



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. 2021106688
)	
)	
Jonathan Briggs and Karen Ann Boulton)	FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
)	AND DECISION
)	
For a Reasonable Use Exception)	
_____)	

SUMMARY OF DECISION

The request for a reasonable use exception to construct a single-family residence and associated appurtenances within a geologic hazard area, marine riparian habitat area, and wetland buffer is **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

SUMMARY OF RECORD

Request

Jonathan Briggs and Karen Ann Boulton (Applicants) requested a reasonable use exception (RUE) to construct an 1,880 square foot single-family residence and associated appurtenances, including a detached garage, driveway, septic system, utilities, and drainage improvements, within a geologic hazard area, marine riparian habitat area, and wetland buffer. The subject property is located at 6925 Kellogg Drive NE, Olympia, Washington.

Hearing Date

The Thurston County Hearing Examiner conducted a virtual open record public hearing on the request on September 13, 2022. The record was held open through September 15, 2022 to allow members of the public who experienced technology-based barriers to 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 September 15, 2022.

Testimony

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

Heather Tschaekofske, Associate Planner, Thurston County
Dawn Peebles, Senior Environmental Health Specialist, Thurston County
Arthur Saint, Civil Engineer, Thurston County
Alex Callender, Land Services NW, Applicant Representative
Randy Foster, Architect, Applicant Representative
Jonathan Briggs, Applicant

Exhibits

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

- Exhibit 1 Community Planning and Economic Development Staff Report including the following attachments:
- A. Notice of Public Hearing, dated September 2, 2022
 - B. Zoning Vicinity Map
 - C. Master Application, received December 14, 2021
 - D. Reasonable Use Exception Application (RUE), received December 14, 2021
 - E. Site plan, revised May 25, 2022
 - F. Geotechnical report, dated October 1, 2020, and addendum dated April 29, 2022 by Quality Geo NW, PLLC
 - G. RUE Supplemental, submitted December 14, 2021
 - H. Notice of Application and Public Hearing, dated February 4, 2022
 - I. Mitigation site plan, dated June 21, 2022
 - J. Critical Areas RUE, Shoreland Analysis Report, dated May 26, 2022
 - K. Wetland and Marine Riparian Buffer Enhancement Plan, dated June 21, 2022
 - L. Contours and Elevation Site Plan, dated February 2, 2022
 - M. Comment email from Mark Biever, Thurston County Engineering Geologist, dated June 17, 2022
 - N. Concurrence letter from Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation, dated June 24, 2022
 - O. Comment Memorandum from Lyndsey Smith, Thurston County Public Health & Social Services Department, dated July 7, 2022
 - P. Comment letters from Brad Beach of the Nisqually Indian Tribe, dated January 3, 2022, and May 5, 2022

- Q. Comment emails from Shaun Dinubilo of the Squaxin Island Tribe, dated December 21, 2021, February 10, 2022, and May 9, 2022
- R. Public comment email from Julie Robertson, dated February 7, 2022
- S. Administrative Shoreline Variance, dated August 18, 2022

Exhibit 2 Septic System Site Plan

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

FINDINGS

1. Jonathan Briggs and Karen Ann Boulton (Applicants) requested a reasonable use exception (RUE) to construct an 1,880 square foot single-family residence and associated appurtenances, including a detached garage, driveway, septic system, utilities, and drainage improvements, within a geologic hazard area, marine riparian habitat area, and wetland buffer. The subject property is located at 6925 Kellogg Drive NE, Olympia, Washington.¹ *Exhibits 1, 1.C, 1.D, 1.E, and 1.G.*
2. The RUE application was received on December 14, 2021 and determined to be complete for the purpose of commencing project review on January 11, 2022. *Exhibit 1.H.*
3. The subject property is 1.26 acres in area and is located on the Puget Sound shoreline. Historically, the property has been used for recreational purposes, including camping by the Applicants, and there is an existing gravel driveway, deck, and staircase to the beach. The lot is otherwise wooded. Surrounding land uses are primarily single-family residential. *Exhibits 1, 1.E, 1.F, and 1.G; Alex Callender Testimony.*
4. The subject property is zoned Residential LAMIRD One Dwelling Unit per Acre (RL 1/1). Primary permitted uses in the zone include single-family and two-family residences, agriculture, and home occupations. The subject property was lawfully created in 1949 through the Plat of Kellogg Beach, and it conforms to the minimum lot size standard of the RL 1/1 zone. *Exhibit 1 and 1.B; Thurston County Code (TCC) 20.11A.020.*
5. Thurston County's shoreline master program, the Shoreline Master Program for the Thurston Region (SMPTR), designates the subject property shoreline as a Conservancy shoreline environment. Single-family residential development is allowed in the Conservancy environment subject to the development standards contained in the SMPTR. In relevant part, these standards require a minimum 100-foot setback from the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) in the Conservancy environment, but allow the setback to be

¹ The legal description of the subject property is a portion of Section 17 Township 19 Range 1W Quarter SW NE KELLOGG BEACH L 49 & L 50 & OYSTER LAND; also known as Tax Parcel Number 57200004900. *Exhibits 1 and 1.C.*

administratively reduced based on the average setback of existing structures within 300 feet of the property. In this case, the average setback of existing structures is 84.93 feet from the OHWM. On August 18, 2022, the Applicant obtained County approval of an administrative shoreline variance authorizing a reduced shoreline setback of 84.93 feet. The minimum setback proposed for the new residential development is 84.98 feet.² *Exhibits 1.E and 1.S; Heather Tschaekofske Testimony.*

6. For marine shorelines with a Conservancy designation, the Thurston County critical areas ordinance (CAO) requires a marine riparian habitat area buffer of 250 feet in width as measured from the OHWM, or measured from the top of the bank if the OHWM cannot be identified. *TCC 24.25.050*. A marine riparian habitat area must be retained in its existing condition unless explicitly authorized by the CAO. *TCC 24.25.050*. In this case the marine riparian habitat area encompasses the entire parcel. *Exhibit 1.E*.
7. The proposed building site is on a marine bluff that slopes steeply downhill towards the north. The slope inclination is approximately 65 degrees, and the slope height is 24 feet. These features are indicative of a marine bluff hazard area (*TCC 24.03.010*) and a landslide hazard area (*TCC 24.03.010*) because the bluff exceeds 15 feet in height and has an inclination greater than 40% (22 degrees). The marine bluff hazard area includes the upland area within 200 feet of the top of the bluff, which in this case encompasses the entire upland portion of the parcel. *Exhibits 1.E, 1.L, and 1.F*.
8. The buffering requirement for landslide hazard areas and marine bluff hazard areas is the greater of (1) fifty feet from the toe and top of slope, or (2) the distance measured from the toe of slope (or ordinary high water mark, for marine bluffs) upward at a slope of 2:1 horizontal to vertical to a point that intersects with the existing topography of the site, or (3) the minimum distance recommended by a geotechnical professional. *TCC 24.15.015*.
9. Based on the results of a geotechnical investigation, which included a site visual reconnaissance, subsurface evaluation, slope analysis, and literature review, the site does not contain active landslide or erosion hazards. No deep-seated landslides are known to exist within or adjacent to the site. The conditions observed on the site did not indicate a pace of bluff crest retreat in excess of what is common in the area. The geologist who conducted the investigation calculated a recommended minimum setback of 18 from the top of the slope to comply with International Building Code (IBC) requirements as adopted by the State of Washington and recommended that the area within five feet of the crest be maintained as a vegetated buffer. *Exhibit 1.F*. Thurston County's engineering geologist accepted the analysis, including the use of IBC criteria, as sufficient to meet the intent of the CAO. *Exhibit 1.M*. The proposed structures would be set back at least 18 feet from the top of the slope. *Exhibit 1.E*.

² There is no record of permitting or review of the existing stairs to the beach. Planning Staff indicated the stairs would need to be permitted, approved as legally nonconforming, or removed prior to occupancy certificate issuance for the primary residence. Staff indicated that the Applicants have already begun the process by submitting an application, as they desire to retain the stairs. *Heather Tschaekofske Testimony.*

10. There is a Category II estuarine wetland on the subject property, which requires a buffer of 220 feet. The CAO does not authorize any administrative reduction in buffer width for estuarine wetlands. The 220-foot buffer, which is contained within the 250-foot marine riparian setback, encompasses the entire parcel. *Exhibits 1.E and 1.J; TCC 24.30.045.*
11. Development on the site is also constrained by archaeological resources, which are located to the west of the proposed building area. The proposed development footprint avoids the archaeological site. *Exhibits 1.N, 1.P, and 1.Q; Heather Tschaekofske Testimony; Alex Callender Testimony.*
12. The proposed development would include an 1,880 square foot single-family residence, a detached 1,055 square foot garage, a 207 square foot covered walkway connecting the garage to the residence, a 408 square foot primary septic drainfield, and 1,910 square feet of additional driveway. These project elements would be clustered in the southern and eastern portions of the property, with the result of minimizing impacts to critical areas, minimizing tree removal, and avoiding impacts to archaeological resources. The residence would be sited in a previously cleared area. The existing deck would be removed. The clearing limits would total 7,655 square feet, which is roughly 19% of the upland area of the site. Mitigation of development impacts would be accomplished through 7,655 square feet of vegetative enhancement within the reduced buffer, to be located in an area generally coinciding with the slope setback. The native plantings are expected to improve species diversity, nutrient uptake from stormwater, wildlife screening, and roughness, and would ensure that there is no net loss of critical areas functions and values. A four-foot construction setback would be maintained between the residence and the edge of the enhanced buffer. *Exhibits 1, 1.E, 1.I, 1.J, and 1.K; Testimony of Alex Callender, Randy Foster, and Jonathan Briggs.*
13. The Thurston County Environmental Health Division has approved the proposed septic system design, including a reduction of the sanitary control radius of the well on an adjacent lot to the north from 100 feet to 75 feet to allow for the proposed drainfield location. The septic system would be 101 feet from the nearest wetland/shoreline edge. *Exhibits 1.O and 2.*
14. Stormwater runoff from the developed portion of the site would be tightlined west to a rock pad, where it would be dispersed through existing and planted vegetation for filtration prior to entry to Puget Sound. The Applicants would be required to submit an engineered drainage plan with their building permit application, and proposed stormwater management would have to be approved by County Public Works prior to construction permit issuance. *Testimony of Randy Foster and Arthur Saint.*
15. Based on a field investigation and database review, there are no federally listed or state priority species of wildlife known to inhabit the site. *Exhibit 1.J.*
16. The construction of a single-family residence and accessory structures is exempt from review under the State Environmental Policy Act. *Exhibit 1; TCC 17.09.055; Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-800.*

17. Notice of the open record hearing was mailed to property owners within 500 feet of the subject property on August 22, 2022 and was published in The Olympian on September 2, 2022. *Exhibits 1 and 1.A.*
18. Having considered all application materials submitted and all testimony, Planning Staff maintained their recommendation of approval subject to the conditions stated in the staff report. *Exhibit 1; Heather Tschaekofske Testimony.* The Applicants waived objection to the recommended conditions. *Alex Callender Testimony.*

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 critical areas ordinance. Based on the uses allowed in the RL 1/1 zone, the size of the parcel, and the character of surrounding development, single-family residential use is the only reasonable use of the property. *Findings 3 and 4.*
2. No reasonable use with less impact on the critical area or buffer is possible. The site is highly constrained, such that it would not be possible to establish a residential use without intruding into a critical area and/or buffer. The proposed residence, which is reasonable in scale relative to the overall area of the site, would be placed near the southern site boundary, to maximize its distance the top of slope and OHWM and to minimize tree removal. The site design provides for a septic drainfield setback from the OHWM of more than 100 feet and avoids known archaeological artifacts. *Findings 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.*
3. With conditions of approval, the requested residential development would not result in damage to other property and 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 recommendations of the geotechnical report, which address setbacks, drainage, vegetation, and erosion control, and the use of construction fencing to protect on-site cultural resources. The Environmental Health Division has approved the proposed septic design and drainfield location. No other issues of concern were identified during the review process. *Findings 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 18.*
4. The proposed reasonable use is limited to the minimum encroachment necessary to prevent denial of all reasonable use of the property. As concluded in item 2 above, it would not be possible to establish reasonable use of the property without encroachment into critical areas and/or regulated buffer. The proposed site design and building scale represents the minimum encroachment necessary for the reasonable use. *Findings 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.*
5. With conditions of approval, the proposed reasonable use would result in minimal alteration of the critical area buffers. The conditions of approval require compliance with the recommendations of the geotechnical report to ensure continued slope stability, and implementation of the mitigation plan. The residence was sited to minimize tree removal. *Findings 9, 12, and 18.*
6. As conditioned, the proposal ensures no net loss of critical area functions and values. Impacts would be mitigated with enhancement plantings at a 1:1 ratio strategically placed to screen and buffer the residence from the shoreline and serving the complimentary purpose of protecting the top of the slope. *Findings 12 and 18.*
7. The use would not result in unmitigated adverse impacts to known species of concern. *Finding 15.*

8. The location and scale of existing development on surrounding properties is not the sole basis for granting the reasonable use exception. The RUE is necessary, and is granted, because critical areas encumber the entire parcel, preventing reasonable residential use of the parcel. *Findings 6, 7, 8, and 10.*

DECISION

Based on the preceding findings and conclusions, the requested reasonable use exception is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to or in conjunction with the issuance of any building or construction permits, all applicable regulations and requirements of the Thurston County Public Health and Social Services Department, Public Works Department, Fire Marshall, and Thurston County Community Planning and Economic Development Department shall be met.
2. The Applicants are responsible for compliance with other jurisdictional permitting requirements.
3. The project shall be in compliance with the recommendations contained in the project Geotechnical Report dated October 1, 2020, and addendum dated April 29, 2022 by Quality Geo NW, PLLC (Exhibit 1.F).
4. The project shall be in compliance with and follow the recommendations and maintenance plan as proposed in the enhancement plan dated June 21, 2022 (Exhibit 1.K).
5. Either proposed mitigation plantings shall be installed prior to final occupancy approval on future residential building permits 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.
6. The project shall be in compliance with and follow the recommendations per the confidential cultural resource survey report, the Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation (DAHP), and local tribes. Construction fencing is required to protect cultural resource areas on site per the cultural resource survey report.
7. All development shall be in substantial compliance with drawings and site plan submitted and made part of this staff report. Any expansion or alteration of this use will require approval of a new or amended approval. The Development Services Department will determine if any proposed amendment is substantial enough to require Hearing Examiner approval.
8. The Applicants shall remove all construction related debris to an approved site (landfill or recycling center) outside of subject property. No fill is allowed on site.
9. 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.

10. The Applicants 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 Applicants must immediately stop work and contact the local tribes and the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.
11. Spaced split rail fencing sections, and/or critical area signage shall be placed along the top of the landslide hazard areas on site at the 18-foot buffer line, as a precautionary safety measure and for critical area protections.
12. Prior to final occupancy approval, the existing deck within the top of bluff must be removed and be verified by Planning Staff.
13. Prior to final occupancy approval on future residential building permits, existing stair tower permit shall be approved (project 2022102885, 22-107539 XL), or verified existing nonconforming pre-dating the SMPTR. If stair tower is not approved, it shall be removed and verified by Planning Staff.
14. A Construction Stormwater Permit from the 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 Applicants' responsibility to obtain this permit if required.

DECIDED September 27, 2022.



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 **\$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.



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 \$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___.