BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY

In re:	
CITY OF ARLINGTON COUNTRY CHARM ANNEXATION PROPOSAL	BRB NO. 01-2013 FINDINGS AND DECISION

DECISION SUMMARY

The City of Arlington's Proposed Country Charm Annexation (BRB No. 01-2013) is hereby **APPROVED.**

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 29, 2013, the City of Arlington (the "City") filed a notice of intention with the Washington State Boundary Review Board for Snohomish County (the "Board") proposing a petition method annexation of approximately 201 acres located adjacent to the city along the west part of the southern boundary and in the northeast unincorporated Arlington Urban Growth Area near Gilman Drive. The notice of intention was deemed legally sufficient by the Chief Clerk of the Board on January 30, 2013. The notice of intention states that the annexation area contains approximately 2 residences and 4 businesses with an assessed valuation of $3,292,300. The Arlington City Council initiated the annexation by 60% petition method.

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

HEARING

On June 26, 2013, a quorum of the Board held a public hearing in public meeting room #2 on the first floor of the Robert J. Drewel Building, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, WA. Notice of the hearing was given pursuant to RCW 36.93.160. During the hearing, the Board heard testimony from representatives of the City of Arlington and Snohomish County. The Board received and considered written material and other evidence, including but not limited to the notice of intention and attachments.

DISCUSSION

Following closure of the public hearing on June 26, 2013, the Board deliberated in open session. After discussing the annexation proposal, pertinent testimony, and other evidence in the record, the Board reached a unanimous decision to approve the annexation. In approving the annexation, the Board, as discussed more fully below, considered all of the factors identified in RCW 36.93.170 and the objectives of RCW 36.93.180, and determined that its decision is consistent with the growth management act pursuant to RCW 36.93.157.

A. FACTORS

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

the written documentation. The Board's decision to approve the annexation is consistent with RCW 36.70A.020(1) because development will occur within an urban growth area, RCW 36.70A.020(5) because economic development consistent with adopted comprehensive plans will be encouraged, RCW 36.70A.020(9) because open space and recreation will be encouraged, RCW 36.70A.020(10) because the environment will be protected and enhanced, RCW 36.70A.020(11) because the City did perform a comprehensive citizen participation effort designed to inform the public about the annexation and its effect on the residents in the proposed annexation area, and with RCW 36.70A.020(12) because the City will provide for public facilities and services.

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

The decision is consistent with RCW 36.70A.210 in that the annexation proposal is generally consistent with Snohomish County county-wide planning policies OD-1 to promote development within urban growth areas; OD-2 to allow development within the incorporated and unincorporated portions of the UGA; and OD-9 to develop comprehensive plans, policies, and development regulations providing for the orderly transition of unincorporated to incorporated areas within UGA.

DECISION

NOW THEREFORE, the Board finds:

The Board specifically considered the population and territory and population density as well as municipal services and need for those services.

B. OBJECTIVES

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

1. Preservation of Natural Neighborhoods and Communities. This objective is furthered. Specifically, the proposal maintains natural neighborhoods and communities.

2. Use of Physical Boundaries, Including But Not Limited to Bodies of Water, Highways, and Land Contours. The Board unanimously agreed this objective is furthered. Specifically, the Stillaguamish River runs along the edge of the proposed annexation to the north, west, and east and the city to the south and southwest.

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

4. Prevention of Abnormally Irregular Boundaries. This objective is furthered. Specifically, it brings in nearly the entire Arlington MUGA thus preventing any irregular boundaries.

5. Discouragement of Multiple Incorporations of Small Cities and Encouragement of Incorporation of Cities in Excess of Ten Thousand Population in Heavily Populated Urban Areas. This objective does not apply.

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

7. Adjustment of Impractical Boundaries. This objective may not apply.

8. Annexation to Cities of Unincorporated Areas Which Are Urban in Character. This objective is furthered. Specifically, the area is considered urban for long term planning purposes.

9. Protection of Agricultural and Rural Lands. This objective is furthered. Specifically, the property has not been identified or designated by the County as long-term, productive agricultural land, nor is it shown as such on their Resource Lands Map.

C. GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT

RCW 36.93.157 requires that the Board's decision be consistent with the following sections of the Growth Management Act: RCW 36.70A.020 (GMA planning goals); RCW 36.70A.110 (county's designation of urban growth areas and potential annexation areas); RCW 36.70A.210 (county-wide planning policies and criteria for approval by County legislative authority).

This decision is consistent with RCW 36.70A.020, as all planning goals were discussed and considered either during public testimony, deliberation, or as part of

1. The jurisdiction of the Board was properly invoked and the Board has jurisdiction over this matter.
2. The objectives of RCW 36.93.180 would be furthered by the proposal.
3. Consideration of all factors outlined in RCW 36.93.170 indicates the proposal provides for public facilities and services.
4. A decision to approve the proposed annexation is consistent with RCW 36.70A.020, RCW 36.70A.110 and RCW 36.70.210.

Based upon the above, a motion was made, seconded, and passed on a vote of 3 to 0 to **APPROVE** the City of Arlington's Country Charm Annexation as submitted.

////

////

////

////

////

////

////

////

////

////

////

////

////

Adopted by the Washington State Boundary Review Board for Snohomish County by a vote of 3 to Ø this 9th day of July, 2013.

WASHINGTON STATE BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD
FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY

MARK T. BEALES, CHAIR

FILED THIS 10th day of July, 2013.

Cindy Hunter, Chief Clerk

NOTICE

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