

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

In the Matter of the Application of )  
 )  
**LAKE STICKNEY ESTATES, LLC** ) **FILE NO. 06 132026 LU**  
 )  
Rezoned from Residential-7,200 (R-7,200) to )  
Low Density Multiple Residential (LDMR) )

---

DATE OF DECISION: June 28, 2007

PLAT/PROJECT NAME: *Lake Stickney Estates*

DECISION (SUMMARY): Rezoned from R-7,200 to Low Density Multiple Residential is APPROVED.

**BASIC INFORMATION**

GENERAL LOCATION: This project is located at 13812 20<sup>th</sup> Place W, Lynnwood, Washington.

ACREAGE: 1.02 acres

ZONING:                   CURRENT:       R-7,200  
                              PROPOSED:     LDMR

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:

General Policy Plan Designation:       Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12 du/ac)

UTILITIES:

Water/Sewer:       Alderwood Water and Wastewater District

SCHOOL DISTRICT:   Mukilteo No. 6

FIRE DISTRICT:     No. 1

## **INTRODUCTION**

The applicant filed the Master Application on November 13, 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 9, 10 and 11)

A SEPA determination was made on April 10, 2007. (Exhibit 8) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on June 13, 2007, the 80<sup>th</sup> day of the 120-day decision making period.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

The public hearing commenced on June 13, 2007 at 1:02 p.m.

1. The Examiner stated that he had read the PDS staff report, reviewed the file and viewed the area.
2. The applicant, Lake Stickney Estates, LLC, was represented by Wendy Downer of The West Group. Snohomish County was represented by Michael Dobesh of the Department of Planning and Development Services.
3. Pre-hearing letters expressing concern or opposition were received from vicinity residents Jim Bet (Exhibit 13) and Jack Duchan (Exhibit 14). Neither appeared at the hearing. They express concern about traffic impacts on 20<sup>th</sup> Place W. and Lake Stickney Drive, especially for children walking there. Mr. Duchan opines that the three or four dwellings allowed by the existing R-7,200 zoning is preferable to the nine dwellings allowed if the requested rezone is approved. He laments the absence of recreational facilities. Mr. Bet asserts that the subject site drains to a Class I wetland and is part of the Lake Stickney/Swamp Creek Watershed, which has been identified as critical urban salmon habitat. A third vicinity resident, Corinne Martin, appeared and testified. Ms. Martin has lived within one and one-half miles of the subject site for more than 50 years. She refers to the density of this proposal as “compaction” and considers this project to be “the modern version of a ghetto.”

The hearing concluded at 1:23 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 applicants, Lake Stickney Estates, LLC, filed an application requesting approval of a rezone of an approximately one acre parcel from R-7,200 to LDMR for the purpose of constructing thereon nine dwellings.
3. The subject site and the surrounding community are zoned R-7,200 and are either undeveloped or developed with single-family residences. One single-family residence now on the site will be demolished.
4. The environmental checklist (Exhibit 2) reports that a 934 square-foot Category III wetland and its 25-foot buffer will be filled. The staff report to the Hearing Examiner notes that the fill is permitted by SCC 30.62.360(6). Mr. Bet argues that water quality in Lake Stickney and in Swamp Creek is certain to be degraded by the development permitted if the requested rezone is approved. The staff report responds that the proposed rezone implements the Comprehensive Plan and that impacts of the rezone will be considered during the administrative construction review of the proposed development.
5. The arguments against the proposed rezone are heart-felt but are more legislative than judicial in nature. The policy choices expressed legislatively in the Comprehensive Plan are not arguable before the quasi-judicial Hearing Examiner.
6. There is no mitigation required for parks, schools or roads and the DPW has no comments or objections but will provide its input during the short plat approval process.
7. The Snohomish County Health District has no objection to this proposal provided that public water and sewer are furnished.
8. Public water, sewer service and electrical power will be available for this development.
9. The subject property is designated Urban Medium Density Residential (UMDR: 6-12 DU/Ac) on the GPP Future Land Use map, and is located within an Urban Growth Area (UGA). It is not located within a mapped Growth Phasing Overlay. According to the GPP, the Urban Medium Density Residential designation "covers various sub-area plan designations which allow a combination of detached homes on small lots, townhouses, and apartments in low density, multifamily residential developments. Land in this category may be developed at a density of 6-12 du/ac and one of the implementing zones is the LDMR zone which is the case here.
10. 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.
11. 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 request is for a rezone and, therefore, must be consistent with the GMACP; GMA based county codes. In this regard, the request is consistent with those plans and codes. The type and character of land use permitted on the project site is consistent with the General Policy Plan (GPP) ULDR designation of the property and meets the required regulatory codes as to density, design and development standards.
3. A rezone must also comply with SCC 30.42A. This is a site specific rezone that conforms to the Comprehensive Plan. Because no substantial evidence was submitted of non-compliance with the requirements of Chapter 30.42A, the application is presumed to meet those requirements. If a preponderance of probative, competent evidence of record demonstrates that a rezone is not in the interest of the public health, safety or welfare, the Examiner may condition or deny a requested site specific rezone even if the rezone implements the area wide provisions of the Comprehensive Plan. That preponderance does not exist in this instance, however.
4. 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 conclusion of the Examiner that the request meets these requirements and should be approved.

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 rezone from Residential-7,200 to Low Density Multiple Residential for this property is hereby **APPROVED**.

Decision issued this 28<sup>th</sup> day of July, 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 **JULY 9, 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 **JULY 12, 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: Michael Dobesh

|  |
|--|
| 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. |
|--|