



COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Carolina Mejia-Barahona  
District One

Gary Edwards  
District Two

Tye Menser  
District Three

**HEARING EXAMINER**

*Creating Solutions for Our Future*

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER**

**THURSTON COUNTY**

**REPORT AND DECISION**

**PROJECT NO.:** 2022103194  
**RUBIDA REASONABLE USE EXCEPTION**

**SEQUENCE NO.:** 2022 108264000 00 XI

**TAX PARCEL NO.:** 09320001005

**LOCATION ADDRESS:** 7410 Byron St. NE  
Olympia, WA 98506

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** Section 14 Township 19 Range 2W Quarter W2 NE Donation Land  
Claim DOFFLEMEYER #39 DLC BLA04102958TC TR C Document  
3628497

**OWNER/APPLICANT:** Kathleen I. Rubida  
7410 Byron St. NE  
Olympia, WA 98506

**PLANNER:** Kraig Chalem, Compliance Unit Supervisor

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST:**

The Applicant seeks approval of a Reasonable Use Exception to construct a single-family residence and appurtenances within a wetland buffer. The proposed residence consists of a new 1,528-square foot single family residence. The project will use the existing community drinking water system and the existing driveway. Access to the property is to be provided from Byron St. NE, a public roadway.

**SUMMARY OF DECISION:** Approved with conditions.

**DATE OF DECISION:**

November 21, 2022

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

After reviewing the Community Planning and Economic Development Department Staff Report and examining available information on file with the application, the Examiner conducted a public hearing on the request as follows:

The hearing was opened on October 25, 2022 at 1:05 p.m. Parties wishing to testify were sworn in by the Examiner.

The following exhibits were submitted and made a part of the record as follows:

- EXHIBIT 1** - **Community Planning and Economic Development Staff Report**
- Attachment a** - **2018 Zoning Screenshot**
- Attachment b** - **2018 Topographic Screenshot**
- Attachment c** - **Master Application and Reasonable Use Exception Application, June 27, 2022**
- Attachment d** - **Legal Notice of Public Hearing**
- Attachment e** - **Impervious Surface Worksheet, October 22, 2021**
- Attachment f** - **Site Plan (Sheet C-01), June 27, 2022**
- Attachment g** - **Wetland Report Addendum & Buffer Mitigation Plan, June 27, 2022**
- Attachment h** - **Wetland Delineation Report, Agua Tierra, June 27, 2022**
- Attachment i** - **Engineered Abbreviated Drainage Plan, June 27, 2022**
- Attachment j** - **Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), June 27, 2022**
- Attachment k** - **Notice of Application, July 15, 2022**
- Attachment l** - **Comment Memorandum, Lyndsey Smith, Thurston County Public Health and Social Services Department, August 4, 2022**
- Attachment m** - **Comment letter, Brad Beach, Nisqually Indian Tribe, July 21, 2022**
- Attachment n** - **Comment email, Shaun Dinubilo, Squaxin Island Tribe, May 12, 2022**
- Attachment o** - **Lot-C\_2004.Boundary Line Adjustment of Dofflemyer Donation Land Claim**

**The Minutes of the Public Hearing set forth below are not the official record and are provided for the convenience of the parties. The official record is the recording of the hearing that can be transcribed for purposes of appeal.**

KRAIG CHALEM, Compliance Unit Supervisor, appeared, requested that the Staff Report and attachments be admitted into the record and testified that the Applicant seeks approval of a Reasonable Use Exception to replace a single-family residence in a critical area. The parcel is located at 7410 Byron St. NE, Olympia, WA, parcel number 09320001005 in the Boston Harbor Improvement District and is zoned RL 1/1. The proposed construction is within a wetland buffer to replace a single family residence that was destroyed by fire. That structure has been removed but an existing carport and driveway remain. The property is serviced by existing utilities and slopes from Byron Street west to the east toward a man-made pond. The proposed construction will result in approximately 3716-square feet of impervious surface as an unavoidable impact to the wetland buffer

which is approximately 16.7% of the property compared to the previous development covering approximately the same size area. He noted the 16.7% is a correction to the 1.2% provided on page 2 of the Staff Report Project Description.

KATHLEEN RUBIDA, Applicant, appeared and testified that she agreed with Mr. Chalem's presentation and agrees with the County Staff recommendations as conditions of approval.

No one spoke further in this matter and the Hearing Examiner took the matter under advisement. The hearing was concluded at 1:25 p.m.

**NOTE:** A complete record of this hearing is available in the office of the Thurston County Community Planning and Economic Development Department.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The Applicant filed a Master Application and a Supplemental Application for a Reasonable Use Exception (RUE) on June 27, 2022, to request approval of a RUE to construct a single-family residence and associated appurtenance to replace a prior residence within a wetland buffer located at 7410 Byron St. NE, Olympia, WA, 98506. (Att. c)
2. The Notice of Application of Application was issued on July 15, 2022, with the comment period expiring on August 4, 2022. (Att. k)
3. In a Memorandum dated August 4, 2022, Lyndsey Smith, Thurston County Environmental Health Specialist, commented that the Thurston County Public Health and Social Services Department had reviewed the request and noted that the replacement single-family residence within a wetland buffer would be served by Boston Harbor water and STEP-Septic Tank Effluent Pumping sanitary sewer and that the site plan proposed the STEP tanks be relocated to accommodate the placement of the new residence. Ms. Lyndsey stated Environmental Health had no objection to the request with the comment that "The Applicant must contact Thurston County Public Works regarding any proposed water or STEP sewer modification. (Att. l)
4. In a letter dated July 30, 2021, Brad Beach, THPO, Nisqually Indian Tribe stated that the Tribe had no specific comments or concerns and requested to be informed if there are any Inadvertent Discoveries of Archaeological Resources/Human Burials. (Attachment m).
5. In an email dated July 20, 2022, Shaun Dinubilo, Archaeologist, Squaxin Island Tribe, commented that the Tribe Cultural Resources Department had no specific cultural resource concerns for this project; however, if DAHP recommends a survey, or any other additional recommendations, the Tribe concurred with DAHP's recommendations. (Att. n)  
(Note: DAHP did not submit a comment on this project)
6. The Washington State Department of Ecology and the Washington State Department of Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife did not provide comment.
7. The construction of a single-family home is exempt from review under the State

Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) (WAC 197-11-800(1)(b)(i).

8. Written notice of the public hearing was mailed to all property owners within 500-feet of the site on October 6, 2022, and was published in The Olympian on October 14, 2022, at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing. (att. a)
9. The Applicant, Kathleen I. Rubida, has a possessory interest in the subject property located at 7410 Byron St. NE, Olympia, WA, 98506; TAX parcel number 09320001005; Legal description Section 14 Township 19 Range 2W Quarter W2 NE Donation Land DOFFLEMEYER #39 DLC BLA04102958TC TR C Document 3628497. The property is within the area known as Boston Harbor which was first settled in 1853. However, the parcel boundaries have been adjusted and are described in its current configuration per deed. (Att. o).
10. The subject .51-acre parcel is located within the rural portion of Thurston County. The Comprehensive Plan designation is residential and the zoning classification is Residential LAMIRD-One Dwelling Unit Per Acre (RL 1/1). The property is not within the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Master Program. The parcel is rectangular in shape and slopes to the rear in the front with a swale in the eastern portion that is culverted to allow water to flow through an access to the interior of the lot via an existing driveway. After crossing the swale, the topography lessens to the south. The property contains a very small manmade pond subsequently deemed a wetland and wetland buffer. (Att. b)
11. The surrounding Land Use and Zoning consist of lots within the RL 1/1 zoning developed with single-family residences on the north and south sides, Byron Rd NE immediately adjacent to the west and undeveloped parcels zoned Rural Residential And Resource - One Unit Per Five Acres (RRR1/5) to the east.
12. The Applicant proposes to replace a single-family dwelling structure within a regulated critical area. Specifically, the Applicant has requested approval of a Reasonable Use Exception to construct a new 1,528-square foot single-family residence and appurtenances within a wetland buffer. The new residence will be the approximate size as the previous structure. The project will use the existing community drinking water system and the existing driveway. Access to the property is to be provided from Byron St. NE, a public roadway. (TCC 24/30/045 and Att. g)
13. The proposal is consistent with the Thurston County Comprehensive Plan zoning designation RL 1/1. The primary permitted uses in the RL 1/1 district are single-family residences and agriculture (TCC 20.11A.020). The purpose of the zone is to provide for residential development in rural areas that were predominately developed at a density of one dwelling unit per acre prior to July 1, 1990; to minimize and contain these areas of more intensive rural development; and to prevent new patterns of low density sprawl.(Comp. Plan 2-21)
14. The proposal is consistent with the Thurston County Zoning Classification RL 1/1 as single-family residences are allowed as a primary use, subject to applicable design standards found in TCC 20.1A.040 entitled "Design Standards."
15. The wetland on the property has been delineated and categorized by a professional wetland

biologist as a Category IV Wetland with a habitat score of 6 and a rating of HHL which requires a 220-foot buffer. (TCC 24.30.045) The wetland is an isolated slope wetland at the back of the site. The new residence is proposed to be located approximately 100-feet from the closest wetland edge. The clearing limits or total disturbed area due to the single-family home and septic system will require 3,716-square feet of unavoidable impact to the buffer of the wetland which represents 0 16.7% of the total lot.

16. Pursuant to TCC 24.50.060 entitled "Development of existing lots-Critical areas excluding frequently flooded areas", the proposed replacement single-family residence would be eligible for a development area of 3,500-square feet in the outer 25% of the standard buffer through a Critical Area Review Permit and applicable standards. However, this allowance appears to provide an insufficient area on the property in the outer 25% of the wetland buffer for the residential development. Therefore, the Applicant has requested the Reasonable Use Exception to construct a single-family residence within the inner 75% of the wetland buffer.

17. The authority for a RUE is expressed in TCC 24.45.010:

A reasonable use exception is required when adherence to the provisions of this title would deny all reasonable use of the subject property as a whole, due to the property's size, topography, or location relative to the critical area and any associated buffer. A reasonable use exception shall only be granted if no other reasonable alternative method of development is provided under this title and the Thurston County Code.

18. TCC 24.45.030, Review criteria, provides that the hearing examiner shall approve, or approve with conditions, the reasonable use exception if the following eight (8) criteria are met:

A. No other reasonable use of the property as a whole is permitted by this title;

The Applicant's proposal is for a replacement single-family residence. The primary permitted uses under RL 1/1 zoning are single-family residential, duplexes, agriculture including forest practices and home occupations. The Applicant's property is too small to support agriculture or forest practices. Residential and new agricultural uses are prohibited in wetlands and wetland buffers. The lot has insufficient area in the outer 25% of the standard wetland buffer for development of a residence and appurtenances consistent with the Nonconforming Use provisions. The residential use is the only alternative reasonable land use on the Applicant's property.

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.

The Applicants' proposal to replace the single-family residence is supported by the design plan that provides a modest home footprint the approximate size of the prior structure and uses the existing driveway and by the mitigation plan that includes native plant enhancement

to make the wetland buffer more resilient.

- 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;

The Applicant's proposal will maintain the stormwater on site and the certified connection to the sewer will insure no offsite impact to "Waters of the State. The wetland mitigation plan for native vegetation enhancement planting should maintain the overall integrity of the wetland and prevent damage to nearby properties as well. As proposed and conditioned, the use will not result in damage to other properties and should not threaten the health, safety, or welfare on or off the Applicant's property.

- D. The proposed reasonable use is limited to the minimal encroachment into the critical area and/or buffer necessary to prevent the denial of all reasonable use of the property;

The development area represents the least amount of impact while maintaining a viable project that prevents the denial of the Applicant's reasonable use of the property. The use will remain residential and will have minimal encroachment to the wetland buffer. The enhancement plan will reduce impact to the buffer and there will be no direct impacts to the wetland. As there is very little unencumbered land in which to site the home, the Applicant has made reductions during the design phase to reduce the overall footprint of the home, will utilize the existing driveway and meet setbacks with minimal adjustment and decommission the septic tanks. The stormwater cross drains will allow surface water to pass; the stormwater from the driveway will be directed to a stormwater ditch so there should be no change in hydrology.

- 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;

The project should have minimal impact to critical areas, including impacts to vegetation, fish and wildlife resources, hydrological conditions and geologic conditions. The construction will not occur in the wetland and the unavoidable removal of vegetation within the wetland buffer will be mitigated to maintain the functions and values of the wetland after buffer reduction. Although the upland forest area near the wetland will be impacted, the mitigation plan will provide an enhanced buffer along the driveway in the outer portion of the buffer. The planting plan will provide species diversity and structure as well as roughness. The buffer areas around the house will be planted with native buffer plants to combine the practical benefit of the plantings with aesthetic attributes of native flora. The hydrological condition will be maintained by stormwater bmp's which will not dewater the wetland but return water to infiltration trenches to maintain this water onsite. The grading requirements for the site are minimal and the geologic condition should be maintained as well.

- 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;

The Applicant's "Wetland Report Addendum Wetland Buffer Mitigation Plan" supplementing the "Critical Areas Report" will address the impacts to the wetland buffer and ensure a "no net loss" from the redevelopment located outside of the reduced 95-foot buffer associated with the wetland. (Att. g and i) The Plan will implement a 1:1 ratio of invasive removal and plantings to enhance the buffer area. The mitigation will occur on site and an analysis of the planting enhancement lift over baseline conditions is provided in the Mitigation plan. The Applicant will be providing a maintenance and monitoring plan for woody and herbaceous vegetation that will assure success over a five-year period as required.

G. The reasonable use shall not result in the unmitigated adverse impacts to species of concern;

The subject property and the immediate vicinity have no listed occurrence of listed plant or animal species of concern.

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

The location and scale of existing development on surrounding properties is not listed by the Applicant as a reason supporting the RUE request.

19. TCC 24.45.020 entitled "Reasonable use exception-Certain properties not eligible" prohibits a RUE if the inability to derive reasonable use is the result of a self-created hardship such as subdividing the property, adjusting a boundary line, or other actions thereby creating the property undevelopable.

Herein, the sole basis for the RUE is the necessity to replace a single-family home built in 1969 by a prior owner that was destroyed by fire to construct a modest sized single-family residence on a parcel too constrained for the Applicant to locate the replacement residence outside of the 220-foot wetland buffer and not from any "self-created" hardship created by the Applicant.

**CONCLUSIONS:**

1. The Hearing Examiner has the jurisdiction to consider and decide the issues presented by this request.
2. The Applicant has demonstrated that the proposal will be consistent with all applicable codes; therefore, the request for the Reasonable Use Exception should be approved subject to the following conditions:
  - A. Prior to or in conjunction with the issuance of any building permit, 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.

- B. Applicant is responsible for compliance with other jurisdictional permitting requirements. Project No.: 2022103194 7 October 25, 2022 KC
- C. A Construction Stormwater Permit from the Washington State Department of Ecology may be required. It is the Applicant's responsibility to obtain this permit if required. Information about the permit and the application can be found at: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/construction/permit.html>.
- D. The Applicant shall complete all buffer mitigation and monitoring as proposed in the "Wetland Report Addendum & Buffer Mitigation Plan, submitted June 27, 2022 (Attachment-g), prior to final building permit inspection. A surety will be required in place of mitigation completion prior to final building permit inspection, per TCC 24.70.
- E. Critical Area signs shall be installed along the reduced buffer edge, subject to standards of TCC 24.60. Sign locations shall be verified and staked by the biologist and installed prior to final building permit inspection.
- F. Construction fencing and erosion control shall be placed outside the buffer alongside proposed development. This fencing and erosion control shall be inspected prior to building permit issuance.
- G. 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 backfilled and reseeded following installation, and TESC measures will remain in place until site conditions are restored.
- H. Approval of this and other County permits may be superseded by federal law. If any protected species are found during construction, the applicant should contact the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Services.
- I. The Applicant must comply with all requirements of state and/or federal law to avoid disturbance and alteration of artifacts, remains, or other cultural resources on site during development. In the event of inadvertent disturbance or alteration, the Applicant must immediately stop work and contact the Tribe and the State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.
- J. All development on the site shall be in substantial compliance with the approved Reasonable Use Exception application, 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.



**DECISION:** The request for the Reasonable Use Exception to construct a single-family residence and appurtenances within a wetland buffer is approved subject to the listed Conditions.

**ORDERED** this 21<sup>st</sup> day of November, 2022.

  
**STEPHEN R. SHELTON**  
Pro Tem Hearing Examiner

**TRANSMITTED** this 21<sup>st</sup> day of November, 2022, to the following:

**OWNER/APPLICANT:** Kathleen I. Rubida  
7410 Byron St. NE  
Olympia, WA 98506

**OTHERS:** THURSTON COUNTY



**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 **\$804.00** for a Request for Reconsideration or **\$1,093.00** an Appeal. Any Request for Reconsideration or Appeal must be **received** in the Building Development Center on the second floor of Building #1 in the Thurston County Courthouse complex 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.



<b>Project No.</b> _____ <b>Appeal Sequence No.:</b> _____
---

**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  \$804.00 for Reconsideration or \$1,093.00 for Appeal. Received (check box): Initial \_\_\_\_\_ Receipt No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Filed with the Community Planning & Economic Development Department this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_.