

**SKAGIT COUNTY
OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER**

re: The application for a Shoreline Variance,
and a Critical Areas Variance Permit by
Three Wise Men, LLC

**SHLN 25-0004 (SVAR)
PLAN3-25-0003 (CVAR)**

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,
AND DECISION

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION AND DECISION

Application: The Applicant, Three Wise Men, LLC, is proposing the removal of a cabin and unpermitted bunkhouse from a 0.16 acre lot and build a new residence.

Decision: The requested Shoreline Variance and Critical Area Variance permits are granted, subject to conditions of approval.

INTRODUCTION

The following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are based upon consideration of the exhibits admitted and evidence presented at a properly noticed public hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT

I.

Applicant: Three Wise Men, LLC
Kyle Young, Matthew Hardin
4665 Stoney Brook Lane
Bellingham, WA 98229

Agent: Robert Arlt
SHED Architecture
1401 S. Jackson Street
Seattle, WA 98144

Site Address: 33835 South Shore Drive
Mount Vernon, WA 98274

Legal Description: LOT 114, BLOCK 1, LAKE CAVANAUGH SUBDIVISION, DIVISION NO. 2, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN VOLUME 5 OF PLATS, PAGES 49 TO 54, INCLUSIVE, RECORDS OF SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON.

Parcel No: P66594

Assessor Number (S): 3938-001-114-0002

Lot Size: 0.16 acres

Zoning: Rural Village Residential

Application Date: 6/10/2025

Determination of Completeness: 7/07/2025

Shoreline Designation: Rural Residential

Statewide Significance: No

SEPA Review: The recommended variances are based on special property characteristics including shape, size, topography and location and, therefore, are exempt from SEPA review under WAC 197-11-800(6)(e).

Notice Information: Notice of Application, posted on-site, July 17, 2025
Notice of Application, published in Skagit Valley Herald, July 17, 2025

Notice of Public Hearing, posted on-site, November 4, 2025
Notice of Public Hearing, published in Skagit Valley Herald, November 6,
2025

Primary Authorizing Codes, Policies, Plans, and Programs:

- Revised Code of Washington (RCW)
 - RCW 36.70A, Growth Management Act
 - RCW 36.70B, Local Project Review
 - RCW 90.58, Shoreline Management Act of 1971 (“SMA”)
- Washington Administrative Code (WAC)
 - WAC 173-27, Shoreline Management Permit and Enforcement Procedures
 - WAC 197-11, SEPA Rules
- Skagit County Code (SCC)
 - SCC 14 – Unified Development Code
 - SCC 14.02 – General Provisions
 - SCC 14.02.070 – Office of the Hearing Examiner
 - SCC 14.06 – Permit Procedures
 - SCC 14.11 – Rural Mixed Zones and Uses
 - SCC 14.11.300, Rural Village Residential (RVR)
 - SCC 14.24 – Critical Areas Ordinance
 - SCC 14.24.140, Critical Areas Variances
 - SCC 14.32 – Stormwater Management
 - SCC 14.48 – Shorelines
 - SCC 14.58 – Variances
- Skagit County Shoreline Master Program of 6/29/76, as amended by Skagit County Board of Commissioners through 7/10/95 (SMP)
- Skagit County Comprehensive Plan 2024-2025, as adopted by Skagit County Board of Commissioners on 6/23/25 (SCP or “Comprehensive Plan”)
- Skagit County Hearing Examiner’s Rules of Procedure (SCRE), as authorized by Skagit County Commissioners per Resolution #R20240280 on 12/16/24

Hearing Date: 11/21/25 at 8:30 AM

Testifying Parties of Record:

Andrew Wargo
Skagit County Planning & Development Services
1800 Continental Place
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

Kyle Young, Member
Three Wise Men, LLC

4665 Stoney Brook Lane
Bellingham, WA 98229

Robert Arlt
SHED Architecture
1401 S. Jackson Street
Seattle, WA 98144

Hearing Examiner Exhibit List:

1. Variance Application Narrative, dated June 10, 2025
2. Shoreline Variance Form and Narrative, dated June 20, 2025
3. Completeness Determination, dated July 7, 2025
4. NOA, dated July 17, 2025
5. NOA Comment from Ecology, dated July 17, 2025
6. NOA Comment Period and Plan Review Status Update Memo, dated August 25, 2025
7. Plan Review Status Update Memo, dated September 30, 2025
8. Site Plan, dated September 17, 2025
9. FWHCA Report and Mitigation Plan, dated October 2, 2025
10. Geotechnical Evaluation & Geohazard Assessment, dated October 7, 2025
11. NOPH, dated November 6, 2025
12. Staff Report, dated November 6, 2025
13. E-mail of Kyle Young, dated November 21, 2025

II.

The Applicant is requesting approval to remove a cabin and unpermitted bunkhouse from this 0.16 acre lot and build a new residence. The site lies between South Shore Drive and Lake Cavanaugh. Very steep slopes of greater than 50% occur in the south part of the lot. The proposed location for the new residence is approximately 31 feet from the OHWM of Lake Cavanaugh.

A roadside parking spot lies across the street. There is no driveway, and access was previously provided by a staircase and a funicular. The proposal would remove the funicular and replace it with a new staircase. Based on the geotechnical recommendation, this will avoid impacts to the steepest portion of the site. This location does not meet the 50-foot setback specified by the SMP and is within the inner 50% of the 100-foot buffer specified by the CAO.

The total distance between the OHWM of Lake Cavanaugh and South Shore drive is approximately

105 feet on the west side and approximately 117 feet on the east side, which leaves most of the parcel encumbered by the 100-foot lakeshore buffer specified by the CAO.

Further, the slope of the forested hillside, which is held back from a county road by a retaining wall, and are a suspected erosion and landslide hazard making a driveway not only unfeasible but undesirable from a public perspective as the intact forested hill and retaining wall protect the county road.

III.

The Skagit County Planning and Development Services Staff (the “Department”) have recommended approval of the requested Shoreline Variance and the Critical Areas Variance permit in a “Staff Report for Public Hearing” (“Staff Report” **Ex. 12**).

The Applicant stipulated to use of the SCC in effect now and not at the time of application.

The Applicant has indicated there are no factual or legal inaccuracies in the Staff Report’s findings or conclusions, and that they agreed with the conditions proposed (**Ex. 13**).

The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in the Staff Report, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein, are supported by the record as a whole and are hereby adopted and incorporated herein by this reference, except where explicitly contradicted by the findings herein.

IV.

There were no written public comments received during the public comment period for the Notice of Application.

V.

SCHE §14 grants parties the right to object to evidence and to cross-examine. In the case at hand, with full knowledge of the evidence being admitted, no objection by the applicant or the Department was made to any of the 13 exhibits that were admitted into the record.

VI.

Any Conclusion of Law below which is deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such. Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, now are entered the following:

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I.

Scope of Hearing, Jurisdiction, & Concurrency

Whenever possible, development applications are consolidated and reviewed according to the highest standard of all of the permits, with some exceptions outlined in the law.¹ Critical area variance proposals that contemplate a 50% or greater reduction of standard buffer widths must be heard by the Hearing Examiner as a Type 3 review.² Similarly, Shoreline Variances, must also be heard by the Hearing Examiner as a Type 3 review.³ As the Hearing Examiner is the highest final decision maker in all of the permits associated with this project they are the final decision maker.

Zoning Applicability

Residential development is a permitted use with the Rural Residential shoreline area⁴ and the Rural Village Residential zoning designation.⁵

II.

Shoreline Variances

The Hearing Examiner is authorized to hear, review and pass consideration on variance permits from the regulations of this SMP.⁶

Variances from the application of specific bulk, dimensional or performance standards set forth in the SMP may be permitted where there are extraordinary or unique circumstances relating to the property; this is for circumstances where the strict implementation of the SMP would impose

¹ SCC 14.06.160

² SCC 14.24.140(1)(b) and .150 at Table 1;

³ SCC 14.06.120(2) and .150 at Table 1; and SMP §9.06

⁴ SMP §6.04(2)

⁵ SCC 14.11.300

⁶ SMP §§9.06 and 10.02(3)

unnecessary hardship and such compliance with the SMP would prohibit reasonable use of the property.⁷

As the dimensions of the lot prevent building outside of the 50-foot setback specified under the Shoreline Master Program, a variance would be required for the proposed construction within 31 feet of the OHWM.⁸

Shoreline Variances fall into two categories, those for uses that fall above the OHWM and those that are located either waterward of the OHWM or within marshes, bogs or swamps as designated pursuant to WAC 173-22. The latter have an additional requirement to meet such “[t]hat the public rights of navigation and use of the shorelines will not be adversely affected by the granting of the variance.”⁹

In the case at hand, the proposed use involves development landward of OHWM. This means a Shoreline Variance can only be granted if it meets the less stringent criteria as follows:

- a.** That the strict application of the bulk, dimensional or performance standards set forth in the Master Program precludes a reasonable use of the property not otherwise prohibited by this Master Program.
- b.** That the hardship described above is specifically related to the property and is the result of unique conditions such as irregular lot shape, size or natural features and the application of this Master Program and not, for example, from deed restrictions or the applicant's own actions.
- c.** That the design of the project will be compatible with other permitted activities in the area and will not cause adverse effects to adjacent properties or the shoreline environment designation.
- d.** That the requested variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege not enjoyed by the other properties in the area and will be the minimum necessary to afford relief.
- e.** That the public interest will suffer no substantial detrimental effect.¹⁰

And, in addition to the above criteria the Hearing Examiner must consider the cumulative impact of additional requests for like actions in the area.¹¹

The strict application of the bulk, dimensional or performance standards set forth in the SMP precludes a reasonable use of the property not otherwise prohibited; and that hardship is specifically related to the property’s unique conditions. The granting of this decision is not likely to result in additional neighboring development that would not be permitted otherwise.

⁷ SMP §10.01

⁸ SMP at §7.13(2)(c) and at “Table RD” on 7-110

⁹ Compare SMP §§10.03(1) and (2)

¹⁰ SMP 10.03(1)

¹¹ SMP 10.03(3)

In this case, after reviewing the files and testimony, and having made the findings above, the Hearing Examiner finds that with appropriate conditions of approval, the project would be compliant with all of the above applicable Shoreline Variance criteria. Consequently, subject to proposed conditions of approval, the Shoreline Variance Permit should be approved.

III.

Critical Areas Variance

Any person wishing to deviate from the terms and standards outlined by the Critical Areas Ordinance (“CAO”),¹² can seek a Critical Areas Variance where the strict application of that ordinance is found to deprive the subject property of rights and privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity, due to special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, and topography.^{13, 14}

Given the proposed residence being within the inner 50% of the 100-foot buffer specified by the CAO, it is impossible to reasonably use this lot with the setback requirements. As the proposal does not meet those requirements and is in fact in the critical area, and thus a critical areas variance is required for the construction of any of the proposed additions.

Critical area variance proposals that contemplate a 50% or greater reduction of standard buffer widths must be heard by the Hearing Examiner.¹⁵ To approve a Critical Areas Variance, the Hearing Examiner must find:

- a) The issuance of a zoning variance by itself will not provide sufficient relief to avoid the need for a variance to the dimensional setback and other requirements for the critical areas regulated by this Chapter; and
- b) Preparation of a site assessment and mitigation plan by a qualified professional pursuant to the requirements of SCC 14.24.080 and all other applicable sections of this Chapter. The site assessment and mitigation plan shall be prepared utilizing best available science; and
- c) The conclusions of the site assessment must utilize best available science to support a modification of the dimensional requirements of this Chapter; and

¹² SCC 14.24

¹³ SCC 14.24.140

¹⁴ “Provided however, that those surrounding properties that have been developed under regulations in effect prior to the effective date of [SCC 14.24] shall not be the sole basis for the granting of the variance.” *Id.*

¹⁵ SCC 14.24.140(1)(b)

- d) The site assessment and mitigation plan demonstrate that the proposed project allows for development of the subject parcel with the least impact on critical areas while providing a reasonable use of the property; and
- e) The reasons set forth in the application justify the granting of the variance, and the variance is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure; and
- f) The granting of the variance will be consistent with the general purpose and intent of this Chapter, and will not create significant adverse impacts to the associated critical areas or otherwise be detrimental to the public welfare; provided, that if the proposal is within the special flood hazard area (SFHA), the applicant must demonstrate that the proposal is not likely to adversely affect species protected under the Endangered Species Act, or their habitat; and
- g) The inability of the applicant to meet the dimensional standards is not the result of actions by the current or previous owner in subdividing the property or adjusting a boundary line after the effective date of the ordinance codified in this Chapter; and
- h) The granting of the variance is justified to cure a special circumstance and not simply for the economic convenience of the applicant.¹⁶

And, the Hearing Examiner may prescribe such conditions and safeguards as are necessary to secure adequate protection of critical areas from adverse impacts and to ensure that impacts to critical areas or their buffers are mitigated to the extent feasible utilizing best available science.¹⁷

In this case, after reviewing the files and testimony, and having made the findings above, the Hearing Examiner finds that with appropriate conditions of approval, the project would be compliant with all of the above applicable Critical Areas Variance criteria. Consequently, subject to conditions of approval, the Critical Areas Variance Permit should be approved – IF the project also meets the general variance criteria of SCC 14.10, as discussed below.

IV.

General Variance Criteria

¹⁶ SCC 14.24.140(3)

¹⁷ SCC 14.24.140(4)

Additionally, in seeking a Critical Areas Variance, the General Variance criteria must also be met; and in the case here of a zoning variance, they must be met for the zoning variance as well. This is clear because SCC 14.58.020(1)(b)(vii) specifically refers to critical area variances at the administrative level and limits them to 50% or under though this is also recited in SCC 14.24, and the Hearing Examiner's application of variance criteria for critical areas is also noted in SCC 14.58.040(d)(i); consequently SCC 14.58 is meant to encompass all of SCC Title 14 variances,¹⁸ and also directs additional criteria that may be outlined in SCC §14.24, *etc.*¹⁹ So, in addition to the Critical Areas Variance Criteria, the project must also meet the General SCC 14.58 Variance Criteria.

Title 14 encompasses all development in Skagit County in order to "implement the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan on matters concerning land and building development and other related issues..." as well as other Skagit County policies outlined in Title 14.²⁰ It is "applicable to all land within unincorporated Skagit County except as allowed by law."²¹

Any person wishing to deviate from the terms and standards outlined in SCC Title 14, can seek a variance where in specific cases that will not be contrary to the public interest, and where, due to special conditions, literal enforcement of the provisions of this Code would result in unnecessary hardship, that is otherwise permissible in the zoning.²² There are three levels of variances in Skagit County, "Hearing Examiner Variances," "Administrative Variances," and "Board of Commissioner Variances."²³ All variances default to the hearing examiner as the default final decision maker unless they meet the exception criteria associated with the other variances. To approve a variance, the deciding body must find:

- a. The variance complies with any relevant variance criteria found in other sections of Skagit County Code.
- b. The variance is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of land, building, or structure.
- c. The granting of the variance will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this Title and other applicable provisions of the Skagit County Code, and will not be injurious to the neighborhood, or otherwise detrimental to public welfare.
- d. For a Hearing Examiner variance and all setback variances:

¹⁸ SCC 14.58.010 "Variances from the terms of this Title" does not mean only Chapter 14.10, but all of Title 14

¹⁹ SCC 14.58.020

²⁰ SCC 14.02.010

²¹ SCC 14.02.040

²² SCC 14.58.010

²³ SCC 14.58.020

- i. The requested variance arises from special conditions and circumstances, including topographic or critical area constraints, which are peculiar to the land, structure, or building involved and which are not ordinarily found among other lands, structures, or buildings in the same district.
- ii. The special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant.
- iii. Literal interpretation of the provisions of this Chapter would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of this Title and SCC Title 15.
- iv. The granting of the variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this Title and SCC Title 15 to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same district.²⁴

As the same conditions exist that require the Critical Areas Variance, those conditions are also a violation of the standards of Title 14, and a satisfaction of the 14.58 variance requirements are required for the proposed use.

In this case, after reviewing the files and testimony, and having made the findings above, the Hearing Examiner finds that with appropriate conditions of approval, the project would be compliant with all of the above applicable general variance criteria.

Specifically, this project would utilize the property as a single-family residence, which will be consistent with the existing Rural Village Residential zoning designation; and embraces and carries forwards the goals in the SCP of using RVR zoning to maintain the “existing rural residential and commercial development patterns and uses, environmental constraints, presence of critical areas, proximity to designated NRL, and adequate capacity to maintain existing rural levels of service.”²⁵

Consequently, subject to conditions of approval, having met the General Variance criteria, the underlying Critical Areas Variance should be approved.

V.

Any Conclusion of Law deemed to be a Conclusion of Fact is hereby adopted as such. Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, now is entered the following:

DECISION

²⁴ SCC 14.58.040

²⁵ SCP at Chap. 3 “RVR”, Policy 3C-1.5

A Shoreline Variance and a Critical Areas Variance permit as described in the Staff Report shall be granted to the applicant Three Wise Men, LLC to remove a cabin and unpermitted bunkhouse and build a new residence on a .16 acre lot, at a site addressed as 33835 South Shore Drive, Mount Vernon, WA, subject to the following conditions:

- 1.** Compensatory mitigation in accordance with the approved FWHCA Assessment & Mitigation Plan (Exhibit #9) is required:
 - a.** Waterward of the new structure the remaining buffer, 1,719 sf must be planted with 60 native shrubs and trees of at least 6 different species as specified on Table 1 of the Mitigation Plan. Substitutions must be approved by PDS staff.
 - b.** Landward of the new structure 3,292 sf must be planted with 77 native shrubs and trees in accordance with Table 2 of the Mitigation Plan. Substitutions must be approved by PDS staff.
 - c.** Prior to final inspection of the building permit all mitigation plantings must be installed and inspected by PDS staff and an as-built report submitted to PDS.
 - d.** Monitoring reports and inspections are required 1, 3, & 5 years after mitigation installation.
 - e.** By Year 5, an 80% minimum planting survival rate is required, an 80% minimum native plant coverage is required, no Class A noxious weeds may be present, and Class B and C noxious weeds may be no more than 10% coverage. Deficiencies in performance standards will require additional monitoring and inspection requirements until standards are met.
- 2.** Prior to approval of any building, septic, or land disturbance permits, a PCA site plan must be recorded with the Skagit County Auditor. The PCA will include the remaining FWHCA buffer and the steep forested slope.
- 3.** A critical areas variance shall expire if the use or activity for which it is granted is not commenced within three years of final approval by the Approving Authority. Knowledge of the expiration date is the responsibility of the applicant.
- 4.** Pursuant to WAC 173-27-190(2) a shoreline variance expires within two years of the date of its approval and a new permit will be required if the permittee fails to make substantial progress toward completion of the project for which it was approved. Pursuant to WAC 173-27-190(3) it will expire if the project is not completed within five years of the date of the approval, unless the permittee has requested a review, and upon good cause shown, been granted an extension of the permit.
- 5.** An inadvertent discovery plan must be prepared and kept onsite at all times. All owners and contractors should be familiar with its contents and know where to find it. Compliance with all applicable laws pertaining to archaeological resources (RCW 27.53, 27.44 and WAC 25-48) and human remains (RCW 68.50) is required. Should archaeological resources (e.g. shell midden,

faunal remains, stone tools) be observed during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity should stop, and the area should be secured. The Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (Local Government Archaeologist, 360-586-3088) and the following Nations' Tribal Historic Preservation Offices should be contacted immediately in order to help assess the situation and to determine how to preserve the resource(s):

- a. Upper Skagit Indian Tribe Scott Schuyler, Cultural Resources
sschuyler@upperskagit.com Phone: 360-854-7009
- b. Swinomish Indian Tribal Community Josephine Jefferson, THPO
jjefferson@swinomish.nsn.us Phone: 360-466-7352
- c. Samish Indian Nation Jackie Ferry, THPO jferry@samishtribe.nsn.us Phone 360-2936404 ext. 126
- d. Stillaguamish Tribe Cultural Resources Department 360-652-5586 /
<https://www.stillaguamish.com/departmentservice/cultural-resources/>

NOTICE OF POTENTIAL REVOCATION & PENALTIES

This Approval is subject to all the above-stated conditions. Failure to comply with them may be cause of its revocation.

Complaints regarding a violation of this permit's conditions should be filed with Skagit County Planning and Development Services. Violations of permit conditions may result in revocation (or modification) of the permit, administrative action under SCC 14.44 (including monetary penalties), and the violations being declared a public nuisance.

Critical Areas Variance Warnings

A variance shall expire if the use or activity for which it is granted is not commenced within three years of final approval by the Approving Authority. Knowledge of the expiration date is the responsibility of the applicant.²⁶

Shoreline Warnings

THIS PERMIT IS NOT VALID (AND NO CONSTRUCTION NOR OPERATION AUTHORIZED BY THIS PERMIT SHALL BEGIN) UNTIL TWENTY-ONE (21) DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF FILING AS DEFINED BY RCW 90.58.140(6) OR UNTIL ALL REVIEW PROCEEDINGS INITIATED WITHIN TWENTY-ONE (21) DAYS FROM THE DATE OF SUCH FILING HAVE TERMINATED; EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN RCW 90.58.140(5) and WAC

²⁶ SCC 14.24.140(6)

173-27-190, UNLESS EXCEPTED BY STATUTE. THE DATE OF FILING WILL NOT OCCUR UNTIL AFTER THE 5 DAYS TO REQUEST RECONSIDERATION OR AN ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL HAS RUN.

Any shoreline substantial development, conditional use or variance permit may be rescinded by Skagit County and/or the Department of Ecology upon the finding that a permittee is in non-compliance with the permit and any conditions, terms or standards attached thereto. Procedure shall follow those outlined in SMMP §9.13.

FURTHER, in addition to incurring civil liability under SCC Ch. 14.44 and RCW 90.58.210, pursuant to RCW 90.58.220 any person found to have willfully engaged in activities on shorelines of the state in violation of the provisions of the act or the Shoreline Management Program or other regulations adopted pursuant thereto shall be guilty of a gross misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$25 or more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment in the county jail for not more than 90 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment; provided that the fine for the third and all subsequent violations in any five year period shall not be less than \$500 nor more than \$10,000.

Any person who willfully violates any court order, regulatory order or injunction issued pursuant to the Shoreline Management Program or the State Shoreline Management Act shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000, imprisonment in the county jail for not more than 90 days, or both. This approval does not release the applicant from any regulations and procedures required of any other public agency, or any County requirements other than the requirement to obtain a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit and Shoreline Conditional Use Permit. This permit may be rescinded pursuant to RCW 90.58.140(8) in the event the permittee fails to comply with the terms or conditions thereof.

Pursuant to WAC 173-27-090(2) this permit shall expire within two years of the date of its approval and a new permit will be required if the permittee fails to make substantial progress toward completion of the project for which it was approved. Pursuant to WAC 173-27-090(3) it shall expire if the project is not completed within five years of the date of the approval, unless the permittee has requested a review, and upon good cause shown, been granted an extension of the permit.

NOTICE OF APPEAL PROCEDURES FROM FINAL DECISIONS OF THE HEARING EXAMINER

This action of the Hearing Examiner is final.

The applicant, any party of record, or any county department may appeal any final decision of a hearing examiner.

- A.** Type 1 decisions are appealed to Skagit Superior Court, pursuant to the provisions of SCC 14.06.150-1; Appeals to the Superior Court must be filed with the Superior Court within 21 calendar days of the final decision of a hearing examiner pursuant to RCW 36.70C.040(C).
- B.** Type 2 and 3 decisions are appealed to the Skagit County Board of Commissioners, pursuant to the provisions of SCC 14.06.150-1; Appeals to the Skagit County Board of Commissioners require filing of a written notice of appeal within 14 calendar days of the final decision of a hearing examiner for most decisions, *but* Shoreline permit decisions require filing a notice of

appeal within five days of the decision per the same ordinance as provided in SCC 14.06.410(3).

More detailed information about reconsideration and appeal procedures are contained in the Skagit County Code Title 14.06 and which is available at <https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/SkagitCounty/>

DATED November 25th, 2025



Rajeev D. Majumdar
Skagit County Hearing Examiner