

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:
DB ID: 567947

REPORT and DECISION of the SNOHOMISH COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER PRO TEM

DATE OF DECISION: April 24, 2007

PLAT/PROJECT NAME: *VISTAS AT SILVER LAKE*

APPLICANT/
LANDOWNER: Brad Albertson

FILE NO.: 06 103315 SD

TYPE OF REQUEST: **REZONE** from Residential-9600 (R-9600) to Residential-7200 (R-7200) and an 11 lot **SUBDIVISION**, utilizing lot size averaging, on 2.23 acres

DECISION (SUMMARY): **APPROVED** subject to **CONDITIONS**

BASIC INFORMATION

GENERAL LOCATION: The property is located at 1317 Silver Lake Road, Everett, WA

ACREAGE: 2.23 acres

DENSITY: 5.0 du/ac (gross)
8.3 du/ac (net)

NUMBER OF LOTS: 11

AVERAGE LOT SIZE: 8,822 square feet

MINIMUM LOT SIZE: 3,885.5 square feet

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

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:

General Policy Plan Designation: Urban Low Density Residential (4-6 du/ac)

UTILITIES:

Water: Silver Lake Water District
Sewage: Silver Lake Water District

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Everett

FIRE DISTRICT: No. 1

SELECTED AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Department of:

Planning and Development Services: Approve subject to conditions

Public Works: Approve subject to conditions

INTRODUCTION

The applicant filed the Master Application on June 28, 2006. (Exhibit 1)

The Hearing Examiner (Examiner) made a site familiarization visit on April 11, 2007 during the noon hour.

The Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) gave proper public notice of the open record hearing as required by the county code. (Exhibits 20, 21 and 22)

A SEPA determination of nonsignificance was made on February 20, 2007. (Exhibit 19) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on April 11, 2007, the 144th 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 April 11, 2007 at 1:00 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.

The hearing concluded at 1:35 p.m.

NOTE: Audio tapes of this 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. One comment letter was received from the public expressing concern for vehicular and pedestrian traffic, water quality of Silver Lake, and cumulative impacts of this and other developments in the vicinity.
4. 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.
5. 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. (Exhibit 21)
6. School mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66C SCC (Title 26C SCC) have been reviewed and set forth in the conditions.
7. A Category 3 wetland is located on the site. It will be impacted by plat construction activity. Mitigation for the disturbance will be the creation of 1,013 square feet of wetland with an enhanced buffer with additional plantings in accordance with Chapter 30.62 SCC (Chapter 32.10 SCC) Critical Area Regulations.
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. Any existing on-site septic systems shall be abandoned.
10. Public water and sewer service will be available for this development as well as electrical power.
11. 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). 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 4-6 du/ac and one of the implementing zones is the R-7,200 zone which is the case here.
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. 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.

14. 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.
15. 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.
16. The aerial photograph (Exhibit 17) very clearly and effectively shows the location of the proposal and how it would fit into the surrounding area.
17. 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. Access to Lot 7 shall be restricted to the west corner of the lot. (Exhibit 39)
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 should be approved subject to compliance by the applicant with the following Conditions:

CONDITIONS

- A. The preliminary plat received by PDS on November 28, 2006 (Exhibit 8) 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 platlor 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 and Buffer Mitigation Plan* prepared by Shockey Brent, Inc. revised January 2007 (Exhibit 7) shall be submitted for review and approval during the construction review phase of this 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 Everett School District No. 2 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 two existing parcel(s). Lots 2 and 8 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:

\$2,299.67 per lot for mitigation of impacts on county roads paid to the county,

\$68.18 per lot for transportation demand management paid to the county,

These payments are due prior to or at the time of each building permit issuance. Notice of these mitigation payments shall be contained in any deeds involving this subdivision of the lots therein. Once building permits have been issued all mitigation payments shall be deemed paid by PDS.

- 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 \$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.

- v. Access to lot 7 shall be restricted to the west corner of the lot.

D. Prior to recording of the final plat:

- i. Urban frontage improvements shall be constructed along the parcel's frontage on Silver Lake Road and 119th Pl. SE to the satisfaction of the DPW.

- ii. 15 feet of additional right-of-way that is required on 119th Pl. SE, which ultimately makes 30 feet of right-of-way on the development side of centerline shall have been dedicated to the County.
- 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 plattor 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 mitigation plan (wetland creation, additional buffers and buffer enhancement) shall be completely implemented.
- v. The easement recorded under Snohomish county Auditor's Number 8701230114 shall be extinguished.

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.

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

DECISION:

The request for a **REZONE** from R-9600 to R-7200 and approval of a **PRELIMINARY PLAT** are hereby APPROVED, SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE by the applicant, with the CONDITIONS set forth in Conclusion 5, above.

Decision issued this 24th day of April, 2007.

Gordon F. Crandall, Hearing Examiner Pro Tem

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 **May 4, 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, 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 **May 8, 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 this case.

Staff Distribution:

Department of Planning and Development Services: David Radabaugh

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.