

**DECISION of the SNOHOMISH
COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER**

DATE OF DECISION: June 11, 2009

PLAT/PROJECT NAME: ***Randy & Rick Wilson***

APPLICANT/
LANDOWNER: Randy & Rick Wilson

FILE NO.: 08 104455 LU

TYPE OF REQUEST: Rezone from Residential- 9600(R-9600) to Residential-7200 (R-7200)

DECISION (SUMMARY): **APPROVED**

BASIC INFORMATION

GENERAL LOCATION: The project site is located at 26 Meadow Place S.E., Everett, WA 98037

ACREAGE: .89 acres

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

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:

General Policy Plan Designation: Urban Low Density Residential (6-12 du/acre)

UTILITIES:

Water: Alderwood Sewer and Water District
Sewage: Alderwood Sewer and Water District

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Mukilteo School District #6

FIRE DISTRICT: Fire District No. 1

SELECTED AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Department of:
Planning and Development Services: Approve
Public Works: Approve

INTRODUCTION

The applicant filed the rezone application on April 28, 2008, and it was determined complete on that date. See Exhibit A1; H.

The Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) gave proper public notice of the open record hearing as required by SCC 30.72.030(4). See Exhibits F1 (mailing), F2 (publication) and F3 (posting).

A SEPA threshold determination of nonsignificance was made on March 20, 2009. See Exhibit E2. No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on June 2, 2009.

NOTE: To obtain a complete record of the proceedings, an electronic recording of this hearing is available through the Office of the Hearing Examiner.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. All exhibits and witnesses included on the Master Exhibit and Witness List were considered by the Examiner and are hereby incorporated by reference, as if set forth in full herein.
2. State Environmental Policy Act Compliance. A Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) was issued March 20, 2009. (Exhibit E2) The DNS was not appealed.
3. Rezone Request: The applicant is requesting a rezone from R-9600 to R-7200 with a concurrent 4-lot short plat of approximately .89 acres. The rezone is processed as a Type 2 application requiring a hearing examiner's decision. The short plat will be processed under Project File No. 08-104455SP as a Type 1 administrative decision and is dependent upon approval of the rezone. Water and sewer will be provided by Alderwood Water and Wastewater District.

PDS staff has included information pertaining to the short plat in the file for the Examiner's reference. The Examiner has no jurisdiction over approval of the site plan. The Examiner does appreciate the information and the visual reference as it is crucial in deciding the issues in the rezone.

4. Site description: The site is developed with a single-family residence and a landscaped lawn. The rear portion of the site is treed.
5. Adjacent uses: Adjacent zoning to the east, south, and west is R-9600. Adjacent zoning to the north is R-7200. An area of PCB zone is located to the immediate northwest. The adjacent uses are residential. This area could be characterized as a "pocket" neighborhood, a rather quiet area behind 128th SW and the old outdoor theater. It is a little deceiving however, since the outdoor theater property is zoned PCB and could be redeveloped into a commercial center. Many of the properties around the subject property are already at R-7200.
6. Transportation: The development is situated near the corner of Meridian Avenue South and Meadow Place SE. The staff report (Exhibit H) contains the following information on the development's compliance with county transportation requirements, which the Examiner incorporates herein for a better understanding of the transportation impacts of the higher density development at this site:

PDS Traffic has reviewed the proposal for compliance with Title 13 and Chapter 30.66B of Snohomish County Code, Snohomish County Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS), and the appropriate policies and procedures.

1. Road System Capacity

A development must mitigate its impact upon the future capacity of the road system by paying a road system impact fee reasonably related to the impacts of the development on arterial roads located in the same transportation service area as the development, at the rate identified in SCC 30.66B.330 for the type and location of the proposed development.

The development will generate 28.71 new average daily trips (ADT) and has a road system impact fee of \$7,665.57(\$1,916.39/SFR) based on \$267/ADT, the current fee rate for residential developments inside the urban growth area, for TSA D. These figures do not include credit for on-site TDM measures. Consistent with SCC 30.66B.340, payment of this road system impact is required prior to building permit issuance.

The estimates of trip generation for the development are based on the 7th Edition of the Institute of ITE Trip Generation Report:

ITE Land Use Category: Single Family Detached Housing

ITE Land Use Code: 210

Applicable Measurement Unit (ITE Independent Variable): Single Family Residence: 3 new SFR

Trip Generation Calculations Based on Average Rates

New average daily trips = 3 SFR X 9.57 ADT/SFR = 28.71 ADT

New PM peak-hour trips = 3 SFR X 1.01 PM PHT/SFR = 3.03 PM PHT

New AM peak-hour trips = 3 SFR X 0.75 AM PHT/SFR = 2.25 AM PHT

2. Concurrency [SCC 30.66B.120]

The County makes a concurrency determination for each development application to ensure that the development will not impact a county arterial unit in arrears.

The subject development has been evaluated for concurrency under the provisions of SCC 30.66B.120 and is concurrent as of June 16, 2008. The expiration date of the concurrency determination is six years from this date. Consistent with DPW rule 4225.070 the point in time for which the concurrency analysis is based (the concurrency vesting date) is April 28, 2008.

Development generating 50 or fewer peak-hour trips in TSA D with one or more arterial unit in arrears, SCC 30.66B.160 (2) (a). The subject development is located in TSA D which, as of the date of submittal, had the following two arterial units in arrears: Unit 202 – Seattle Hill Road from 35th Ave SE to SR96; and Unit 204 – 35th Ave SE from 168th St SE to Seattle Hill Road. Based on peak-hour trip distributions, the subject development will NOT add three (3) or more peak-hour trips to any of the arterial units in arrears. Pursuant to SCC 30.66B.160 (2) (a) the development is determined concurrent. The development generates 2.25 a.m. peak-hour trips and 3.03 p.m. peak-hour trips which is not more than the threshold of 50 peak-hour trips in which case the development would also have to be evaluated under SCC 30.66B.035.

3. *Inadequate Road Condition (IRC) [SCC 30.66B.210]*

Regardless of the existing level of service, any development which adds three or more p.m. peak-hour trips to a location in the road system determined to have an existing inadequate road condition (IRC) at the time of imposition of mitigation requirements, or development whose traffic will cause an IRC at the time of full occupancy of the development, must eliminate the IRC.

The subject proposal will not impact any IRC locations identified at this time within TSA D with three or more of its p.m. peak hour trips, nor will it create any. Therefore, it is anticipated that mitigation will not be required with respect to inadequate road conditions and no restrictions to building permit issuance or certificate of occupancy/final inspection will be imposed under this section of Chapter 30.66B SCC.

4. *Frontage Improvements [SCC 30.66B.410]*

All developments will be required to make frontage improvements along the parcel's frontage on any opened, constructed, and maintained public road. The required improvement shall be constructed in accordance with the EDDS, including correction of horizontal and vertical alignments, if applicable.

As per DPW Rule 4222.020(1) full urban frontage improvements are required along the subject parcel's frontage on Meadow Place SE and consist of:

Asphalt concrete pavement with 18-foot width from right-of-way centerline to the face of curb

Cement concrete curb and gutter

Planter strip with a width of 5-feet

Cement concrete sidewalk with a width of 5-feet

The road, Meadow Place SE, on which the development's frontage improvements are required, is not in the impact fee cost basis (Appendix D of the Transportation Needs Report), therefore credits towards the applicant's impact fee for any frontage improvements that can be used in the ultimate build-out of the road are not applicable.

A condition will be included in the administrative preliminary approval document to require the frontage improvements.

5. *Access and Circulation [SCC 30.66B.420]*

All developments are required to provide for access and transportation circulation in accordance with the comprehensive plan and SCC 30.66B.420, design and construct such access in accordance with the EDDS, and improve existing roads that provide access to the development in order to comply with adopted design standards, in accordance with SCC 30.66B.430.

Access to the four lots is proposed through a new private road at the west boundary of the development. Road classification is Private Urban Residential. Proposed design speed is 25 mph which is acceptable. Access to Meadow Place SE shall be a residential drop curb driveway approach per EDDS 2-020. Access point spacing is acceptable. Intersection Sight Distance (ISD) to the west is inadequate: 335-feet is required and approximately 10-feet is existing due to large tree growth in the right-of way in front of the parcel adjacent to the subject development. Vegetation needs to be trimmed or cleared so that a minimum clear sight distance of 335-feet is unobstructed. A Sight Distance Plan and Profile has been submitted

which shows the sight distance triangles and areas of clearing/trimming, which are within the right-of-way. A condition will be included in the administrative preliminary approval document to require the Sight Distance Plan and clearing/trimming areas be part of the Construction Drawings.

Required Stopping Sight Distance is 200-feet and the Actual Stopping Sight Distance is greater than 500-feet. The private road is 137-feet long, which per EDDS 3-150 may end in a road stub if less than four access points are within 50-feet of the road end. This development has less than four access points within 50-feet of the road end so a stub road end is acceptable. Pedestrian facilities and planter strips are not required for a road stub less than 150-feet with no cul-de-sac turnaround. Road alignment is straight and vertical slope is steady at approximately 2%. Connectivity potential to the south is not feasible because of existing SFRs in a previously subdivided plat. The road layout as shown on the submitted drawings is acceptable.

The private road shown on the preliminary plat for the subject development with the ISD clearing/trimming areas proposed to be cleared/trimmed.

6. Dedication of Right-of-Way [SCC 30.66B.510 and 30.66B.520]

A development shall be required to dedicate, establish, or deed right-of-way to the county for road purposes as a condition of approval of the development, when to do so is reasonably necessary as a direct result of a proposed development, for improvement, use or maintenance of the road system serving the development.

The road serving this development, Meadow Place SE, is designated as a collector arterial on the County's Arterial Circulation Map. This requires a right-of-way width of 35-feet on each side of the right-of-way centerline. Currently, 30-feet of right-of-way exists on the development's side of the right-of-way. Therefore, the development is required to dedicate 5-feet of additional right-of-way. This is adequately shown on the preliminary short plat. A condition will be included in the administrative preliminary approval document to require the dedication of right-of-way.

This road, Meadow Place SE is not in the impact fee cost basis (Appendix D of the Transportation Needs Report), therefore credit towards the applicant's impact fee for the right-of-way dedicated that is more than 30 feet from centerline is not applicable.

7. State Highway Impacts [SCC 30.66B.710]

This development is subject to SEPA and thus is subject to Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)/County effective December 21, 1997, and as amended.

The proposed development generates less than 3 directional PM Peak Hour Trips (3 SFR X 1.01 PM PHT/SFR X 0.63 = 1.91). Since the impacts to the County road system and WSDOT road system are under the threshold requiring mitigation for the state, none will be required from the Applicant. WSDOT provided comments and agreed that no mitigation payments were required (Exhibit G.2).

8. *Other Streets and Roads [SCC 30.66B.720]*

Mitigation requirements for impacts on streets inside cities and roads in other counties will be established consistent with the terms of interlocal agreements between the County and the other jurisdictions.

There are city jurisdictions that have an ILA with the County that will be impacted by new trips from the subject development. The proposed development is subject to SEPA and thus is subject to interlocal agreements for impacts on city streets and is effected by the interlocal agreement (ILA) with Mill Creek.

The City was provided notice of application for this project and provided comments comment. The City of Mill Creek has indicated by form letter dated May 27, 2008, that no mitigation is required as the project is under the threshold of 3 PM PHT (Exhibit G.1).

9. *Transportation Demand Management (TDM) [SCC 30.66B.630]*

Transportation demand management (TDM) is a strategy for reducing vehicular travel demand, especially by single occupant vehicles during commuter peak hours. TDM offers a means of increasing the ability of transportation facilities and services to accommodate greater travel demand without making expensive capital improvements. The County requires TDM of developments inside the UGA and developments that impact arterial units designated as ultimate capacity.

All new developments in the urban area shall provide TDM measures. Sufficient TDM measures shall be provided to indicate the potential for removing a minimum of five percent (5%) of the development's PM peak hour trips from the road system. This requirement shall be met by the provisions of site design requirements under SCC 30.66B.640, as applicable, except where the development proposes construction or purchase of specific offsite TDM measures or voluntary payment in lieu of site design, in accordance with SCC 30.66B.620 and SCC 30.66B.625.

The trip reduction percentage for this development is 5%. The TDM obligation for this development is therefore equivalent to $5\% \times 3.03 \text{ new PM PHT} \times \$6,500/\text{PHT} = \$984.75$ (246.19/lot).

On April 28, 2008, the applicant submitted a TDM offer of \$984.75 to fulfill the TDM obligation. This offer is acceptable. A condition will be included in the administrative preliminary approval document to require the TDM mitigation payment.

7. Environmental Impacts of Higher Density.

A. Grading, drainage, and critical areas.

There are no critical areas on site and no critical areas within 100 feet of the site.

The project proposes to develop four lots with three new SFRs and driveways served by a private road. All existing structures and pavements will be removed. The new construction will create over 5,000 square feet of new impervious surface and generates more than 0.1 cubic feet per second (cfs) of net, new 100-year, 24-hour stormwater runoff. Hence, water quality treatment and runoff control are required. Water quality treatment is proposed to be accomplished with a storm filter. Runoff control is proposed to be accomplished by an underground detention pipe under the private road and a control structure which will release

runoff at 50% of the 2-year, and 100% of the 10- and 100-year predeveloped runoff rates. Frontage improvements on Meadow Place SE create less than 5,000 square feet of new impervious surface and less than 0.1 cfs of net, new 100-year, 24-hour stormwater runoff, therefore water quality and runoff control for the frontage improvements are not required.

The downstream conveyance system consists of a system of closed conveyance and ditches which generally trends to the southeast to Cascadian Way. The drainage engineer reports that no visible drainage problems were observed at the time of field inspection (Exhibit C.1). There are three recorded drainage complaints within the vicinity of the project. Snohomish County SWM has responded to this application with a forward of three specific drainage complaints (File numbers 20060035, 20020039, and 20030079). SWM has expressed no concerns with the development (Exhibit G.12). The applicant's engineer has responded to complaints and reported that the issues have been resolved as a result of maintenance of private drainage systems by the affected landowners. He has also put together a comprehensive report detailing the complaints and the responses. Exhibit A4.

The development proposes greater than 5,000 sf of new impervious surface which per SCC 30.63A causes it to be required to provide water quality and quantity controls. Therefore, a final Drainage Report and Plan are required. Over 100 cubic yards of grading are estimated, therefore, pursuant to SCC 30.63B and Rule 3044, the project will require full construction plans with Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control (TESC) plans and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Analysis (SWPPP) and Grading Permit.

Based on the preliminary findings made by the staff of PDS's Engineering Section relating to drainage and grading, this project will meet the requirements of UDC Chapter 30.63A and 30.63B SCC, EDDS 2004 Edition, Rule 3044, and the 1992 DOE Stormwater Management Manual.

One citizen appeared at the hearing and expressed concern regarding drainage from the development onto adjoining lots to the east. Given the documentation and the testimony of Mr. Constant, the project engineer, the Examiner is convinced that there is not an issue with drainage.

Planning and Development Services (Engineering) has reviewed the concept offered and is recommending approval of the project, subject to conditions which would be imposed during full drainage plan review pursuant to Chapter 30.63A SCC. Grading quantities are anticipated to be approximately 350 cubic yards of cut and 750 cubic yards of fill, primarily for road, drainage facility, and home site construction. Water quality would be controlled during construction by use of silt fences and straw bales in accordance with a Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (TESCP) required by Chapter 30.63A SCC.

B. Parks and schools impacts.

1. Parks. The staff report (Exhibit H) contains the following information on the development's compliance with county parks mitigation requirements which the Examiner incorporates herein for a better understanding of the parks impacts of the higher density development at this site:

The proposal is within Park District No. 307 (Nakeeta Beach) and is subject to Chapter 30.66A SCC, which requires payment of \$1,244.49 per each new single-family residential unit, to be paid prior to building permit issuance for each unit. Such payment is acceptable mitigation for parks and recreation impacts in accordance with county

policies. A condition will be included in the administrative preliminary approval document to require the mitigation fees.

Exhibit H at 3.

2. Schools. The staff report states the following regarding mitigation of impacts to schools that are a result of the development.

The Snohomish County Council amended Chapter 30.66C SCC by Amended Ordinance 97-095, adopted November 17, 1997, which became effective January 1, 1999, in accordance with Amended Ordinance 98-126, to provide for collection of school impact mitigation fees at the time of building permit issuance based upon certified amounts in effect at that time. The subject application was determined to be complete after the effective date of amended Chapter 30.66C SCC. Pursuant to Chapter 30.66C SCC, school impact mitigation fees will be determined according to the Base Fee Schedule in effect for the Mukilteo School District No. 6, at the time of building permit submittal and collected at the time of building permit issuance for the proposed units. Credit is to be given for the 1 existing lot. PDS has will include a condition in the preliminary plat approval document the school mitigation payments.

Exhibit H at 7.

8. General Policy Plan Designation. In the General Policy Plan (GPP), the subject property is designated Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR: 4-6 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 Low Density Residential designation "allows mostly detached housing developments on larger lot sizes. Implementing zones: R-7,200, PRD-7,200, R-8,400, PRD-8,400, R-9,600, PRD-9,600 and WFB." GPP at LU-89.

9. Health and Safety Issues.

A. Compliance with Fire Code and Safety Issues. PDS received comments from Fire District # 1 on May 19, 2008. (Exhibit G9) Fire District # 1 requested fire hydrants and construction of the access road prior to construction of buildings. These features are required prior to final plat approval, and final plat approval is required prior to construction of any dwellings within the short plat. It should be noted that short subdivisions are not allowed to construct model homes, which may be built as a part of a subdivision (SCC 30.41A.500 through 30.41A.550).

The County Fire Marshall of Snohomish County conducted an internal review of the proposed plat and recommended approval of the Rezone and the Preliminary Plat on June 20, 2008. The conclusions of the review were that fire apparatus access as depicted meets the minimum requirements of Snohomish County Code 30.53A.150.

Condition will be included in the administrative preliminary short subdivision approval to require the fire hydrant locations, fire flow, and emergency vehicle access.

B. Pedestrian Facilities [RCW 58.17.110]. The staff report contains the following information regarding pedestrian facilities to be provided to allow for safe walking conditions for school children:

The County is required to make findings regarding safe walking conditions for school children who may reside in the subject short subdivision. Comments from the applicable school district dated May 20, 2008 have been received from the School District stating that students from this development will be picked up by bus (Exhibits H.7 and H.8). The elementary and middle school bus stop is located at Meadow Place SE & 1st Ave SE. The high school bus stop is located at Cascadian Way and 2nd Avenue SE with a bus pull off.

Pedestrian facilities consisting of seven-foot wide paved shoulder or 5-foot wide separated walkway to the school bus stop locations shall be required to be constructed to the satisfaction of DPW. The Applicant's engineer has indicated that other nearby northern developments will be constructing walkways to the school bus stops which will meet the walkway requirements for this development. These walkways, when constructed, will be on the north side of Meadow Place SE. This development is on the south side of Meadow Place SE. The County Traffic Engineer does not recognize a private road as an adequate intersection for a crosswalk (RCW 46.04.160). A condition will be included in the administrative preliminary approval document to require walkways to be constructed to the satisfaction of DPW on the south side of Meadow Place SE to the intersection of Cascadian Way.

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

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Examiner has original jurisdiction over the rezone application pursuant to SCC 30.42A.020 and 30.72.020(2).
2. Rezones are not presumed valid. The proponent of a rezone has the burden of proof of showing (1) that conditions have changed since the original zoning, or that the proposed rezone implements policies of the comprehensive plan; and (2) that the rezone bears a substantial relationship to the health, safety, morals or welfare. *Woods v. Kittitas County*, 130 Wn. App. 573, 584, 123 P.3d 883 (2005); see *Citizens of Mount Vernon v. Mount Vernon*, 133 Wn.2d 861, 875, 947 P.2d 1208 (1997). The county's regulations are a direct expression of the criteria expressed by case law.
3. Chapter 30.42A SCC 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.¹

¹ This criterion is not applicable in this case as it only applies to performance standard zones, resource land zones, and overlays.

4. In the context of the Growth Management Act, development regulations and therefore rezones must be consistent with and implement the comprehensive plan. RCW 36.70.040. But in the context of site-specific rezones, the inquiry goes beyond mere consistency with the map designation of the comprehensive plan—as the Snohomish County Council explained in Motion 07-447 *A Motion Vacating and Remanding the Hearing Examiner's Decision of the Brookstone Investments, LLC (Hearing Examiner File No. 06-135148 LU) Back to the Examiner to Supplement the Record at 3* (August 8, 2007), “The Comprehensive Plan is the most direct expression of public policy in the area of land use. In determining that a proposed rezone is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the proposal must be consistent with the policies as well as the map designation.” The Examiner interprets this language, as well as the law applicable to rezones, to mean that the burden is upon the applicant to demonstrate to the Examiner that the proposed rezone meets the applicable comprehensive plan policies.
5. This rezone is a request to up-zone these properties in the Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR) Designation from R-9600 to R-7200 to allow a total of 4 units on .89 acre site. Although it is clear that this request fits within the ULDR designation (which allows up to 6 units per acre), as stated above, the analysis of consistency must go beyond the designation and identify how the project is consistent with the policies in the plan.
6. The Land Use Element of the General Policy Plan (GPP) introduces the way in which Urban Growth Areas are planned for and how densities are to be determined:

The GMA requires that urban growth areas (UGAs) be designated through the county's plan. UGAs are to include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county over the next twenty years. Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas.

Planning for growth in this way accomplishes two GMA goals: 1) the efficient provision and utilization of public facilities and services, including public transportation; and 2) reduced conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.

General Policy Plan at LU-1.

This rezone application invokes consideration most directly of Goal LU 2 and its policies. The introduction to that Goal states:

To promote efficient utilization of land within unincorporated UGAs, the county will encourage well-designed, more pedestrian-friendly urban development patterns with a greater mix of uses and a more efficient, creative use of land. By improving land use efficiency in UGAs, several GMA objectives can be accomplished:

- reduced dependence on the automobile;
- increased support for public transportation;
- improved air quality;
- increased choice of housing types;
- improved efficiency of infrastructure provision and usage; and
- reduced consumption of rural lands.

To improve the efficiency of urban residential land utilization, planning within UGAs and development regulations will ensure that future residential subdivisions will achieve a minimum net density of 4 to 6 dwelling units per acre except in areas within or near critical areas that are large in scope, with a high rank order value, and are complex in structure and function. In addition, the county will provide for higher density and mixed use housing types around and within centers and along major transportation corridors; encourage infill and intensification of areas at existing residential densities; and also broaden the variety of housing types within both 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 UGAs, as long as they are carefully sited, well designed, and sensitively integrated into existing communities.

General Policy Plan at LU-15.

Goal LU 2 of the GPP requires that the County “[e]stablish development patterns that use urban land more efficiently”, although Objective LU 2.A qualifies that statement by requiring the County to “[i]ncrease residential densities within UGAs by concentrating and intensifying development in appropriate locations.” GPP at LU-16 (emphasis added). The urban low density residential designation allows mostly detached housing developments on larger lot sizes. GPP at LU-89.

Specific policies under Goal LU 2 that are relevant to this development are:

2.A.3 Any UGA shall provide for a variety of residential densities identifying minimum and maximum allowable. Density ranges shall consider the presence of critical areas.

7. The Examiner will provide applicants and planning staff with a number of questions to analyze in a typical urban rezone. These questions simply provide factors to consider and discussion points derived from the language of the GPP; no one factor is exclusive and not all questions have to be answered in a particular way. An analysis of each of these points taken from the policy language of the GPP will provide a thorough discussion of the issues intended by the Council in the adoption of the proposed plan and provide the Examiner a reasonable basis on which to analyze urban rezone proposals.

A. Is this area already characterized by urban growth that has adequate existing facility and service capacities to serve such development for the following types of public facilities and services? Please demonstrate. (See LU-1)

- i. Streets, roads and highways (including but not limited local access and circulation, arterial systems and road systems capacity, concurrency, state highway impacts);
- ii. Sidewalks;
- iii. Street and road lighting systems;
- iv. Traffic signals;
- v. Domestic water systems;
- vi. Sanitary sewer systems;
- vii. Public parks and recreational facilities, or useable open space, common areas, or other recreational facilities within the development ;
- viii. Storm and sanitary sewer disposal system;
- ix. Fire and police protection suppression;
- x. Law enforcement;
- xi. Public health;

- xii. Education; and
- xiii. Other services.²

B. Will the rezone help to establish development patterns that use urban land more efficiently? How? (See Goal LU-2)

Does the development concentrate and intensify development at an appropriate location? Why? (Objective LU-2.A)

i. Is the development carefully sited?

- (a) Critical areas/shorelines.
 - (i) Please describe the type and location of any critical areas on or in close proximity to the site (if any). **(Policy LU 2.A.3)**
 - (ii) Describe how impacts to critical areas will be avoided. **(Policy LU 2.A.3)**
 - (iii) Please describe any shoreline environment that the proposed rezone/development is located within and how the rezone complies with goals and policies of the Snohomish County Shoreline Master Program.³
- (b) Is the rezone or development proposed in an area within walking distance of transit access or designated transit corridor, medical facility urban centers, parks, and recreational amenities? **(Policy LU 2.A.5)**
- (c). How will the development made possible by the requested rezone tend to lessen dependence on private automobiles and promote the use of alternative forms of transportation? **(Page LU-15)**

ii. Is the rezone proposal/development sensitively integrated into the existing community? (See LU-15)

- (a) What is the character of the existing neighborhood? How would the requested rezone or development proposal be appropriate in the context of the existing neighborhood, keeping in mind that the GPP calls for a mix of housing types in medium density areas? **(LU-15, Policy 2.A.4)**
- (b) Does the rezone/development proposal help to provide a mix or variety of affordable housing types, if the area is a medium density area? **(Policy LU 2.A.4)**
- (c) Is the requested rezone/development close to a city that is likely to annex it in the future? If so, what comments, if any are in the record regarding the proposed rezone/development? **(See Policy I.C.2)**

iii. If known at the time of submittal of the rezone, is the development well designed? (See LU-15)

- (a) Even if density is at a higher level are efforts made to have the character fit into the existing community? If so, what is the character of the existing community and how will the development maintain it? **(See LU-15)**

² Taken from the GMA definitions of public facilities and services. RCW 36.70A.030(12) &(13).

³ Since the goals and policies of the Snohomish County Shoreline Master Program (SCSMP) are considered an element of the county's GMA Comprehensive Plan, the rezone must be consistent with the SCSMP. See RCW 36.70A.480.

- (b) How specifically will the building design integrate into the existing neighborhood? Are structures of a size, height, mass, and separation to be consistent with vicinity homes and the surrounding neighborhood? Describe in detail. Will the development be at the same elevation as the rest of the existing neighborhood? How will the elevation affect the perception of the development? **(LU-15)**
- (c) If applicable, what selective and innovative land use measures will be used to preserve the character of the stable residential neighborhood? **(See Policy HO 2.A.4)**
- (d) If the proposed rezone/development will have negative impacts on the character of the surrounding neighborhood, describe whether the developer plans on using features such as landscaping, fencing, setbacks, or other design features to soften or eliminate those impacts. **(LU-15)**
- (e) Will the development be designed to provide for adequate fire and medical emergency access through the provision of adequate resident and guest parking, cul-de-sac radii, and building separation? Has the opinion of both the County Fire Marshall and any local Fire District been placed in the record? **(LU-15)**
- (f) Is the public health, safety and welfare adequately provided for (examples are safe pedestrian access, safe place for children to wait for school bus, adequate off street parking so that a fire truck can access development)? **(See LU-15)** (See also discussion of public health, safety and welfare criteria, below).

8. Applying this test to the Randy & Rick Wilson rezone, the Examiner makes the following conclusions regarding consistency with the comprehensive plan:

- A. The area is already characterized by urban growth such that it has adequate existing public facilities and services to serve the development for the following types of facilities and services, as demonstrated below and in applicant's Exhibit A4, which the Examiner herein incorporates by reference:
 - i. Streets, roads and highways. The Examiner relies on Finding of Fact 6 in part to conclude that the development is adequately served by existing streets, roads and highways.
 - ii. Sidewalks. The applicant will be providing adequate pedestrian facilities as a part of the development proposal. Finding 9B.
 - iii. Street and road lighting system. Streetlights do not exist along Meadow Place SE; they are not currently required by the county code or administrative rules as a requirement for approval of this project.
 - iv. Traffic signals. There are no traffic signals in the vicinity. The County's analysis of the proposal does not indicate that any new signals are warranted for this proposal, according to SCC 30.66B.165 and EDDS Section 7-03.
 - v. Water systems. Water will be provided by Alderwood Sewer and Water District and the file contains a preliminary certificate of water availability. Exhibit G6.
 - vi. Sanitary Sewer Systems. Sewer will be provided by Alderwood Sewer and Water District and the file contains a preliminary certificate of sewer availability. Exhibit G6.
 - vii. Park and recreational facilities. As stated in Finding of Fact 7.B.1, the developer will pay park mitigation fees as a part of the development proposal. Those fees currently are identified to support community parks and special use facilities such as golf courses that are necessary to serve new development. See Snohomish

County Parks Plan at page 41. These criteria, however, addresses existing park and recreational facilities the inhabitants of the development may use and whether they are sufficient at this location in the county. The Examiner can determine, based on a map located on the County Parks and Recreation Department website, that there are a number of county parks in the vicinity of the development, including McCollum Park, which is within one mile of the site. Regional parks in the area are Willis Tucker Park, Martha Lake Park, Meadowdale Park, Lord Hill Park, Silver Creek Park, Rhody Ridge Arboretum, Picnic Point Park, and Forsgren Park. In the future, the Examiner would like to hear from parks planners whether the parks level of service is met for citizens in each particular proposed development and how that may be determined at the planning level. The Parks Plan was not altogether clear that levels of service had been adopted for every type of park, although Objective CF 7.C of the GPP states, related to parks, “[m]onitor and maintain minimum LOS standards, as defined in the Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan and the CIP, through adequate CIP funding.”

- viii. Storm and sanitary sewer disposal system: A stormwater disposal system is provided as indicated in Finding of Fact 7A.
- ix. Fire and police suppression system: Fire protection is provided by Snohomish County Fire District No. 1. Fire District 1 has made comments as outlined in Finding 9A. The Fire Marshall’s Office in PDS approved the proposal. Police protection is provided by the Snohomish County Sheriff’s Department.
- x. Public health: Public health issues are addressed by the Snohomish Health District. See Exhibit G3.
- xi. Education: The site is served by the Mukilteo School District. Exhibit G8.
- xii. Other services: There is sufficient electrical system capacity for the proposal, according to a letter from the Snohomish County PUD No. 1, dated May 9, 2008. Exhibit G4.

B. The Examiner concludes that the rezone will accomplish GPP Goal LU-2 of helping to establish development patterns by using urban land more efficiently by intensifying and concentrating development at an appropriate location, in furtherance of Objective LU2-A.

- i. The development is carefully sited.
 - (a) There are no critical areas or shorelines on the site or within close proximity to the site. (Policy LU 2.A.3)⁴
 - (b) The rezone or development is ½ mile from a transit stop, which may be walking distance for some. The subject property is near a major transit corridor, I-5, and 128th Street SW, which has major park and ride facilities at McCollum Park and on the west side of the highway. There are numerous shopping opportunities nearby on 128th SW. The nearest medical facilities are in Everett. As stated above in conclusion 8, there are multiple parks in the vicinity. **(Policy LU 2.A.5)**
 - (c) The development made possible by the requested rezone may tend to lessen dependence on private automobiles and promote the use of alternative forms of transportation because it is within walking or biking distance of urban services and facilities that will serve the proposal, which

⁴ Since the goals and policies of the Snohomish County Shoreline Master Program (SCSMP) are considered an element of the county’s GMA Comprehensive Plan, the rezone must be consistent with the SCSMP. See RCW 36.70A.480.

will promote those forms of transportation in place of automobiles. The proximity of the property to park and ride lots will encourage commuting by buses or carpools instead of using single occupancy vehicles. **(Page LU-15)**

- ii. The rezone proposal is adequately integrated into the neighborhood.(See LU-15)
 - (a) The Examiner characterizes the neighborhood as actively changing. It appears that many of the lower density uses have been or will be bought out and infill is occurring. This zoning designation will help fulfill the GPP goal of providing efficient use of the county's infill area. **(LU-15, Policy 2.A.4)**
 - (b) The proposal will help provide a mix of affordable housing types, such as smaller lot detached units. This type of housing helps provide a desirable type of housing to the public, but on a smaller lot than the traditional R-9600 lot. The cost of the development per unit is reduced, resulting in a more cost effective and affordable type of housing. Exhibit A2. **(Policy LU 2.A.4)**
 - (c) There are no city comments in the record. **(See Policy I.C.2)**
 - iii. If known at the time of submittal of the rezone, is the development well designed? (See LU-15)
 - (a) The proposed density of this development is 5.13 units per acre (net). This density is one that is not inconsistent with other densities in this changing area. Since this development is on a private road and the new houses will not be visible from the street, there is no issue regarding visual impact from the street. See Exhibit B4. **(See LU-15)**
 - (b) The applicant indicates the building design will be consistent with old and new development in the neighborhood. Exhibit A2. **(LU-15)**
 - (c) The Examiner is not aware of any "selective and innovative land use measures" that will be used to preserve the character of the stable residential neighborhood. **(See Policy HO 2.A.4)** In this case, this policy is not applicable because the Examiner would not characterize this neighborhood as a "stable residential neighborhood".
 - (d) There do not appear to be any significant negative visual impacts from the addition of these homes in this area that been brought to the attention of the Examiner. **(LU-15)**
 - (e) The development appears to be designed to provide for adequate fire and medical emergency access through the provision of driveways and fire hydrants as approved by the Department of Public Works, the Fire Marshall, and Fire District #1. Exhibit H; Finding 7A. **(LU-15)**
 - (f) The Examiner concludes that the public health, safety and welfare are adequately provided for by this development. There appears to be adequate pedestrian facilities. Finding of Fact 9B.
9. The other criteria in SCC 30. 42A.100 is whether the proposal bears a substantial relationship the public health, safety, and welfare. See SCC 30.42A.100(2). Returning to Council Motion 07-447 the Council clarified the proper role of the Examiner in reviewing this criteria:

Although consistency with the Comprehensive Plan is a significant factor in determining whether a proposed rezone bears a substantial relationship to the public health, safety and welfare, in some cases, there may be other factors outside the Comprehensive Plan policies that may be relevant to that issue and which may be considered. If there are such factors apparent from the application documents or otherwise known to PDS, they must be identified and discussed both in the written PDS staff report and by the Examiner in his decision. The written PDS staff report and the Examiner's decision should specify if any of these other factors are related to the rezone or should be considered at the project level with the specific development proposal being made. PDS staff is not required to anticipate opposition or to consider factors or issues outside of the Comprehensive Plan or not required by the Snohomish County Code. However, this does not limit the Hearing Examiner's ability to consider testimony at the public hearing concerning whether the proposed rezone bears a substantial relationship to the public health, safety and welfare.

Motion 07-447 at 3.

The Examiner interprets this language to mean that most of the time, analysis of whether the rezone is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan should suffice for review of a rezone proposal because in most cases, analysis of the comprehensive plan policies is analysis of whether the proposal bears a substantial relationship to the public health, safety and welfare. However, the Examiner and PDS may use this second criteria to analyze other issues of concern that may be raised outside of the scope of the Comprehensive Plan.

10. In this case, the Examiner concludes there are no issues of concern that warrant analysis under SCC 30.42B.100(2). No issues of concern were identified in the PDS staff report (See Exhibit 30) and no one except the applicant and PDS staff testified at the hearing. The Examiner identified no issues of concern in reviewing the file.
11. Since this request involves rezoning only, any details or conditions which would normally appear as conditions of the development in the Examiner's decision will be issued as a part of the administrative plan approval by PDS.
12. The request for a rezone was based upon the information and impacts submitted in the Determination of Nonsignificance.
13. 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 for this property is granted.

Decision issued this 11th day of June 2009.



Barbara. Dykes, 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, 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 **JUNE 22, 2008**. 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, Robert J. Drewel Building (Admin-East), 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, Washington (Mailing address: M/S #604, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, WA 98201) on or before **JUNE 25, 2009** and shall be accompanied by a filing fee in the amount of five hundred dollars (\$500.00); for each appeal filed; provided that the fee shall not be charged to a department of the County. The filing fee shall be refunded in any case where an appeal is summarily dismissed in whole without hearing under SCC 30.72.075.

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: Ed Caine

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.