

BEFORE THE
SNOHOMISH COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER
DECISION of the DEPUTY HEARING EXAMINER

In the Matter of the Application of)
) **FILE NO. 05 120068**
TERRY & LINDSAY RUDE)
)
12 lot Rural Cluster Subdivision (RCS) on 40.33 acres)

DATE OF DECISION: March 2, 2006
PROJECT NAME: *Viewmont Estates*
DECISION (SUMMARY): The 12-lot rural cluster subdivision is **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED.**

BASIC INFORMATION

GENERAL LOCATION: The property is located 27826 15th Avenue NE, Stanwood, Washington.
ACREAGE: 40.33 acres
NUMBER OF LOTS: 12
AVERAGE LOT SIZE: 44,789 square feet
MINIMUM LOT SIZE: 43,570 square feet
DENSITY: 0.3 du/ac (gross)
ZONING: R-5
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:
General Policy Plan Designation: Rural residential – 5 (1 du/5 ac)
Subarea Plan: Northwest County
Subarea Plan Designation: Rural (1 du/2.3 – 5 ac)

UTILITIES:

Water: Individual wells
Sewer: Individual septic

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Stanwood No. 401

FIRE DISTRICT: No. 18

SELECTED AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Department of:

Planning and Development Services (PDS): Approval subject to conditions

Public Works (DPW): Approval subject to conditions

INTRODUCTION

The applicant filed the Master Application on August 25, 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 18, 19 and 20)

A SEPA determination was made on January 10, 2006. (Exhibit 17) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on February 15, 2006, the 69th 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 February 15, 2006 at 3:02 p.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 was represented by Thomas Barry of Metron & Associates, Inc. Snohomish County was represented by Ed Caine of the Department of Planning and Development Services. Three vicinity households submitted pre-hearing letters into the record raising concern about traffic and potable water wells. Those parties are Fred Bushby, neighbor abutting on the west; Rich and Mary Chapman, neighbors abutting on the south; and Shirley Lumia, neighbor directly across (east of) 15th Avenue NE. Of those three, only Mr. Chapman testified at the hearing.

The hearing concluded at 3:40 p.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. The staff report to the Hearing Examiner is adopted by reference except as may be specifically noted otherwise herein.
2. The applicant proposed a 12-lot rural cluster subdivision with a private road off 15th Avenue NE as access. Adjacent zoning is R-5 and is either vacant or single-family residential with forest or pasture. The plat complies with SCC 30.41C.010 by clustering the lots on the most buildable and least environmentally sensitive portion of the site while retaining approximately 62% (25 acres) of the property in restricted open space. Open space within the plat is in the form of wetlands and buffer areas. There is a Category 2 wetland, a Type 4 stream and critical slopes on the site. The County staff recommends to the Hearing Examiner that the Critical Areas Study and Mitigation Plan be found to meet the critical areas regulations. The Examiner so finds as fact.
3. The plat would produce 105 average daily vehicle trips, of which eight would be a.m. peak-hour trips and 11 would be p.m. peak-hour trips. The DPW reviewed the request with regard to traffic mitigation and road design standards. This review covered Title 13 SCC and Chapter 30.66B SCC (Title 26B SCC) as to road system capacity, concurrency, inadequate road conditions, frontage improvements, access and circulation, and dedication/deeding of right-of-way, state highway impacts, impacts on other streets and roads, and Transportation Demand Management. As a result of this review, the DPW has determined that the development is concurrent and has no objection to the requests subject to various conditions.
4. Vicinity residents are concerned about vehicular traffic. Richard Chapman testifies that he has lived for 15 years at his present home abutting the subject site. He points out that 15th Avenue NE is hardly adequate for two cars to meet with no shoulders. He is concerned about poor drivers' sight distance at the intersection of 15th Avenue NE and 268th Street NE. Vicinity resident Fred Bushby shares those concerns (Exhibit 25), particularly as to pedestrian and bicyclist safety. (His son rides a bicycle here.) Neighbor Shirley Lumia (Exhibit 24) focuses on turning movement dangers at the intersection of 15th Avenue NE and 268th Street NE. Her one-page letter is a concise summation of the need for improvements at that intersection. In view of her description of that intersection, Richard Chapman's testimony about growth in the immediate vicinity takes on added significance: 10 homes under construction a Bryant Estates, 13 more homes proposed at Bryant Estates II, eight homes south of the subject plat and the 12 homes of the subject plat: 43 homes adding approximately 411 daily vehicular trips.
5. Concern about potable water corresponds with concerns about vehicular traffic. Richard Chapman testifies that for 15 years his well has pumped 30 gallons per minute of excellent water. He asks if one or more of the proposed plat's 12 wells directly north of his property taps the aquifer, what would be the chance of him retaining the water supply for his home. The applicant responds that preliminary research was conducted about water supply and the Health District reported no concerns about the adequacy of the aquifer.
6. The project would comply with park mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66A SCC (Title 26A SCC) by the payment of \$861.00 for each new single-family home.

7. School mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66C SCC (Title 26C SCC) have been reviewed and set forth in the conditions.
8. The PDS Engineering Division has reviewed the concept of the proposed grading and drainage and recommends approval of the project subject to conditions, which would be imposed during full detailed drainage plan review pursuant to Chapter 30.63A SCC (Title 24 SCC).
9. The Snohomish County Health District has no objection to this proposal provided that public water and sewer are furnished. Public water and sewer service and electrical power will be available for this development.
10. The subject property is designated Rural Residential -5 on the GPP Future Land Use map, and is not located within an Urban Growth Area (UGA). It is not located within a mapped Growth Phasing Overlay. According to the GPP, the Rural Residential-5 designation applies to lands which were previously designated Rural by various subarea plans and have been subsequently zoned R-5. The implementing zone in this designation will continue to be the R-5 zone.
11. The proposed use (single-family detached development) is essentially compatible with existing single-family detached developments on larger lots. The proposed lot sizes will average 44,789 square feet with the smallest being 43,570 square feet.
12. The request complies with the Snohomish County Subdivision Code, Chapter 30.41A SCC (Title 19 SCC) as well as the State Subdivision Code, RCW 58.17. The proposed plat complies with the established criteria therein and makes the appropriate provisions for public, health, safety and general welfare, for open spaces, drainage ways, streets or roads, alleys, other public ways, transit stops, potable water supplies, sanitary wastes, parks and recreation, playgrounds, schools and school grounds, and other planning features including safe walking conditions for students.
13. 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.
14. 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.
2. The Department of Public Works recommends that the request be approved as to traffic use subject to conditions specified below herein.

3. The request is consistent with the (1) GMACP, GMA-based County codes, (2) the type and character of land use permitted on the site, (3) the permitted density, and(4) the applicable design and development standards.
4. The request should be approved subject to compliance by the applicant with the following conditions:

CONDITIONS

- A. The preliminary plat received by the Department of Planning and Development Services on December 22, 2005, (Exhibit 6) shall be the approved plat configuration. Changes to the approved plat are governed by SCC 30.41A.330.
- B. Prior to initiation of any further site work; and/or prior to issuance of any development/construction permits by the county:
 - i. All site development work shall comply with the requirements of the plans and permits approved pursuant to Condition A, above.
 - ii. The plat shall mark with temporary markers in the field the boundary of all Native Growth Protection Areas (NGPA) required by Chapter 30.62 SCC, or the limits of the proposed site disturbance outside of the NGPA, using methods and materials acceptable to the county.
 - iii. A final mitigation plan based on the Critical Areas Study prepared by Wetland Resources dated December 20, 2005 (Exhibit 12), and the Buffer Mitigation Plan prepared by Wetland Resources dated January 4, 2006 (Exhibit 8A and 8B) shall be submitted for review and approval during the construction review phase of this project.
 - iv. “The lots within this subdivision will be subject to school impact mitigation fees for the Stanwood School District No. 401 to be determined by the certified amount within the Base Fee Schedule in effect at the time of building permit application, and to be collected prior to building permit issuance, in accordance with the provisions of SCC 30.66C.010. Credit shall be given for 1 existing parcel. Lot 1 shall receive credit.”
- C. The following additional restrictions and/or items shall be indicated on the face of the final plat:
 - i. Chapter 30.66B SCC requires the new lot mitigation payments in the amounts shown below for a single-family residence (SFR) building permit:

\$2,143.68 per lot for mitigation of impacts on county roads paid to the County,
\$345.24 per lot for mitigation on state highways paid to the County,
\$209.68 per lot for mitigation of impacts on the City of Arlington streets paid to the City.
Proof of payment shall be provided.

These payments are due prior to or at the time of building permit issuance for each single-family residence. Notice of these mitigation payments shall be contained in any deeds involving this subdivision of the lot(s) therein. Once building permits have been issued all mitigation payments shall be deemed paid by PDS.

- ii. All Critical Areas shall be designated Native Growth Protection Areas (NGPA) (unless other agreements have been made) with the following language on the face of the plat;

"All NATIVE GROWTH PROTECTION AREAS shall be left permanently undisturbed in a substantially natural state. No clearing, grading, filling, building construction or placement, or road construction of any kind shall occur, except removal of hazardous trees. The activities as set forth in SCC 32.10.110(29)(a), (c), and (d) are allowed when approved by the County."

D. Prior to recording of the final plat:

- i. The developer shall pay the County \$811.29 per new dwelling unit as mitigation for parks and recreation impacts in accordance with Chapter 30.66A SCC; provided, however, the developer may elect to postpone payment of the mitigation requirement until issuance of a building permit for that lot. The election to postpone payment shall be noted by a covenant placed on the face of the recorded plat and included in the deed for each affected lot within the subdivision.
- ii. Rural frontage improvements shall be constructed along the parcel's frontage on 15th Avenue NE to the specifications of the Department of Public Works.
- iii. Native Growth Protection Area boundaries (NGPA) shall have been permanently marked on the site prior to final inspection by the county, with both NGPA signs and adjacent markers which can be magnetically located (e.g.: rebar, pipe, 20 penny nails, etc.). The platlor may use other permanent methods and materials provided they are first approved by the county. Where an NGPA boundary crosses another boundary (e.g.: lot, tract, plat, road, etc.), a rebar marker with surveyors' cap and license number must be placed at the line crossing.

NGPA signs shall have been placed no greater than 100 feet apart around the perimeter of the NGPA. Minimum placement shall include one Type 1 sign per wetland, and at least one Type 1 sign shall be placed in any lot that borders the NGPA, unless otherwise approved by the county biologist. The design and proposed locations for the NGPA signs shall be submitted to the Land Use Division for review and approval prior to installation.
- iv. The final wetland mitigation plan shall be completely implemented.
- v. Covenants, deeds, and homeowners association bylaws and other documents as appropriate, to be recorded prior to, or simultaneous with, final plat recording shall have been approved as to substance and completeness by the Department of Planning and Development Services, and shall at a minimum:
 - a. Establish all restricted open space as shown on the approved preliminary plat in separate tracts.
 - b. Establish a Homeowner's Association, guaranteeing maintenance of Tracts 999, 998, 997, and 996, including the private road.

- E. In conformity with applicable standards and timing requirements:
 - i. The preliminary landscape plan (Exhibit 5) shall be implemented. All required detention facility landscaping shall be installed in accordance with the approved landscape plan.
- F. All development activity shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 30.63A SCC.

Nothing in this permit/approval excuses the applicant, owner, lessee, agent, successor or assigns from compliance with any other federal, state or local statutes, ordinances or regulations applicable to this project.

Preliminary plats which are approved by the county are valid for five (5) years from the date of approval and must be recorded within that time period unless an extension has been properly requested and granted pursuant to SCC 30.41A.300.

- 5. 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 12-lot rural cluster subdivision on 40.33 acres is hereby **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED**, subject to the conditions set forth in Conclusion No. 4 above.

Decision issued this 2nd day of March, 2006.

Ed Good, Deputy Hearing Examiner

EXPLANATION OF RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL PROCEDURES

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, 2nd 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 13, 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, 2nd 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 16, 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: Ed Caine
Department of Public Works: Mark Brown

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.
--