



COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Carolina Mejia, District One
Gary Edwards, District Two
Tye Menser, District Three
Wayne Fournier, District Four
Emily Clouse, District Five

HEARING EXAMINER

Creating Solutions for Our Future

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER FOR THURSTON COUNTY

In the Matter of the Application of)	NO. 2023100892
)	
City of Olympia)	City of Olympia Park
)	
)	
)	FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
For Approval of a Special Use Permit)	AND DECISION
)	

SUMMARY OF DECISION

The request for a special use permit to develop a community park at 3327 Yelm Highway SE is **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

SUMMARY OF RECORD

Request:

The City of Olympia requested a special use permit to develop a community park at 3327 Yelm Highway SE, Olympia, Washington. By the time of hearing, the proposed scope of work was significantly less than described in the permit application and public notices; the application had included a school site for a future Olympia School District high school, which is no longer proposed. The park, which would be developed in phases, would include five full-sized synthetic turf rectangular fields with lighting, 12 pickleball courts, two basketball courts, playground areas, a sprayground, a skate park, a bike park, a dog park, walking trails, parking lots, restrooms, picnic shelters, a community garden, and a maintenance facility at full build-out.

Hearing Date:

The Thurston County Hearing Examiner conducted a virtual open record public hearing on the request on March 12, 2024. The record was held open through March 14, 2024 to allow any members of the public having difficulty joining the virtual hearing to submit written comments, with time scheduled for responses from the parties. No post-hearing public comment was submitted, and the record closed on March 14, 2024.

Testimony:

At the hearing the following individuals presented testimony under oath:

Scott McCormick, Associate Planner, Thurston County Community Planning and Economic Development Department

Arthur Saint, Civil Engineer, Thurston County Public Works Department

Dawn Peebles, Program Manager, Thurston County Environmental Health Division

Laura Keehan, Parks Planning and Design Manager, City of Olympia

Anna O'Connell, Landscape Architect

Aaron Van Aken, Civil Engineer, Health & Associates

David Slotwinski

Sharon Benshoff

Valerie Gerst

Exhibits:

The following exhibits were admitted in the record through the open record hearing process:

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

- A. Notice of Public Hearing
- B. Zoning map
- C. Master Application, submitted March 3, 2023
- D. Special Use Permit Application, submitted May 22, 2023 – revised from original Master Planned Development application
- E. Division of Land Application (original Master Planned Development application) (application withdrawn)
- F. Email from Applicant Laura Keehan, City of Olympia dated February 27, 2024 clarifying project
- G. Original project narrative as is currently being reviewed, dated February 17, 2023
- H. Email from Applicant Laura Keehan, City of Olympia (meeting agenda), dated May 3, 2023
- I. Original site plan for park and school, received March 6, 2023
- J. Revised draft site plan for future site design without the school (future site plan), dated February 2, 2024
- K. Revised Notice of Application explaining that the project changed from a Master Planned Development to a Special Use Permit, dated May 26, 2023

- L. Original Notice of Application for Master Planned Development, dated March 15, 2023
- M. Original project description, dated February 17, 2023
- N. Certificate of Water Availability (COWA), received March 3, 2023
- O. SEPA Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance, issued December 22, 2023
- P. SEPA Checklist, received March 3, 2023
- Q. Adjacent property owners list, dated March 10, 2023 used for all notices and SEPA
- R. Yelm Highway Community Park & Future School, Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) by Heath & Associates, dated February 21, 2023 and received March 3, 2023
- S. Yelm Highway Community Park & Future School, Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Appendix, Intersection Count Sheets by Heath & Associates, received March 3, 2023
- T. Yelm Community Park Prairie Inspection Report by Shannon & Wilson, dated July 21, 2023
- U. Yelm Highway Community Park and Future School Critical Areas Report by Shannon & Wilson, dated September 14, 2023
- V. Wetland data sheets by Shannon & Wilson, dated November 6, 2022
- W. Yelm Hwy Community Park and Future School Mazama Pocket Gopher Study by Shannon & Wilson, received March 3, 2023
- X. Integrated Pest Management Plan by the City of Olympia, received March 3, 2023
- Y. Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Evaluation by Shannon & Wilson, received March 3, 2023
- Z. Email from Dawn Peebles, Thurston County Environment Health to Scott McCormick, Thurston County Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED), dated August 11, 2023 indicating no change to their approval
- A1. Approval memo from Dawn Peebles, Thurston County Environment Health, dated December 13, 2023
- B1. Approval memo from Arthur Saint, P.E., Thurston County Public Works, dated February 22, 2024
- C1. SEPA recommendation from Arthur Saint, P.E., Thurston County Public Works, dated December 14, 2023
- D1. Revised Letter from City of Olympia re: project comments and conditions from the City of Olympia, dated December 20, 2023

- E1. Letter from City of Olympia, City of Olympia comments and conditions, updated June 5, 2023
- F1. Comments from the Washington Department of Ecology, dated June 15, 2023
- G1. Comments from the Washington Department of Ecology, dated April 4, 2023
- H1. Comment email from ORCAA regarding need for asbestos survey for structures to be demolished, dated March 21, 2023
- I1. Comment email from the Squaxin Island Tribe, dated March 22, 2023 indicating no concerns
- J1. Email from Scott McCormick, Associate Planner to CPED Director, Joshua Cummings and Planning Manager Brett Bures, dated May 3, 2023
- K1. Email from Lauren Whybrew, ORCAA stating that an asbestos survey is needed prior to demolish structures, dated May 31, 2023
- L1. Email from Orion Albro to Scott McCormick, CPED, dated January 4, 2024
- M1. Email from Madeline Bishop to Scott McCormick, CPED, dated January 3, 2024
- N1. Email from Esther Grace Kronenberg to Scott McCormick, CPED, dated January 3, 2024
- O1. Letter from Hamptons Homeowner Association and Joan Cullen to Scott McCormick, CPED, dated January 5, 2024
- P1. Email from Leslie Hammaker to swandajj@aol.com with multiple cc's including to Scott McCormick, CPED, dated January 3, 2024
- Q1. Email from Harry Branch to Scott McCormick, CPED, dated January 3, 2024
- R1. Letter from the Olympia School District to Cheri Peterson, dated July 5, 2023 with Mrs. Peterson's comments March 31, 2023
- S1. Email from Laura Keehan, City of Olympia Park and Arts Department responding to comments from Jason Selwitz with Mr. Selwitz's attached comments
- T1. Email from Laura Keehan, City of Olympia Park and Arts Department responding to comments from Joan Cullen, dated June 29, 2023
- U1. Email from Laura Keehan, City of Olympia Park and Arts Department responding to comments from Guy Grayson, dated June 29, 2023
- V1. Comment letter from the Hamptons Homeowners Association to Scott McCormick, CPED, dated June 14, 2023 regarding a revised Notice of Application dated May 26, 2023
- W1. Email from Paul Maclurg to Scott McCormick, CPED, dated May 31, 2023
- X1. Letter from Hamptons Homeowners Association to Scott McCormick, CPED dated April 4, 2023

- Y1. Letter from JW Peterson to Scott McCormick, CPED, dated March 31, 2023
- Z1. Letter from Cheri Peterson to Scott McCormick, CPED, dated March 31, 2023
- A2. Email from Paul Maclurg to Scott McCormick, CPED, dated May 31, 2023
- B2. Letter from Guy Grayson to Scott McCormick, CPED dated March 21, 2023
- C2. Email from Joshua Cummings, CPED Director to Scott McCormick and Brett Bures, CPED, dated April 4, 2023 with document from Guy Grayson & Nancy Watkins
- D2. Document from Indian Summer Homeowners Association (undated)
- E2. Letter from Mike & Jan Zenk to Scott McCormick, CPED (undated)

Exhibit 2 Letter from R. Marcus and D. Slotwinski, dated March 1, 2024

Exhibit 3 Email from Scott McCormick re: Emergency Response, dated March 12, 2024¹

Exhibit 4 Memorandum from Scott McCormick seeking to supplement the record with phasing information, dated March 20, 2024²

Based on the record developed through the open record hearing process, the following findings and conclusions are entered in support of the decision of the Hearing Examiner:

FINDINGS

1. The City of Olympia (Applicant) requested a special use permit to develop a community park at 3327 Yelm Highway SE, Olympia, Washington. At the time of application and of notice of application, the proposal included both a public park and an Olympia School District high school within the subject property. However, after application, the School District recalculated its projected student population and subsequently withdrew from the proposal. At the time of the hearing, only the City park was proposed, and its improvements had been reconfigured to occupy the entire subject property. No portion of the site is retained for future development of any school amenities. Removal of the school from the proposal would result in less impervious surface area, less traffic, less parking less noise, and less intense use generally than was contemplated in the original application and notices of application and hearing. At full build out, the park would include five full-sized synthetic turf rectangular fields with lighting, 12 pickleball courts, two basketball courts, playground areas, a sprayground, a skate park, a bike park, a dog park, walking trails, parking lots, restrooms, picnic shelters, a community garden, and a maintenance facility. *Exhibits 1, 1.C, 1.D, 1.F, and 1.J (revised site plan); Testimony of*

¹ At hearing, Mr. McCormick offered to supplement the record after close of the record with information identifying emergency response agencies that would serve the park if approved; this offer was accepted and the timely submitted memo on the subject is admitted.

² On March 20, 2024, Mr. McCormick asked that the record be reopened to receive additional information about intended phasing of the proposed improvements and an additional recommended condition of approval; the memo was admitted in the record.

Scott McCormick and Laura Keehan. The improvements are expected to be built in phases over approximately 20 years. *Exhibit 4.*

2. The subject property consists of four parcels totaling 86.25 acres.³ Yelm Highway borders the northern property boundary, Hamptons Street SE borders the northern portion of the western property boundary, and Wiggins Road borders the northern portion of the eastern property boundary. Surrounding development is residential and includes the Hamptons neighborhood to the west and the Indian Summer neighborhood to the east. *Exhibits 1, 1.G, and 1.J; see also Exhibit 1.XI.*
3. The subject property has historically been in agricultural use and approximately 40% of the site consists of u-pick strawberry fields operated by Spooner's Berry Farms. There is a berry stand and a gravel parking area along Yelm Highway. The southern portion of the property is wooded. The former property owner resides on site in a seven-acre lease area in the western portion of the property and holds a lifetime lease. Structures outside of the lease area would be removed. *Exhibits 1.I, 1.J, 1.G, and 1.P.*
4. The subject property is within the Olympia urban growth area and contains three zoning designations. Most of the property is zoned Mixed Residential Seven to Thirteen Units per Acre (MR 7-13), with small areas zoned Residential Six to Twelve Units per Acre (R 6-12) and Residential Multifamily Eighteen Units per Acre (RM-18). Parks are allowed in all three zones with approval of a SUP. *Exhibits 1 and 1.B.*
5. With elimination of the school in the north end of the property from the project scope, the proposed park uses would be spread throughout the property and not confined to the southern portion. The number of park features would also be increased slightly as compared to the original proposal. The key differences would include: one additional rectangular play field at full build-out (from the originally proposed four, including the track and field shared with the high school, to the currently proposed five), four additional pickleball courts, and an increase in area for the dog park. *Exhibits 1.I and 1.J; Laura Keehan Testimony.*
6. The first phase of park development would include one rectangular field, the pickleball and basketball courts, a playground, a futsal facility for informal soccer, the park maintenance facility, pathways, a restroom, up to two picnic shelters, and the off-leash dog park. The projected completion date of these facilities would be late 2026. Future phases would be smaller and dependent on funding. *Laura Keehan Testimony.*
7. The proposed park maintenance building would be 5,850 square feet in area and one story in height. Its location would be set back more than 150 feet from the nearest exterior property line. *Exhibits 1.I and 1.J.*

³ The staff report states the subject property's legal description as follows: "Portions of Section 31 – T. 18 -1W and Section 6, T. 17, R 1W; W.M."; also known as Tax Parcel Numbers 09330005000, 09330005001, 09330006000, and 09330008002. *Exhibits 1 and 1.C.*

8. The subject property is generally flat. It contains a Type F (fish-bearing) stream known as Chambers Ditch and a Category I wetland with a habitat score of 7 (HHL). The Category I wetland (identified as Wetland A) covers the southwest corner of the property and extends offsite. Chambers Ditch runs along a portion of the western property boundary through Wetland A, terminating at Chambers Creek. The Thurston County critical areas ordinance (CAO) requires a 200-foot buffer for Chambers Ditch and a 260-foot buffer for Wetland A. Pursuant to TCC 24.30.050, the wetland buffer may be reduced by 25%, or to 195 feet, with mitigation subject to administrative approval. *Exhibits 1.U and 1.P.*
9. With removal of the school from the project scope, the only intrusion into the wetland and buffer would be a proposed trail system, which would include a raised boardwalk on pin pile footings within the wetland itself.⁴ Trees originally marked for removal within this area would be retained. The sports courts, dog park, skate park, bike park, parking areas, drive aisles, restroom facilities, and all other structures and infrastructure would be at least 260 feet from the wetland. *Exhibit 1.J; Laura Keehan Testimony.* Pursuant to TCC 24.30.260, trails and trail-related passive recreation facilities may be allowed within wetland buffers subject to administrative approval and provided the specified criteria are satisfied. The ordinance specifies that raised boardwalks must be used in “wet areas.” *TCC 24.30.260.A.*
10. No administrative review of the proposed trail in the wetland and/or buffer had been completed at the time of hearing. Planning Staff indicated that they did not evaluate the proposed wetland and buffer intrusion based on an assumption that revised design (to eliminate school) would have little or no impacts. Staff submitted that “any possible future impacts to wetlands or other critical areas will be reviewed through future phases of review.” *Exhibit 1, page 4.* The determination as to whether a critical area review permit is required would occur at the time of earthwork or construction permits. *Scott McCormick Testimony.*
11. The submitted critical areas report addresses impacts associated with the portion of the trail within the buffer but does not address the wetland boardwalk, which is proposed to be added in a late phase of development for which funding has not been secured. The boardwalk alignment shown on the submitted plans is only conceptual. The actual alignment would be field located to avoid trees. *Exhibits 1.U and 1.P; Laura Keehan Testimony.* One member of the public requested that an observation deck be provided instead of a boardwalk through the wetland, to reduce impacts to wildlife. *Valerie Gerst Testimony.*
12. With respect to potential wetland impacts associated with pet waste, the fenced dog park would be wholly outside of the 260-foot wetland buffer. The wetland buffer width was established in code for the purpose of protecting water quality within the wetland. The

⁴ This trail system is to be distinguished from the 20-foot-wide looped access path around the sports fields, which – with the elimination of the proposed school – would be outside of all buffers. *Exhibit 1.J; Laura Keehan Testimony.*

City would provide dog waste bags, and waste receptacles would be emptied daily by onsite park staff. *Laura Keehan Testimony; Exhibit 1.J.*

13. The subject property contains soil types associated with prairie habitat, which constitute a regulated critical area in the County's CAO. Based on field analysis by a biologist, the subject property does not meet prairie criteria, as it does not contain sufficient prairie vegetation. The subject property does not contain Mima mounds. *Exhibit 1.T.*
14. The site contains soil types that are preferred by Mazama pocket gophers, and Mazama pocket gopher mounds were identified on site by a qualified biologist using US Fish and Wildlife Service screening protocols. These mounds are mostly found within the central and eastern portions of the property outside of wetland, forest, and active agriculture areas. The Mazama pocket gopher is a state and federally listed threatened species, and it is also protected under the Thurston County CAO. The US Fish and Wildlife Service has issued an "incidental take" permit to Thurston County, allowing certain categories of development to occur pursuant to an approved Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). TCC 17.40 provides the regulatory framework for implementation of the HCP, which includes an application process and payment of mitigation fees, which are then used to purchase property in other locations for replacement habitat. Planning Staff recommended as a condition of SUP approval that the mitigation fees be paid prior to site development or soil disturbance. *Exhibits 1 and 1.W; TCC 17.40; Scott McCormick Testimony.*
15. At time of hearing, 400 parking stalls were proposed to serve the park use, which is a reduction from the 839 stalls originally proposed to serve the combined high school and park. *Exhibit 1.I (see sheet L-001); Anna O'Connell Testimony.* The parking requirements for the Olympia UGA do not specify a minimum number of parking stalls for parks. *TCC 23.38.100.*
16. The largest of the proposed parking areas and a cluster of rectangular play fields would be near the eastern property boundary. To minimize impacts to residents of the adjacent Indian Summer residential neighborhood, which has back yards abutting the eastern site boundary, the Applicant proposes to provide a six-foot tall, 80-foot wide landscaped berm along that segment of the eastern property line (a distance of nearly 1,000 feet). *Exhibits 1.J and 1.I; Laura Keehan Testimony.* Existing trees would be retained within the wetland and buffer areas at the south end of the site, providing natural screening between the use and residences to the south, southwest, and southeast. Landscaping (including trees) would be provided elsewhere along the site perimeter and within the site, including along the street frontages, within the parking areas, between the basketball courts and Hamptons Street, between the pickleball courts and Yelm Highway, and within an approximate 50-foot buffer between the community garden and adjacent parking area and residences to the north. *Exhibit 1.J.* County Planning Staff reviewed the proposed landscaping and submitted that it exceeds the requirements set forth in TCC Chapter 23.36. For example, the buffer required by TCC 23.36.190 to separate incompatible uses is only 30 feet wide, whereas much wider buffers are proposed. *Exhibits 1 and 1.J.*

17. One of the concerns raised in public comment on the application was that noise associated with the dog park would impact neighbors. *Exhibit 2; David Slotwinski Testimony*. The dog park fence would be approximately 240 feet from the south property line and approximately 160 feet from the east property line, and the setback areas are forested.⁵ The City operates another dog park with setbacks from residential properties that are half those currently proposed, and there have not been noise complaints. *Laura Keehan Testimony; Exhibit 1.J*.
18. The park hours of operation would generally be from dawn to dusk, except for scheduled game play on the lit rectangular fields, which might continue past dark to as late as 11:00 pm. The proposed LED field lighting would be directed downward to avoid spillover onto adjacent properties. *Exhibit 1.D; Laura Keehan Testimony*.
19. The agencies responsible for emergency response to the site would be East Olympia Fire District and the Thurston County Sheriff. The City employs full-time park rangers who, although not stationed at the site, would be available seven days a week by phone and email to address concerns at the site. The maintenance facility on site would provide opportunities for parks department staff to observe site conditions. Maintenance staffing would range from 3 to 15 workers, depending on the season. *Laura Keehan Testimony; Exhibits 1.D and 3*.
20. Access to the park would be from Wiggins Road SE and from Hamptons Street SE. An east-west driveway through the center of the site would connect these access points and provide access to the parking lots. There would be no driveway into the park from Yelm Highway at Lakeview Drive SE as was proposed for the school. *Exhibit 1.J; see also Exhibit 1.I*.
21. The Wiggins Road SE access is expected to be the primary access to the site, as the intersection of Wiggins Road and Yelm Highway is signalized, and the intersection of Hamptons Street and Yelm Highway is not. Traffic calming devices would be placed along Hamptons Street south of Yelm Highway (where single-family residences border the street) to slow traffic, thereby discouraging access by that route. *Testimony of Aaron Van Aken and Arthur Saint*.
22. Based on a professionally prepared traffic impact analysis (TIA), the park project at full build-out is expected to add 65 weekday AM peak hour, 125 weekday PM peak hour, and 126 weekend PM peak hour trips to the local street system. It should be noted that this analysis assumed that the park would occupy approximately 60 acres of the site, which was the case when a school was proposed. This traffic impact represents a significant reduction from the combined park and school project, which at full build-out was expected to generate 793 AM weekday peak hour, 321 weekday PM peak hour, and 294 weekend PM peak hour trips. Although the TIA included an analysis of the combined

⁵ The original site plan depicts that there would be a parking lot between the dog park and the Indian Summer neighborhood, but the revised site plan eliminates that parking area and retains the setback in a forested condition. *Exhibits 1.I and 1.J*.

traffic impact of the park and school on 17 intersections in the vicinity, with respect to the site access intersections (Yelm Highway/Hamptons Street and Yelm Highway/Wiggins Road) and the intersection of Yelm Highway and Landview Drive, it also evaluated the traffic impact from the park element only, to provide information on the access points in the event that the school portion of the proposal did not proceed. The result of the analysis was that all three intersections would operate at or above the County's adopted level of service (LOS) standard of "D" without intersection improvements.⁶ *Exhibit I.R.* With respect to the remaining 14 study intersections, the impact of the park only scenario has not been evaluated, although the impact is expected to be significantly less than with the school. *Testimony of Aaron Van Aken and Arthur Saint.* Even with the school, the only study intersection that was expected to have a failing LOS other than the intersection of Yelm Highway and Hamptons Street was the intersection of 37th Avenue SE and Wiggins Road SE. However, that intersection already has a failing LOS during the PM peak hour and the City of Olympia has a planned transportation improvement project to install a roundabout at the intersection. *Exhibit I.R.* Because the expanded park under the current park only proposal might change the distribution and timing of traffic, the Applicant would be required to submit updated traffic information prior to construction permit issuance. *Arthur Saint Testimony.*

23. Traffic impacts would be mitigated by payment of impact fees. *Exhibit I.R.*
24. Potable water would be provided to the project by the City of Olympia. The City of Olympia issued a certificate of water availability for the combined park and school project, confirming that the City has capacity to serve the project once all required infrastructure is installed, on February 3, 2023. *Exhibits I.N and I.A1.*
25. The project would be connected to the City of Olympia sewer system, which has capacity to serve the project. Existing septic systems on site would be abandoned. *Exhibit I.A1.*
26. The Thurston County Environmental Health Division reviewed the project for compliance with the Thurston County Sanitary Code and recommended approval, subject to conditions requiring the Applicant to: abandon the existing septic systems consistent with Sanitary Code requirements; decommission the wells on site consistent with Washington Department of Ecology standards; submit confirmation of final water and sewer construction approval; obtain City approval for drilling an irrigation well and locate the well at least 100 feet from stormwater infiltration facilities; prepare a non-public restrictive covenant for an off-site well; obtain approval of the Washington State Department of Health of the sprayground facility; and complete an inspection by the Thurston County Food & Environmental Services Section prior to occupancy approval for the sprayground. Additional conditions specific to the school aspect of the proposal were withdrawn by Environmental Health at the hearing. *Exhibit I.A1; Dawn Peebles Testimony.*

⁶ The combined traffic of the park and school was projected to require some form of mitigation at the intersection of Yelm Highway and Hamptons Street – either a roundabout or traffic signal – to meet LOS standards. *Exhibit I.R.*

27. The Olympic Region Clean Air Agency (ORCAA) submitted comments on the proposal, requesting an asbestos survey prior to demolition of the existing structures on site. *Exhibits 1.H1 and 1.K1.* Planning Staff incorporated the request into the recommended conditions of SUP approval. *Exhibit 1.*
28. The Department of Ecology submitted comments on the proposal, identifying solid waste management, toxics cleanup, and water quality requirements that apply or might apply to the project. Planning Staff incorporated the requirements into the recommended conditions of SUP approval. *Exhibits 1 and 1.G1.*
29. The Thurston County Public Works Department reviewed the project for compliance with the Thurston County Road Standards and the Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual and determined that applicable preliminary requirements have been satisfied. Public Works recommended approval of the project, subject to conditions addressing roads, drainage, traffic mitigation, and procedural requirements. These conditions were incorporated into Planning Staff's recommended conditions of SUP approval. *Exhibit 1.B1.* Planning Staff's recommended conditions also include requirements identified by the City of Olympia's engineering division to ensure compliance with the City's Engineering Design and Development Standards. *Exhibit 1.D1.*
30. Thurston County acted as lead agency for review of the environmental impacts of the proposal under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). After reviewing the environmental checklist, application, critical areas report, drainage report, traffic report, cultural resource survey, integrated pest management plan, pocket gopher and prairie surveys, geotechnical letter, and agency and neighbor comments, the County issued a mitigated determination of non-significance (MDNS) on December 22, 2023. The conditions require the Applicant to: notify the Department of Ecology if contamination of soil or groundwater is detected; maintain testing records relating to toxic substances; improve the intersection of Yelm Highway and Hamptons Street prior to occupancy of any school structures; provide an east-west street between Wiggins Road and Hamptons Street through the site; install traffic calming along Hamptons Street south of Yelm Highway (with design to be coordinated with residents and County); pay Thurston County impact fees; cleanup any spills of oil or hazardous materials; comply with the noise limits of state law; limit construction to 7 am to 7 pm; avoid disturbing any cultural resources detected during site development; implement erosion control measures on site; and comply with City of Olympia requirements identified during the review process, which address street improvements, water, and sewer. *Exhibits 1.O and 1.D1.*
31. The combined park and school project was originally proposed as a master planned development and notice of the master plan application was issued on March 15, 2023. After the permit type was changed from master plan to special use permit, a revised notice of application was issued on May 26, 2023 and mailed to surrounding property owners. *Exhibits 1, 1.K, 1.L, and 1.Q.*

32. Notice of the public hearing was mailed to all property owners within 300 feet of the site on February 26, 2024, published in The Olympian on March 1, 2024, and posted on site on or before March 1, 2024, at least ten days prior to the hearing. *Exhibits 1 and 1.A.* This notice did not inform the public that the School District had pulled out of the proposal. Planning Staff felt that the project as originally noticed needed to be heard, and that the Applicant would have to later come in for an SUP amendment to remove the school from the SUP if approved. *Scott McCormick Testimony.*

33. Public comment on the application focused predominately on the following topics:

- Traffic impacts to the Hamptons neighborhood, immediately to the west of the subject property: The concern was that visitors would cut through the Hamptons neighborhood from Rich Road via 57th Avenue SE and Devonshire Street SE. There was also concern regarding the safety of the intersection of Hamptons Street and Yelm Highway. A related concern was that visitors would park within the Hamptons neighborhood.
- Health and environmental effects of synthetic turf, which is proposed for the rectangular fields;
- The berm along the eastern property line: comments included questions about the height and extent of the berm, and the height of vegetation, and requests for additional fencing on the park side of the berm;
- Safety/security;
- Request for adding bocce courts for older residents; and
- Noise.

See e.g., Exhibits 1.L1, 1.N1, 1.O1, 1.D2, 1.E2, and 2; Testimony of David Slotwinski and Sharon Benshoff.

34. The elimination of the school from the project addresses much of the traffic concern, as the school element of the original proposal was expected to generate more traffic than the park element. The revised site plan, while still showing access from Hamptons Street, no longer shows an access driveway directly across from Devonshire Street. Traffic calming would be installed on Hamptons Street to discourage access by that route. Frontage improvements would also be provided. The revised project proposal still includes the 80-foot wide vegetated berm. With respect to artificial turf, the Applicant submitted that the Washington State Department of Health determined in 2017 that it does not pose a significant risk to users. The City submitted that artificial turf would facilitate year-round recreation. Runoff from the artificial turf areas would be conveyed and collected by the site's stormwater facilities. With respect to noise, as described in previous findings, the project includes significant landscaping and natural buffering. The City previously had a bocce ball court at Evergreen Park, which was removed due to lack of use. If the City were to receive sufficient request for bocce ball amenities, one or more courts could potentially be added to the proposed park site in a future phase. *Exhibits 1.J, 1.R, and 1.D1; Testimony of Arthur Saint Testimony and Laura Keehan.*

35. Having heard all testimony, Planning Staff maintained their recommendation that the SUP be approved for park development subject to the conditions in the staff report. Environmental Health Staff suggested that their recommended conditions addressing the formerly proposed school use be stricken. *Exhibits 1 and 1.A1; Testimony of Scott McCormick and Dawn Peebles*. At hearing, Applicant representatives waived objection to the recommended conditions. *Laura Keehan Testimony*.
36. Following the close of the record, Planning Staff requested that the record be supplemented with information and an additional recommended condition of approval addressing phased construction over 20 years. The Applicant anticipates development would occur over the course of 20 years as funding is obtained for the contemplated improvements. Work on site would occur as funds are available, with each phase of development reviewed through the applicable development permits prior to construction, e.g., clear and grade permits, construction permits, commercial building permit (for the maintenance facility), etc. Planning Staff submitted that if all proposed improvements are not successfully funded and built within the 20-year timeframe proposed, the Applicant would need to request extension of the approval (if granted) and/or apply for new applications. Staff recommended a condition imposing a 20-year sunset on approval if granted. *Exhibit 4*.

CONCLUSIONS

Jurisdiction

The Hearing Examiner is granted jurisdiction to hear and decide special use permit applications within the Olympia Urban Growth Area pursuant to TCC 2.06.010 and 23.48.020.

Criteria for Review

The Hearing Examiner may approve an application for a special use permit within the Olympia Urban Growth Area only if the following general standards set forth in TCC 23.48.030 are satisfied:

- A. Plans, Regulations, Laws. The proposed use at the specified location shall comply with the Olympia Joint Plan, and all applicable federal, state, regional, and Thurston County laws or plans.
- B. Underlying Zoning District. The proposed use shall comply with the general purposes and intent of the applicable zoning district regulations and subarea plans. Open space, lot, setback and bulk requirements shall be no less than that specified for the zoning district in which the proposed use is located unless specifically provided otherwise in this chapter.
- C. Location. No application for a special use shall be approved unless a specific finding is made that the proposed special use is appropriate in the location for which it is proposed. This finding shall be based on the following criteria:
 - 1. Impact. The proposed use shall not result in substantial or undue adverse effects on adjacent property, neighborhood character, natural environment, traffic conditions, parking, public property or facilities, or other matters affecting the

- public health, safety, and welfare. However, if the proposed use is a public facility or utility deemed to be of overriding public benefit, and if measures are taken and conditions imposed to mitigate adverse effects to the extent reasonably possible, the permit may be granted even though said adverse effects may occur.
2. Services. The use will be adequately served by and will not impose an undue burden on any of the improvements, facilities, utilities, or services existing or planned to serve the area.

Pursuant to TCC 23.48.040, the Hearing Examiner may impose additional conditions on a particular use if it is deemed necessary for the protection of the surrounding properties, the neighborhood, or the general welfare of the public. The conditions may:

- A. Increase requirements in the standards, criteria or policies established by this title;
- B. Stipulate an exact location as a means of minimizing hazards to life, limb, property, traffic, or of erosion and landslides;
- C. Require structural features or equipment essential to serve the same purpose set forth in subsection B above;
- D. Impose conditions similar to those set forth in subsections B and C above to assure that a proposed use will be equivalent to permitted uses in the same zone with respect to avoiding nuisance generating features in matters of noise, odors, air pollution, wastes, vibration, traffic, physical hazards and similar matters;
- E. Ensure that the proposed use is compatible with respect to the particular use on the particular site and with other existing and potential uses in the neighborhood;
- F. Assure compliance with the Olympia UGA Design Guidelines, Chapter 23.20.

Conclusions Based on Findings

1. As conditioned, the proposal is consistent with applicable laws and plans, including the State Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Thurston County Critical Areas Ordinance, the Thurston County Sanitary Code, and the Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual. Conditions of approval imposed in this decision include a requirement for further critical area review prior to development of any trails within the wetland or buffer. The conditions also incorporate requirements identified by the Department of Ecology, ORCAA, and the City of Olympia engineering division. *Findings 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 35, and 36.*
2. As conditioned, the use is consistent with the purpose and intent of the zoning districts. The park would provide an amenity for residential uses in the vicinity and the community at large and has been designed (through use of buffers) to minimize adverse impacts. With elimination of the school from the project scope, buildings on site would be limited to the maintenance facility and restroom structures. Detailed review of compliance with zoning standards with respect to setbacks, height, impervious surface coverage, etc. would occur during building permit review. Based on the site plan and elevations presented, it appears that compliance can be achieved.

A condition of approval has been added to require a final updated/revised Phase 1 site plan that identifies all currently contemplated future improvements as future phases. *Findings 1, 2, 4, 7, and 16.*

3. As conditioned, the use is appropriate in the location in which it is proposed. The proposed public facility would benefit the community by providing sports fields and other recreational facilities. The project includes measures that would minimize impacts to the extent reasonably possible, including buffering that exceeds ordinance requirements, particularly along the eastern property boundary. An additional requirement to install a fence along the park side of the 80-foot wide berm would not be reasonable as it would prevent maintenance access. The site plan avoids impacts to the wetland and buffer, with the exception of the proposed walking trail and boardwalk, which would be reviewed for compliance with the critical areas ordinance at a later date. Although the traffic information requires updating, the TIA submitted was sufficient to demonstrate that County standards can be met. Traffic calming would be provided on Hamptons Street to encourage use of the signalized intersection of Wiggins Road. The proposed parking, to be constructed in phases tracking the recreational improvements, is expected to adequately serve the proposed uses and is proposed to be located and screened with vegetation to minimize visual and noise impacts to surrounding residential uses. *Findings 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 33, and 34.*
4. With respect to the authority to add conditions established in TCC 23.48.040, the proposal already exceeds ordinance standards with respect to landscaping and screening so as to improve compatibility with the adjacent residential neighborhoods. *Finding 16.*

DECISION

Based upon the preceding findings and conclusions, the request for a special use permit is **GRANTED**, subject to the following conditions:

Public Works Conditions:

Roads

1. The proposed roadway in concept and design shall conform to the Road Standards and the City of Olympia standards and development guidelines.
2. A construction permit shall be acquired from the Thurston County Public Works – Development Review Section prior to any construction.

Traffic Control Devices

3. All traffic control devices shall be designed, located, manufactured, and installed in accordance with the Road Standards, Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices and applicable WSDOT Standards & Specifications. A sign and striping plan shall be incorporated into the construction drawings for the project. Please contact Thurston

County Public Works – Development Review Section Staff to obtain the most current Thurston County guidelines.

4. County forces may remove any traffic control device constructed within the County right-of-way not approved by this division and any liability incurred by the County due to non-conformance by the Applicant shall be transferred to the Applicant.

Drainage

5. The stormwater management system shall conform to the Drainage Design & Erosion Control Manual.
6. All drainage facilities outside of the County right-of-way shall remain private and be maintained by the developer, owner and/or the property owners association.
7. Stormwater runoff shall be controlled through all phases of the project by facilities designed to control the quality and quantity of discharges and shall not alter nor impact any existing drainage or other properties.

Utilities

8. The proposed water and sewer system shall be designed in accordance with the standards and specification of the respective utility purveyor. All water and sewer plans are subject to review and acceptance by the respective utility purveyor.
9. Proposed utility work within the Thurston County Right-of-Way shall conform to the Road Standards and Chapter 13.56 Thurston County Code. These standards do not address specific utility design requirements but rather only items such as restoration of the County right-of-way and traffic control.
 - a. Placement of utilities within the County right-of-way will require a Franchise Agreement with Thurston County pursuant to Title 13.56 TCC. This agreement shall be executed with Thurston County prior to final approval.
 - b. Please note all utilities placed parallel to and within the pavement structure are required to rebuild a minimum of half the road, to include grinding and replacement of a minimum of 0.20 feet of asphalt concrete pavement.

Right-Of-Way & Survey

10. Permanent survey control needs to be placed to establish all public street centerlines, intersections, angle points, curves, subdivision boundaries and other points of control.
11. Permanent survey control monuments shall be installed in accordance with the standards provided by the Thurston County Public Works – Survey Division. The Survey Division can be reached at 754-4580.

Traffic

12. Payment of the off-site traffic mitigation required in the December 22, 2023 mitigated determination of non-significance is required prior to final approval in accordance with Section 2.13 of the Thurston County Road Standards. Timing of such payments to the other jurisdictions may be altered upon agreement with the respective jurisdiction and Thurston County.
13. Per Thurston County Resolution 14820, traffic impact fees shall be paid prior to issuing any building permits associated with this project.

General Public Works Conditions:

14. No work shall take place until a construction permit has been issued by Thurston County Public Works – Development Review Section.
15. Development within the City of Olympia urban growth boundary, requiring review by both Thurston County and the corresponding city jurisdiction, shall be designed to the more stringent standards of the two jurisdictions.
16. The proposed grading or site work shall conform to Appendix J of the International Building Code, Title 14.37 of the Thurston County Code and Drainage Design & Erosion Control Manual.
17. When all construction/improvements have been completed, contact the Thurston County Public Works – Development Review Section at 360-867-2051 for a final inspection.
18. This approval does not relieve the Applicant from compliance with all other local, state and/or federal approvals, permits, and/or laws necessary to conduct the development activity for which this permit is issued. Any additional permits and/or approvals shall be the responsibility of the Applicant. One permit that may be required is a Construction Stormwater Permit from the Washington State Department of Ecology. Information on when a permit is required, and the application can be found at: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/construction/permit.html>. Any additional permits and/or approvals shall be the responsibility of the Applicant.

Project Specific Conditions:

19. Once the planning department has issued the official approval, submit two complete full-size sets of construction drawings, the final drainage and erosion control report and all applicable checklists along with an electronic copy to Thurston County Public Works – Development Review Section for review and acceptance.
20. Prior to construction, the Applicant shall:
 - a. Pay outstanding construction review and inspection fees*
 - b. Receive erosion and sediment control permit
 - c. Have the erosion and sediment control inspected and accepted

- d. Receive a construction permit
- e. Schedule a pre-construction conference with county staff.

* The current fee schedule can be found online at <http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/permitting/fees/fees-home.html> or contact Ruthie Padilla with the Thurston County Public Works – Development Review Section by phone at 360-867-2050, or by e-mail at ruthie.moyer@co.thurston.wa.us.

General Information:

Final Review

- 21. Prior to receiving final approval from this department, the following items shall be required:
 - a. Completion of all roads and drainage facilities.
 - b. Final inspection and completion of all punch list items.
 - c. Record drawings submitted for review and acceptance. The record drawings shall include street names and block numbers approved by Addressing Official.
 - d. Receive and accept Engineer's Construction Inspection Report Form (Appendix I-C, Volume I of the Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual).
 - e. Receive and accept Maintenance Agreement Form (Appendix I-E, Volume I of the Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual).
 - f. Completion of required frontage improvements.
 - g. Completion of required signing and striping.
 - h. Payment of any required permitting fees.
 - i. Complete the right-of-way dedication process.

Public Health and Social Services Department Conditions:

- 22. The Applicant must prepare a non-public restrictive covenant for the existing off-site well on Parcel 09330004000 encroaching on the site. The covenant must be submitted to Environmental Health for review prior to being recorded with the Thurston County Auditor's Office.
- 23. As the property is located within City of Olympia's water service area, the Applicant must obtain a no objection letter from City of Olympia to drill the proposed irrigation well onsite. The irrigation well must be relocated at minimum 100 feet from any stormwater infiltration. The Applicant must prepare a non-public declaration of covenant for the proposed well. The covenant must be submitted to Environmental Health for review prior to being recorded with the Thurston County Auditor's Office.
- 24. The existing wells must be decommissioned by a licensed well driller per Washington State Department of Ecology standards. Copies of the decommissioning reports must be submitted to Environmental Health.

25. The four existing septic systems must be properly abandoned per Article IV of the Thurston County Sanitary Code. Abandonment permits are required and copies of all abandonment documentation from a certified septic system pumper must be provided.
26. Confirmation of final water and sewer construction approval from the City of Olympia must be submitted to Environmental Health.
27. Prior to release of the building permit for the sprayground water recreation facility, the plans and specifications must be reviewed and approved by the Washington State Department of Health Water Recreation Program. More information, including a Water Recreation Facility Construction Permit, may be obtained by contacting the Washington State Department of Health Water Recreation Program at 360-236-3330 or by visiting their website at:
<http://www.doh.wa.gov/CommunityandEnvironment/WaterRecreation/RegulatedFacilities/DesignerandBuilder>.
28. Prior to final occupancy approval of the water recreation facility, a pre-opening construction inspection must be satisfactorily completed by the Food & Environmental Services Section (FESS). The Applicant must contact FESS at 360-867-2667 to schedule an inspection.

Community Planning and Economic Development Conditions:


29. No work within the wetland or buffer is authorized by this decision. Future development of the contemplated wetland boardwalk and/or viewing platform in or adjacent to the wetland shall be subject to review for compliance with the critical areas ordinance in effect at the time such work is formally proposed.
30. The outer edge of the wetland buffer shall be formally delineated and field-identified with flags and/or orange fencing at the buffer edge prior to construction of any proposed improvements adjacent to the wetland and buffer, including the sport courts and loop road proposed at the edge of the buffer.
31. Erosion control measures must be in place prior to any clearing, grading, or construction. These control measures must be effective to prevent stormwater runoff from carrying soil and other pollutants into surface water or storm drains that lead to waters of the state. Sand, silt, clay particles, and soil will damage aquatic habitat and are pollutants.
32. Landscaping shall be completed prior to final building permit approval unless a financial surety in the amount of 125% the cost of landscaping materials and installation is submitted to Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED) prior to final building permit approval. Landscaping may be phased to correspond with other phased site work, building permits, construction permits and other necessary land use approvals.
33. In the case of inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources or human burial, the Applicant and/or contractor must immediately stop work and contact the Washington

Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation at (360)586-3067, Thurston County CPED and local tribes including the Nisqually and Squaxin Tribes.

34. Parking provided shall meet City of Olympia UGA parking standards as each phase of the project is constructed.
35. Structures to be demolished shall meet ORCAA requirements for testing for toxics such as asbestos.
36. Future development of the site shall meet all conditions of the SEPA mitigated determination of non-significance which became final on January 12, 2024 (Exhibit 1.O), except that mitigation measures addressing only school-related improvements no longer apply.
37. If contamination is suspected, discovered, or occurs during the project activities, testing of the potentially contaminated media must be conducted. If contamination of soil or groundwater is readily apparent, or is revealed by sampling, the Department of Ecology must be notified per the Washington Department of Ecology letter dated April 4, 2023 (Exhibit 1.G1).
38. Prior to any issuance of any permits authorizing earthwork or construction for the first phase, the Applicant shall submit an updated revised site plan clearly identifying all “Phase 1” improvements and clearly calling out all currently contemplated future phases and improvements.
39. Each future phase of site development shall be developed in substantial compliance with an updated site plan that shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved prior to each phase of development.
40. In all phases, any substantial expansion or alteration of the uses that were considered through the instant permit hearing process will require approval of a new or amended special use permit. Community Planning and Economic Development will determine if any proposed expansion or alteration is substantial enough to require Hearing Examiner approval.
41. Thurston County Habitat Conservation Plan mitigation fees shall be paid prior to site development or soil disturbance.
42. All conditions contained in the letter from the City of Olympia dated November 2, 2023 and revised December 20, 2023 (Exhibit D1) shall be met, except that all conditions limited to the school use may be considered stricken.
43. The instant special use permit, authorizing phased construction of the uses described

herein and shown on the site plan at Exhibit 1.J, shall sunset 20 years following the final decision date for the project. Any improvements still desired to be built at the park after the 20-year sunset shall be subject to regulations in effect at that time.

Decided March 26, 2024.



Sharon A. Rice
Thurston County Hearing Examiner

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 **\$861.00 for a Request for Reconsideration or **\$1,174.00** 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 ☐ \$861.00 for Reconsideration or \$1,174.00 for Appeal. Received (check box): Initial _____ Receipt No. _____
Filed with the Community Planning & Economic Development Department this _____ day of _____, 20____.