

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

ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION

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

WHEREAS, the City of Gold Bar Hearing Examiner (“Examiner”) issued a Decision in the above-entitled matter on January 26, 2026; and

WHEREAS, Matthew Rhodes (“Rhodes”) filed, by email, a timely request for reconsideration (the “Request”) on January 30, 2026, the substantive content of which reads in its entirety as follows:

[1] "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.

[2] “I object to the basis of this permit grant as the Andersons do not have a Business License for the City of Gold Bar. They do have a business license for the city of Snohomish which does not require a conditional use permit. Per the law they need a business license per each business and one permit for the City of Gold Bar.

[3] “Furthermore they have incorrectly applied their conditional use permit to their Snohomish residence "The Nest" not their Gold Bar residence on Alder Ln. I also have evidence which shows they never removed their listing and were still hosting guests throughout the month of December before the conditional use permit was even approved. A posted review with snow is included in the attachments which would have been just after Christmas December of 2025.

[4] “Based on these grounds I demand an immediate halt and denial to stop all of their business activities within the city of Gold Bar.

[5] “As the Andersons only have one UBI Number it is clear they only have one Business License. Therefore the endorsement is the permit and not the license.”

[Direct copy of the entire body of the email with two changes: bracketed paragraph numbers added for reference purposes; original fonts changed to match the font used in this Order]; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Hearing Examiner Rule of Procedure (“RoP”) 504(d)(3) the Examiner granted “all parties of record [until February 18, 2026,] to submit written comments” on the Request [RoP 504(d)(3)]; and

WHEREAS, two written responses were timely received:

City of Gold Bar (“City”), response received February 9, 2026; and
Scott and Alison Anderson (“Anderson”), response received February 9, 2026; and

WHEREAS, having considered the Rhodes Request, the City and Anderson responses, and the entirety of the hearing record, the Examiner reaches the following Conclusions of Law regarding each of the five substantive paragraphs in the Rhodes Request:

- [1] Paragraph [1] is simply a short statement of the reconsideration process. It does not allege any error on the part of the Examiner.
- [2] Short-term rentals are regulated under two different portions of the Gold Bar Municipal Code (“GBMC”): Business licensing aspects of the activity are regulated under Title 5, GBMC, Business Licenses and Regulations, especially Chapter 5.04 GBMC, Business Licenses, and Chapter 5.20 GBMC, Short-Term Rental Business Licenses; land use aspects of the activity are regulated under Chapter 17.16 GBMC, R-7200 Single-Family residential, Pre-Platted Zone, especially Sections 17.16.032 - .037.

Section 17.16.034 GBMC states that “[a] business license for a vacation rental business will not be issued by the city until an approval for short-term rental use of the dwelling has been issued.” [Emphasis added] In simple terms, a business license for an STR cannot be issued by the City until the required land use approval (Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”)) has been issued. Approval of the land use permit must precede approval of the business licenses. No error has been committed in this regard.

- [3] Business names are irrelevant to the CUP process. For example, a person or entity may operate several coffee kiosks in different locations in different municipalities under the same business name so long as each location complies with the applicable land use regulations for that location.

Anderson acknowledges in their response letter that they had two rentals at the 1509 Alder Lane address during December of 2025. Anderson erroneously assumed that the City’s regulations were the same as regulations in unincorporated Snohomish County. Anderson operates a B&B in unincorporated Snohomish County for which they do not need a special permit. They thought they could the same in the City. On or about November 18, 2025, the City informed Anderson that they needed a CUP and a business license to operate an STR in the City. Anderson subsequently visited City Hall and began the CUP and licensing processes. Anderson told City staff that they had two December rentals booked; City staff allowed them to honor those booked rentals under the condition that Anderson not book any additional rentals until the required permit and license had been issued. Thus, there were two December rentals. The Examiner finds that resolution to be reasonable. It would not be reasonable to deny the current CUP because of those facts.

- [4] Based on the record before the Examiner, it appears that Anderson is not operating an STR at 1509 Alder Lane at this time.
- [5] The meaning and intent of the fifth reconsideration paragraph is unclear. What is clear is that it is addressing State business licensing requirements in some fashion. State business licensing requirements have absolutely nothing to do with City zoning regulations. Compliance with City CUP requirements is wholly separate and independent of compliance with State requirements; and

WHEREAS, none of the five paragraphs in the Rhodes Request allege any specific error of fact or law in any specific portion of the Examiner’s January 26, 2026, Decision; and

WHEREAS, Rhodes has failed to show that the Decision as issued on January 26, 2026, subject to the Clerical Correction issued on February 3, 2026, should be changed in any regard.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Examiner **DENIES** the request for reconsideration and reaffirms the Decision as issued on January 26, 2026, subject to the Clerical Correction issued on February 3, 2026.

ORDER issued February 19, 2026.

ls/ John E. Galt

John E. Galt
Hearing Examiner

NOTICE OF RIGHT OF APPEAL

The initial Decision, subject to the Clerical Correction issued on February 3, 2026, and as affirmed by this Order Denying Reconsideration, is the final and conclusive action for the City 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 Order. (See RCW 36.70C.020(2).) See GBMC 2.26.140 and 19.06.060 for additional information and requirements regarding judicial appeals.

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.”