

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

In the Matter of the Application of )  
 ) **FILE NO. 07 106603 LU**  
**GARY and JAN CRAWFORD** )  
 )  
Rezoned from Residential-9,600 (R-9,600) to )  
Residential-7,200 (R-7,200) )

---

DATE OF DECISION: October 23, 2007

PLAT/PROJECT NAME: *Crawford Property*

DECISION (SUMMARY): Rezoned from R-9,600 to R-7,200 is **APPROVED**.

**BASIC INFORMATION**

GENERAL LOCATION: This project is located at 21006 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SE, Bothell, Washington.

ACREAGE: 1.5 acres

ZONING: CURRENT: R-9,600  
PROPOSED: R-7,200

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:

General Policy Plan Designation: Urban Low Density Residential

UTILITIES:

Water/Sewer: Alderwood Water and Wastewater District

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Northshore No. 417

FIRE DISTRICT: No. 7

## **INTRODUCTION**

The applicant filed the Master Application on June 4, 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 11, 12 and 13)

A SEPA determination was made on August 11, 2007. (Exhibit 10) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on October 3, 2007, the 36<sup>th</sup> day of the 120-day decision making period.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

The public hearing commenced on October 3, 2007 at 1:05 p.m.

1. The Examiner stated that he had read the PDS staff report, reviewed the file and viewed the area.
2. The applicants, Gary and Jan Crawford, were represented by Pete LaRock. Snohomish County was represented by Elbert Esparza of the Department of Planning and Development Services. No member of the general public participated in this matter.
3. The hearing concluded at 1:22 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, Gary and Jan Crawford, filed an application requesting approval of a rezone of a 1.5-acre parcel from R-9,600 to R-7,200. The subject site consists in three platted lots addressed 20924, 20932 and 21006 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SE, Bothell approximately midway between Highway 9 and Thrashers Corner. No critical area (steep slope, wetland, or stream) is on or near the site. The site is served by the Alderwood Water and Wastewater District.

3. The subject site contains one single-family dwelling, two accessory structures and a tennis court. The Crawfords reside in the home. In theory, the proposed rezone to R-7,200 could allow 11 to 12 lots through lot size averaging as a subdivision. Alternatively, nine lots could be created as an administrative short plat, unless dedication of a public road required a subdivision process. However, the applicants' representative, Pete LaRock, testifies that, in reality, roads would consume so much of the land that such density cannot be achieved. Therefore, the Crawfords' intent is to use the proposed rezone, coupled with a boundary line adjustment, in order to reduce the two 20,000 square foot lots to the smaller size allowed by the requested R-7,200 zoning by adding that square footage to the lot containing their existing home, then selling the two smaller lots. Their retained enlarged lot might then be large enough to allow a short plat to create one more smaller lot in the future for their own on which to build a smaller home for themselves, enabling them to give to their children the balance of the lot that now contains their existing home.
4. The anticipated (not promised) plan described above would implement the Comprehensive Plan's designation of Urban Low Density Residential in that the proposal increases residential density while preserving the single-family character of the neighborhood along 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SE in the vicinity, which is characterized by traditional single-family homes in mixed zoning. In the broader neighborhood nearby, zoning includes R-7,200, R-9,600, PRD-7,200 and R-5.
5. The staff report to the Hearing Examiner expressly addresses compliance of the proposed rezone with the rezone decision criteria set out at SCC 30.42A.100. Specifically, the staff report describes the proposal's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Goal LU1 and Objectives LU1.A, a.A.3 and Goal LU2 and Objectives LU2.A, 2.A.4 and 2.A.5. The staff report expresses the opinion that future development proposals pursuant to the requested rezone will have to meet county codes and will, thereby, bear a substantial relationship to the public health, safety and welfare. The Examiner would not accept that presumption if the record contained facts asserting the contrary but, in this instance, the Examiner finds no basis for insisting on further site-specific analysis to support compliance with SCC 30.42A.100.
6. No evidence in this record demonstrates any reason why the Hearing Examiner should condition or deny this application in the interest of the public health, safety or welfare.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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 Hearing Examiner's decision on a rezone application is a Type 2 decision based on (1) a report by the County staff and a file assembled by that staff and (2) evidence received through an open record public hearing. The burden of proof is on the applicant to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the proposed rezone meets the two applicable rezone decisional criteria set out at SCC 30.42A.100: (1) that the proposed rezone is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and (2) that the proposed rezone bears a substantial relationship to the public health, safety and welfare. The Hearing Examiner's decision on those criteria is the final County action unless appealed to the County Council. (SCC 30.72.020 -.025)
3. The request is for a site-specific rezone and, therefore, must be consistent with the GMA Comprehensive Plan and Snohomish County Code regulatory provisions which implement that plan. The request for R-7,200 zoning here is consistent with the type and character of land use permitted on the project site by the General Policy Plan (GPP) ULDR designation of the property. However, in addition to being consistent with the map designation, the proposal must also be consistent with relevant Plan policies such as (but not limited to) Land Use Policy 1.A.4 concerning infrastructure capacity, Land Use Policy 2.A.3 concerning critical areas, and Housing Policy 2.A.1 concerning preservation of the character of stable residential neighborhoods. (See County Council Motion No. 07-447.) In fact, the General Policy Plan provides at page LU-15 that the County will broaden the variety of housing types in traditional single-family and multi-family neighborhoods:

*“...while respecting the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods A mix of housing types with a range of densities will be encouraged throughout UGA's, as long as they are carefully sited, well designed, and sensitively integrated into existing communities.”* (Emphasis supplied.)
4. As noted above, the instant proposal's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan is only one of the two applicable criteria set out at SCC 30.42A.100 which must be met before a rezone can be approved. A rezone must also comply with the second criterion: i.e., the rezone must bear a substantial relationship to the public health, safety and welfare. The bold-quoted language above is an expression of the second of the two rezone criteria. Stated in the converse, the quoted language provides that until it is determined that a proposed rezone's housing types are carefully sited, well designed, and sensitively integrated into an existing community, the proposed rezone cannot be found to bear a substantial relationship to the public health, safety and welfare. That burden of proof which must support that determination cannot be met without actual consideration of site-specific facts. A conclusory statement that a proposed rezone meets the criteria is no more acceptable than would be a conclusory statement that the proposed rezone fails to meet the criteria. The departmental staff and, in turn, the Hearing Examiner, must “show your work” and rationale in concluding whether or not a proposed rezone meets or does not meet the applicable criteria.
5. The requirement to actually consider the applicable criteria, particularly when relevant citizen concerns are expressed, is mandated by the County Council's Amended Ordinance No. 07-022 effective June 4, 2007, which at page 2 repeats the above-quoted Comprehensive Plan provision encouraging a mix of housing types with a range of densities only if “*carefully sited, well designed, and sensitively integrated into existing communities...*” The County Council reinforced that requirement to “show your work” in its Motion No. 07-447 of August 8, 2007 remanding a rezone application on appeal (Brookstone

Investments, LLC, 06-135148) for failure to have adequately evaluated all project-level factors concerning the two criteria discussed above herein.

6. The applicants own three contiguous, platted tax lots. Their plan to rezone the lots so that two can be made smaller in order to sell those while enlarging the site of their pre-existing home results in density consistent with the Comprehensive Plan designation for the subject site. Further, there is no evidence that the proposed rezone would result in development posing any threat to the public health, safety and welfare. The request should be approved as submitted.
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 request for a rezone from Residential-9,600 to Residential-7,200 for this property is hereby **APPROVED**.

Decision issued this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of October, 2007.

---

Ed Good, Deputy Hearing Examiner

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

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 **NOVEMBER 2, 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 **NOVEMBER 6, 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.