

**REPORT and DECISION of the SNOHOMISH
COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER PRO TEM**

DATE OF DECISION: August 2, 2007

PLAT/PROJECT NAME:**MADISON MEADOWS**

APPLICANT/
LANDOWNER: Madison Meadows, LLC

FILE NO.: 06 134762 LU

TYPE OF REQUEST: **REZONE** from Residential-7200 (R-7200) to Low Density Multiple Residential (LDMR)

DECISION (SUMMARY): **APPROVED**

BASIC INFORMATION

GENERAL LOCATION: The property is located at 1813 Madison Way, Lynnwood, WA

ACREAGE: 2.83 acres

ZONING: CURRENT: R-7200
PROPOSED: LDMR

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:

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

UTILITIES:

Water: Alderwood Water & Wastewater District
Sewage: Alderwood Water & Wastewater District

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Mukilteo

FIRE DISTRICT: No. 1

SELECTED AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Department of:
Planning and Development Services: Approve

INTRODUCTION

The applicant filed the Master Application on February 6, 2007. (Exhibit 1)

The Hearing Examiner (Examiner) made a site familiarization visit on July 16, 2007 in the morning.

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 of nonsignificance was made on June 5, 2007. (Exhibit 8) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on July 18, 2007, the 83rd 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 July 18, 2007 at 3:00 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.
2. County planner Roxanne Pilkenton summarized the staff recommendation, and emphasized the proposal was for a rezone only, not for a specific development..
3. Laurie Tobiason represented the Applicant. He said that his company had done several successful projects along Madison Way and expected the same results here. The proposal was consistent with the Comprehensive plan, he said, which designates the site for Urban Medium Density Residential land uses, with 6-12 dwelling units per acre.
4. Nancy Duchan spoke for herself and some of her neighbors. She was concerned that multiple housing would not be safe or economical for young families; that there would not be adequate parking and that emergency vehicles would not be able to negotiate the streets. She also cited adverse environmental impacts such as the loss of birds and small animals and possible pollution of Swamp Creek. The area receives flood waters from the school property to the east, and increased impervious surfaces will make this worse. She felt that LDMR zoning would be bad for her long-established neighborhood.

5. Jack Duchan spoke against the rezone. He thought the area was already dense enough and that more housing would bring crime. He urged that the land be used for park purposes as an attachment to the Lake Stickney Middle School property. He was also concerned that there would be a loss of trees, and urged that the site be developed with ranch-style housing instead.
4. No one appeared in opposition to the request.

The hearing concluded at 3:46 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 these hearings 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 as a rezone only, 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. The request is for a rezone from R-7200 to LDMR. This will make it possible to develop a maximum of 30 single-family attached dwellings units on the site.
4. The site and immediately surrounding properties are zoned R-7200.
5. 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.

6. The Snohomish County Health District has no objection to this proposal provided that public water and sewer are furnished.
7. Public water and sewer service will be available for this development as well as electrical power.
8. Since this request involves rezoning only, any details or conditions which would normally come from DPW will be done at the time of administrative plat approval and are not required here.
9. Exhibit 5 is an aerial photograph which very clearly shows the property itself and the surrounding area and its compatibility in this area.
10. Any Conclusion of Law in this Report and Decision, which should be deemed a Finding of Fact, 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 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. The request would allow for 30 single-family detached dwelling units.
4. This request is for a rezone only and not for a specific development. The County's General Policy Plan designates the site for Urban Medium Density Residential, and the LDMR zone is one of the implementing zones for this land use classification. The site is adjacent to a large, open space at Lake Stickney Middle School and Applicant has successfully developed similar properties in the vicinity. The Examiner can appreciate the anxiety of the neighbors for the future of their neighborhood. However, the proposal to rezone the site is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and there is no reason to believe that a project on this site will be contrary to the public health, safety and welfare. The rezone from R-7200 to LDMR should be approved. Residents will have the opportunity to influence the development of the site when plans are submitted to the County.
5. Any Finding of Fact in this Report and Decision, which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law, is hereby adopted as such.

DECISION:

The request for a **REZONE** from R-7200 to LDMR for this property is hereby **APPROVED**.

Decision issued this 2nd day of August, 2007.

Gordon Crandall, Hearing Examiner Pro Tem

<p>EXPLANATION OF RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL PROCEDURES</p>
--

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 **August 13, 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 **August 16, 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: Roxanne Pilkenton

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.