

**BEFORE THE**  
**SNOHOMISH COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER**

**DECISION of the DEPUTY HEARING EXAMINER**

In the Matter of the Application of	)	
	)	<b>FILE NO. 05 117989</b>
<b>MARTY GLASER</b>	)	
	)	<i>Easton Lane</i>
Rezone from R-9,600 to Low Density	)	
Multiple Residential	)	

---

DATE OF DECISION: March 14, 2006

DECISION (SUMMARY): The proposed rezone from R-9,600 to LDMR is **APPROVED**

**BASIC INFORMATION**

GENERAL LOCATION: This project is located at 12831 Alexander Road, Everett.

ACREAGE: 2.11 acres

ZONING:                   CURRENT:       Residential-9,600 (R-9,600)  
                              PROPOSED:     Low Density Multiple Residential (LDMR)

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:

General Policy Plan Designation:    Urban Medium Density Residential (ULDR 6-12 du/ac)  
Subarea Plan:                         Paine Field  
Subarea Plan Designation:          Urban (4-6 du/ac)

UTILITIES:

Water/Sewer:           Alderwood Water and Wastewater District

SCHOOL DISTRICT:       Mukiltoe School District No. 6

FIRE DISTRICT:         No. 1

SELECTED AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Department of:

Planning and Development Services: Approval

Public Works: No recommendations at this time

**INTRODUCTION**

The applicant filed the Master Application on April 13, 2005. (Exhibit 1)

The Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) gave proper public notice of the open record hearing as required by the county code. (Exhibits 8, 9 and 10)

A SEPA determination was made on February 9, 2006. (Exhibit 7) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on March 7, 2006, the 114<sup>th</sup> day of the 120-day decision making period. Witnesses were sworn, testimony was presented and exhibits were entered at the hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

The public hearing commenced on March 7, 2006 at 10:08 a.m.

1. The Examiner announced that he had read the PDS staff report, reviewed the file and viewed the area and therefore was generally apprised of the particular request involved.
2. The applicant, Marty Glaser, was represented by himself and by Laurey Tobiason of Tobiason & Co., Inc. Snohomish County was represented by Darryl Eastin of the Department of Planning and Development Services. No member of the general public attended the hearing but pre-hearing correspondence raising concern was submitted into the record by nine vicinity residents using substantially identical documents. An e-mail by Gabrielle Fortuna is in the record (Exhibit 13). Jeff Lind submitted concerns by letter (Exhibit 12). The public concerns are discussed below herein.

The hearing concluded at 10:24 a.m.

**NOTE:** For a complete record, an electronic recording of this hearing is available in the Office of the Hearing Examiner.

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISION**

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

Based on all the evidence of record, the following findings of fact are entered.

1. The master list of exhibits and witnesses which is a part of this file and which exhibits were considered by the Examiner is hereby made a part of this file as if set forth in full herein.

2. The PDS staff report has correctly analyzed the nature of the application, the issues of concern, the application's consistency with adopted codes and policies and land use regulations, and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). That staff report is hereby adopted by the Examiner as if set forth in full herein.
3. The applicant, Martin Glaser, requests a rezone of 2.11 acres from R-9,600 to LDMR in order to process an administrative approval of a site plan for 16 single-family detached dwelling units. The staff report recommends no conditions upon the approval of the rezone.
4. The vacant subject site is located north of Russell Way, west of Highway 99 and abuts the east side of Alexander Road, approximately 120 feet south of 128<sup>th</sup> Street SW. The site is addressed 12831 Alexander Road, Everett. The site slopes generally to the south at no greater than 14 percent. The site is covered with evergreen conifer and deciduous trees including alder and maple. The site contains a Category 3 wetland that extends off site to the south and a Type 5 stream that flows in a ditch along the west property line. At the Examiner's pre-hearing site visit on March 3, 2006, the Type 5 stream was running briskly although there had been no rain for at least two days.
5. The subject site and the surrounding community are zoned R-7,200, R-9,600 and General Commercial. Single-family residential subdivisions predominate with homes built to the north and west. To the east toward Highway 99 lie the commercial uses and businesses. Undeveloped land lies to the south, in which Snohomish County in recent years has constructed a major stormwater facility.
6. Citizen concerns focus on asserted: (1) loss of wildlife habitat, especially for birds; (2) need for reduced speed limits on Alexander Road from the current 35 to 25 miles per hour; (3) need to construct sidewalks on Alexander Road, especially from York Road to Russell Way, and (4) flooding of Russell Road, (5) need to protect a posted wetland on the opposite side of Alexander from the subject site, (6) need to protect the Type 5 stream (above-mentioned) which flows under Alexander Road at 128<sup>th</sup> Place, where fish shapes were once painted on the street and, (7) need to reduce noise and potential road damage from use of Alexander Road by cranes from Max Ford.
7. The Hearing Examiner can condition or deny a rezone if there is substantial evidence in the record of the need to do so in the interest of the public health, safety and welfare. However, none of the assertions listed above achieves that evidentiary level in this record at this rezone stage. Instead, the findings of fact herein are intended to facilitate the administrative site plan review process, at which stage conditions should be considered which address in detail the concerns expressed by the citizens as summarized above.
8. Chapter 30.42A covers rezoning requests and applies to site specific rezone proposals that conform to the Comprehensive Plan. The decision criteria under SCC 30.42A.100 provides as follows:

The hearing examiner may approve a rezone only when all the following criteria are met:

- (1) The proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan;
- (2) the proposal bears a substantial relationship to the public health, safety, and welfare;  
and
- (3) where applicable, minimum zoning criteria found in chapters 30.31A through 30.31F SCC are met.

It is the finding of the Examiner that the request meets these requirements generally and should be approved.

9. The property is designated Urban Medium Density Residential (UMDR 6-12 du/ac) on the General Policy Plan (GPP) Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and is located within an Urban Growth Area (UGA). According to the GPP, the Urban Medium Density Residential designation "covers various sub-area plan designations which allow a combination of detached homes on small lots, townhouses, and apartments in low density, multifamily residential developments. Land in this category may be developed up to a maximum density of twelve dwelling units per acre. Land in this category may be developed at a density of 6-12 du/ac and one of the implementing zones is the LDMR zone which is the case here.
10. The request is consistent with Section 30.70.100 SCC (Section 32.50.100 SCC), which requires, pursuant to RCW 36.70B.040, that all project permit applications be consistent with the GMACP, and GMA-based county codes.
11. Any finding of fact in this decision which should be deemed a conclusion is hereby adopted as such.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Based on the findings of fact entered above, the following conclusions of law are entered.

1. The Examiner having fully reviewed the PDS staff report hereby adopts said staff report as properly setting forth the issues, the land use requests, consistency with the existing regulations, policies, principles, conditions and their effect upon the request. It is therefore hereby adopted by the Examiner as a conclusion as if set forth in full herein, in order to avoid needless repetition. There are no changes to the recommendations of the staff report.
2. The request is for a rezone and, therefore, must be consistent with the GMACP; GMA based county codes. In this regard, the request is consistent with those plans and codes. The type and character of land use permitted on the project site is consistent with the General Policy Plan (GPP) ULDR designation of the property and meets the required regulatory codes as to density, design and development standards.
3. The request would allow for 16 residences instead of the one residence allowed as now zoned.
4. The request is for a rezone and therefore must comply with Chapter 30.42A. This is a site specific rezone that conforms to the Comprehensive Plan. Because no substantial evidence was submitted contrary to the requirements of Chapter 30.42A, the evidence is presumed to meet these requirements.
5. The request should be approved as submitted.
6. Any conclusion in this decision which should be deemed a finding of fact is hereby adopted as such.

### **DECISION**

Based on the findings of fact and conclusions of law entered above, the decision of the Hearing Examiner on the application is as follows:

The request for a rezone from Residential-9,600 to Low Density Multiple Residential for this property is hereby **APPROVED**.

Decision issued this 14<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ed Good, Deputy Hearing Examiner

<b>EXPLANATION OF RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL PROCEDURES</b>
---

The decision of the Hearing Examiner is final and conclusive with right of appeal to the County Council. However, reconsideration by the Examiner may also be sought by one or more parties of record. The following paragraphs summarize the reconsideration and appeal processes. For more information about reconsideration and appeal procedures, please see Chapter 30.72 SCC and the respective Examiner and Council Rules of Procedure.

**Reconsideration**

Any party of record may request reconsideration by the Examiner. A petition for reconsideration must be filed in writing with the Office of the Hearing Examiner, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, County Administration-East Building, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, Washington, (Mailing Address: M/S #405, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett WA 98201) on or before **MARCH 24, 2006**. There is no fee for filing a petition for reconsideration. **“The petitioner for reconsideration shall mail or otherwise provide a copy of the petition for reconsideration to all parties of record on the date of filing.” [SCC 30.72.065]**

A petition for reconsideration does not have to be in a special form but must: contain the name, mailing address and daytime telephone number of the petitioner, together with the signature of the petitioner or of the petitioner’s attorney, if any; identify the specific findings, conclusions, actions and/or conditions for which reconsideration is requested; state the relief requested; and, where applicable, identify the specific nature of any newly discovered evidence and/or changes proposed by the applicant.

The grounds for seeking reconsideration are limited to the following:

- (a) The Hearing Examiner exceeded the Hearing Examiner’s jurisdiction;
- (b) The Hearing Examiner failed to follow the applicable procedure in reaching the Hearing Examiner’s decision;
- (c) The Hearing Examiner committed an error of law;
- (d) The Hearing Examiner’s findings, conclusions and/or conditions are not supported by the record;
- (e) New evidence which could not reasonably have been produced and which is material to the decision is discovered; or
- (f) The applicant proposed changes to the application in response to deficiencies identified in the decision.

Petitions for reconsideration will be processed and considered by the Hearing Examiner pursuant to the provisions of SCC 30.72.065. Please include the County file number in any correspondence regarding this case.

## Appeal

An appeal to the County Council may be filed by any aggrieved party of record. Where the reconsideration process of SCC 30.72.065 has been invoked, no appeal may be filed until the reconsideration petition has been disposed of by the hearing examiner. An aggrieved party need not file a petition for reconsideration but may file an appeal directly to the County Council. If a petition for reconsideration is filed, issues subsequently raised by that party on appeal to the County Council shall be limited to those issues raised in the petition for reconsideration. Appeals shall be addressed to the Snohomish County Council but shall be filed in writing with the Department of Planning and Development Services, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, County Administration-East Building, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, Washington (Mailing address: M/S #604, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, WA 98201) on or before **MARCH 28, 2006** and shall be accompanied by a filing fee in the amount of five hundred dollars (\$500.00); PROVIDED, that the filing fee shall not be charged to a department of the County or to other than the first appellant; and PROVIDED FURTHER, that the filing fee shall be refunded in any case where an appeal is dismissed without hearing because of untimely filing, lack of standing, lack of jurisdiction or other procedural defect. [SCC 30.72.070]

An appeal must contain the following items in order to be complete: a detailed statement of the grounds for appeal; a detailed statement of the facts upon which the appeal is based, including citations to specific Hearing Examiner findings, conclusions, exhibits or oral testimony; written arguments in support of the appeal; the name, mailing address and daytime telephone number of each appellant, together with the signature of at least one of the appellants or of the attorney for the appellant(s), if any; the name, mailing address, daytime telephone number and signature of the appellant's agent or representative, if any; and the required filing fee.

The grounds for filing an appeal shall be limited to the following:

- (a) The decision exceeded the Hearing Examiner's jurisdiction;
- (b) The Hearing Examiner failed to follow the applicable procedure in reaching his decision;
- (c) The Hearing Examiner committed an error of law; or
- (d) The Hearing Examiner's findings, conclusions and/or conditions are not supported by substantial evidence in the record. [SCC 30.72.080]

Appeals will be processed and considered by the County Council pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 30.72 SCC. Please include the County file number in any correspondence regarding the case.

---

---

### Staff Distribution:

Department of Planning and Development Services: Darryl Eastin

<p>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." A copy of this Decision is being provided to the Snohomish County Assessor as required by RCW 36.70B.130.</p>
---