

PIERCE COUNTY

Office of the County Council
930 Tacoma Ave S., Rm. 1046
Tacoma, WA 98402



Robert E. Mack
Pierce County Hearing Examiner

September 12, 2024

William T. Lynn
Gordon Thomas Honeywell LLP
PO Box 1157
1201 Pacific Ave, Suite 2100
Tacoma, WA 98401

Zachary K. Griefen
Bricklin & Newman LLP
123 NW 36th Street, Suite 205
Seattle, WA 98107

RE: Reconsideration Request Application No. 1038347
Planned Development District (PDD) / Conditional Use Permit: Pierce County
Village Application Number: 1013476

Reconsideration Request Application No. 1038497
Environmental Appeal: Pierce County Village Application Number: 1026848

Mr. Lynn and Mr. Griefen:

Transmitted herewith are the Decisions of the Pierce County Deputy Hearing Examiner regarding your above-referenced Reconsideration Requests.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Stephen R. Shelton", is written over the typed name.

STEPHEN R. SHELTON
Deputy Hearing Examiner

SRS/sh

cc: Parties of Record

**PIERCE COUNTY
HEARING EXAMINER
RECONSIDERATION REQUESTS
REPORT AND DECISIONS**

CASE NUMBERS: **Reconsideration Request Application No. 1038347**
Planned Development District (PDD) / Conditional Use
Permit: Pierce County Village Application Number 1013476;
Related Application Numbers: 1013477, 1013002, 1013003,
1013480, 1013482, 1013483, 1013560 and 1026848

APPLICANT: Tacoma Rescue Mission

ATTORNEY: William T. Lynn
Gordon Thomas Honeywell LLP
1201 Pacific Ave, Suite 2100
Tacoma, WA 98401

CASE NUMBER: **Reconsideration Request Application No. 1038497**
Environmental Appeal: Pierce County Village Application
Number 1026848 Related Application Numbers: 1013476,
1013477, 1013480, 1013482, 1013483 and 1013560

APPELLANT: Spanaway Concerned Citizens

ATTORNEY: Zachary Griefen
Bricklin & Newman LLP
123 NW 36th ST S
Seattle, WA 98107

COUNTY CONTACT: Rob Jenkins, Current Planning Supervisor

LOCATION: The site is located at 1609 176th Street South and 17320
Spanaway Loop Road South, Spanaway, WA, within the
South ½ of Section 29, T19N, R3E, W.M., in Council District
#3.

PARCEL NUMBER(S): 031929-3002, 031929-3004, 031929-4046, 031929-4135

LAND USE: Residential Resource (RR) zone classification of the
Parkland- Spanaway-Midland Communities Plan area.

RECONSIDERATION REQUESTS:

APPLICANT TACOMA RESCUE MISSION requests clarification of three conditions on pages 47- 48 of the Hearing Examiner's June 3, 2024, Decision, specifically Conditions 24, 25, and 29.

APPELLANT SPANAWAY CONCERNED CITIZENS requests reconsideration of the finding that Drainage District number 15 condemned only an easement and not a fee interest pursuant to a superior court judgment dated March 8, 1920, on grounds that the findings represent a misinterpretation of fact. The Appellant also requests reconsideration as the Applicant's argument that the 1920 deed did not convey a fee interest was presented only the day prior to oral argument and did not leave adequate time for the Appellant to respond.

DECISION DATE: September 12, 2024

DECISION SUMMARY: Applicant's Request to Reconsider Conditions 24 and 25 is granted.
Applicant's Request to Reconsider Condition 29 is denied.
Appellant's Request to Reconsider Finding 13 is denied.
Appellant's Request to Reconsider Finding 13 is denied

EXHIBITS ADMITTED:

The Reconsideration Requests exhibits as well as the Hearing Zoom recording, exhibits and Decision may be found at this link:

<https://piercecounity.imagerelay.com/fl/17239f7bc5d347ea82a7cc242a7db16d>

NOTICES TO PARTIES OF RECORDS:

- On June 3, 2024, the Decision rendered by Deputy Hearing Examiner Eric Sidles approving the Applicant's proposed PDD and CUP and denying the Appellant's appeal of the MDNS was sent to all Parties of Record.
- On receipt of the June 3, 2024, Decision approving the Applicant's proposed PDD and CUP and denying the Appellant's appeal of the MDNS, the Applicant filed a written request for reconsideration on June 12, 2024.
- On receipt of the June 3, 2024, Decision approving the Applicant's proposed PDD and CUP and denying the Appellant's appeal of the MDNS, the Appellant filed a written request for reconsideration on June 13, 2024
- On June 16, 2024, Deputy Examiner Sidles sent a notice to Parties of Record of the Requests for Reconsideration noting submittals of comments regarding the Requests would be due within ten (10) business days of the notice which was July 1, 2024.

- On June 25, 2024, the Deputy Examiner Sidles sent a revised notice to Parties of Record of the Requests for Reconsideration noting submittals of comments regarding the Requests would be due within ten (10) business days of the notice which was July 10, 2024.
- On July 15, 2024, Hearing Examiner Robert E. Mack sent a letter to the Parties of Record noting that Deputy Examiner Sidles had been appointed as a member of the State Growth Management Hearings Board and had requested the Reconsideration Requests be reassigned. Examiner Mack honored that request, noted that he could not rule on the motions because his firm had previous involvement in litigation regarding the subject property and that he had appointed Deputy Hearing Examiner Stephen R. Shelton to rule on the Requests.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISIONS:

In regard to the Reconsideration Requests, the Hearing Examiner has received, reviewed and admitted documentary evidence identified as “Village Reconsideration Materials” which includes Exhibits R1 through R9 and comments and herein makes the following Findings and Conclusions and Decisions.

FINDINGS:

1. On June 3, 2024, Deputy Hearing Examiner Eric Sidles issued a Decision approving the Applicant’s proposed PDD and CUP and denying the Appellant’s appeal of the MDNS.

Applicant’s Reconsideration Requests

2. On June 12, 2024, the Applicant filed a written Request for Reconsideration pursuant to PCC 1.22.130(A) requesting the Examiner approve additions to Conditions 24 and 25 to correct specific errors of procedure or misinterpretations of fact due to an inconsistency between the applicable Finding 22 and Conditions 24 and 25. (Ex. R1)

Finding 22 states:

County staff, in its supplemental staff report, Exhibit 457, suggested that the agricultural and civic buildings could be used for community accessory uses under PCC 18A.45.030 only. The Hearing Examiner finds that the agricultural and civic buildings may be used both for the community accessory uses under PCC 18A.45.030 and the uses allowed outright or conditional under PCC 18A.28.010. The Hearing Examiner further finds that the Applicant’s proposed uses and limitations for the agricultural and civic buildings are consistent with the uses allowed under PCC 18A.45.030 and PCC 18A.28.010. (emphasis added)

By this verbiage, the Applicant asserts that the Examiner acknowledged that the uses allowed by the underlying Residential Resource (RR) zoning are allowed. However, the implementing Conditions of Approval only reference PCC 18A.45.030 and not PCC 18A.28.010. Therefore, to correct such error, the Applicant requests revision of the Conditions 24 and 25 as follows:

Condition No. 24.

The Agriculture Building shall only be used in conformance with the definition of “community accessory uses” for the residents allowed per PCC 18A.45.030.I.2 and the uses allowed outright or conditionally under PCC 18A.28.010. This includes uses allowed under Levels 1 and 2 of the Community and Cultural Services Use Type per PCC Table 18A.33.220-1 such as indoor wedding facilities, community centers, grange halls, etc. However, I Agriculture Building shall not be used as a profit-generating event center for weddings or other similar private gatherings.

Condition No. 25.

The Civic Building shall only be used in conformance with the definition of “community accessory uses” for the residents allowed per PCC 18A.45.030.I.2 and the uses allowed outright or conditionally under PCC 18A.28.010. This includes uses allowed under Levels 1 and 2 of the Community and Cultural Services Use Type per PCC Table 18A.33.220-1 such as indoor wedding facilities, community centers, grange halls, etc. However, I Civic Building shall not be used as a profit-generating event center for weddings or other similar private gatherings or used for commercial purposes that are not operated by Pierce County Village residents unless the use is allowed outright in the Residential Resource zone.

3. On July 10, 2024, Pierce County supported and concurred with the Applicant’s Requests by stating that the “additions to Conditions 24 and 25 would ensure consistency with the Finding of Fact 22.” (Ex. R14)
4. The Appellant filed comments in opposition to the Applicant’s request regarding Conditions 24 and 25 which articulated three arguments in opposition: (Ex. R11) (Note: Petr Goltov - Ex. R7 and Kurt Reidinger – Ex. R10 also filed comments in opposition.)
 - (1) The request is not an error that is subject to reconsideration. The criteria for reconsideration do not allow for reconsideration of a condition that is more restrictive than a finding. The code provides the Examiner with “the power to attach any reasonable conditions found necessary to make a project compatible with its environment and to carry out the goals and policies of the applicable comprehensive plan, community plan, . . . or other

relevant plan, regulations, Federal or State law, case law or Shorelines Hearings Board decisions.”

- (2) The conditions are an accurate reflection of the code’s limitations on uses allowed in a Shared Housing Village (“SHV”). The uses the motion seeks to add are not allowed in an SHV. The Appellant states that the Applicant had proposed and sought approval for a Shared Housing Village. The use of the land in the Shared Housing Village is limited to the uses that the code allows in Shared Housing Villages under PCC 18A.45.030.I.1–2. The Applicant seeks to combine the uses allowed in a shared housing village with other uses allowed in RR zone to create a smorgasbord-style project not provided for in the code. The Appellant then provides and discusses a detailed list of such uses and asserts that the request would enable the agriculture and civic buildings to serve the community at large instead of exclusively serving village residents and their guests.
 - (2) Some of the additional uses sought by the Applicant are precluded by other (non-SHV) sections. For instance, the Applicant seeks to add a micro-enterprise business as an allowed use which would be a commercial use prohibited in the RR zone. (PCC 18A.33.270) Sales of merchandise and services are commercial activities/services that are prohibited not only in shared housing villages but also in the RR zone in PSM plan area. (PCC 18A.28.010) Home occupations may be allowed provided they are clearly incidental and secondary to the residential use of the property and do not change the residential character of the dwelling or neighborhood. (PCC 18A.37.110.A.1.d) In addition, the Appellant notes other uses which are not allowed: commercial sales of farm products and produce stands and “activities that bring visitors to an active farm or ranch” known as “agritourism” under PCC 18A.33.260.A is a prohibited use in the Residential Resource zone. (PCC 18A.28.010)
5. In response to the Appellant’s objections and to the public comments by Petr Glotov and Kurt Reidinger, the Applicant stated (Ex. R13) that no party had requested reconsideration of Finding 22 of the Hearing Examiner’s June 3 Decision, nor did anyone made any reconsideration requests relating to the use of the Agricultural and Civic Buildings. The only reconsideration request on this issue was filed by the Applicant and the proposed minor revisions to Conditions 24 and 25 are to make them consistent with Finding 22 and, thereby, correct a clear inconsistency between the findings and the decision/conditions.

However, even if a reconsideration request had been timely filed, the Applicant states the project is a Planned Development District (PDD), which allows for multiple uses pursuant to PCC 18A.75.050(G) entitled “Uses Permitted in a PDD:

 - (3) Non-Residential: Uses permitted by the underlying zone as authorized in the

development plan and (4) Conditional Uses, if permitted in the underlying zone and as specifically authorized by the final development plan.

Specifically, a Shared Housing Village (SHV) is a conditional use in the Residential Resource (RR) zone under the applicable ordinance and thus allowed in a PDD. (See Ordinance 2023-5s) Pursuant to PCC 18A.28.010, Community and Cultural Service uses are also allowed as non-residential uses permitted by the underlying RR zone. Accordingly, both are permitted in the PDD. The Applicant asserted that this is the position taken by the County in prehearing briefing, in testimony at the Hearing and in the supplemental Staff Report. (Pierce County's Pre-Hearing Brief at 13-14; Rob Jenkins testimony; Supplemental Staff Report at 15-16.) Furthermore, the Applicant noted that this position was not challenged at the Hearing, the record supports this position and the County's interpretation of its own code is entitled to deference. (Homeward Bound In Puyallup v. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board, 23 Wn. App.2d 875, 909, 517 P.3d 1098 (2022)).

In conclusion, the Applicant noted that the concerns referenced in the opposition to the Reconsideration Request that the Applicant could potentially use the buildings as profit-oriented wedding and event centers were raised at the Hearing by the Examiner. After the Applicant testified at the hearing that it had no intent to use the buildings in this manner (see Duke Paulson testimony), the Hearing Examiner addressed these concerns about using the buildings for for-profit wedding/event venues and those provisions were not challenged by including language in Conditions 24 and 25 to ensure this does not occur.

6. The Applicant has also requested Condition No. 29 be revised as follows to correct an error under PCC 1.22.230(A):

The largest of the significant trees on the site shall be preserved within a conservation tract or alternative mechanism meeting the requirements set forth in PCC 18E.10.080.D pursuant to PCC 18E.40.040

The Applicant states that PCC 18E.40.040 contemplates protecting trees "within a conservation tract or alternative mechanism meeting the requirements set forth in PCC 18E.10.080.D." (PCC 18E.40.40.C.1.a.) PCC 18E.10.080.D describes the alternative mechanisms. The track requirement of PCC 18E.40.040 arises in a subdivision with creation of lots for sale and development and tracts for other purposes. The property is not being subdivided and the Applicant cannot create separate and discrete tracts as part of the PDD. In addition, the largest of the significant trees are not necessarily located in the same area on the property so tracts are not practical. Under these circumstances, a "tract" might contain a single tree. Moreover, there is no need to differentiate development lots sold to others from tracts, as would be the case in a traditional subdivision. The whole site will be in a single ownership. (County Biologist Scott Sissons testimony) For these reasons, the Applicant proposes the change to remove the requirement to create

a tract that is impractical, unnecessary and would not accomplish the purposes of PCC 18E.40.040, while at the same time ensure the same level of permanent protection as would occur with separate tracts. (Ex. R1)

7. Pierce County supported the Applicant's Request by stating that "The addition to Condition 29 would resolve any uncertainty with respect to the implementation of the Examiner's obvious intent: to ensure permanent protection of significant trees." (Ex. R14)
8. The Appellant requests the Examiner to deny the Applicant's request to revise Condition 29 (Ex. R11) by initially asserting the Condition as written is supported by PCC 18E.40.040.C.1.b, the County Comprehensive Plan policies LU-18.1 and LU-25.4 and Goal D-1 and the evidence that the Applicant has not yet determined how many significant trees are on the site or where on the site they are located. The Appellant notes the Examiner had stated:
 - It was the Applicant's choice to concentrate development in the western portion of the property, not some requirement of the code. The Applicant can modify the proposal to preserve more significant trees and is required to do so under both the PDD criteria and the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies." (Decision at 26, Finding 24).
 - The Examiner also stated "it is necessary under PCC 18E.40.040 to impose a condition that the largest of the significant trees on the site shall be preserved within a conservation tract." (Decision at 37, Finding 64.)

The Appellant then asserts that even though PCC 18E.40.040 addresses Garry oaks, the Examiner's Condition 29 requires the protection of "the largest of the significant trees on the site" whether those trees are Garry oaks, Douglas firs, or significant trees of some other species (Decision at 35–36, Finding 56). In this regard, the Appellant argues that the Applicant's reliance on PCC 18E.10.080.D is unpersuasive for two reasons.

- The subsection is part of the general critical area protective measures that apply to all critical areas and PCC 18E.40.040 addresses protection of significant trees requires which requires that "The largest of the significant trees on the site shall be preserved within a conservation tract" with no mention of alternative protective mechanisms. (PCC 18E.40.040.C.1.b.4) The Appellant then opined that the specific applicable section of the code controls over the general language in PCC 18E.10.080.D.
- The general language in PCC 18E.40.040 applies to "binding site plans" that are used for Condominium developments which, like the subject PDD, do not require the subdivision of land. (PCC 18F.60.010) In light of that, Appellant asserts that the Applicant's position that "the Tract requirement typically arises where there is a subdivision in which the applicant is creating lots for sale and development, and tracts for other purposes" is also

unpersuasive. The Appellant notes that although tracts may “typically” be used for subdivisions, County Code does not limit their use to subdivisions.

The Appellant then disputes the Applicant’s statement that separate and discreet tracts cannot be created as part of the PDD as the property is not being subdivided for the Shared Housing Village.

- The Applicant provides no support for this assertion nor does the code support that assertion.
- PCC 18A.75.050 specifically contemplates and addresses subdivision of land within a PDD: “When it is the intention of an applicant to subdivide or resubdivide all or portions of property within a proposed PDD, application for approval of a preliminary subdivision or short plat may be filed and considered concurrently with an application for approval of a preliminary development plan.” (PCC 18A.75.050.O) The Appellant then opines that the Examiner has broad authority to mold a PDD under PCC 18A.75.050.A.

The Appellant then questions the Applicant’s statements that “the largest of the significant trees are not necessarily located in the same area on the property so tracts are not practical’ and “Under these circumstances a tract might contain a single tree” in light of the Applicant not knowing where the largest of the significant trees are on the site, how many of them exist, or how many are proposed to be removed. The Appellant noted that the Examiner had stated Finding 61 that “The witnesses were never able to explain the source of all the discrepancies, and even the Applicant referred to the confusion as ‘embarrassing’ during closing, an assessment with which the Hearing Examiner agrees.”

The Appellant then states the Applicant has not provided any support for the assertion that creating a tract containing and preserving the largest of the significant trees on site “would not accomplish the purposes of PCC 18E.40.040” and that the code does not support that assertion. The Appellant asserts that creation of such a tract is specifically required by PCC 18E.40.040 and serves that chapter’s purpose “to identify regulated fish and wildlife species and habitats and establish habitat protection procedures and mitigation measures that are designed to achieve no ‘net loss’ of species and habitat due to new development or regulated activities.” PCC 18E.40.010. The Appellant opines that the Examiner’s Condition 29 serves the purpose of PCC Chapter 18E.40 by requiring the Applicant to accurately identify the largest trees on site and then protect those trees in the long term by identifying and placing them within a defined legal space, whether or not the land is in single ownership or in subdivided lots is irrelevant to the purpose of the protective tracts.

In conclusion, the Appellant requests the Examiner reject the revision of Condition 29. However, in the event the Examiner does approve the request to modify Condition 29 to include the option of an “alternative protective mechanism,” the Examiner should define and describe the alternative protective mechanism” within the appealable decision.

Appellant’s Reconsideration Requests

9. On June 13, 2024, the Appellant filed a written Request for Reconsideration pursuant to PCC 1.22.130(B) based on an irregularity in the proceeding because the Applicant’s argument that the 1920 deed did not convey a fee interest was submitted only the day prior to the oral argument on this matter and the Appellant did not have adequate time to gather all additional factual information responsive to that new argument. The Appellant asserts that granting this request based on finding an irregularity of the proceeding would enable the Examiner to now consider additional documents and presentation rebutting the Applicant’s arguments that would be evidence of the error contained in Finding 13. (Ex. R2)

On June 13, 2024, the Appellant also filed a written Request for Reconsideration pursuant to PCC 1.22.130(A). The Appellant requests reconsideration of the Examiner’s Finding 13 that Drainage District number 15 condemned only an easement pursuant to a superior court judgment dated March 8, 1920, and not a fee interest. The Appellant asserts that Finding 13 is erroneous and requests reconsideration on grounds that it represents a misinterpretation of fact. (Ex. R2)

10. The Applicant’s response (Ex. R12) to the Appellant’s request is an assertion that there was no irregularity in the proceedings that prevented the Appellant from having a fair hearing. The Applicant also asserts that the official record is closed and the new information the Appellant now presents is long after such closure and should not be considered as there is no legitimate basis to authorize the untimely submittal. The Applicant opines that the Appellant made a strategic choice to submit its 13-page “comment letter” accompanied by 109 pages of attachments challenging the vested status of the Applicant’s development application on April 22, 2024, only one week before the public hearing began. The Applicant then responded by evaluating the vesting challenge, conducting necessary historical title and legal research and prepared and submitted a written response in just 8-days. The Applicant then lists multiple reasons why the Appellant’s request to submit new information should not be considered.
 - The Appellant did not preserve this objection at the time of the hearing. When the Examiner formally announced the closing of the record, the Appellant did not request for the record to remain open to submit additional material, much less state on the record that it would be denied a fair

opportunity to reply to the Applicant's written response unless the record remained open.

- Even more significant, the Applicant states that the Appellant's argument ignores the unusual and extraordinary opportunity it was afforded to present its vesting challenges. Although neither the Code nor the Examiner Rules entitled the Appellant to any oral argument on its "comment letter" and while the rest of the public was generally limited to a 3-minute oral presentation and/or written comments submitted before the public comment period closed, the Examiner allowed the Appellant to present a 90-minute oral argument on its "comment" addressing the Applicant's written response, and then was afforded further oral rebuttal argument after the Applicant's oral response.
- Referring to PCC 1.22.130 and Examiner Rule 1.8.4 that allow reconsideration upon demonstration of an "irregularity in the proceedings before the Hearing Examiner by which such party was prevented from having a fair hearing," the Applicant opines that the Appellant cannot credibly argue denial to a fair hearing on its comment. To the contrary, the Applicant states the Appellant was afforded an exceptional process that included a separate three hour hearing.
- The Applicant then asserts that any perceived disadvantage by the Appellant was self-inflicted as it made a deliberate choice to wait until a week before the hearing to submit its lengthy challenge to the Applicant's vested status. The Applicant then opines that it appears the Appellant was surprised that the Applicant could respond so thoroughly before the oral argument on the vesting challenge.
- The Applicant concluded by noting that the Appellant had declined the Examiner's offer to a schedule for and present motions.

11. The County (Ex. R14) responded to the Appellant's assertion that there is an irregularity with the proceeding as their primary ground supporting their request by stating that the Appellant had multiple opportunities to assert their arguments about vesting and, in fact, did so in lengthy untimely filings as well as lengthy oral argument. The County asserts the Appellant's asserted "irregularity" stems from their own inaction and is unfounded. Contrary to their claim, the County opines there was sufficient time to gather additional evidence to respond to the Applicant's April 30, 2024, vesting rebuttal letter. For example, the Appellants supported their April 22, 2024, vesting letter with an order of public necessity and decree from a 1920 condemnation proceeding. The County opines that the Appellant is now going back to the same well as they request to submit the jury verdict from the same proceeding to support their Motion for Reconsideration. The hearing herein commenced on April 29, 2024, and concluded ten days later May 9, 2024. The

Appellant has not given a reason why the verdict was not gathered prior to the record closing. Further, the County opines, the Appellants chose to raise vesting as an issue in public comment, yet the Appellant did not allude to it in closing argument thereby demonstrating the significance the Appellants attributed to this issue. The County then asserted that if there was any irregularity, it was Appellant's failure to timely file a motion as requested by the Examiner. Therefore, any harm done is self-induced and the Appellant has failed to satisfy the grounds for a motion for reconsideration. In addition, the County asserts that the Appellants failed to request the record be kept open. The record is now closed. The comment period is now closed. To the extent the "reconsideration" request introduces any new documents or arguments, it is untimely, not dispositive, and will only confuse matters.

The County concludes by noting that the County had deemed the application complete on May 23, 2023, and deficiencies, if any, were "cured" 29-days later. As no notice of deficiencies was issued, the application was complete as a matter of law. (RCW 36.70B.070 and PCC 18.160.050(A)) Therefore, the County also argues that the Appellant's request for reconsideration should be denied as this not the forum to litigate the alleged title issues.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. Pursuant to Pierce County Code 1.22.130 entitled "Reconsideration," the Hearing Examiner has jurisdiction to decide this matter.

Any aggrieved party or person affected by the decision of the Examiner may, within seven working days of the date of the Examiner's written decision, file with the Planning Department a written request for reconsideration based on any one of the following grounds materially affecting the substantial rights of said party or person:

- A. Errors of procedure or misinterpretations of fact, material to the party seeking the request for reconsideration.
- B. Irregularity in the proceedings before the Examiner by which such party was prevented from having a fair hearing.
- C. Clerical mistakes in the official file or record transmitted to the Examiner, including errors arising from inadvertence, oversight, or omission, which may have materially affected the Examiner's decision on the matter.

Upon receipt of a request for reconsideration, the Examiner shall review said request in light of the record and take such further action as is deemed proper; including, but not limited to, requesting a response from another party, denying the request, granting the request, with or without oral argument, and may render a revised decision. The decision of the

Examiner shall be subject to reconsideration only one time, even if the Examiner reverses or modifies the original decision.

If a request for reconsideration is filed, a decision is not final for purposes of further appeal until the Examiner issues a final order on the request for reconsideration.

2. On June 3, 2024, Deputy Hearing Examiner Eric Sidles issued the Decision herein approving the Applicant's proposed PDD and CUP applications and denying the Appellant's appeal of the MDNS.
3. On June 12, 2024, the Applicant timely filed a written Reconsideration Request to revise Conditions No. 24 and 25 to correct a clear inconsistency between such conditions and Finding 22 to correct an error pursuant to PCC 1.22.130(A).
4. On June 12, 2024, the Applicant timely filed a written Reconsideration Request to revise Condition No. 29 to remove the requirement to create a tract that is impractical, unnecessary and would not accomplish the purposes of PCC 18E.40.040 to correct a clear inconsistency thereby correcting an error under PCC 1.22.130(A).
5. On June 13, 2024, the Appellant timely filed a written Request for Reconsideration pursuant to PCC 1.22.130(B) that due to an irregularity in the proceedings, the Appellant did not have adequate time to respond to the Applicant's new information which was submitted the day before the oral argument regarding Finding No. 13.
6. On June 13, 2024, the Appellant timely simultaneously filed a written Request for Reconsideration pursuant to PCC 1.22.130(A) that the inability to have time to gather documents to respond to the Applicant's new information resulted in a misrepresentation of facts making Finding 13 erroneous and requests the Examiner to allow submittal of additional documents and argument for review after the closing of the record that would rebut the Applicant's new arguments regarding Finding 13.
7. On June 16, 2024, and again on June 25, 2024, upon receipt of the Requests for Reconsideration and pursuant to PCC 1.22.130, Deputy Examiner Sidles reviewed the requests in light of the record and decided to send a notice and then a revised notice to parties of record of the Requests for Reconsideration and requesting responses and comments due within ten (10) business days of the notice which was initially July 1, 2024, and, subsequently, July 10, 2024.
8. As neither Deputy Hearing Examiner Sidles nor Deputy Hearing Examiner Shelton requested oral argument, pursuant to PCC 122.122.130 Deputy Examiner Shelton is required to review the requests in light of the record and take such further action

as is deemed proper: denying the request, granting the request, and may render a revised decision.

9. After a review of the record, the Examiner finds the Applicant's Request for Reconsideration of Conditions 24 and 25 of the Hearing Examiner's June 3, 2024, Decision is appropriate and in compliance with PCC 1.22.130(A) as it corrects an error of procedure or misinterpretations of fact, material to the party seeking the request for reconsideration; specifically, the Applicant's request corrects an error that Conditions 24 and 25 imposed by the Examiner are not consistent with the underlying Examiner's Finding 22.
10. After a review of the record, the Examiner finds the Applicant's Request for Reconsideration of Conditions No. 29 of the Hearing Examiner's June 3, 2024, Decision is not appropriate nor in compliance with PCC 1.22.130(A) as it does not correct an error of procedure or misinterpretations of fact, material to the party seeking the request for reconsideration; specifically, the Request adds a provision to Condition 29 that was not presented to nor contemplated by Deputy Examiner Sidles during the Hearing.
11. After a review of the record, the Examiner finds the Appellant's Request for Reconsideration of Finding 13 of the Hearing Examiner's June 3, 2024, Decision is not appropriate nor in compliance with PCC 1.22.130(B) as the Examiner cannot find that an Irregularity in the proceedings occurred before Deputy Examiner Sidles by which the Appellant was prevented from having a fair hearing; specifically, the Appellant was afforded sufficient opportunity for written and oral presentations and/or to keep the record open for such presentations and failed to do so.
12. After a review of the record, the Examiner finds the Appellant's Request for Reconsideration of Finding 13 of the Hearing Examiner's June 3, 2024, Decision is not appropriate nor in compliance with PCC 1.22.130(A) as the Examiner cannot find that the Finding 13 represents a misinterpretation of fact before Deputy Examiner Sidles; specifically, the Examiner's Conclusion No. 11 above precludes the Examiner from reopening the record for further evidence and argument and the Examiner has not done so herein.

DECISION:

1. APPLICANT TACOMA RESCUE MISSION Request for Reconsideration of Conditions No. 24 and 25 of the Hearing Examiner's June 3, 2024, Decision is hereby granted and will read as follows:

Condition No. 24.

The Agriculture Building shall only be used in conformance with the definition of "community accessory uses" for the residents allowed per PCC 18A.45.030.1.2 and the uses allowed outright or conditionally under PCC 18A.28.010. This includes uses allowed under Levels 1 and 2 of the Community and Cultural Services Use Type per PCC Table 18A.33.220-1 such as indoor wedding facilities, community centers, grange halls, etc. However, the Agriculture Building shall not be used as a profit-generating event center for weddings or other similar private gatherings.

Condition No. 25.

The Civic Building shall only be used in conformance with the definition of "community accessory uses" for the residents allowed per PCC 18A.45.030.1.2 and the uses allowed outright or conditionally under PCC 18A.28.010. This includes uses allowed under Levels 1 and 2 of the Community and Cultural Services Use Type per PCC Table 18A.33.220-1 such as indoor wedding facilities, community centers, grange halls, etc. However, the Civic Building shall not be used as a profit-generating event center for weddings or other similar private gatherings or used for commercial purposes that are not operated by Pierce County Village residents unless the use is allowed outright in the Residential Resource zone.

2. APPLICANT TACOMA RESCUE MISSION Request for Reconsideration of Condition No. 29 of the Hearing Examiner's June 3, 2024, Decision is denied and will read as follows:

Condition No. 29.

The largest of the significant trees on the site shall be preserved within a conservation tract pursuant to PCC 18E.40.040

3. APPELLANT SPANAWAY CONCERNED CITIZENS Request for Reconsideration that due to an irregularity in the proceedings the Appellant did not have adequate time to respond to the Applicant's new information submitted only the day before oral argument regarding Finding No. 13 to gather all additional factual information responsive to that new argument and to authorize the Appellant to submit additional documents rebutting the Applicant's arguments is denied.

4. APPELLANT SPANAWAY CONCERNED CITIZENS Request for Reconsideration pursuant to PCC 1.22.130(A) that due to a misinterpretation of fact the Finding 13 is erroneous is denied.

ORDERED this 12th day of September 2024.


STEPHEN R. SHELTON
Deputy Hearing Examiner
Pierce County

TRANSMITTED this 12th day of September 2024, to the following:

APPLICANT: Tacoma Rescue Mission

ATTORNEY: William T. Lynn
Gordon Thomas Honeywell LLP
1201 Pacific Ave, Suite 2100
Tacoma, WA 98401

APPELLANT: Spanaway Concerned Citizens

ATTORNEY: Zachary Griefen
Bricklin & Newman LLP
123 NW 36th ST S
Seattle, WA 98107

OTHERS:

Alicia Netter	akaynetter@gmail.com
Angela Schick	anngschick@gmail.com
Ben LoBue	Friendsofpiercecounty@gmail.com
Carole Stevens	Animalfreak98037@yahoo.com
Cathy Ceely	rdobe1@hotmail.com
Cheri Bridges	cheribridges86@icloud.com
Christina Manetti	manetti.christina@gmail.com
Christine Wright	wright.christinemarie@gmail.com
Claudia Finseth	dragonflypond@gmail.com
Cynthia Froembling	Flyingfish8@yahoo.com
Dale & Elaine Kvamme	Dale@Kvammes.com
Daniel Atwood	leadpastor@faithcommunity.church
Don Russell	Krdr1@juno.com
Eva Robinett	evamarierobinett@aol.com
Germaine Young	germyyoung@gmail.com
Gabreil Hinman	Gabe@smithalling.com
Garry Oak Coalition	Action@oak.eco

George Wearn
James Dunlop
Kathleen Failey
Kim Underwood
Lori Uhler
Lynette Borcharding
Marian Craig
Marion Opdahl
Melody Atwood
Melvin Oleson
Michael Mirra
Paul Lubbesmeyer
Randie and Laurie Armatas
Russelene Johnsen
Russell Netter
Sara Coccia, Bethel School District
Sharon Netter
Sherry Haviland
Tiffany Speir
Tracey Taunt
Travis Axe, MPA
Zenna Dunning
Todd Ward
Allan Belton, President, Pacific
Lutheran University
Rober S. Rayburn, PhD, Faith
Presbyterian Church
Richard VanCleave, MA, LMHC,
Carelon Behaviorial Health
Latisha Hamilton
William Harmond
Marsha Williams
Frances Barnes
Susan Esson
Arland Fagerstrom
Bruce Cheney
Cheryl Rogers
Jason Isenberg
Dawn Wagner
Christina Jimmink
Molly Towslee
Craig Hamilton
Jeff Thompson, MD
Jaime Long
Chandra Hallam
Ann Pool

gwearn@gmail.com
consultarchie@gmail.com
kafchat@aol.com
sunnyfurdays1@gmail.com
lmulmt@yahoo.com
Lyn23@hush.com
m.bean05@yahoo.com
Marionopdahl@ymail.com
teamatwood88@gmail.com
meloleson@gmail.com
Michael.mirra@nwjustice.org
plubby@comcast.net
armatas7@comcast.net
cheribridges86@icloud.com
akaynetter@gmail.com
scoccia@bethelsd.org
rnetterfamily@yahoo.com
s.haviland1@comcast.net
tspeir@cityoflakewood.us
Tauntot@gmail.com
Axe.travis@gmail.com
Zennadunn@icloud.com
todd@toddwardllc.com

president@plu.edu

fpc@faithtacoma.org

Richard.VanCleave@carelon.com
lmh4571@yahoo.com
billharmond37@gmail.com
marshajwms@outlook.com
francesc55@live.com
otsuz@nventure.com
arland.fagerstrom@gmail.com
cheneybw1975@gmail.com
carogers54@aol.com
jakesdad@me.com
marthasNightmare@comcast.net
cjimmink@centurytel.net
Mollytowslee@gmail.com
coachhams@hotmail.com
occdoc56@mac.com
jlong@tacomapsyciatric.com
challam@chapelhillpc.org
annpool63@gmail.com

Jill Hamilton	craighillhamilton@hotmail.com
Stephanie Shinn	stephanie@fa-partners.com
Lori Harnick	lorifh@goodwillwa.org
Steve Harlow	sharlow@wamail.net
Connor Mott	mottcr@plu.edu
Audrey Pedersen	audreymarie411@yahoo.com
Nicholas and Richele Pogreba	rpogreba@gmail.com
Pam Beale	pambeale@gmail.com
Arnold Cox	twoblackjacks@msn.com
Don Mellott, PE, Ethos Civil	don@ethoscivil.com
Marc Pudists, PE, Momentum Civil	marcp@momentumcivil.com
Jeff Mcinnis, PE, Mcinnis Engineering	jeff@mcinnisengineering.com
Drew Harris, PE, Momentum Civil	drewh@momentumcivil.com
Life With Meme	starbert71@gmail.com
Laurie and Randie Armatas	2onthelake@protonmail.com
Pat McDonald	sfcmac57@gmail.com
Lee Ann Westwood	law3169@hotmail.com
Victoria Ray	victoria88@comcast.net
Sue Turner	sueturner761@gmail.com
Janet Spingath	janbal1776@gmail.com
Penny Howard	plch25275@icloud.com
Mayor Jim Kastama, City of Puyallup	placipierre@puyallupwa.gov
Pat Pimento	pspimento60@gmail.com
Katie Craig	katiecraig82@yahoo.com
Ron Degroote	rldegroote@msn.com
Sharon Babcock	shbabcock@earthlink.net
John Briehl	jbriehl@hotmail.com
Anthony McDonald	nthnymcdnld@yahoo.com
Tricia Parsons	hi@triciaparsons.com
Rita Indrebo	rindrebo@comcast.net
Greg Cooper	lngcoop@yahoo.com
Mandy Candler	mandycandler@gmail.com
Kurt Reidinger	aldertonkayaks@gmail.com
Terry C. Kuno	terrykuno@gmail.com
Nancy Harvey	nancyj1101@comcast.net
Carrie Umporowicz	cumporowicz@gmail.com
Sean Arent	seanarent5@gmail.com
Jennifer Imholt	jen_imholt@yahoo.com
Sandy (Alex) & Deborah Williamson	sandeb2@gmail.com
David and Laura La Forest	dlaforest1@cox.net
Taylor Underwood	taylorunderwood2.99@gmail.com
Bud Rehberg	budsinfo@icloud.com
Allen Chapman	ajchapman01@hotmail.com
Ronald O'Neill	trlrhauler@gmail.com
Jennifer Adams	jennifer.renee.adams@gmail.com
Todd and Michelle Del Vecchio	toddydv@gmail.com

Tichomír Dunlop
Sharon Costello
Janine Tollin
Shari Boone
Dr. Linda Hagerman
Janice Overway
Chris and Deidre Conant
Kailee Barry
Stephanie Parton
Faith Mueller
Alisha & Joe Manteleone
Alissa Karin Keough
Angela & Greg Wiest
Angela Schick
Barbara Lilly
Brian Dunn
Carolyn Sanders
Cindy Beckett
Cody Rouderick
Craig Nance
Daagon Mosley
Dan Donahoue
Daniel McMullin
Dave Opdahl
Debra Brigham
Diana & John Rogers
Elizabeth Iselin
Erica Borden
Gabriel Hinman
Gary Borden
Gayle Carlson
Gomer Roseman
Janet Hdm
Janine Tollin
Jason Anderson
Jenny Duczale
Jim Overway
Judy Scott
Ken Straub
Kristina Hege
Lynette Borchering
Marianne Lincoln
Marion Opdahl
Mauro Mendez
Mel Olson
Michael Duczale

tiskolin@gmail.com
shazron123@hotmail.com
jessershad@hotmail.com
twoblackjacks@hotmail.com
drhindahagerman17@gmail.com
janis.overway@comcast.net
canddconant@gmail.com
kberry131@live.com
stephiejop67@gmail.com
faithmueller911@gmail.com
squish19@comcas.net
Kkeough@bywitsend.com
gnawiestgmail@gmail.com
AngelaSchick@gmail.com
Getapprovedasap@yahoo.com
Docwink@yahoo.com
Sanderssspc@comcast.net
cindybeckett@comcast.net
Cody.rouderick@gmail.com
Craignance@gmail.com
Daagon.mosley@gmail.com
Themandtm@aol.com
DanielMcMullin@gmail.com
dave.opdahl@yahoo.com
fandffriends@gmail.com
sledjiskirogers@msn.com
Elizabethis1@aol.com
Elborden19@gmail.com
Gabe@smithalling.com
Gmborden@gmail.com
GayleCarlson@outlook.com
Roaming_Gomer@yahoo.com
Photopaws@yahoo.com
Jessershad@hotmail.com
jtaduckeater@gmail.com
Castlerose@icloud.com
Jao3414@comcast.net
Flygerjusy@gmail.com
KenS@cascadedata.com
KristinaHege@gmail.com
LynB23@protonmail.com
Mariann26435@gmail.com
Marionopdahl@ymail.com
Mauro1.2mendez@gmail.com
Melolson@msn.com
Doozee74@icloud.com

Michael Mirra
Michael Tuton
Noell Pacho
Paul Lubbesmeuer
Penny Howard
Petr Glotov
Ptorph Roseman
Richard D'Aurora
Richard VanCleave, MA, LMHC,
Carelton Behavioral Health
Renee Buck
Rick Gehrke
Rikla McGee
Robert Taurino
Rodney Lige
Ruben Pacho
Ruby Kiutz
Sandy Williamson
Scott Munson
Sharon & Alicia Netter
Sheila & Trenton Turner
Stephanie & Andrew Grazzini
Summer Zuchowski
Sylvia Zuchowski
Theresa Byess
Tiffany Sadlon
Tim & Lisa Ross
Tina Maffey
Trudy Confchin
Ward Rodgers
William Drake
Xaymara Aviles Cintron
Yvonne Fox
Zenna Dunning
Michael Eatherly
Mike Presutti
Elisha Babukas
Diedre Conant
Sean Roberts
Craig Hays
Chaplain Ed Jacobs
Sean Lewis
Hayley Uliana
Darren Miller
Sharon Remagen
Merrick Dupea

MichaelMirraTacoma@outlook.com
MCT221@yahoo.com
4noell@gmail.com
plubby@comcast.net
plch825274@icloud.com
pglotov@yahoo.com
ptorph@gmail.com
rdaurora@comcast.net

Richard.VanCleave@carelon.com
rbuckccwc@gmail.com
rickgehrke@hotmail.com
DrpMcgee@Gmail.com
bkhobob@aol.com
Rodney.lige@hotmail.com
rap2u2@yahoo.com
Ybur4640@comcast.net
sandeb2@gmail.com
Scottmunson@comcast.net
rnetterfamily@yahoo.com
Seilaktturner@comcast.net
Shammer757@yahoo.com
SummerZuchowski@gmail.com
S.Zuchowski123@gmail.com
90ktheresa@aol.com
tmsadlon@gmail.com
2timaross@gmail.com
Tmaffey@comcast.net
tcofhin@comcast.net
Wardrodgers1963@gmail.com
Drake730@yahoo.com
xaymaraaviles12@gmail.com
Pteaser53@hotmail.com
Zennadunn@icloud.com
michaeleatherly@hotmail.com
mikejpresutti@gmail.com
ebabukas@gmail.com
diedreconant@gmail.com
seanroberts38@hotmail.com
craig.lhays@yahoo.com
ed.jacobs2@gmail.com
seanl@trm.org
hayleyuliana@gmail.com
wdarrinm@gmail.com
sremagen@comcast.net
rdupea@gmail.com

Sarah Grice	sarah.grice@piercecountywa.gov
Joseph Harper	harperlawoffices@comcast.net
Donah Greiner	donah.02@comcast.net
Linda Small	lindasmall@reagan.com
Miller	luv2zzzz@hotmail.com
Greg Garner	greg@greggarner.com
William Hunt	williamhuntmd@aol.com
Guy Berry	guyberry767@gmail.com
Ethen Bartley	efbartley13@gmail.com
Teri Curtis	chester710@msn.com
Tony Curtis	tcurtis@bethelsd.org
Abigail Rosas	abigailrosas25@gmail.com
Theresa Vilona	theresakayvilona@gmail.com
Cynthia Kaiser	cynthiakaiser@gmail.com
Erika Snell	erikasnell87@outlook.com
Karen Marchesini	kamarchesini@gmail.com
Marvin Hollant	buster98445@gmail.com
Ed Larson	edl94@comcast.net
Keith Meredith	kmeredith95@gmail.com
Cameron Sheppard	csheppard@thenewstribune.com
Laura Hokenstad	laurah@trm.org
Steve McCoy	scmcc107@msn.com
Frank Jackson	frankj@trm.org
Steve O'Ban	steve.oban@piercecountywa.gov
Scott & Wendy Vissering	msviss56@gmail.com
Kate Aranjó & Beth Bricker	katearooo@yahoo.com
Jordan Cowart	jordancowart034@gmail.com
Chad Wirth	crwirth@msn.com

Andrew Britton	9915 153rd St Ct E	Puyallup, WA	98375
Bud Rehberg	3802 232 St	Spanaway, WA	98387
Carol Bartle	407 138th St S	Tacoma, WA	98444
Chris Spieth	856 143rd St S	Tacoma, WA	98444
	17303 Spanaway Loop Rd S		
Christi Chapman	Unit 15	Spanaway, WA	98387
Claudia Finseth	13524 15th Ave S	Tacoma, WA	98444
Dan & Melody Atwood	17107 17th Ave Ct S	Spanaway, WA	98387
	17303 Spanaway Loop Rd S		
David Dorosky	#17	Spanaway, WA	98387
Debbie Williamson	16809 Lakeside Dr S	Spanaway, WA	98387
	17303 Spanaway Loop Rd S		
Debra Schmeil	#50	Spanaway, WA	98387
Denise & Marty Frost	PO Box 4745	Spanaway, WA	98387
Donna Haley	15902 Fair Oask Dr S	Spanaway, WA	98387
George & Becky Ortega	2803 289th St S	Spanaway, WA	98387
George Wearn	PO BOX 1350	Graham, WA	98338

Greg Cooper	1123 Lake Vista Blvd	Spanaway, WA	98387
Hazel A Rpragsl	15716 Fair Oaks Dr S	Spanaway, WA	98387
James Pruitt	4912 268th St E	Spanaway, WA	98387
James Warnke	821 173rd St S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Jennifer Spencer	1591 Fairbanks Dr S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Jessie & Tom Richards	1008 152nd St S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Joanne Jeffery	1211 Creso Rd S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Joanne Seymour	PO Box 280	Spanaway, WA	98387
John Briehl	13210 Tule Lave Ave S	Tacoma, WA	98444
Jrandie Armatus	1018 Mountain View Blvd S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Kathy Creso	16015 16th Ave S	Spanaway, WA	98387
	17303 Spanaway Loop Rd S		
Ken Lind	#35	Spanaway, WA	98387
Kerm Dillard	631 173rd St S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Kevin Kintz	642 165th St S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Kim Underwood	12111 Clover Creek Dr SW	Lakewood, WA	98499
Kurt Reidinger	PO Box 44105	Tacoma, WA	98448
Lani Briehl	13210 Tule Lake Ave S	Tacoma, WA	98444
Laurie Anderson	646 169th St S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Leah Warnke	821 173rd St S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Linda & Earl Gibson	15725 Fair Oaks Dr S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Lisa Foster	646 169th St S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Marianne Lincoln	16008 11th Ave Ct E	Tacoma, WA	98445
Mario Mathisen	1319 Creso Rd S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Mark Richards	1307 Creso Rd S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Michael D Shupe	17303 Spanaway Loop Rd S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Murray Clarno	15902 Fair Oaks Dr S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Richard Moierif	17720 Spanaway Loop Rd S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Roberta Stephens	16925 Spanaway Loop Rd S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Roxy Giddings	12211 C St S	Parkland, WA	98444
Russell Netter	1912 165th St Ct S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Sharon Hotter	615 S 163rd St	Spanaway, WA	98387
		Bonney Lake,	
Shirley Craig	9302 180th Ave E	WA	98391
Trisha Tibbitts	1600 Creso Rd	Spanaway, WA	98387
William & Erika Burraza	18018 17th Ave Ct E	Spanaway, WA	98387
	13 Ponce de Leon Terrace		
Judith and Carlo Manetti	SW	Lakewood, WA	98499
Jenny Duczak	17240 10th Ave South	Spanaway, WA	98387
Colleen Carmichael	3350 Mottman Rd SW	Olympia, WA	98512
Steve Novak	1003 Creso Rd S.	Spanaway, WA	98389
Richard Miller	927 126th St Ct E	Tacoma, WA	98445
Linda Piper	621 119th St S.	Tacoma, WA	98444
Christina Stuart	17103 Spanaway Loops Rd S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Cynthia S.	506 102nd St Ct S	Tacoma, WA	98387
T.V.	13521 15th Ave S	Tacoma, WA	98444

Mila	13212 108th Ave Ct E	Puyallup, WA	98374
Joanne Stafford	1211 Creso Rd S	Spanaway, WA	98387
D. Hayward	1310 S 80th St	Tacoma, WA	98408
Diane Henderson	1702 Rainier St	Steilacoom, WA	98388
Bob Perez	227 179 St E	Spanaway, WA	98387
Steve H.	16801 Lakeside Dr. S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Dale Helt	10004 Alaska St S	Tacoma, WA	98444
Debbie & Chris Nelson	644 169th ST S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Wendy Wright	10905 144th St E	Puyallup, WA	98374
Elizabeth Taunt	16912 18 Ave Ct S	Spanaway, WA	98387
Tobi Cookson	718 157th St Ct E	Tacoma, WA	98445

PIERCE COUNTY PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS
 PIERCE COUNTY BUILDING DIVISION
 PIERCE COUNTY DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
 PIERCE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS AND UTILITIES DEPARTMENT
 TACOMA-PIERCE COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
 FIRE PREVENTION BUREAU
 PIERCE COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION
 PIERCE COUNTY COUNCIL
 PIERCE COUNTY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
 PIERCE COUNTY CODE ENFORCEMENT

NOTICE

CASE NUMBER: **APPLICATION NO. 1013476**
 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT / CONDITIONAL
 USE PERMIT: PIERCE COUNTY VILLAGE

RECONSIDERATION APPLICATION NOS. 1038347 AND
1038497

APPEAL OF EXAMINER'S DECISION:

The final decision by the Examiner may be appealed in accordance with the Land Use Petition Act, Chapter 347, Laws of 1995, Sections 701-719, and Pierce County Ordinance No. 96-19S and RCW 36.70C.