

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

In the Matter of the Application of )  
 )  
**BEAUMONT, LLC** ) **FILE NO. 05 123119**  
 )  
Preliminary plat for a 54-lot subdivision utilizing lot )  
size averaging and a rezone from R-9,600 to R-7,200 )

---

DATE OF DECISION: February 8, 2006

PLAT/PROJECT NAME: *Beaumont*

DECISION (SUMMARY): The requested rezone from the existing R-9,600 to R-7,200 and concurrent 54-lot subdivision are **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED.**

**BASIC INFORMATION**

GENERAL LOCATION: This project is located west of 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE and north of 223<sup>rd</sup> Street SE in the Bothell area.

ACREAGE: 10.81 acres

NUMBER OF LOTS: 54

AVERAGE LOT SIZE: 6,294 square feet

MINIMUM LOT SIZE: 4,988 square feet

DENSITY: 4.9 du/ac (gross)  
6.8 du/ac (net)



The hearing concluded at 2:01 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.
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 request is for a rezone of 10.81 acres from R-9,600 to R-7,200 in order to construct a 54-lot subdivision using lot size averaging.
4. Witness Gene Grieve submitted a packet of materials (Exhibit 23) with focus on (1) the need for a paved walkway along the existing grass and gravel walk on 220<sup>th</sup> Street SE and (2) issues related to sewer service for property at the west end of 220<sup>th</sup> Street SE. Steve Duke testifies that he owns more land abutting the subject plat than anyone does and he urges provision of sewer service via his Lot 7 directly west of the subject plat. Witness Erin Metcalf testifies that the platter concurs.
5. Mr. Grieve points out that East Bothell has the highest rate of growth in Snohomish County, demonstrated by his listing of 26 land development projects in the area, with new homes proposed or built for each. By the Examiner's quick count, Mr. Grieve documents approximately 1280 new homes for that vicinity. Mr. Grieve describes a citizen process of negotiation underway as an adjunct to the governmental processes to insure consideration of parks, streets, sewers, trails and amenities for those new homes. He is aggravated by what he feels is a threat to achieving those goals by continued reference to the quarter-century-old North Creek Subarea Plan. He considers the plan an obsolete embarrassment.
6. The project would comply with park mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66A SCC (Title 26A SCC) by the payment of \$1,244.49 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.
8. School mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66C SCC (Title 26C SCC) have been reviewed and set forth in the conditions.

9. There are no critical areas on site or within 100 feet of the subject property.
10. 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. Public water and sewer service and electrical power will be available for this development.
12. The property is designated Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR 4-6 du/ac) on the General Policy Plan (GPP) Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and is located within an Urban Growth Area (UGA). Land in this category may be developed at a density of 4-6 du/ac and one of the implementing zones is the R-7,200 zone which is the case here.
13. The proposed use (single-family detached development) is essentially compatible with existing single-family detached developments on larger lots. Because the property is within a UGA, policies were adopted to promote urban densities of development. A comparison with the present lower density character of much of the area is inappropriate since the present density of development in much of the surrounding area is inconsistent with both the adopted comprehensive plans and the present zoning.
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. 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 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 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 evidence was submitted contrary to the requirements of Chapter 30.42A, the application is presumed to meet these requirements.
5. The conclusions of law immediately above herein are entered with awareness of the public concerns expressed in this record. However, the higher density infill in lieu of sprawl implements the applicable law and policies.
6. 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 January 9, 2006 (Exhibit 11) 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.
- 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 Northshore School District No. 417 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 8 existing parcels. Lots 2, 7, 15, 25, 26, 34, 50, and 53 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 (or twice the amount for a duplex):

\$1,538.69 per lot to Snohomish County as mitigation for project impacts on county road system capacity within Transportation Service Area F. Credits for certain expenditures may be allowed against said payment to the extent authorized by county code.

Notice of these mitigation payment obligations shall be contained in any deeds involving this subdivision or the lots therein. Once building permit has been issued all mitigation payments shall be deemed paid.

- iii. Additional right-of-way adjacent to the existing right-of-way of 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE shall have been dedicated to the County along the development's entire frontage such that a minimum of 40 feet of right-of-way exists from centerline of the 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE right-of-way.
- iv. The developer shall pay the County \$1,244.49 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.

D. Prior to recording of the final plat:

- i. Construction of urban standard frontage improvements along the project's frontage on 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE and the 220<sup>th</sup> Street SE cul-de-sac shall have been completed.
- ii. An existing, paved pedestrian walkway shall have been delineated by striping along 220<sup>th</sup> Street SE from the development's frontage to 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE.

E. 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 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 requests for a preliminary plat for a 54-lot subdivision utilizing lot size averaging provisions and for a rezone from Residential-9,600 to Residential-7,200 are hereby **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED**, subject to the conditions set forth in Conclusion No. 6 above.

Decision issued this 8<sup>th</sup> day of February, 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 **FEBRUARY 21, 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 **FEBRUARY 22, 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: Mona Davis  
Department of Public Works: Norm Stone

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.
--