

**BEFORE the HEARING EXAMINER for the
CITY of GOLD BAR**

DECISION

FILE NUMBER: LS-002-2025

APPLICANT: Scott Anderson

TYPE OF CASE: Conditional Use Permit for Short-Term Rental of the residence at 1509 Alder Lane

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

EXAMINER DECISION: APPROVE subject to conditions

DATE OF DECISION: January 26, 2026

INTRODUCTION¹

Scott Anderson (“Anderson”) seeks a Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) for Short-Term Rental (“STR”) of the residence at 1509 Alder Lane.

Anderson filed an application for a CUP on December 2, 2025. (Exhibits 1; 6²) The Gold Bar Public Works Director (“Director”) deemed the application to be complete on December 11, 2025.³ (Exhibit 5) The City issued a Notice of Application on December 11, 2025. (Exhibit 6)

The subject property is located at 1509 Alder Lane. Its Assessor’s Parcel Number is 012363300002500 (“Lot 25”). (Exhibit 1. PDF 5)

The Gold Bar Hearing Examiner (“Examiner”) viewed the subject property via Google Earth imagery: Overhead imagery dated June 7, 2025; Street View imagery dated August 2025.

The Examiner held a hybrid open record hearing on January 21, 2026: In-person participation was available at the City Hall; remote participation was available through the “Zoom” platform. The Director gave notice of the hearing as required by the Gold Bar Municipal Code (“GBMC”). (Exhibits 7 - 10)

¹ Any statement in this section deemed to be either a Finding of Fact or a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.

² Exhibit citations are provided for the reader’s benefit and indicate: 1) The source of a quote or specific fact; and/or 2) The major document(s) upon which a stated fact is based. While the Examiner considers all relevant documents in the record, typically only major documents are cited. Citations to exhibits that are available electronically in PDF use PDF page numbers, not source document page numbers. The 13 exhibits in this case are contained in one consolidated PDF file with PDF page numbers from 1 – 81. The Examiner’s Decision is based upon all documents in the record.

³ The Director has the lead City staff responsibility for processing land use applications. [Gold Bar Municipal Code (GBMC) 19.05.020]

The following exhibits were entered into the hearing record during the hearing:

Exhibits 1 – 10 and 12 - 14: As enumerated in Exhibit 14, the Staff Report ⁴

The action taken herein and the requirements, limitations and/or conditions imposed by this decision are, to the best of the Examiner's knowledge or belief, only such as are lawful and within the authority of the Examiner to take pursuant to applicable law and policy.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On June 21, 2022, the Gold Bar City Council adopted Ordinance No. 757 establishing business licensing and zoning requirements for STRs. STRs had not previously been allowed in Gold Bar. Ordinance No. 757 became effective later that same month. The business license provisions for STRs are contained in Chapter 5.20 GBMC; the zoning regulations for STRs are contained in GBMC 17.16.030 - .038. STRs are a listed Conditional Use in all residential zones. [GBMC 17.16.030(f), 17.20.040, and 17.24.030]

The Anderson STR CUP is the third application to be processed under Ordinance No. 757 regulations.

2. Lot 25 is one of 39 lots in the relatively new *Fall View* subdivision. The *Fall View* preliminary subdivision was approved on June 6, 2023. The subdivision's infrastructure was subsequently installed and the final plat was recorded. Home construction followed. *Fall View* is located on the west side of Ley Road, a short distance from Wallace Falls State Park. *Fall View* has two streets: Alder Lane and Birch Court. Birch Court is a short cul-de-sac around which 10 lots are located; Alder Lane is a longer cul-de-sac around which 29 lots are located. As of the date the Google Earth overhead imagery was captured, 27 single-family homes and two duplex residential structures (each containing two residences) had been completed on Alder Lane; one duplex was under construction. (Exhibit 4, PDF 19; Official notice: Google Earth imagery; City file number LS-001-23)
3. Lot 25 is a flat lot. (Exhibit 4, PDF 19) The Anderson house on Lot 25 is a one-story, gable-roofed structure with an enclosed two-car garage and a fenced side and rear yard. (Exhibit 4, PDF 19, 21, & 22; testimony: Anderson) Alder Lane is a paved, two-lane street with curbs, gutters, planter strips, and sidewalks. (Exhibit 4, PDF 19 & 21)
4. Scott and Alison Anderson (collectively the "Andersons") live at 12618 Robinhood Lane, approximately one mile north of the Evergreen State Fairgrounds outside of Monroe.⁵ They moved to their current residence in or around 2004. They started a bed and breakfast ("B&B") at their

⁴ The Director reserved Exhibit 11 for written public comments. None were received. Therefore, Exhibit 11 was not needed and has not been entered into the hearing record.

⁵ The Anderson Mailing address is Snohomish, but the physical location is much closer to Monroe.

residence in early 2018 to supplement their income. They have hosted over 550 guests since that time and have a 5 Star Airbnb rating. They have never experienced any adverse incidents at their B&B. (Testimony: the Andersons)

Their family situation is changing, leading them to decide to buy a single-story residence for future family use and to use it as an STR in the meantime. They purchased the 1509 Alder Lane residence for that purpose. In or around the early Fall of 2025 they began using 1509 Alder Lane as an STR. Believing that Gold Bar's rules would be the same as those in unincorporated Snohomish County,⁶ they did not seek any permits before starting the STR use. The City contacted them shortly thereafter to advise them that they needed permits from the City before they could operate an STR in Gold Bar. The present application was filed shortly thereafter. (Testimony: the Andersons)

5. Section 17.16.035 GBMC sets forth criteria for approval of an STR CUP. Those criteria and the facts associated with each are:

“The following criteria shall be met in order for Conditional Use approval of a property to be authorized by the city as a short-term rental dwelling.

“1. Occupancy. Maximum occupancy of the rental shall be based on the International Building Code standards. The property owner shall be responsible for ensuring that the dwelling unit is in conformance with its maximum occupancy.”

Facts: The 1509 residence is classified under the International Building Code as an R-3 structure. It has three bedrooms. (Exhibit 13, PDF 71) The Andersons have stated in their “house rules” (the Examiner’s term) that no more than six persons may overnight at the residence. (Exhibit 12, PDF 60)

“2. Parking. At least one (1) additional off-street parking space shall be provided for the vacation rental use, in addition to all other parking required for the dwelling. Parking on-site along the front property line shall not exceed forty (40) percent of the front-yard frontage. The number of vehicles at a vacation rental residence shall not at any time exceed the number of available parking spaces on the subject property. However, this limitation shall not apply to condominium dwellings.”

Facts: Two parking spaces are available in the driveway as well as one space in the garage (if needed). (Exhibits 4, PDF 21; 13, PDF 71)

“3. Signage. No outdoor advertising signs related to the vacation dwelling shall be allowed on the site.”

Facts: No outdoor signs are present or contemplated.

⁶ Their Robinhood Lane residence is located in unincorporated Snohomish County. (Testimony: the Andersons)

“4. Solid Waste Collection. Weekly solid waste collection is required during all months.”

Facts: The Andersons will provide an outdoor bin in the rear yard for STR tenants to use. (Exhibit 13, PDF 66) The requirement for weekly garbage pick-up is an operational requirement that can be ensured through a permit condition.

“5. Local Property Representative. Where the property owner does not reside full-time within twenty-five (25) miles driving distance of Gold Bar, a local property manager shall be designated. The local property manager shall reside full-time within twenty-five (25) miles driving distance from Gold Bar. The local representative or property owner shall be responsible for responding to complaints about the rental. The name, address, and telephone contact number of the property owner or local representative shall be kept on file at the city of Gold Bar. Additionally, a notice that states the name, address, and telephone number of the property owner or local representative will be sent to all property owners within one hundred fifty (150) feet of the short-term rental property. If the local representative changes, the owner of the short-term rental property shall be required to send out new notices to all property owners within one hundred fifty (150) feet of the subject property.”

Facts: The Andersons’ residence is approximately 16.5 miles by road from 1509 Alder Lane. (Exhibit 14, PDF 80)

“6. Informational Sign. A sign shall be posted conspicuously inside the dwelling to provide information on maximum occupancy, location of off-street parking, contact information for the property owner or local representative, evacuation routes, and the renter's responsibility not to trespass on private property or to create disturbances.”

Facts: The Andersons have developed a guidebook which will be kept in the residence for guest usage. (Exhibit 12, PDF 53 – 67) Required information not in the guidebook can be added or placed on a sign inside the residence.

“7. Other Standards. The short-term rental dwelling shall meet all applicable requirements of the zone in which it is located, including, but not limited to:

“a. Setbacks.”

Facts: No additions are proposed. Existing setbacks are as approved by the City when the residence was built.

“b. Maximum height.”

Facts: No additions are proposed. Existing building height is as approved by the City when the residence was built.

“c. Lot coverage.”

Facts: No additions are proposed. Existing lot coverage is as approved by the City when the residence was built.

“d. All short-term rentals must be separated by two hundred fifty (250) feet from any other short-term rental. Measurement is from building to building.”

Facts: The nearest STR was approved for 1617 Birch Court on January 5, 2026.⁷ The approximate distance from the nearest part of the 1617 Birch Court building to the nearest part of the 1509 Alder Lane building is approximately 616 feet.⁸ The building separation far exceeds the minimum established in the GBMC.

“e. No additional short-term rental shall be permitted within the city limits when the existing percentage of short-term rentals is at, or above, six (6) percent of the total housing stock permitted within the residential zoning districts. The six (6) percent shall be defined by the assessor's data for residential dwellings in residential zoning districts within the city limits.”

Facts: Since this is only the third STR to be established within the City under the current regulations, it is intuitively obvious that three STRs do not constitute anywhere near 6% of the City's housing stock.⁹

6. Two residents on Birch Court, Matthew Rhodes (“Rhodes”) and Jeffrey Paliga (“Paliga”), testified against approval of the requested STR.¹⁰ In summary:

A. Rhodes said that STRs are pricing his generation out of housing in an already high-cost state; that a 2025 study found that New Mexico, Washington, and Oregon are the top three states for vandalism at Airbnbs; that STRs are harming hotel/motel workers by making such businesses less profitable, thus leading to staff reductions; that some of his co-workers are looking to relocate to South Carolina, Texas, or Florida because of housing costs and general cost of living in Washington state; that President Trump recently signed an Executive Order barring “Wall Street” (it was clear from the context that Rhodes did not literally mean the street itself in New York City) from buying single-family residences; that the Mayor of

⁷ LS-001-2025, John & Dinah Pillion (“Pillion”). The Examiner's hearing in that case was held on December 18, 2025, and the permit was issued on January 5, 2026.. The City emailed to the Examiner on January 13, 2026, a copy of the pre-filed exhibits for the Anderson application. The Examiner was unaware of the Anderson application until after he issued the Decision in the Pillion application.

⁸ Measured by the Examiner from Google Earth imagery using the program's line measurement tool.

⁹ The estimated 2025 Gold Bar population is 2,505. [<https://www.washington-demographics.com/gold-bar-demographics>, last visited January 23, 2026] Making an overly-pessimistic assumption that each residence houses four people, there would be approximately 626 residential dwelling units in Gold bar, 6% of which would be approximately 37.

¹⁰ Both had also testified against approval of the Pillion STR on Birch Court.

Leavenworth, Washington, recently said that they are “losing their community” (Rhodes’ exact words) because of STRs; and that the Examiner should Google “Short Term Rental” to “find everything [I] need.” (Rhodes testimony, Zoom recording 26:54 – 30:40)

- B. Paliga said that two STRs in *Fall View* constitute 5% of the 39 lots in that subdivision, close to the 6% allowable maximum; that Washington ranks second among the states for danger to Airbnb hosts; that in 2023 Washington’s burglary rate was the highest in the nation; that there were 1,000 property crime and vandalism incidents per 100,000 residents in Washington State in 2023; that Washington State has the highest arson rate in the nation; that Washington is one of the three states in the nation with the highest property crime rate; and that those items should help one determine if family life can exist in Gold bar. (Paliga testimony, Zoom recording 31:58 – 34:00)
- 7. The Director testified that during its deliberations on the STR ordinance in 2022, the Gold Bar Council took notice of the Town of Skykomish’s experience with STRs. Skykomish initially had fairly weak limits on STRs, the result of which was way too many STRs for the good of the Town. The Town Council subsequently imposed limits on the number of STRs allowed within the Town. The Gold Bar City Council put the separation and total number limits into Gold bar’s code to prevent that from happening in Gold Bar. The 6% limit applies to the City as a whole, not on an individual neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis. (Norris testimony: Zoom recording 37:07 – 41:00)
- 8. The Andersons have also applied for the required business license. (Exhibit 3, PDF 15)

The criteria for approval of an STR business license differ somewhat from the STR CUP approval criteria.¹¹ The business license criteria expressly prohibit use of an STR “for a wedding, banquet, reception, bachelor or bachelorette party, concert, fundraiser, sponsored event, or any similar group activity.” [GBMC 5.20.020(A)(3)] They also require proof “that the dwelling is insured as a short-term or vacation rental.” [GBMC 5.20.020(A)(7)] The business license criteria also require issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy as a transient accommodation and an “annual safety inspection.” [GBMC 5.20.020(A)(8)] Lastly, the business license criteria require that “[a]ll short-term or vacation rentals must comply with all city codes and ordinances, including but not limited to GBMC Chapter 8.16, Nuisances and Chapter 8.20, Fireworks.” [GBMC 5.20.020(A)(9)]

- 9. The Director recommends approval of the STR. (Exhibit 14, PDF 81)
- 10. Any Conclusion of Law deemed to be a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK¹²

¹¹ Which is not surprising given that one is licensing a business and the other is authorizing a land use: The focus of each is different.

¹² Any statement in this section deemed to be either a Finding of Fact or a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.

The Examiner is legally required to decide this case within the framework created by the following principles:

Authority

A CUP is a Type III application which is subject to an open record hearing before the Examiner. The Examiner makes a final decision on the application which is subject to the right of reconsideration and appeal to Superior Court. [GBMC 2.26.120, .125, and .140; GBMC 19.01.030; and GBMC 19.06.060]

The examiner's decision may

grant, deny, or grant with such conditions, modifications, and restrictions as the examiner finds reasonable to make the application or appeal compatible with its environment, the Gold Bar Municipal Code, the Gold Bar Comprehensive Plan, other official policies and objectives, and land use regulatory enactments. Examples of the kinds of conditions, modifications, and restrictions that may be imposed include, but are not limited to, additional setbacks, screenings in the form of fencing or landscaping, easements, dedications, or additional right-of-way and performance bonds[.]

[GBMC 2.26.120(B)]

Review Criteria

Short-Term Rental

The special review criteria for STRs in GBMC 17.16.035 have been listed ion Finding of Fact 5, above.

Conditional Use Permit

The GBMC does not specify review criteria for CUPs. However, several code sections provide guidance. In addition to GBMC 2.26.120(B), quoted immediately above, GBMC 17.72.060 and GBMC 19.04.010(B) are particularly relevant:

When considering an application for a conditional use permit or special use permit, the [Examiner] shall consider the applicable standards, criteria, and policies established by this title as they pertain to the proposed use and may impose specific conditions precedent to establishing the use in order to satisfy the criteria of this chapter. The conditions may:

- A. Increase requirements in the standards, criteria, or policies established by this title;
- B. Stipulate the exact locations and means of minimizing hazards to life, limb, property damage, erosion, landslides, or traffic;
- C. Require structural features or equipment essential to serve the same purpose set forth in subsection (B) of this section,
- D. Impose conditions similar to those set forth in subsections (B) and (C) of this section as deemed necessary to establish parity with uses permitted in the same zone and their freedom from nuisance generating features and matters of noise, odors, air pollution, wastes, vibration, traffic, physical hazards, and similar matters; provided, the [Examiner] may not, in connection with action on a conditional use permit or special use permit, reduce the requirements specified by this title as pertaining to any

use nor otherwise reduce the requirements of this title in matters for which a variance is the remedy provided;

- E. Assure that the degree of compatibility with the purpose of this title shall be maintained with respect to the particular use on the particular site and in consideration of other existing and potential uses within the general area in which the use is proposed to be located;
- F. Recognize and compensate for variations and degree of technological processes and equipment as related to the factors of noise, smoke, dust, fumes, vibrations, odors, and hazards or public need;
- G. Require the posting of construction and maintenance bonds or other securities sufficient to secure to the city the estimated costs of construction and/or installation and/or maintenance of required improvements.

[GBMC 17.72.060]

During project permit application review, [Gold Bar] shall determine whether the items listed in this subsection are defined in the development regulations applicable to the proposed project. In the absence of applicable development regulations, [Gold Bar] shall determine whether the items listed in this subsection are defined in [Gold Bar's] adopted comprehensive plan. This determination of consistency shall include the following:

- 1. The type of land use permitted at the site, including uses that may be allowed under certain circumstances, if the criteria for their approval have been satisfied;
- 2. The level of development, such as units per acre, density of residential development in urban growth areas, or other measures of density; and
- 3. Availability and adequacy of infrastructure and public facilities identified in the comprehensive plan, if the plan or development regulations provide for funding of these facilities as required by RCW Chapter 36.70A; and
- 4. Character of the development, such as development standards.

[GBMC 19.04.010(B)]

Vested Rights

The City has no vesting regulations. "Vesting" serves to "fix" the regulations against which a development application is judged. [*Potala Village Kirkland, LLC v. City of Kirkland*, ___ Wn. App. ___ (Div. I, 2014)]

In the 1950s, the [state] supreme court first adopted the common law vested rights doctrine [for building permit applications]. ... In cases that followed, Washington courts applied the vested rights doctrine to permit applications other than building permit applications. They included conditional use permit applications, grading permit applications, shoreline substantial development permit applications, and septic permit applications.

In 1987, the legislature enacted legislation regarding the vested rights doctrine. The session laws added ... RCW 19.27.095(1) and RCW 58.17.033(1) respectively ... [which] only refer to building permit applications and subdivision applications. ...

Most recently, in *Town of Woodway v. Snohomish County*, the [state] supreme court reiterated that "[w]hile it originated at common law, the vested rights doctrine is now statutory."

[*Potala*, Slip Opinion 6 – 8 and 11] “With these points in mind, [the *Potala* court held] that the filing of [an] application for [a] shoreline substantial development permit, without filing an application for a building permit, [does] not vest rights to zoning or other land use control ordinances.” [*Potala*, Slip Opinion at 12] The *Potala* court “express[ed] no opinion on whether or to what extent the vested rights doctrine applies to permits other than shoreline substantial development permits. These questions [were] not before [it].” [*Potala*, Slip Opinion at 25] Therefore, whether the vested rights doctrine still applies to CUPs is debatable.

Vesting is not particularly important in this case as the City has made no development regulations changes between the time the applications were filed and this date.

Standard of Review

The standard of review is preponderance of the evidence. The applicant has the burden of proof. [GBMC 19.05.060]

Scope of Consideration

The Examiner has considered: all of the evidence and testimony; applicable adopted laws, ordinances, plans, and policies; and the pleadings, positions, and arguments of the parties of record.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. ¹³ A Hearing Examiner is a quasi-judicial hearing officer, not a legislative official. In simple terms, that means that the Examiner must apply the regulations as adopted by the City’s legislative officials, not write an alternate version. The Examiner has no authority to rewrite or otherwise amend adopted regulations. Likewise, the Examiner has no authority to entertain challenges to the content of adopted regulations when considering an application before the Examiner. [RCW 36.70B.030 & .040]

In the context of this case, that means that the Examiner cannot consider the objections and concerns of those who testified in opposition to all or some of the City’s STR regulations. The Examiner understands the sincerely held concerns of the full-time residents on Birch Court who testified in this case as well as in the Pillion case: They quite sincerely believe that STRs are bad for the community and they oppose their entry into Gold Bar. But their concerns are not unique to the Anderson application. They would apply to every STR application anywhere in the City. They oppose the provisions in the GBMC which allow STRs.

¹³ The Pillion STR Decision contains a nearly identical Conclusion of Law. It is appropriate here, too, as the Rhodes and Paliga testimony raise essentially the same concerns they raised in the Pillion hearing.

The question before the Examiner is: Does the Anderson application comply with the adopted criteria for approval? If not, Can the application be conditioned to comply with those criteria? If it can, it must be approved. The question is not: Does the Examiner think that the adopted regulations should be different in some fashion? The Examiner has no authority to consider that question.

2. The evidence in Finding of Fact 5, above, shows by well more than a preponderance that the Anderson application complies with all of the established criteria in GBMC 17.16.035 with but one exception. The exception is Criterion 4: "Weekly solid waste collection is required during all months." In reality, Criterion 4 is an on-going operational requirement more than it is an initial approval requirement. An applicant could include a statement in their application that they will provide weekly garbage collection year round, but that doesn't prove that weekly garbage collection has occurred. In fact, no statement made before the STR is in operation could prove that weekly garbage service has occurred.

The solution is simple: Impose a condition on the permit requiring weekly solid waste collection during all months. Such a condition will be added.

3. The Anderson application includes a number of self-imposed conditions: six occupants maximum; parking only on the driveway (unless special permission is given to park a car in the garage); no smoking or vaping; no events, parties, or gatherings; no fireworks; quiet hours between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.; and no animals. (Exhibit 12) Those characteristics of the STR operation essentially constitute voluntary restrictions that the City, the public, and the Examiner have considered in the review of the application.

Some items in that list are statements of City regulations with which the Anderson STR must comply, whether or not listed as special conditions: prohibition of fireworks [Chapter 8.20 GBMC]; and noise during quiet hours [Section 8.16.090 GBMC]. The latter is more restrictive than Anderson's proposal as the end of the code quiet time is 8:00 a.m., not 7:00 a.m. Because those topics are regulated by City ordinances, they need not be listed as special conditions on a permit. The rest will be listed to ensure that the offers are carried out.

4. No need exists for imposition of the type of special conditions discussed in GBMC 17.72.060. This STR will use an existing single-family residence; no new construction is proposed. The STR will use the residence as a residence with appropriate occupancy limits; it will not inherently be any more dangerous to the neighborhood than any other residence. Neither construction nor maintenance bonds are necessary as there will be no new construction nor any new landscaping that would need maintenance until well established.
5. The Anderson STR passes the "consistency" test: STRs are allowed as Conditional Uses in all residential zones in the City; the STR does not change the density of development; utilities will not be taxed beyond the level of use that would be typical for a family living in a three-bedroom home; and the existing residence matches the physical character of the neighborhood.
6. Any Finding of Fact deemed to be a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.

DECISION

Based upon the preceding Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the testimony and evidence submitted at the open record hearing, and the Examiner's site view, the Examiner **GRANTS** the requested Conditional Use Permit for Short-Term Rental of the residence at 1509 Alder Lane **SUBJECT TO THE ATTACHED CONDITIONS.**

Decision issued January 26, 2026.

\s\ *John E. Galt*

John E. Galt
Hearing Examiner

HEARING PARTICIPANTS ¹⁴

Scott Anderson
Rich Norris
Jeffrey Paliga

Alison Anderson
Matthew Rhodes

NOTICE of RIGHT of RECONSIDERATION

This Decision is final subject to the right of any party of record to file a written request for reconsideration within seven (7) calendar days of the date this Decision was mailed to the parties. See GBMC 2.26.125 for additional information and requirements regarding reconsideration.

NOTICE of RIGHT of APPEAL

This Decision is final subject to the right of a party of record with standing, as provided in RCW 36.70C.060, to file a land use petition in Superior Court in accordance with the procedures of GBMC 2.26.140 and 19.06.060. Any appeal must be filed within 21 days following the issuance of this Decision unless reconsideration has been requested. See GBMC 2.26.140 and 19.06.060 for additional information and requirements regarding judicial appeals.

¹⁴ The official Parties of Record register is maintained by the City's Hearing Clerk.

The following statement is provided pursuant to RCW 36.70B.130: "Affected property owners may request a change in valuation for property tax purposes notwithstanding any program of revaluation."

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
LS-002-2025
ANDERSON SHORT-TERM RENTAL**

This Conditional Use Permit is subject to compliance with all applicable provisions, requirements, and standards of the Gold Bar Municipal Code, standards adopted pursuant thereto, and the following special conditions:

1. This Conditional Use Permit authorizes the single-family residence at 1509 Alder Lane to be used as a short-term rental for up to six (6) persons.
2. The following rules/restrictions proposed by the applicant are made conditions of this permit:
 - A. six overnight occupants maximum;
 - B. parking only on the driveway (unless special permission is given to park a car in the garage);
 - C. no events, parties, or gatherings;
 - D. no smoking or vaping; and
 - E. no animals.
3. The owner/permittee shall provide weekly solid waste collection for the residence at 1617 Birch Court during all months as required by GBMC 17.16.035(4).