by the Examiner's decision. The form is provided for this purpose on the opposite side of this notification.
2. Written notice of Appeal and the appropriate fee must be filed with the Community Planning & Economic Development Department **within fourteen (14) days of the date of the Examiner's written decision**. The form is provided for this purpose on the opposite side of this notification.
3. An Appeal filed within the specified time period will stay the effective date of the Examiner's decision until it is adjudicated by the Board of Thurston County Commissioners or is withdrawn.
4. The notice of Appeal shall concisely specify the error or issue which the Board is asked to consider on Appeal, and shall cite by reference to section, paragraph and page, the provisions of law which are alleged to have been violated. The Board need not consider issues, which are not so identified. A written memorandum that the appellant may wish considered by the Board may accompany the notice. The memorandum shall not include the presentation of new evidence and shall be based only upon facts presented to the Examiner.
5. Notices of the Appeal hearing will be mailed to all parties of record who legibly provided a mailing address. This would include all persons who (a) gave oral or written comments to the Examiner or (b) listed their name as a person wishing to receive a copy of the decision on a sign-up sheet made available during the Examiner's hearing.
6. Unless all parties of record are given notice of a trip by the Board of Thurston County Commissioners to view the subject site, no one other than County staff may accompany the Board members during the site visit.

C. STANDING All Reconsideration and Appeal requests must clearly state why the appellant is an "aggrieved" party and demonstrate that standing in the Reconsideration or Appeal should be granted.

D. FILING FEES AND DEADLINE If you wish to file a Request for Reconsideration or Appeal of this determination, please do so in writing on the back of this form, accompanied by a nonrefundable fee of **\$821.00** for a Request for Reconsideration or **\$1,112.00** an Appeal. Any Request for Reconsideration or Appeal must be **received** in the Building Development Center at 3000 Pacific Ave SE, Suite 100 no later than 4:00 p.m. per the requirements specified in A2 and B2 above. **Postmarks are not acceptable**. If your application fee and completed application form is not timely filed, you will be unable to request Reconsideration or Appeal this determination. The deadline will not be extended.

* Shoreline Permit decisions are not final until a 21-day appeal period to the state has elapsed following the date the County decision becomes final.



Project No. _____
Appeal Sequence No.: _____

☐ Check here for: **RECONSIDERATION OF HEARING EXAMINER DECISION**

THE APPELLANT, after review of the terms and conditions of the Hearing Examiner's decision hereby requests that the Hearing Examiner take the following information into consideration and further review under the provisions of Chapter 2.06.060 of the Thurston County Code:

(If more space is required, please attach additional sheet.)

☐ Check here for: **APPEAL OF HEARING EXAMINER DECISION**

TO THE BOARD OF THURSTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS COMES NOW _____
on this _____ day of _____, 20____, as an APPELLANT in the matter of a Hearing Examiner's decision
rendered on _____, 20____, by _____ relating to _____

THE APPELLANT, after review and consideration of the reasons given by the Hearing Examiner for his decision, does now, under the provisions of Chapter 2.06.070 of the Thurston County Code, give written notice of APPEAL to the Board of Thurston County Commissioners of said decision and alleges the following errors in said Hearing Examiner decision:

Specific section, paragraph and page of regulation allegedly interpreted erroneously by Hearing Examiner:

1. Zoning Ordinance _____
2. Platting and Subdivision Ordinance _____
3. Comprehensive Plan _____
4. Critical Areas Ordinance _____
5. Shoreline Master Program _____
6. Other: _____

(If more space is required, please attach additional sheet.)

AND FURTHERMORE, requests that the Board of Thurston County Commissioners, having responsibility for final review of such decisions will upon review of the record of the matters and the allegations contained in this appeal, find in favor of the appellant and reverse the Hearing Examiner decision.

STANDING

On a separate sheet, explain why the appellant should be considered an aggrieved party and why standing should be granted to the appellant. This is required for both Reconsiderations and Appeals.

Signature required for both Reconsideration and Appeal Requests

APPELLANT NAME PRINTED

SIGNATURE OF APPELLANT

Address _____

Phone _____

Please do not write below - for Staff Use Only:

Fee of ☐ \$821.00 for Reconsideration or \$1,112.00 for Appeal. Received (check box): Initial _____ Receipt No. _____
Filed with the Community Planning & Economic Development Department this _____ day of _____, 20____.