1		Before Hearing Examiner Gary N. McLean
2		Gary N. McLean
3		
4	BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER FOR THE CITY OF RICHLAND	
5		
6)	
7	RE: "FRIENDS OF COUNTRY RIDGE"	
8	DECISION APPROVING PRELIMINARY	File No. S2022-102
9	PLAT OF HALARA HILLS	ODDED DENVING DEQUEST FOD
10		ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
11)	
12	Applicant,	
13		
14	By separate Order dated October 27, 2022, all parties of record to the hearing process for the Halara Hills Preliminary Plat matter, File No. S2022-102, were invited to submi written responses to the "Friends of Country Ridge" Request for Reconsideration of the	
15		
16	Examiner's Decision approving the Prelimin	ary Plat of Halara Hills, with a copy of the
17	submitted the only timely written response to	the reconsideration request, in the form of a
18	received and reviewed the applicant's respon	
19	for Reconsideration and the applicant's Response are on file with the City and shall be maintained as part of the record for this matter.	
20	Upon consideration of the Request	and applicant's Response, and following
21	additional legal research into issues raised in both and concludes that there is insufficient evidence or le by Friends of Country Ridge, i.e. denial of the Hala	both documents, the Hearing Examiner finds
22		
23		
24		
25 26	RECONSIDERATION OF DECISION APPROVING	GARY N. MCLEAN
26	FILE NO. 62022 102	HEARING EXAMINER FOR THE CITY OF RICHLAND CITY HALL - 625 SWIFT BOULEVARD

The Examiner directs attention to the following Finding and Condition included in the Decision:

2 *Finding No. 34.* The Examiner notes that an access/connection point from the west, towards Dallas Road, instead of via Strawberry Lane to the east, may present itself before the time of 3 final plat approval – which could be up to five years away – and that such a change could be 4 deemed a revision to this preliminary plat approval, triggering a Type I permit approval as a Minor Revision to this preliminary plat (See RMC 19.20.010(A)(5)), or a Type III permit 5 approval as a Major Revision to this preliminary plat (See RMC 19.20.010(C)(1)).¹ Type I permit approvals are subject to appeal to the Hearing Examiner, and Type III permit 6 approvals require full public notice and a pre-decision hearing before the City's Hearing Examiner. (See RMC 19.20.030, Project permit application framework). If such a revision 7 is proposed before Final Plat approval, staff must determine if additional environmental 8 information or reviews are required, in accord with application SEPA regulations.

9 Condition of Approval No. 54. Evidence that an easement or other legal rights securing a secondary emergency vehicle access (SEVA) route shall be provided to the City prior to or 10 concurrent with the first set of construction drawings submitted for any aspect of this development, including without limitation grading permits. Any proposed SEVA route shall 11 be subject to review and approval by the Richland Fire Marshal. It is expressly understood 12 that no city permits or approvals for land clearing, grading, utility installation or other aspects of subdivision development can be issued until an appropriate SEVA route has been approved 13 in writing by the Fire Marshall. Revisions to this Condition of Approval or the proposed plat that would eliminate the need for a SEVA to serve the new plat shall require either a Type I 14 Permit under RMC 19.20.010(A)(5 or 12); or a Type III Permit under RMC 19.20.010(C), as determined by the Planning Manager under authority granted in RMC 19.20.020. 15

Again, as explained in Finding No. 34, Type I decisions/permits/approvals are subject to appeal to the Hearing Examiner, and Type III permit approvals require full public notice and a pre-decision hearing before the City's Hearing Examiner. *(See RMC 19.20.030, Project permit application framework).*

The applicant's Response expressly notes that it does not object to Condition 54. In reaching this decision to deny reconsideration, the Examiner does not rely upon and does not share the applicant's point of view to the effect that Fire Code provisions and Fire Marshall Standards should not be viewed as development regulations when applied to a preliminary

24

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

 25 ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF DECISION APPROVING
26 PRELIMINARY PLAT OF HALARA HILLS – FILE NO. S2022-102

GARY N. MCLEAN HEARING EXAMINER FOR THE CITY OF RICHLAND CITY HALL - 625 SWIFT BOULEVARD RICHLAND, WASHINGTON 99352

Page 2 of 3

¹ RMC 19.20.020, captioned "Determination of proper type of procedure," reads in relevant part as follows: "A. Determination by Director. The deputy city manager for community and development services or his/her designee (hereinafter the "director") shall determine the proper procedure for all development applications. If there is a question as to the appropriate type of procedure, the director shall resolve it in favor of the higher procedure type number."

plat, especially when they form the basis for a Condition of Approval for the preliminary plat itself.

The Record for this matter fully supports the Decision and all Conditions of Approval. The reconsideration request fails to provide any legal or factual basis to reverse or modify such decision. The Request for Reconsideration is respectfully denied. The Decision approving the preliminary plat stands as written.

ISSUED this 22nd Day of November, 2022

Jam N. Melen

Gary N. McLean Hearing Examiner

25	ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR	
	RECONSIDERATION OF DECISION APPROVING	
26	PRELIMINARY PLAT OF HALARA HILLS –	
20	FILE NO. S2022-102	

Page 3 of 3