

# **REPORT and DECISION of the SNOHOMISH COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER**

DATE OF DECISION: February 17, 2006

PLAT/PROJECT NAME: *AMBER GLEN*

APPLICANT/  
LANDOWNER: Amber Glen, LLC

FILE NO.: 05 120158

TYPE OF REQUEST: A 17-lot preliminary subdivision of 4.49 acres utilizing lot size averaging with a concurrent REZONE from Residential-9600 (R-9600) to Residential-7200 (R-7200)

DECISION (SUMMARY): Requests APPROVED subject to CONDITIONS

## **BASIC INFORMATION**

GENERAL LOCATION: The property is located at 2810 79<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Everett

ACREAGE: 4.49 acres

NUMBER OF LOTS: 17

AVERAGE LOT SIZE: 5,616 square feet

MINIMUM LOT SIZE: 4,693 square feet

DENSITY: 3.79 du/ac (gross)  
7.76 du/ac (net)

OPEN SPACE: 45.613 lineal feet (0.96 acre – open space plat 21.1%)

ZONING: CURRENT: R-9600  
PROPOSED: R-7200

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:

General Policy Plan Designation: Urban Low Density Residential-Limited (4-5 du/ac) Marysville UGA  
Subarea Plan: Snohomish-Lake Stevens  
Subarea Plan Designation: Suburban (2-4 du/ac)

UTILITIES:

Water: Snohomish County PUD No. 1  
Sewage: City of Marysville

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Lake Stevens

FIRE DISTRICT: No. 8

SELECTED AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Department of:  
Planning and Development Services (PDS): Approve  
Public Works (DPW): Approve

**INTRODUCTION**

The applicant filed the Revised Master Application on January 17, 2006. (Exhibit 20)

The Hearing Examiner (Examiner) made a site familiarization visit on January 26, 2006 in the afternoon.

The Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) gave proper public notice of the open record hearing as required by the county code. (Exhibits 17, 18 and 19)

A SEPA determination was made on January 6, 2006. (Exhibit 16) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on February 2, 2006, the 136<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 February 2, 2006 at 2:15 p.m.

1. The Examiner indicated that he has read the PDS staff report, reviewed the file and viewed the area and therefore has a general idea of the particular request involved.
2. Mr. Martin Robinett appeared on behalf of the applicant and with regard to Condition C.ii., he asked for the middle sentence to be removed and also that the precondition be removed. Otherwise, he agreed with the PDS staff report and the conditions.
3. Mr. Darryl Eastin, PDS, had no objection.

4. No one appeared in opposition.

The hearing concluded at 2:23 p.m.

**NOTE:** The above information reflects the information submitted to the Examiner summarizing the statements that were made at the hearing. However, for a full and complete record, verbatim audio tapes of the hearing are available in the Office of the Hearing Examiner.

## **FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISION**

### **FINDINGS:**

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 Protection Act (SEPA) evaluation with its recommendation and conditions. This report is hereby adopted by the Examiner as if set forth in full herein.
3. No letters in opposition were received.
4. The request is for a rezone of a 4.49 acre site from R-9600 to R-7200 with a preliminary subdivision of the site into 17 lots, utilizing lot size averaging.
5. The surrounding properties are generally developed as single-family residences on a mix of small and large lots. The zoning surrounding the area on the north, east, west and south is R-9600.
6. The project would comply with park mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66A SCC (Title 26A SCC) by the payment of \$1,361.22 for each new single-family home.
7. 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. (See Pages 4-7, Exhibit 41)
8. School mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66C SCC (Title 26C SCC) have been reviewed and set forth in the conditions.
9. A Category 3 wetland extends off-site to the north into the *Sienna* subdivision site. The PDS staff has reviewed the wetland plan and it will be protected within a Native Growth Protection Area (NGPA) buffer in accordance with Chapter 30.62 SCC (Chapter 32.10 SCC) Critical Area Regulations.

10. The site lies within one drainage basin and flows in a southwesterly direction. Downstream drainage is collected through a series of ditches and culverts and stormwater runoff will be collected in catch basins and conveyed to a stormwater detention pond located in the southwest corner of the site. 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).
11. The Snohomish County Health District has no objection to this proposal provided that public water and sewer are furnished. Any existing on-site septic systems shall be abandoned.
12. Public water and sewer service will be available for this development as well as electrical power.
13. The property is designated Urban Low Density Residential-Limited (ULDR 4-5 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 ULDR designation covers various subarea plan designations which would allow mostly detached housing developments on larger lot sizes. Land in this category may be developed at a density of 4-5 du/ac and one of the implementing zones is the R-7,200 zone which is the case here.
14. 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.
15. 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.

16. The proposal has been evaluated by PDS for compliance with the lot size averaging provisions of SCC 30.41A.240 and SCC 30.23.210. This proposal is consistent with these provisions.
17. 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.
18. The aerial photograph (Exhibit 9) very clearly and effectively shows the location of the proposal and how it would fit into the surrounding area.

19. Any Finding of Fact in this Report and Decision, which should be deemed a Conclusion, is hereby adopted as such.

**CONCLUSIONS:**

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 Department of Public Works recommends that the request be approved as to traffic use subject to certain conditions.
3. The request is consistent with the GMACP; GMA-based County codes; and the type and character of land use permitted on the site and the permitted density with the applicable design and development standards.
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 and since no evidence was submitted contrary to the requirements of Chapter 30.42A, the evidence is presumed to meet these requirements.
5. The request will allow for the development of single-family homes in this rapidly developing area near Marysville.
6. The request should be approved subject to compliance by the applicant with the following Conditions:

**CONDITIONS**

- A. The revised preliminary plat received at the hearing on February 2, 2006 (Exhibit 42) shall be the official site plan and 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 plattor 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 conceptual Critical Area Study and Wetland Mitigation Plan for Amber Glen prepared by Wetland Resources, Inc dated November 2, 2005 (Exhibit 14) shall be submitted for review and approval during the construction review phase of this project.

- iv. The platlor shall submit a detailed hydrogeological analysis report that addresses the hydrological balance of the altered/created wetland following development will be addressed during the construction review phase of the project.

C. The following additional restrictions and/or items shall be indicated on the face of the final plat:

- i. “The lots within this subdivision will be subject to school impact mitigation fees for the Lake Stevens School District No. 4 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 one existing parcel. Lot 1 shall receive credit.”

- ii. Chapter 30.66B SCC requires the new lot mitigation payments in the amounts shown below for each single-family residential building permit:

\$1,961.85 per lot for mitigation of impacts on county roads paid to the county,  
\$75.75 per lot for transportation demand management paid to the county for TSA “A”,  
\$2,020.00 per lot for mitigation of impacts on the City of Marysville streets paid to the city.  
\$209.68 per lot for mitigation of impacts on the City of Arlington streets paid to the city.

These payments are due prior to or at the time of each building permit issuance. Once building permits have been issued all mitigation payments shall be deemed paid by PDS.

- iii. On lots with more than one road frontage, county Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS) restricts lot access to the minor road, unless the Department of Public Works grants a formal deviation.

- iv. 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 UDC 30.91N.010 are allowed when approved by the County.”

- v. The dwelling units within this development are subject to park impact fees in the amount of \$1,361.22 per newly approved dwelling unit pursuant to Chapter 30.66A. Payment of these mitigation fees is required prior to building permit issuance; provided that the building permit has been issued within five years after the application is deemed complete. After five years, park impact fees shall be based upon the rate in effect at the time of building permit issuance.

D. Prior to recording of the final plat:

- i. Urban standard frontage improvements shall be constructed along the property frontage with 79<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and along Soper Hill Road unless bonding of improvements is allowed by PDS, in which case construction is required prior to any occupancy of the development. [SCC 30.66B.410].

- ii. The existing home on Lot 1 shall take access from the new plat road, and the existing driveway on 79<sup>th</sup> Ave NE must be removed.
- 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.
- E. In conformity with applicable standards and timing requirements:
- i. The landscape plan for Amber Glen received January 17, 2006 (Exhibit 23) 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.

- 7. Any Conclusion in this Report and Decision, which should be deemed a Finding of Fact, is hereby adopted as such.

**DECISION:**

The requests for a REZONE from R-9600 to R-7200, along with approval of a 17-lot PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION utilizing lot size averaging are hereby APPROVED, SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE by the applicant, with the CONDITIONS set forth in Conclusion 6, above.

Decision issued this 17th day of February, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert J. Backstein, Hearing Examiner

## EXPLANATION OF RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL PROCEDURES

This 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 Examiner's action on reconsideration would be subject to appeal to the Council.) 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, 2802 Wetmore Avenue, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Everett, Washington, (Mailing Address: M/S #405, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett WA 98201) on or before **February 27, 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 Examiner exceeded his jurisdiction;
- (b) the Examiner failed to follow the applicable procedure in reaching his decision;
- (c) the Examiner committed an error of law or misinterpreted the applicable comprehensive plan, provisions of Snohomish County Code, or other county or state law or regulation;
- (d) the Examiner's findings, conclusions and/or conditions are not supported by the record;
- (e) newly discovered evidence alleged to be material to the Examiner's decision which could not reasonably have been produced at the Examiner's hearing; and/or
- (f) changes to the application proposed by the applicant 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. Appeals shall be addressed to the Snohomish County Council but shall be filed in writing with the Department of Planning and Development Services, 5th Floor, County Administration Building, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, Washington (Mailing address: M/S #604, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, WA 98201) on or before **March 3, 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 and PROVIDED FURTHER that the filing fee shall be refunded in any case where an appeal is dismissed in whole without hearing under SCC 30.72.075.



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 are limited to the following:

- (a) the Examiner exceeded his jurisdiction;
- (b) the Examiner failed to follow the applicable procedure in reaching his decision;
- (c) the Examiner committed an error of law or misinterpreted the applicable comprehensive plan, provisions of Snohomish County Code, or other county or state law or regulation; and/or
- (d) the Examiner's findings, conclusions and/or conditions are not supported by the record.

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 this case.

---

---

Staff Distribution:

Department of Planning and Development Services: Darryl Eastin  
Department of Public Works: Ann Goetz

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.
--