

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

In the Matter of the Application of )  
 )  
**GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS, L.L.C.** ) **FILE NO. 05 125359 SD**  
 )  
17 lot Rural Cluster Subdivision (RCS) on 39.5 acres )

---

DATE OF DECISION: September 5, 2007  
PROJECT NAME: *Grandview Heights*  
DECISION (SUMMARY): The 17-lot rural cluster subdivision is **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED.**

**BASIC INFORMATION**

GENERAL LOCATION: The property is located 800 feet east of Heimer/Cedarvale Loop Road approximately ½ mile northeast of the intersection of 292<sup>nd</sup> and Heimer Road, Arlington, Washington.

ACREAGE: 39.5 acres

NUMBER OF LOTS: 17

AVERAGE LOT SIZE: 43,912 square feet

MINIMUM LOT SIZE: 43,561 square feet

DENSITY: .43 du/ac (gross)

ZONING: R-5

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:  
General Policy Plan Designation: Rural Residential (1 du/5 acres, Basic)

UTILITIES:

Water: Individual wells  
Sewer: Individual septic

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Arlington No. 16

FIRE DISTRICT: No. 18

## INTRODUCTION

The applicant filed the Master Application on February 2, 2006. (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 19, 20 and 21)

A SEPA determination was made on June 29, 2007. (Exhibit 18) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on August 21, 2007, the 82<sup>nd</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 August 21, 2007 at 2:10 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, Grandview Heights, L.L.C., was represented by David Arnesen. Snohomish County was represented by Ed Caine of the Department of Planning and Development Services. No member of the general public attended the hearing. Vicinity resident Michael R. Ray submitted a letter (Exhibit 24) noting that there are only 11 homes on Heimer Road west of the proposed subdivision, which will more than double that number of homes. He expresses concern about impacts during construction such as traffic, equipment storage, turnaround, dust and noise. He also expresses concern about the proposed subdivision's access to Heimer Road due to asserted visibility limitations for southbound traffic.
3. The Washington State Department of Ecology became a party of record by submittal into the record of its July 11, 2007 letter (Exhibit 32) expressing doubt that a proper finding of potable water can be made here, stating: "*It is not clear whether 5,000 gpd for domestic use is adequate to serve 17 residential homes.*"

The hearing concluded at 2:25 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 applicant, Grandview Heights, LLC, filed an application for a rural cluster subdivision of 17 detached single-family homes, each on a lot of at least one acre, on approximately 40 acres zoned R-5 and located 800 feet east of the Heimer/Cedarvale Loop Road, Arlington.
3. Adjacent zoning districts are either Forestry or R-5. Adjacent uses are either single-family, forestry or undeveloped.
4. The 17 new homes will each generate 9.57 vehicular trips per day for a total of 163 daily trips, of which 13 trips will be a.m. peak-hour trips and 17 will be p.m. peak-hour trips. As noted under "Public Hearing" above, vicinity resident Michael Ray objects (Exhibit 24) to the proposed development because it will more than double the number of households (i.e., trips) on the local roads. The traffic analysis by Gibson Traffic Consultants (Exhibit 7) demonstrates that current background levels of traffic are light enough that the additional traffic is absorbed without threat to public health, safety or welfare. That report also notes (p. 4) that a sight distance easement was purchased to ensure adequate stopping and entering sight distance to the north, as approved by Snohomish County. At hearing, the owner, David Arnesen, testified that the easement purchase was made in response to the concerns of Michael Ray. Further, recommended conditions upon approval No. D.ii requires that the easement must be recorded prior to or with the final plat.
5. The alignment and location of the proposed private access easement between the subject property and the Heimer Road must be identified and approved by the Department of Public Works before final plat approval. (Condition D.i.)
6. The DPW reviewed the request with regard to traffic mitigation and road design standards. That review covered Title 13 SCC and Chapter 30.66B 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 that review, the DPW has determined that the development is concurrent and has no objection to the requests subject to various conditions.
7. The project would comply with park mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66A SCC by the payment of \$48.82 for each new single-family home.
8. School mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66C SCC have been reviewed and set forth in the conditions. Arlington School District requests safe walkways for students to the intersection of Heimer Road and Cedarvale Road or other location designated by that School District.
9. There is a Category 3 wetland and a Type 3 stream on site. The off-site access road will cross a Type 5 stream. Areas of unbuildable lands with slopes greater than 40 percent and critical areas because of slopes greater than 33 percent are also on site.

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.
11. The Snohomish County Health District has no objection to this proposal using potable water wells and individual septic systems. The Washington State Department of Ecology challenges (Exhibit 32) whether 17 lots are adequately and lawfully served by the 5,000 gallons of ground water per day allowed without a water right pursuant to the exemption provided at RCW 90.44.050 and consistent with *Ecology v. Campbell & Gwinn, L.L.C.*, 146. Wn.2d 1, 43 P.3d 4 (2001). The Examiner takes notice that Snohomish PUD No. 1 requires 33 cubic feet of potable water per day per single-family residence (assuming four persons). The 17 lots proposed would, thus, require 561 cubic feet of water per day. A cubic foot of water equals 7.48 gallons. The total of 561 cubic feet converted to gallons is 4,196 gallons, which is 84 % of the 5,000 gallon exemption. The Examiner finds as fact that the requested withdrawal from wells is within the exception.
12. 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.
13. The proposed use (single-family detached development) is essentially compatible with existing single-family detached developments on larger lots. 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 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. The proposed plat also meets Chapter 30.41A SCC requirements. A complete application for the proposed plat was received by PDS on May 31, 2005. The proposed plat as conditioned also meets the general requirements under Section 30.41A.100 with respect to health, safety and general welfare of the community as noted in this report. As proposed, the subject lots will not be subject to flood, inundation or swamp conditions. The lots as proposed are outside of all regulated flood hazard areas. As conditioned, the plat will meet all SCC 30.41A.210 design standards for roads.
16. The subject rural cluster subdivision (RCS) application has been reviewed for conformance with the RCS standards in Chapter 30.41C SCC. The applicant has provided the information required on an RCS development plan and preliminary plat, the latest versions of which were received by PDS on February 1, 2006 (Exhibit 15), and in an open space management plan (Exhibit 8) that is to be implemented by a homeowners' association. The RCS application meets all of the criteria required for preliminary approval listed in SCC 30.41C.200.

17. The request is consistent with Section 30.70.100 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 relationship to 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. 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 17-lot rural cluster subdivision on 39.5 acres is hereby **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions:

### **CONDITIONS**

- A. The preliminary plat received by PDS on June 4, 2007 (Exhibit 15), 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 Area Study and Buffer Averaging Plan for Grandview Heights prepared by Wetland Resources, Inc. revised March 1, 2007 shall be submitted for review and approval during the construction review phase of this project.
- iv. The disclosure text required under SCC 32A.220 is required to be placed on the face of the plat.

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 Arlington School District No. 16 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.”

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

\$2,526.48 per lot for mitigation of impacts on County roads paid to the County,  
 \$344.52 per lot for mitigation of impacts on state highways paid to the County,  
 \$838.70 per lot for mitigation of impacts on City streets for the City of Arlington paid to the City. Proof of payment shall be provided.

The developer of this subdivision has elected to defer these payment obligations to a time preceding building permit issuance. 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. 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 30.91N.010 are allowed when approved by the County.”

- iv. The developer shall pay the County \$48.82 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. The alignment and location of the proposed private access easement between the subject property and the Heimer Road shall be identified and approved by the DPW [SCC 30.66B.420].
- ii. The sight distance easement shall be recorded prior to or with the final plat recording [SCC 30.66B.420].

- iii. Provide adequate pedestrian facilities from the subject development to the intersection of Heimer Road/Cedarvale Road or other location acceptable to both the DPW and the School District [RCW 58.17.110].
- iv. 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 plat 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.

- v. The final wetland mitigation plan shall be completely implemented.
- E. In conformity with applicable standards and timing requirements:
- i. The preliminary landscape plan (Exhibit 17) 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.

Decision issued this 5<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_  
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, 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 **SEPTEMBER 17, 2007**. 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 **SEPTEMBER 19, 2007** 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

<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>
---