

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
SKAGIT COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2005**

- *T 8:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. Public Works Department – Chal Martin, Director
1. Public Hearing – Consideration of Vacation of Unopened County Right-of-Way East of Old Highway 99 North and North of Butler Hill Road
 2. Discussion/Update – Bayview Ridge Drainage and Subarea Planning Efforts
 3. Discussion – Status of Solid Waste Review and Rate Study
 4. Discussion/Possible Action – Request to Transfer the \$1,000,000 Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) Grant No. 03-1182A to the Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife
 5. Submittal – 2003 Annual Bridge Report
 6. Miscellaneous
- 9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. Work Session – Solid Waste Gasification Process
- 10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. Johnson Ag Variance Appeal
- 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Closed Record Appeal No. PL05-0029 Submitted by Allen Bush and Allen Bush, Jr. of the Hearing Examiner's Decision to Deny a Variance (PL04-0651) to Allow the Applicant to Divide His 12.3 Acre Property In To Two 6.15 Acre Lots
- 2:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Decision – Closed Record Appeal No. PL04-0878 Submitted by Charles Scheid of the Hearing Examiner's Decision Regarding the Denial of a Request For a Reduction in Setbacks (PL04-0560)

The Skagit County Board of Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, February 15, 2005, with Commissioners Don Munks, Kenneth A. Dahlstedt and Ted W. Anderson present.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT – CHAL MARTIN, DIRECTOR

1. Public Hearing – Consideration of Vacation of Unopened County Right-of-Way East of Old Highway 99 North and North of Butler Hill Road.

Steve Flude, Assistant County Engineer, stated that the petitioner for this vacation is Miles Sand & Gravel. Mr. Flude provided photographs of the area, which runs adjacent to the Samish River. He recommended that the said portion of right-of-way be vacated to the petitioner as there are other roads of equal utility for public use; the right-of-way is enclosed on three sides by one property owner and its vacation would create more logical property boundaries; and the right-of-way is of no benefit to the public as a County roadway. Mr. Flude further recommended that all fees be waived; however, any easements or restrictions would remain in effect.

Chairman Munks opened the public hearing.

Michael Crawford, 20675 Rocky Ridge Lane, Sedro-Woolley, stated that he is an officer with Miles Sand & Gravel. He said the request for vacation was made because the company is interested in having the right-of-way become a part of their other property, which surrounds the roadway.

There being no further public testimony, Commissioner Munks motioned to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Commissioner Anderson. The public hearing was closed.

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2005
PAGE NO. 2**

Commissioner Dahlstedt motioned to accept the vacation of unopened County right-of-way, as outlined by Mr. Flude, with no additional costs. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson and passed unanimously.

2. Discussion/Update – Bayview Ridge Drainage and Subarea Planning Efforts.

Gary Christensen, Director of Planning & Development Services, provided an update of the Bayview Ridge Drainage and Subarea Planning efforts. He stated that following extensive deliberations, the Planning Commission is prepared to forward a recommendation to approve the proposed Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan with some minor revisions, but only when it includes a stormwater proposal that the affected drainage districts can support.

Mr. Christensen said that Planning and Public Works are working on a set of policies and findings that condition further land divisions in Bayview Ridge on completion of the Bayview Stormwater Management Plan. These conditions will likely include some restrictions on development in order to minimize further residential/commercial/industrial intensification and the associated potential for significant increased impervious surfaces with additional drainage and surface water runoff impacts downstream. Mr. Christensen said this acknowledges the districts' concern that negative drainage impacts are occurring even without new urban residential development.

The completed Stormwater Management Plan will include interlocal agreements with each of the affected drainage districts spelling out responsibilities, including projects and funding sources. Significant staff time will be necessary to craft and execute these agreements, including staff time from the Prosecuting Attorney's office. Mr. Christensen said that this approach should resolve the major remaining issues that prevent the subarea plan from moving forward.

Dave Brookings, Public Works Administrator, showed an aerial photograph of the area. He indicated that the Bayview Ridge Subarea Plan is approximately 65% complete. His recommendation is to continue working on the Plan and engaging Dike Districts 8, 14 and 19 to help find solutions. Mr. Brookings said he is hopeful that the Plan will be completed by September 2005.

3. Discussion – Status of Solid Waste Review and Rate Study.

Mr. Brookings advised that HDR Engineering has completed a draft of the Solid Waste Rate Study, which is currently in the process of being reviewed. The Study will be presented to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee when it is completed. Mr. Brookings said at that time the consultant will come before the Board to review the findings.

4. Discussion/Possible Action – Request to Transfer the \$1,000,000 Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) Grant No. 03-1182A to the Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife.

Tom Karsh, Public Works, stated that a request has been received from the Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW) for Skagit County to transfer the Telegraph Slough Complex Property Acquisition Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) grant to WDFW.

Mr. Karsh said that Skagit County initially sought to acquire the Knudson Trust property south of Highway 20 near the Swinomish Channel and Telegraph Slough complex in order to limit development in the area of the outlet of the proposed flood bypass. A secondary interest in the property is for the development and construction of an estuary restoration project. Skagit County applied for, and was awarded, an ALEA grant in the amount of \$1,000,000 to purchase properties in the Telegraph Slough complex. The WDFW applied for, and was awarded, a Coastal Wetlands Preservation grant, also in the amount of \$1,000,000, to be used as a match for the County's ALEA grant. Mr. Karsh said that in partnership with Skagit County, Ducks Unlimited agreed to apply for \$600,000 from a North American Wetlands Conservation Act grant towards restoration of the acquired properties.

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2005
PAGE NO. 3**

Skagit County was unable to acquire the target property, stated Mr. Karsh, and to date there appears to be limited property owner willingness to allow conservation easements or restoration sites south of Highway 20. WDFW believes that there may be willing property owners north of Highway 20 along Padilla Bay.

Mr. Karsh asked the Board if they would agree to transfer the County's ALEA grant to WDFW for acquisition of other properties within the general Telegraph Slough complex.

After a brief discussion, Commissioner Dahlstedt motioned to approve the transfer, as outlined by Mr. Karsh. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion, which carried.

5. Submittal – 2003 Annual Bridge Report.

Chal Martin, Public Works Director, provided the 2003 Engineer's Bridge Report to the Commissioners for their review. He stated that the report satisfies the requirements of WAC 13-20-060. It includes a written resume of the findings of the bridge inspection effort and recommendations for the replacement, repair, or load restrictions for deficient bridges. Mr. Martin indicated that Skagit County has 104 bridges located within the County road system, which includes the Guemes Ferry terminals at Anacortes and Guemes Island. He noted that Skagit County staff inspects 92 bridges biennially and two bridges annually.

The Commissioners agreed that the report was well done and advised that it might be a good idea to look into the idea of replacing the Old Highway 99 overpass.

6. Miscellaneous.

Mr. Martin gave a brief update on the ongoing struggle to obtain additional flood storage in the Baker Dam area.

JOHNSON AG VARIANCE APPEAL.

Carly Ruacho, Associate Planner, stated that this closed record hearing is to consider an Agricultural Variance, application No. PL04-0531, submitted by Kim Johnson, requesting approval to place a single family residence outside of the 200 foot maximum front setback, required by SCC 14.16.400(5)(a)(i)(A), to utilize the highest portion of the property for home placement. The subject property is adjacent to and east of Chuckanut Drive and is approximately 10.71 acres in size. The applicant is requesting to place the residence approximately 850 feet from the front (west) property line abutting Chuckanut Drive and in the center of the parcel. The lot has been actively farmed and is enrolled in the Open Space Farm and Agriculture taxation program.

Ms. Ruacho said there is a newly constructed agricultural building located along the northern property line approximately 760 feet from Chuckanut Drive. She said it is important to note that the placement of agricultural buildings within 200 feet of the front property line is not required; this is a requirement for residential structures. There are approved septic designs on file for both within the required building envelope as well the area of the applicant's proposed home site. Both designs require an alternative system and each call for the same type of system, a Glendon Bio Filter. The elevation of the property within the required building envelope ranges from 1 foot to 2.5 feet above sea level. The elevation of the proposed home site is 4.4 feet, according to the applicant. Base flood elevation on this property is 8 feet. Any residential construction on this property would require elevation of the lowest living floor to 9 feet (1 foot above the base flood elevation).

Ms. Ruacho stated that a staff report was prepared by the Planning and Permit Center on October 13, 2004, and forwarded to the Hearing Examiner. The staff report found that the proposal did not meet the required variance criteria (SCC 14.10.030(10)) and concluded that the necessary findings (SCC 14.10.040) could not be supported and approval could not be substantiated. A public hearing before the Hearing Examiner was held on October 20, 2004. He issued Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations on December 27, 2004, recommending conditional approval of the variance.

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2005
PAGE NO. 4**

Kimberly Johnson, 2800 Cedarwood Avenue, Bellingham, commented that if she hadn't called Ms. Ruacho to find out the date of this hearing, she wouldn't be here today because she received no notification. She said a neighbor that spoke at the prior hearing with the Hearings Examiner as well as their septic representative were unable to be here because of the lack of notification

Ms. Johnson said that as previously noted, the elevation at the entrance of the property is approximately 1 foot above sea level. The building elevation where her and her husband propose to build is 4.5 feet, a gain of 3.5 feet, which is natural elevation gain rather than bringing in fill. It is her understanding that where a natural land source can be used for other means of elevation, the County would prefer not to use fill to elevate. Due to the elevation changes, some fill would definitely be needed at either location. She said Skagit County Code also prefers to have buildings grouped together. The elevation choice is why they chose to put the agriculture building at the highest location on the property. It makes sense to put a building at that location as far as flood relief is concerned since the property is located in the flood zone. She said they are working on a revised site plan that would place the house in close proximity to the ag building and not where it is in the previously submitted site plan.

Ms. Johnson said the driveway was there prior to the purchase of the property. By putting the house in the front part of the property, within the 200 foot envelope, Ms. Johnson contended that they would have to construct a new driveway to access a home site as well as provide a means of elevating the driveway to keep it above the water. During the last flood event, the first 200 feet was under at least 6 inches of water.

Ms. Johnson stated that if they are required to build on the front of the property it would require the addition of fencing as they anticipate putting horses on it. Their septic evaluation was done by Rich Anderson, who specifically indicated that there were better soils at the 850 foot mark versus the front portion of the property. Either location would require the use of a Glendon Bio Filter. She said two wetlands evaluations were done, one by the prior owner that was completed in August 2003, which was done by Graham Bunting. They suggested placement of the house around the 850 foot marker, which is consistent with the proposed building site plan. The second evaluation was done in May 2004, which also suggested the placement of the residential home at their proposed site.

The agricultural building was placed 21 feet off of the property line due to the current fire code that requires at least 20 feet if a one hour fire wall is not installed. The building is 40 feet wide so the house placement has been reduced to 115 feet off of the property line.

Ms. Johnson said there are several other home owners in the area whose residences sit directly along Chuckanut Drive. Therefore, they are not asking for anything other than what other land owners have been given.

Commissioner Anderson said they were probably approved prior to 1997 when the Comprehensive Plan was officially adopted.

Commissioner Dahlstedt confirmed that there would be horses on the property that would be outside during the winter. He said it was his understanding that if the horses were to be near the road where the water is then there wouldn't be a place where the current ag building is that would allow outside access on higher ground for the animals that would be there through the winter. Ms. Johnson said it is drier in the back part of the property and they would try to accommodate the horses there.

Commissioner Anderson asked Ms. Johnson if they knew full well what the County Codes were on agricultural property at the time they purchased the acreage. Ms. Johnson said they were not aware of what Skagit County Code required for ag land at the time of purchase. Commissioner Anderson said that according to the record, the Johnson's submitted a plan for a house and a barn and were informed then that they couldn't locate the building where it is due to the 200 foot setback. Ms. Johnson said that was correct. Commissioner stated that the Johnson's chose to proceed with the ag building anyway feeling that it was situated on the best location, thereby ignoring County Code. He asked if it was true that the Johnson's then decided to ask for a variance to put the house at the 850 foot mark. Ms. Johnson said that due to the elevation gain, it was true that they chose to put the ag building where it would be highest and

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2005
PAGE NO. 5**

driest. When reading through Skagit County Code, she said it suggests grouping buildings together to allow the greatest farming of agricultural land. She also said it was true that they submitted a site plan that would put the residential house to the ag building, keeping the buildings together.

Chairman Munks said the driveway looks like it is 20 feet off the property line and Ms. Johnson said that is true for a portion of it. As it gets closer to the ag building, the driveway was veered away and was not done on a straight perpendicular line. Chairman Munks asked what the side setbacks were and Ms. Ruacho said 8 feet. So he asked that if the home were to be sited within 200 feet of Chuckanut Drive then it could be sited next to the driveway and still be within code as far as the setback are concerned. Ms. Johnson responded that other than the wetland issue, that was correct.

Ms. Ruacho stated that it's not an issue of either/or on the siting criteria. The reference by the Hearing Examiner of the 200 feet ag siting criteria of being located next to a property line would still be required even if they located within the 200 feet. They would either have to locate in bottom left corner next to the driveway or in the right corner. The Johnson's can't place the residence in the middle regardless of whether it's within 200 feet or outside of 200 feet. Ms. Ruacho said the ag siting criteria still needs to be met either way.

Commissioner Dahlstedt asked if that was the lowest part of the property. Ms. Ruacho said adjacent to the road it is a 1 foot elevation but within the 200 foot building envelope it rises to 2.2 feet.

Chairman Munks said there would be an impact on the property whether the Johnson's built on the front or back of it. He asked if the home could be sited within the front 200 feet next to the driveway but not on Chuckanut Drive, where the rear line is at the 200 foot mark. Ms. Ruacho said it would have to be located near the driveway or the Johnson's could choose to locate it on the opposite side. All that is required is that the residence be located where there is the least amount of impact, either adjacent to existing buildings within the 200 feet or an interior lot line, one side or the other. There is nothing in the record that shows that a new driveway would need to be constructed.

Ms. Ruacho clarified the lack of notice issue. She stated that it appears there was a glitch in the system. The notices are to be sent out from the Commissioner's office, which didn't happen at the correct time. Ms. Johnson did call a week and 1-2 days ago; therefore, receiving longer than a week's notice, but not the 14 days. Ms. Ruacho said she specifically stated that the hearing could be postponed so that the 14-day notice requirement was adhered to and people could have sufficient notice, or move forward with it. Ms. Johnson told Ms. Ruacho that she would prefer to hold the hearing regardless of the lack of notification.

Commissioner Dahlstedt asked if any folks testified against the variance. Ms. Ruacho said Ms. Johnson's septic evaluator and designer spoke at the hearing as well some property owners. Ms. Johnson also had some written comments from property owners that are in the record.

Commissioner Anderson said that when someone purchases a piece of ag land it is their responsibility to research the rules. The Johnson's decided to locate the ag building where they did even though they were told not to and then came back before the Board asking for a variance. He said people need to abide by the Skagit County Code. It is his opinion that the applicants knew full well what the rules were and went into this with their eyes wide open when they purchased the piece of property.

Commissioner Dahlstedt said we don't want to have any more fill put into any of the areas around the County than is absolutely necessary. One of the considerations with a livestock operation is to have the livestock buildings on the highest ground. A person doesn't want to see livestock standing out in the waterways or in any area that is going to drain into the drainage system. Therefore, he certainly understands locating the livestock buildings on the highest ground available. Commissioner Dahlstedt said he thinks it makes sense to put the house on the highest ground also in order to keep the buildings together.

Chairman Munks said he understands Ms. Johnson's argument on siting their building. The buildings for agricultural use need to be sited on the most usable ground on the property, which is where theirs is

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2005
PAGE NO. 6**

located. However, he questions the reasonable use regarding where the home is going to be sited. He feels that the house can be accommodated within the footprint of the 200 feet, although it might require a bit more fill than what would be required on the back of the property. It would also be keeping with the Comprehensive Plan that was adopted in 1997.

Commissioner Anderson moved to uphold the Planning Department's original recommendation and deny the variance for the 200 foot setback. Chairman Munks seconded the motion, which carried 2 to 1. Commissioner Dahlstedt voted against the motion.

CLOSED RECORD APPEAL NO. PL05-0029 SUBMITTED BY ALLEN BUSH AND ALLEN BUSH, JR. OF THE HEARING EXAMINER'S DECISION TO DENY A VARIANCE (PL04-0651) TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT TO DIVIDE HIS 12.3 ACRE PROPERTY INTO TWO 6.15 ACRE LOTS.

Brent Morrow, Senior Planner, said the project is located at 4352 Eden's Road and 6628 West Shore Drive, Anacortes (Guemes Island), Washington. The applicants, Allen Bush and Allen Bush, Jr., are requesting a variance to subdivide a 12.3 acre property into two 6.15 acre lots from Skagit County Code 14.16.320(5)(e). This section of Code requires that the minimum lot size in the Rural Reserve zone be 10 acres, unless created through a Conservation and Reserve Development (CaRD). Mr. Bush filed Variance application #PL04-0651 on August 24, 2004. Letters of incompleteness were sent to him on August 25, 2004, and September 9, 2004. The application was determined to be complete on October 11, 2004.

On January 5, 2005, the Skagit County Hearing Examiner denied Variance #PL04-0651, which had been submitted by Allen Bush. A fourteen day appeal period was attached to the decision, which ended on January 19, 2005. On January 18, 2005, a timely appeal (#PL05-0029) of the variance denial was filed by Allen Bush and Allen Bush Jr.

Mr. Morrow said this appeal generally states that the Hearing Examiner has not realized there are physical circumstances in existence with respect to the land and building, neighbors are enjoying smaller lot sizes with no restrictions, there are two legal residences on the applicant's property, and Skagit County refuses to acknowledge a density increase. In addition, the appellants discuss issues related to a land division in a sole source aquifer area and try to make the case that neighboring properties with a smaller lot size justify the approval of the variance to allow lots to be created, which are substandard to the Rural Reserve zone. The appellants further state that they are being denied reasonable use of their property.

Mr. Morrow said the Hearing Examiner has thoroughly reviewed and considered all facts relevant to this variance request. He has concluded that County staff was correct in stating that special circumstances for granting of the variance are not present in this case. The Hearing Examiner determined that there is nothing peculiar physically about this property that dictates a departure from the lot size rule and that the lot size of neighboring properties is not a basis for a variance from the lot size being specified by the zoning code. He further states that under SCC 14.16.700, an accessory dwelling unit is permitted as accessory to an existing single-family dwelling, provided that certain restrictions are met. One of these is that "accessory dwelling units shall not be subdivided or otherwise segregated in ownership from the principle unit of the single-family dwelling, unless allowed by the zoning." As pointed out by the appellants, the Hearing Examiner made an error in quoting the correct Code number (the correct Code is SCC 14.16.710(c)), but the language and intent of the code were correctly conveyed by the Hearing Examiner.

County staff concurs with the Findings, Conclusion, and Decision of the Hearing Examiner. In addition, staff would like to clarify an issue that has been brought up by the appellants. The appellants have brought up the sole source aquifer issue in terms of the fact that the two residences already exist on the property and would cause no further impacts to the environment. The consideration of this issue is not relevant to the requested variance because it applies to a subdivision proposal that involves a Conservation and Reserve Development process. In this variance request, a CaRD subdivision was not proposed, and the traditional subdivision that was proposed, as previously stated, would require a

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2005
PAGE NO. 7**

minimum lot size of 10 acres in the Rural Reserve zone. Mr. Morrow stated that the appellants have failed to demonstrate in any instance that the Hearing Examiner was clearly erroneous in making his decision.

Based on review of the filed Notice of Appeal, Mr. Morrow said that the Skagit County Department of Planning and Development Services recommends that the Board of County Commissioners uphold the Hearing Examiner's decision and deny appeal #PL05-0029.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the property had two tax parcel numbers prior to 1997. Mr. Morrow said he didn't know and wasn't certain that it was ever lot certified. He did know; however that the addition of the AVU came after 1997. Commissioner Anderson asked how the well was placed on the property and Mr. Morrow indicated that the Health Department gave the Bush's the right to supply the AVU with what it needed.

Mr. Morrow provided a vicinity map of the property and stated that it is rectangular in shape and is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Eden's Road and West Shore Drive. It contains minimal slopes of 3-4%. There are currently two legal residences on the property, a main house occupied by the applicants and a second house occupied by their son. The second house is an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) approved by the County. Both residences have garages and are serviced by individual well and septic systems.

Chief Deputy Civil Prosecutor Don Anderson underscored the rules for a closed record appeal. He noted that the Bush's submitted additional materials on February 28, 2005, to the Clerk of the Board. Mr. Anderson said she sent them to him for determination and he rejected them and sent them back. He said only materials allowed in front of the Hearing Examiner will be permitted.

The Commissioners noted that they didn't receive the findings of the Hearing Examiner and maps in their packets; however, they chose to proceed with the appeal. Those materials will be provided to them at the close of the hearing.

Allen Bush, Jr., 6628 West Shore Drive, Anacortes, said he and his family would like the Board to overturn the Hearing Examiner's decision for denial of their variance application. He said the variance approval would not detrimentally impact the environment or the community. A simple line on the map at the Assessor's office isn't going to impact anything other than a separate tax parcel so that he and his father can have some sound estate planning, according to Mr. Bush.

Commissioner Anderson asked when the ADU was placed on the property. Mr. Bush said the initial planning meeting he had with Mr. Morrow was in August 2001. Building permits were approved in April 2002. It was placed on the property so that he could take care of his father.

Commissioner Dahlstedt said that when an ADU is allowed it is with the agreement is that the parcel of property will not be subdivided unless it meets the zoning criteria. Mr. Morrow agreed with that assessment and said it is a Code requirement.

Commissioner Anderson stated that if the ADU is no longer in use then it has to be removed.

Mr. Bush said there is also a portion of the Code that would allow him to apply for a Change of Use Permit.

Commissioner Anderson told Mr. Bush that he should have separated the property through a CaRD. Mr. Morrow said it wasn't clear what the applicant wanted, which is what prompted the two incompleteness letters. That is when the applicants came back with the two 6.15 acre lot proposals. Mr. Morrow said every option was explored. Commissioner Anderson discussed the possibility of a CaRD. Mr. Morrow said the request before the Board is for a variance to allow a subdivision in Rural Reserve, not a CaRD option.

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2005
PAGE NO. 8**

Mr. Anderson said in the Hearing Examiner's decision is a remark that indicates that although a CaRD is not requested, staff suggested there would be problems with such an application because of the sole source aquifer designation on Guemes Island. The CaRD density bonus is not available for properties that are not served by public water outside the designated area. The Code section for that is SCC 14.24.350(3).

Commissioner Anderson said that the property already has a well. At one point the sole source aquifer is referred to and yet another well has been allowed. He said it is a confusing issue.

Commissioner Dahlstedt said hypothetically, a CaRD could potentially be put together on this property with the exception of the concern regarding the sole source aquifer.

Mr. Bush stated that there are probably five different portions of the Code that state that there shall be no bonus density in a sole source aquifer. In his pre-application meeting with Planning for the ADU and the variance application, Mr. Bush said he was told he couldn't do a short CaRD because of the density bonus granted in a sole source aquifer. His contention was that physical impacts have been made and there is a density increase planned and permitted by the County, which is not being recognized in this particular case. To go back to the short CaRD now is in fact shifting the planning from before the physical impacts to after.

Mr. Morrow noted that when the applicant mentioned that Mr. Morrow was present for building discussions in 2001, it must have been someone else as he didn't work for Skagit County at that time.

Commissioner Dahlstedt motioned to reconvene on Tuesday, February 22, 2005, at 1:30, and bring forth a decision on closed record appeal #PL05-0029. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderson and passed unanimously.

DECISION – CLOSED RECORD APPEAL NO. PL04-0878 SUBMITTED BY CHARLES SCHEID OF THE HEARING EXAMINER'S DECISION REGARDING THE DENIAL OF A REQUEST FOR A REDUCTION IN SETBACKS (PL04-0560).

Commissioner Dahlstedt moved to deny appeal #PL04-0560 and uphold the Hearing Examiner's decision as there were no grounds to find the Hearing Examiner' decision clearly erroneous. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT.

Commissioner Dahlstedt made a motion to adjourn the proceedings. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

Don Munks, Chairman

Kenneth A. Dahlstedt, Commissioner

Ted W. Anderson, Commissioner

ATTEST:

**RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2005
PAGE NO. 9**

JoAnne Giesbrecht, Clerk of the Board
Skagit County Board of Commissioners