

1 BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON BOUNDARY REVIEW
2 BOARD FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY

3 In re:

4 CITY OF ARLINGTON
5 HILLTOP SPORTS ANNEXATION

BRB NO. 06-2010

DECISION

7
8 **DECISION SUMMARY**

9 City of Arlington Hilltop Sports Annexation (BRB No. 06-2010) is hereby

10 **APPROVED.**

11
12 **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

13 On December 15, 2010, the City of Arlington (the "City") filed a notice
14 of intention with the Washington State Boundary Review Board for Snohomish
15 County (the "Board") proposing a petition method annexation of approximately
16 29.07 acres located south of SR 531 (172nd ST NE) and west of SR9. The notice of
17 intention states that the annexation area currently has one single family residence,
18 one commercial gun range, and miscellaneous outbuildings located on the
19 property.
20

21 The Board's jurisdiction was invoked by Snohomish County (the "County").
22

23 **PUBLIC HEARING**

24 On May 17, 2011, a quorum of the Board held a public hearing in public
25 meeting room #2 on the first floor of the Robert J. Drewel Building, 3000

1 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, WA. Notice of the meeting was given pursuant to
2 RCW 36.93.160. During the meeting, the Board heard testimony from
3 representatives of the City, the County, and the public. The Board received and
4 considered written material and other evidence, including but not limited to the
5 notice of intention and attachments.

6 **DISCUSSION**

7
8 Following the closure of the public hearing on May 17, 2011, the Board
9 discussed the annexation proposal, pertinent testimony, and other evidence in the
10 record and reached a unanimous decision to approve the annexation. In approving
11 the annexation, the Board, as discussed more fully below, considered all of the
12 factors identified in RCW 36.93.170 and the objectives of RCW 36.93.180, and
13 determined that its decision is consistent with the growth management act pursuant
14 to RCW 36.93.157.

15 **A. FACTORS**

16
17 The Board considered and discussed all of the factors identified in RCW
18 36.93.170. The Board found that the City's notice of intention adequately
19 addressed the relevant statutory factors and supports its proposal to annex this
20 area.

21 The Board specifically considered the population and territory and
22 population density as well as municipal services and need for those services.
23
24
25

1 B. OBJECTIVES

2 The Board considered each of the nine (9) objectives set forth in RCW
3 36.93.180 and whether each objective is applicable to this annexation, and if so,
4 whether it would be hindered or furthered.

5 1. Preservation of Natural Neighborhoods and Communities. The Board
6 unanimously agreed this objective is furthered. Specifically, the proposal maintains
7 natural neighborhoods and communities.

8 2. Use of Physical Boundaries, Including But Not Limited to Bodies of
9 Water, Highways, and Land Contours. The Board unanimously agreed this
10 objective is furthered. The proposed annexation uses SR9 and SR531 as eastern
11 and northern boundaries respectively.

12 3. Creation and Preservation of Logical Service Areas. The Board
13 determined that this objective is furthered. The proposal is contiguous to the City's
14 current municipal boundaries and lies fully within the City's Urban Growth Area.

15 4. Prevention of Abnormally Irregular Boundaries. The Board
16 determined that this objective is furthered. The annexation area is a rectangular
17 shape and will close current gaps in rights-of-way upon the County's agreement
18 with the City's recent ordinance.

19 5. Discouragement of Multiple Incorporations of Small Cities and
20 Encouragement of Incorporation of Cities in Excess of Ten Thousand Population in
21 Heavily Populated Urban Areas. This objective does not apply.
22
23
24
25

1 6. Dissolution of Inactive Special Purpose Districts. This objective does
2 not apply.

3 7. Adjustment of Impractical Boundaries. This objective does not apply.

4 8. Annexation to Cities of Unincorporated Areas Which Are Urban in
5 Character. The Board determined that this objective is furthered as the area is
6 urban in character.

7 9. Protection of Agricultural and Rural Lands. This objective does not
8 apply.
9

10 C. GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT

11 RCW 36.93.157 requires that the Board's decision to be consistent with the
12 following sections of the Growth Management Act: RCW 36.70A.020 (GMA
13 planning goals); RCW 36.70A.110 (comprehensive plans); RCW 36.70A.210
14 (county-wide planning policies and criteria for approval by County legislative
15 authority).
16

17 This decision is consistent with RCW 36.70A.020, as all planning goals were
18 discussed and considered either during public testimony or as part of the written
19 documentation. Specifically, the decision is consistent with RCW 36.70A.020(1)
20 development will occur within an urban growth area, RCW 36.70A.020(3) because
21 transportation systems will be encouraged, RCW 36.70A.020(5) because
22 economic development will be encouraged in this commercial area, RCW
23 36.70A.020(10) because the environment is better served by the City providing
24
25

1 services, and RCW 36.70A.020(12) because the City will provide for public facilities
2 and services.

3 The decision is consistent with RCW 36.70A.110 because the City and
4 County both have adopted comprehensive plans.

5 The decision is consistent with RCW 36.70A.210 because the County has
6 developed countywide planning policies which are in place and the proposal is
7 consistent with those policies. Specifically discussed and considered were OD-1 to
8 promote development within urban growth areas in order to use land efficiently,
9 add certainty to capital facility planning, and allow timely and coordinated extension
10 of urban services and utilities for new development, OD-2 to allow development
11 within the incorporated and unincorporated portions of the UGA, and OD-9 to
12 develop comprehensive plan policies and development regulations that provide for
13 the orderly transition of unincorporated to incorporated areas within UGA.
14

15 **DECISION**

16 **NOW THEREFORE**, the Board finds:
17

- 18 1. The jurisdiction of the Board was properly invoked and the Board has
19 jurisdiction over this matter.
- 20 2. Overall, the objectives of RCW 36.93.180 that are most pertinent to
21 the proposal would be furthered by the annexation.
- 22 3. A decision to approve the proposed annexation is consistent with
23 RCW 36.70A.020, RCW 36.70A.110, and RCW 36.70.210
24

1 Based upon the above, a motion was made, seconded, and passed on a
2 vote of 4:0 to **APPROVE** the City of Arlington Hilltop Annexation as submitted.
3 Adopted by the Washington State Boundary Review Board for Snohomish County
4 by a vote of 4:0, this 7th day of June, 2011.

5
6 WASHINGTON STATE BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD
7 FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY

8
9
10 
11 _____
12 MARK BEALES, CHAIR

13 Filed this 8th day of June, 2011

14
15 
16 _____
17 Marsha Carlsen, Chief Clerk

18 NOTICE

19 Pursuant to RCW 36.93.160(5), this decision shall be final and conclusive
20 unless within thirty (30) days from the date of this decision a governmental unit
21 affected by the decision or any person owning real property or residing in the area
22 affected by the decision files a notice of appeal in Snohomish County Superior
23 Court.