

**BEFORE THE**  
**SNOHOMISH COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER**

**DECISION of the DEPUTY HEARING EXAMINER**

In the Matter of the Application of )  
 )  
**VIKING PROPERTIES** ) **FILE NO. 06 137015 LU**  
 )  
 )  
Rezone from Residential-8,400 (R-8,400) to Low )  
Density Multiple Residential (LDMR) and official )  
site plan approval for the future development of six )  
single-family detached units on a .6 acre site )

---

DATE OF DECISION: October 10, 2007

PLAT/PROJECT NAME: *Viking Properties 228*

DECISION (SUMMARY): The proposed rezone to LDMR and site plan approval for six dwellings on approximately a half-acre site are **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED**.

**BASIC INFORMATION**

GENERAL LOCATION: This project is located at 8006 228<sup>th</sup> Street SW, Edmonds, Washington.

ACREAGE: .6 acre

NUMBER OF UNITS: 6

DENSITY: 10.7 du/ac (net)

ZONING:           CURRENT:       R-8,400  
                  PROPOSED:     LDMR

UTILITIES:  
    Water/Sewer:   Alderwood Water and Wastewater District

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Edmonds No. 15

FIRE DISTRICT: City of Edmonds

## **INTRODUCTION**

The applicant filed the Master Application on February 21, 2007. (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 13, 14 and 15)

A SEPA determination was made on July 16, 2007. (Exhibit 12) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on September 12, 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 September 12, 2007 at 10:01 a.m.

1. The Examiner stated that he had read the PDS staff report, reviewed the file and viewed the area.
2. The applicant, Viking Properties, was represented by S. Michael Smith of LSA, Engineering. Snohomish County was represented by Elbert Esparza of the Department of Planning and Development Services.
3. No member of the general public participated in this matter.

The hearing concluded at 10:15 a.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 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 from R-8,400 to LDMR and official site plan for the future development of six single-family detached units on a .6 acre site. Four dwellings exist so the new weekday vehicle trips are those of only two dwellings: 19 trips. Frontage is largely within the City of Edmonds; thus, the applicant is coordinating frontage improvements with Edmonds. The applicant requested two deviations from the EDDS related to that coordination and both were approved by the County Engineer. A third deviation approved by the County Engineer allows a 10-foot reduction in driveway width. A fourth deviation (also approved) allows dedication of five feet instead of 10 feet of right-of-way, of which some will be dedicated to the City of Edmonds.
4. The applicant testifies that the proposed development is sensitively integrated into the existing community by (1) articulation of the homes to look more neighborhood-like, (2) by reducing the visual impact of vehicles by recessing the garages or tucking them out of public view, (3) by rear yards of up to 15 feet instead of the five-foot year allowed, (4) by use of landscaping although not required, (5) by burying detention out of public view and (6) by removing four run-down buildings.
5. The project would comply with park mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66A SCC by the payment of \$1,244.49 for each new single-family home.
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 this review, the DPW has determined that the development is concurrent and has no objection to the requests subject to various conditions.
7. School mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66C SCC have been reviewed and set forth in the conditions.
8. There are no critical areas on or within 100 feet of the project property.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. The property is designated Urban Medium Density Residential (UMDR 6-12 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 Urban Medium Density Residential designation allows high density residential land uses such as townhouses and apartments generally near other high intensity land uses. Land in this category may be developed up to a maximum density of 12 dwelling units per acre. Implementing zones include the LDMR zone.

12. 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, where policies 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 plan and the present zoning.
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 and should be approved.

14. 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.
15. 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. 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 of non-compliance with the requirements of Chapter 30.42A, the project is presumed to meet those requirements.

5. 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 subdivision 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.
6. The Snohomish County Council by its Motion 07-447 of August 8, 2007 ordered that there be consideration of whether a proposed rezone bears a substantial relationship to the public health, safety and welfare and that consideration go beyond consideration of only the Comprehensive Plan to include other issues relevant to that requisite substantial relationship. The Council required that if such factors other than the Comprehensive Plan are apparent from the record, those factors must be identified and discussed in staff report and in the Examiner's decision. No such factors are shown in this record.
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 rezone of a .6 acre from R-8,400 to LDMR and official site plan for the future development of six single-family detached units on a .6 acre site are hereby **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions:

### **CONDITIONS:**

- A. The revised preliminary site plan received by PDS on May 17, 2007 (Exhibit 9A) shall be the official site plan and approved configuration. SCC 30.42B.220 governs changes to the official site plan.
- 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 applicant shall pay an impact fee to Snohomish County for traffic impacts to Transportation Service Area F in the amount of \$733.70 per unit. This payment may be made proportionately with each building permit.
  - iii. The applicant shall make a payment to Snohomish County for Transportation Demand Management measures within Transportation Service Area F in the amount of \$25.25 per unit. This payment may be made proportionately with each building permit.
  - iv. 5 feet of right-of-way along the subject parcel's frontage on 228<sup>th</sup> St SW shall be deeded to Snohomish County.

- v. “The units within this development will be subject to school impact mitigation fees for the Edmonds School District 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 the 1 existing lot.”
- vi. 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.
- vii. NFPA 13-D fire suppression systems: All units shall be provided with NFPA 13-D systems due to an access road that exceeds 150 feet in length with a hammerhead turnaround in lieu of a cul-de-sac turnaround.
- viii. Emergency access: Fire apparatus access shall be maintained at all times during construction.
- ix. Prior to combustible construction: the developer shall provide a final certificate of water availability indicating that all hydrants are installed, charged, and they are operational. The hydrants shall provide a minimum 1,000 gpm for a two hour duration at 20 psi.

C. Prior to any Certificate of Occupancy or Final Inspection:

- i. Urban frontage improvements shall be constructed along the parcel’s frontage on 228<sup>th</sup> Street SW to the satisfaction of the County.
- ii. Prior to final inspection of the first unit, the following needs to be completed by the applicant and approved by Snohomish County:
  - Address numbers shall be on the building and street signage shall be in place.
  - Fire apparatus access shall not be obstructed in any manner including the parking of vehicles. Signage shall be installed stating “NO PARKING – FIRE LANE” to ensure access availability as indicated on the site plan.
  - The top of the new hydrant shall be colored green.
  - All new hydrants shall be provided with a 4” STORZ fitting.
- iii. After final asphalt lift: Install a blue street reflector on the hydrant side of centerline to indicate hydrant location.

D. In conformity with applicable standards and timing requirements:

- i. The preliminary landscape plan (Exhibit 9B) shall be implemented. All required street frontage landscaping shall be installed in accordance with the approved landscape plan.

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.

Decision issued this 10<sup>th</sup> day of October, 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 **OCTOBER 22, 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 **OCTOBER 24, 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: Elbert Esparza

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.
--