

**BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER
FOR SEDRO-WOOLLEY**

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| In the Matter of the Application of |) | No. CUP-2020-032 |
| |) | |
| Lance Campbell, on behalf of |) | Skagit Self Storage |
| Skagit Self Storage |) | Expansion CUP |
| |) | |
| |) | FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, |
| <u>For a Conditional Use Permit</u> |) | AND DECISION |

SUMMARY OF DECISION

The request for a conditional use permit to allow expansion of the existing Skagit Self Storage Facility, including the addition of nine single-story storage buildings and associated driveways and landscaping, on five acres at 1320 East Moore Street, is **APPROVED**. Conditions are necessary to address specific impacts of the proposal.

SUMMARY OF RECORD

Hearing Date:

The Hearing Examiner for the City of Sedro-Woolley (City) held an open record hearing on the request on September 8, 2020, using remote technology in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. The record was left open until September 16, 2020, to allow the Applicant to submit requested materials and to allow the City to respond to the Applicant’s submitted materials.

Testimony:

The following individuals presented testimony under oath at the open record hearing:

- Katherine Weir, City Assistant Planner
- John Coleman, City Planning Director
- Lance Campbell, Applicant Representative
- John Ravnik, Project Engineer
- Carl Lundstrom

Exhibits:

The following exhibits were admitted into the record:

- A. Transmittal & Report Memorandum (Staff Report)
- B. Conditional Use Permit Application, dated February 6, 2020; Affidavit of Correct Names and Addresses, dated February 6, 2020
- C. Original Site Plans:
 - 1. Preliminary Site Plan, dated February 4, 2020
 - 2. Overall Site Plan, dated February 4, 2020
 - 3. Preliminary Landscape Plan, dated February 4, 2020

*Findings, Conclusions, and Decision
Sedro-Woolley Hearing Examiner
Skagit Self Storage Expansion CUP, No. CUP-2020-032*

- D. Notice of Application and SEPA Comment Period, published February 28, 2020
- E. SEPA Notice of Threshold Determination Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance (MDNS), issued May 18, 2020
- F. Updated Application Materials
 - 1. Conditional Use Permit Application, received July 2, 2020
 - 2. Affidavit of Correct Names and Addresses
 - 3. Supplemental Building Description
- G. Revised Preliminary Site Plan, dated August 4, 2020
- H. Comment from Dan Younkin, received March 10, 2020
- I. Comment from Carl Lundstrom, received March 13, 2020
- J. Comment from Tim Woodmansee, received March 11, 2020
- K. Notice of Public Hearing, published August 25, 2020
- L. Hearing Examiner Decision, CUP-2016-030, dated April 15, 2016
- M. Hearing Examiner Decision, CUP-2017-281, dated October 26, 2017
- N. Wetland Reconnaissance Report, Bob Whitefield, dated October 23, 2019
- O. SEPA Environmental Checklist, dated February 6, 2020
- P. Comment from John Wright, dated September 7, 2020
- Q. Site Plan, dated December 5, 2019; Supplemental Building Description, updated September 11, 2020
- R. Final City Comments to Address Issues Raised at Public Hearing, dated September 16, 2020

The Hearing Examiner enters the following findings and conclusions based upon the testimony and exhibits admitted at the open record hearing.

FINDINGS

Application and Notice

1. Lance Campbell, on behalf of Skagit Self Storage (Applicant), requests approval of a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow expansion of the existing Skagit Self Storage Facility, including the addition of nine, new single-story buildings containing a total of 450 variously-sized rentable storage units and associated driveways and landscaping. The proposed expansion would be located on approximately five acres of undeveloped land north of and adjacent to the existing self-storage facility. The property is located at 1320 East Moore Street.¹ *Exhibit A, Staff Report, pages 1 through 3; Exhibit B; Exhibit C; Exhibit F; Exhibit G; Exhibit Q.*
2. The City of Sedro-Woolley (City) held a pre-application meeting on November 27, 2019. The City determined that the application was complete on February 24, 2020. Notice of the application was posted on the subject property on February 26, 2020. The following day, the City mailed notice to residents and property owners within 500 feet of the

¹ The property is identified by tax parcel numbers P39548 and P133765. *Exhibit A, Staff Report, page 2.*

subject property. Notice of the application was published in the *Skagit Valley Herald* on February 28, 2020. The City provided notice of the open record hearing associated with the application by posting notice on the subject property on August 20, 2020; mailing notice to residents and property owners within 500 feet of the subject property on August 24, 2020; and publishing notice in the *Skagit Valley Herald* on August 25, 2020. The City received four public comments in response to its notice materials. Dan Younkin submitted a comment opposing the project, noting concerns about the loss of farmlands and the lack of employment opportunities with the expansion of the existing facility. Carl Lundstrom submitted a comment expressing concerns about the project's impacts on his neighboring residential property. Specifically, Mr. Lundstrom expressed concerns about the proposed height of building L, the proposed height of landscaping to visually shield building L, and the potential for access to building L from his property. Tim Woodmansee of BYK Construction submitted a comment expressing concerns about the proposed site layout and landscape screening in relation to potential future residential development to the north of the site. John Wright submitted a comment expressing concerns about the existing facility's noncompliance with light shielding requirements. *Exhibit A, Staff Report, pages 3 through 5; Exhibit D; Exhibit H; Exhibit I; Exhibit J; Exhibit K; Exhibit P.*

State Environmental Policy Act

3. The City acted as lead agency and analyzed the environmental impacts of the proposal, as required by the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), Chapter 43.21C Revised Code of Washington (RCW). The City consolidated notice of the SEPA review and application comment periods under the optional process provided for by Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-355, with a comment deadline of March 13, 2020. The notice materials stated that the City expected to issue a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance (MDNS) for the proposal. The City received comments from Dan Younkin, Carl Lundstrom, and Tim Woodmansee during the SEPA comment period, as described above. After reviewing the Applicant's Environmental Checklist and other information on file, the City determined that, with mitigation, the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Accordingly, the City issued an MDNS on May 18, 2020. The MDNS requires the Applicant to shield vehicle lights and other exterior lighting from surrounding residential properties; to comply with all local, state, and federal regulations, including Chapter 13.36 Sedro-Woolley Municipal Code (SWMC) Stormwater Management Standards, Chapter 13.40 SWMC Stormwater Facilities Maintenance, Chapter 15.40 SWMC Public Works Construction Standards, Title 17 SWMC Zoning, Sedro-Woolley Public Works Design Standards, and the Sedro-Woolley Comprehensive Plan; to comply with Northwest Clean Air Agency Regulations during construction; to receive approval from the Public Works Department for any water that would be discharged to the City stormwater system; to provide a temporary erosion and sedimentation plan for approval from the City engineer; and to use temporary construction access approved by the Public Works Department during construction. The

MDNS provided for an appeal deadline of June 1, 2020. The MDNS was not appealed. *Exhibit A, Staff Report, pages 3 through 5; Exhibit D; Exhibit E; Exhibits H through J.*

4. The Applicant submitted updated application materials on July 2, 2020, and an updated site plan on August 4, 2020. The Applicant's updated materials generally maintained the proposed lot coverage and changed the proposed layout to accommodate a reduction in the number of proposed larger storage units and an increase in the number of proposed smaller storage units. City staff determined that new SEPA notice and determination were not necessary for the updated plans because the proposed overall lot coverage had been slightly decreased, and the updated plans would not change the environmental impacts of the proposal. As discussed in detail below, the Applicant again submitted an updated site plan and building description on September 11, 2020, which incorporated minor revisions in response to concerns raised at the open record hearing. *Exhibit A, Staff Report, page 4; Exhibit F; Exhibit G; Exhibit Q.*

Comprehensive Plan and Zoning

5. The property is designated Mixed Commercial by the City Comprehensive Plan. The purpose of the Mixed Commercial designation is to allow for a comparable mix of commercial and residential development, with standards intended to present an attractive and welcoming appearance to visitors at the entrances to the city and at selected nodes along major roads. *City Comprehensive Plan, page 31.* City staff identified the following Comprehensive Plan goals and policies as relevant to the proposal:
 - Buffer commercial and industrial land uses when they abut residential development (Policy LU1.5).
 - Provide for limited commercial development catering to auto-oriented customers and tourists along State Route 20, outside the central business district (Policy LU1.6).
 - Identify and promote sites that can be developed for a variety of local employment projects. Promote development of business and industrial parks, office and professional centers, and specialized commercial and entertainment centers (Policy E1.3).
 - Work with property owners to determine the effective development capacity of sites having employment center possibilities (Policy E1.4).*Exhibit A, Staff Report, pages 5 through 8.*
6. City staff noted that the proposed expansion of the self-storage facility would not meet the specific intent of the Mixed Commercial designation because it would not fully utilize the capacity of the site's employment center possibilities and would not present an attractive and welcoming appearance at the entrance to the city. City staff determined, however, that these concerns would be alleviated by the proposed location of the expansion behind the existing self-storage facility and that, with conditions requiring landscaping to visually screen the existing facility and proposed expansion, the project

would not significantly interfere with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. *Exhibit A, Staff Report, pages 5 through 8.*

7. The property is zoned Mixed Commercial (MC). The intent of the MC zone is to encourage a compatible mix of commercial and residential development, with standards intended to present an attractive and welcoming appearance to visitors at city entrances and selected nodes along major roads; manage traffic impacts; encourage non-motorized trips; and reduce stormwater runoff. *SWMC 17.20.005.* Commercial development within the MC zone should be scaled down when located adjacent to residential areas to improve compatibility between uses. *SWMC 17.20.005.* Mini-storage facilities may be allowed in the MC zone with a conditional use permit. *SWMC 17.20.010.B.4.* *SWMC 17.20.020* provides bulk restrictions applicable to development in the MC zone, including minimum setback and maximum building height requirements. The Applicant's site plans and building descriptions show that the proposed single-story buildings would not exceed the applicable maximum building height of 35 feet. *SWMC 17.20.020.B.* *SWMC 17.20.020.A.1* requires minimum 20-foot front and rear setbacks and 35-foot side setbacks from adjacent residential zones. The 35-foot minimum side setbacks may be reduced to 20 feet if building step-backs, as required by the design standards and guidelines of Chapter 15.44 *SWMC*, are incorporated into the site design. *SWMC 17.20.020.A.1.* The Applicant proposes 20-foot side setbacks from adjacent residential properties. City staff initially determined that the Applicant's proposed building layout would not meet step-back design standards that would allow the project to qualify for reduced 20-foot side setbacks. Following project revisions reducing the proposed height of a building on the west property line, however, City staff determined that the project would meet the requirements for reduced 20-foot side setbacks. *Exhibit A, Staff Report, page 9; Exhibit C; Exhibit F; Exhibit G; Exhibit Q; Exhibit R.*
8. Property to the north of the proposed project site is zoned Residential 7 and is undeveloped. Property to the south is zoned Mixed Commercial and is developed with the existing self-storage facility. Property to the east is zoned Residential 7 and is developed with a mobile home park. Property to the west is zoned Residential 7 and is developed with single-family residences. *Exhibit A, Staff Report, pages 2 and 3.*

Conditional Use Permit

9. As noted above, the Applicant requests a CUP to allow expansion of the existing Skagit Self Storage Facility. Under the current version of the proposal, the Applicant would construct nine fully-enclosed, single-story buildings totaling 90,309 square feet, which would contain a total of 450 storage units, varying in size from 5 feet by 5 feet to 14 feet by 40 feet, with an average unit size of 200.7 square feet. Impervious drive surfaces totaling 91,435 square feet would be installed to provide vehicular access to the buildings and associated storage units. The Applicant would also provide landscaping that would provide visual screening to adjacent properties and, as proposed, would exceed 15 percent of the area of the site in compliance with *SWMC 17.50.040.* The Applicant's full

landscaping plan would be reviewed with its building permit application. City staff reviewed the Applicant's site plan and determined that the proposal would meet the off-street parking requirements under Chapter 17.36 SWMC. The project would be required to comply with the design review requirement of Chapter 15.44 SWMC. Bob Whitefield submitted a wetland reconnaissance report on behalf of the Applicant, dated October 23, 2019, which determined that no wetlands are present on the property. *Exhibit A, Staff Report, pages 9 through 12; Exhibit C; Exhibit F; Exhibit G; Exhibit N; Exhibit Q; Exhibit R.*

10. The Applicant submitted a project narrative addressing how the project would comply with the criteria for a CUP under SWMC 17.56.060. Specifically, the Applicant's narrative notes:
- The property is zoned Mixed Commercial, which promotes retail and commercial businesses along corridors, such as Highway 20. The proposed mini-storage expansion would not front directly on Highway 20. The location of the proposed facility would not consume valuable street frontage slated for retail and commercial businesses. The visibility of this site location is buffered by mixed commercial lots along the northerly side of Highway 20.
 - The proposed facility would provide needed storage space to accommodate medium- to high-density residential development in the area.
 - Under the City Comprehensive Plan, mixed commercial development is intended to allow a compatible mixture of retail, commercial, office uses, general services, light manufacturing, and residential development at selected locations. The proposed storage facility would provide a general service that does not necessarily need high exposure, as would retail and commercial uses. Due to the orientation of Highway 20, the positioning of this facility is setback approximately 200 to 600 feet from the center of Highway 20. The proposed facility expansion would provide a needed service on property that may otherwise be more difficult to develop as retail or commercial because of its location and lack of visibility.
 - The proposed use of the property, as an expansion of an adjoining mini-storage facility, is compatible with existing and intended surrounding uses. Mini-storage uses and activities are peaceful, do not generate significant vehicle traffic, do not generate constant loud noises, and do not generate smells or odors. The proposed site development would not create an obtrusive visual effect. The proposal would comply with setback and landscaping requirements.
 - The city and surrounding communities are economically strong and stable, supporting a considerable amount of new residential development. Mini-storage facilities serve a need for residents in the city and from nearby communities to have a safe location where they can store household items.

Exhibit F.

11. City staff analyzed the proposal to ensure that it would be consistent with the criteria for a CUP under SWMC 17.56.060 and determined:
- Although the proposal does not strictly comply with the Comprehensive Plan, the unique circumstances of the property combined with recommended conditions for approval would mitigate the City's concerns to an acceptable level.
 - The area of the proposed expansion would be surrounded on the north, east, and west by residential uses. Recommended conditions would mitigate concerns of the proposed use's incompatibility with the surrounding residential uses.
 - The Applicant stated that this expansion would be an asset to the community because many people do not have adequate storage at their homes and may need small scale storage units as a result of the impact on the economy from COVID-19. City staff agrees that this is a reasonable argument. Additionally, the proposal as conditioned is well planned because the expansion area would be behind the existing facility, not plainly visible from State Route 20.

Exhibit A, Staff Report, pages 9 and 10.

Testimony

12. City Assistant Planner Katherine Weir testified generally about the proposal and how, with conditions, it would meet the requirements for approval of a conditional use permit. She noted that the proposed expansion of the existing self-storage facility would not strictly comply with the City Comprehensive Plan, but that, with recommended conditions, the project would not interfere with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Weir stated that the City agrees with the Applicant's proposal for 20-foot side setbacks in light of the Applicant's willingness to locate shorter buildings along the west side of the project site. She clarified that MDNS conditions and the City's recommended conditions for approval of a CUP applied to the entire property, including the existing self-storage facility. Ms. Weir explained that the Applicant's landscape plan would be reviewed at the building permit phase. *Testimony of Ms. Weir.*
13. City Planning Director John Coleman testified that the MDNS condition related to light shielding is designed to bring the existing facility into compliance with requirements of the previously issued CUP. He explained that City code provides options for compliance with landscape screening requirements and that the requirements for maintenance of landscaping would be addressed through the City code. *Testimony of Mr. Coleman.*
14. Applicant Representative Lance Campbell testified that the public would not have access to the property from an existing alleyway at the southwest corner of the proposed expansion site. He noted that segments of security fencing would be installed to protect the proposed facility. Mr. Campbell explained how the Applicant team has worked to reduce proposed building heights in a manner that would address the City's concerns while maintaining the economic needs of the business. *Testimony of Mr. Campbell.*

15. Project Engineer John Ravnik testified that the Applicant would install appropriate shielding for lights on the existing facility. He noted that a licensed landscape architect would be retained to prepare a landscape plan to assure that it would comply with City regulations. Mr. Ravnik stated that he appreciates the City's willingness to work with the Applicant regarding proposed side yard setbacks. He noted that there would be three access points for the proposed expansion, explaining that vehicles could access the new buildings from two driveways connecting to the existing facility or from a driveway connecting directly to East Moore Street/State Route 20. Mr. Ravnik stated that self-storage facilities generate little traffic and have simple utility needs that include drainage, electricity, and water. He explained that stormwater runoff would be managed and infiltrated on-site. *Testimony of Mr. Ravnik.*
16. Carl Lundstrom testified that he reviewed the Applicant's revised plans and that the revised plans address the concerns raised in his written comments on the proposal. He noted that he does not have any concerns with the current lighting of the facility. Mr. Lundstrom stated that he does not have any issue with the current landscaping separating his property from the existing facility and the proposed expansion, noting that landscaping with tall trees would potentially cause debris to enter his property. He stated that he is satisfied with the Applicant's current proposal. *Testimony of Mr. Lundstrom.*

Additional Materials

17. The Hearing Examiner left the record open until September 11, 2020, to allow the Applicant to submit its most current project plans, and until September 16, 2020, to allow the City to respond to the Applicant's submitted materials.
18. The Applicant submitted an updated site plan and building description on September 11, 2020. The Applicant's updated building description states:
 - A total of nine fully-enclosed, single-story buildings are proposed on five acres. Each building would contain a series of rentable self-storage units that would vary in size from 5 feet by 5 feet up to 14 feet by 40 feet. The proposed configuration of unit sizes is based on the Applicant's experience in operating the adjacent self-storage facility. There may be minor changes in unit sizes once the final building design has been completed.
 - Typically, units smaller than 10 feet by 20 feet are too small for a vehicle and are generally used for standard storage. The larger units would be available to accommodate larger components, such as a car, motor home, trailer, or boat. These larger units would also be very convenient for a variety of people in the community, such as military personnel leaving on deployment, or homeowners in transition after selling their house.
 - All buildings would have uniformly sloped shed roofs.
 - Due to the current health pandemic and looming economic struggle, the quantity of proposed large storage units was reduced and reconfigured into smaller units. The overall project area of five acres is the same.

- The project was updated to ensure it would meet the City’s minimum 15 percent landscaping requirement.
- In response to City staff’s recommendation, the west building “M” was changed from a peak height of 13.25 feet, pitched downhill east, to a peak height of 12.0 feet, pitched downhill west. This change in height was provided to meet the City’s step-back requirement for the building along the west property line to have a 20-foot setback.
- Storage units at the west end of building “Q” and the adjoining east end of building “R” were slightly modified. The drive aisle between the opposing two ends of these buildings was replaced with storage units. This change resulted in the addition of four storage units and a slight increase in the overall average size of the storage units.

Exhibit Q.

19. The City submitted a response to the Applicant’s updated site plan and building description on September 16, 2020. The City noted that the updated site plan and building description would meet the intent of the step-back requirement allowing for 20-foot side setbacks and that it had no other concerns about the Applicant’s proposed revisions. *Exhibit R.*

Staff Recommendation

20. City staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit, with conditions. *Exhibit A, Staff Report, pages 11 and 12; Exhibit R.*

CONCLUSIONS

Jurisdiction

The Hearing Examiner has jurisdiction to hear and decide conditional use permit applications. *SWMC 17.56.030.E; Chapter 17.61 SWMC.*

Criteria for Review

Conditional Use Permit

The criteria upon which a conditional use permit application is judged shall be the extent to which it:

- A. Conforms to the comprehensive plan;
- B. Is compatible with the surrounding area, that is, causes no unreasonable adverse impacts; and
- C. Is well-planned in all respects so as to be an asset to the community.

SWMC 17.56.060.

Conditional use permits become void if substantial progress toward construction of improvements is not made within two years or if the use has not commenced within five years. The Hearing Examiner may extend these periods for good cause.

SWMC 17.56.050.

*Findings, Conclusions, and Decision
Sedro-Woolley Hearing Examiner
Skagit Self Storage Expansion CUP, No. CUP-2020-032*

The criteria for review adopted by the City Council are designed to implement the requirement of Chapter 36.70B RCW to enact the Growth Management Act. In particular, RCW 36.70B.040 mandates that local jurisdictions review proposed development to ensure consistency with City development regulations, considering the type of land use, the level of development, infrastructure, and the characteristics of development. *RCW 36.70B.040.*

Conclusions Based on Findings

- 1. With conditions, the proposal would conform to the Comprehensive Plan.** The property is designated Mixed Commercial by the City Comprehensive Plan, which allows for a comparable mix of commercial and residential development, with standards intended to present an attractive and welcoming appearance to visitors at the entrances to the city and at selected nodes along major roads. City staff determined that, while the proposed self-storage facility expansion would not promote employment opportunities and a welcoming appearance at entrance to the city, given the location of the proposed expansion behind the existing facility, the expansion area would be obscured from view from State Route 20, mitigating concerns. The Hearing Examiner concurs with City staff's determination. Conditions are necessary to ensure that the Applicant provides adequate landscape screening and a landscape plan meeting code requirements; arranges the proposed buildings along the perimeter in a manner that would mitigate for incompatibility with surrounding uses; complies with required setbacks; complies with City design standards, including standards for screening of blank walls in the Mixed Commercial zoning district; complies with MDNS mitigation conditions; and does not allow outside storage at the facility. *Findings 1, 5 – 20.*
- 2. With conditions, the proposal would be compatible with the surrounding area and cause no unreasonable adverse impacts.** The property is zoned Mixed Commercial, which encourages a compatible mix of commercial and residential development. Property to the south is also zoned Mixed Commercial and is developed with the existing self-storage facility. Surrounding property to the east, north, and west is zoned Residential 7 and is developed, or is planned to be developed, with various residential uses. The Applicant's updated site plan and other application materials show that the project would comply with bulk restrictions applicable to development in the Mixed Commercial zone, including requirements for minimum setbacks and maximum building heights. The Applicant proposes 20-foot side setbacks from adjacent residential properties, which is allowed under SWMC 17.20.020.A.1 if building step-backs meeting Chapter 15.44 SWMC design standards and guidelines are incorporated into the site design. City staff reviewed the Applicant's updated site plan and building description and determined that the project would qualify for 20-foot side setbacks. The Applicant would be required to submit landscape plans with its building permit application to demonstrate compliance with City code landscaping requirements. Review for compliance with the City Design Standards and Guidelines Manual would also occur during the building permitting stage. As detailed in Conclusion 1, conditions would

ensure that the proposal meets all requirements of the municipal code and criteria required for CUP approval. *Findings 1, 5 – 20.*

3. **The proposal is well planned in all aspects to be an asset to the community.** The City provided reasonable notice of the application and associated open record hearing. Public comments on the proposal expressed some concerns about the proposal, including: the lack of employment opportunities, visual impacts to neighboring residential properties, and the existing facility's light impacts to the surrounding area. The City and the Applicant addressed concerns related to the visual and light impacts of the existing facility and the proposed expansion. City Planning Director John Coleman noted that a condition of the MDNS would require exterior lighting to be shielded from surrounding residential development, and Project Engineer John Ravnik described how the Applicant would install appropriate shielding for lights on the existing facility. The City and the Applicant also detailed how perimeter landscaping would mitigate visual impacts to surrounding residential properties. The City issued an MDNS for the proposal with additional requirements that must be followed to ensure the project does not have adverse impacts on the environment. The MDNS was not appealed. All appropriate planning has occurred with the proposal to ensure that it is an asset to the community. *Findings 1 – 20.*

DECISION

Based on the preceding findings and conclusions, the request for a conditional use permit to allow expansion of the existing Skagit Self Storage Facility, including the addition of nine single-story storage buildings and associated driveways and landscaping, on five acres at 1320 East Moore Street is **APPROVED**, with the following conditions:

1. Landscaping screening shall be required on the east side of the existing building, on the eastern 20 feet of the north side of the existing easternmost building, and along the northern face of the proposed eastern portion of the project. The landscape screening shall be eighty percent sight-obscuring at time of planting and one hundred percent within two years. The landscape screening shall extend a minimum of six feet above ground surface. The intent is to screen the entire side of the buildings nearest the screening, thus the chosen landscaping materials shall be suitable to grow to the necessary height to screen the buildings.
2. Comply with the 20-foot side setbacks from the adjacent residential properties per the bulk restrictions set forth in SWMC 17.20.020.
3. Comply with the Sedro-Woolley Design Standards and Guidelines, Chapter 4, Additional Standards for the Mixed Commercial Zone for screening blank walls.
4. Arrange the buildings on the construction site plan to have the shortest buildings on the perimeter to mitigate the storage facility's incompatibility with the surrounding uses.

Findings, Conclusions, and Decision
Sedro-Woolley Hearing Examiner
Skagit Self Storage Expansion CUP, No. CUP-2020-032

5. Provide a landscape plan that meets the requirements of Chapter 17.50 SWMC and these conditions at time of building application.
6. Comply with the mitigation requirements set forth by the MDNS.
7. No outside storage shall be allowed at the storage facility.

Decided this 29th day of September 2020.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew M. Reeves", enclosed within a thin black rectangular border.

ANDREW M. REEVES
Hearing Examiner
Sound Law Center