REPORT and DECISION of the SNOHOMISH COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER

DATE OF DECISION: February 16, 2006

PLAT/PROJECT NAME: ESTATES AT THOMAS LAKE

APPLICANT/LANDOWNER: Thomas Lake Estates, LLC

FILE NO.: 04 118517

TYPE OF REQUEST: Preliminary plat approval to subdivide a 32.04 acre property into 21 lots utilizing lot size averaging provisions with a concurrent REZONE from Residential-9600 (R-9600) to Residential-7200 (R-7200)

DECISION (SUMMARY): Requests APPROVED subject to conditions

BASIC INFORMATION

GENERAL LOCATION: The property is located at 14224 Seattle Hill Road, Snohomish

ACREAGE: 32.03 acres

NUMBER OF LOTS: 21

AVERAGE LOT SIZE: 5,340 square feet

MINIMUM LOT SIZE: 4,250 square feet

DENSITY: .66 du/ac (gross) 8.17 du/ac (net)

OPEN SPACE: 1,237,871 square feet

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

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:

General Policy Plan Designation: Urban Low Density Residential (4-6 du/ac)
Subarea Plan: Mill Creek East UGA Plan
Subarea Plan Designation: Urban Low Density Residential (4-6 du/ac)
UTILITIES:
Water: Silver Lake Water District
Sewage: Silver Lake Water District

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Everett
FIRE DISTRICT: No. 1

SELECTED AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS:

- **Department of:**
  - Planning and Development Services (PDS): Approve subject to conditions
  - Public Works (DPW): Approve subject to conditions

INTRODUCTION

The applicant filed the Master Application on March 23, 2005. (Exhibit 1)

The Hearing Examiner (Examiner) made a site familiarization visit on January 26, 2006 in the afternoon.

The Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) gave proper public notice of the open record hearing as required by the county code. (Exhibits 16, 17 and 18)

A SEPA determination was made on December 5, 2005. (Exhibit 15) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on February 1, 2006, the 112th 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 February 1, 2006 at 1:00 p.m..

1. The Examiner indicated that he has read the PDS staff report, reviewed the file and viewed the area and therefore has a general idea of the particular request involved.

2. Mr. Lee Michaels appeared representing the applicant. He stated that as to Conditions C.v. and vi., both of these have been met and he agrees with the rest of the other conditions.

3. He indicated that the lake is part of the plat.


5. No one appeared in opposition to the request.

The hearing concluded at 1:13 p.m.
NOTE: The above information reflects the information submitted to the Examiner summarizing the statements that were made at the hearing. However, for a full and complete record, verbatim audio tapes of the hearing are available in the Office of the Hearing Examiner.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISION

FINDINGS:

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 correctly 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 Protection Act (SEPA) evaluation with its recommendation and conditions. This report is hereby adopted by the Examiner as if set forth in full herein.

3. No one appeared in the record in opposition to the request.

4. The request is for a rezone of a 32.03 acre site from R-9600 to R-7200 and for preliminary plat approval for a 21 lot subdivision utilizing lot size averaging.

5. The site is bordered on the west by 35th Avenue SE and on the east by Seattle Hill Road. The zoning surrounding the property is R-9600 and single-family residential is found on the north, south and east.

6. The project would comply with park mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66A SCC (Title 26A SCC) by the payment of $1,244.49 for each new single-family home.

7. The DPW reviewed the request with regard to traffic mitigation and road design standards. This review covered Title 13 SCC and Chapter 30.66B SCC (Title 26B 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. (See Pages 3-6, Exhibit 33)

8. School mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66C SCC (Title 26C SCC) have been reviewed and set forth in the conditions.

9. Thomas Lake is located adjacent to the property and there is a large associated Category 1 wetland which occupies all but the east 1/5 of the property. PDS has reviewed the Critical Areas Study and Wetland Mitigation Plan and has determined that the project can comply with the county Critical Areas Regulations in Chapter 30.62 SCC (Chapter 32.10 SCC) Critical Area Regulations.

10. Rainwater runoff will be collected and transported via catch basins and pipes to an open detention pond located at the southwest side of the proposed plat. 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 (Title 24 SCC).
11. The Snohomish County Health District has no objection to this proposal provided that public water and sewer are furnished.

12. Public water and sewer service will be available for this development as well as electrical power.

13. 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.

14. 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 plat 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.

15. 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 generally and should be approved.

16. The proposal has been evaluated by PDS for compliance with the lot size averaging provisions of SCC 30.41A.240 and SCC 30.23.210. This proposal is consistent with these provisions.

17. 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.

18. The aerial photograph (Exhibit 9) very clearly and effectively shows the location of the proposal and how it would fit into the surrounding area.

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

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 Department of Public Works recommends that the request be approved as to traffic use subject to certain conditions.

3. The request is consistent with the GMACP; GMA-based County codes; and the type and character of land use permitted on the site and the permitted density with 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 and since no evidence was submitted contrary to the requirements of Chapter 30.42A, the evidence is presumed to meet these requirements.

5. The request will allow for the development of single-family homes in an area that is rapidly filling in and which is very attractive, being located as it is near Thomas Lake.

6. The request should be approved subject to compliance by the applicant with the following Conditions:

CONDITIONS:

A. The preliminary plat, received by Planning and Development Services (PDS) on January 17, 2006 (Exhibit 19), shall be the approved plat. Changes to approved preliminary plats are governed by SCC 30.41A.330.

B. Prior to initiation of any further site work, and/or prior to issuance of any development permits by the county;

i. The plattor shall mark with temporary markers in the field the boundary of all Native Growth Protection Areas (NGPA) required by Chapter 30.62 SCC, or the limits of the proposed site disturbance outside of the NGPA, using methods and materials acceptable to the county.

ii. A final mitigation plan based on the conceptual IDD Wetland Mitigation Plan for Gamut 360 – Thomas Lake, prepared by Wetland Resources, Inc., dated March 11, 2005 shall be submitted for review and approval during the construction review phase of this project.

C. The following additional restrictions and/or items shall be indicated on the face of the final plat:

i. “The lots within this subdivision will be subject to school impact mitigation fees for the Everett 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 one existing parcel. Lot 1 shall receive credit.”

ii. “The dwelling units within this development are subject to park impact fees in the amount of $1,244.49 per single family unit as mitigation for impacts to the Nakeeta Beach parks service area of the County parks system in accordance with SCC 30.66A. Payment of these mitigation fees is
required prior to building permit issuance, provided that the building permit is issued by March 23, 2010 (5 years after the completeness date of the subject application). After this date, park impact fees shall be based upon the rate in effect at the time of building permit issuance."

iii. All Critical Areas shall be designated Native Growth Protection Areas (NGPA) (unless other agreements have been made) with the following language on the face of the plat:

"All NATIVE GROWTH PROTECTION AREAS shall be left permanently undisturbed in a substantially natural state. No clearing, grading, filling, building construction or placement, or road construction of any kind shall occur, except removal of hazardous trees. The activities as set forth in SCC 32.10.110(29)(a), (c), and (d) are allowed when approved by the County."

iv. Chapter 30.66B SCC requires the new lot mitigation payments in the amounts shown below for each single-family residential building permit:

$1,956.84 per lot to Snohomish County as mitigation for project impacts on county road system capacity within Transportation Service Area D. Credits for certain expenditures may be allowed against said payment to the extent authorized by county code.

$284.57 per lot for mitigation of impacts on City roads paid to the City of Mill Creek,

These payments are due prior to or at the time of each building permit issuance. Notice of these mitigation payments shall be contained in any deeds involving this subdivision, short subdivision of the lots therein or binding site plan. Once building permits have been issued all mitigation payments shall be deemed paid by PDS.

D. Prior to recording of the final plat:

i. Construction of urban standard frontage improvements on Seattle Hill Road shall have been completed.

ii. Native Growth Protection Area boundaries (NGPA) shall have been permanently marked on the site prior to final inspection by the county, with both NGPA signs and adjacent markers which can be magnetically located (e.g.: rebar, pipe, 20 penny nails, etc.). The plattor may use other permanent methods and materials provided they are first approved by the county. Where an NGPA boundary crosses another boundary (e.g.: lot, tract, plat, road, etc.), a rebar marker with surveyors’ cap and license number must be placed at the line crossing.

NGPA signs shall have been placed no greater than 100 feet apart around the perimeter of the NGPA. Minimum placement shall include one Type 1 sign per wetland, and at least one Type 1 sign shall be placed in any lot that borders the NGPA, unless otherwise approved by the county biologist. The design and proposed locations for the NGPA signs shall be submitted to the Land Use Division for review and approval prior to installation.

iii. The final mitigation plan shall be completely implemented.

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.

Preliminary plats which are approved by the county are valid for five (5) years from the date of approval and must be recorded within that time period unless an extension has been properly requested and granted pursuant to SCC 30.41A.300.
7. Any Conclusion in this Report and Decision, which should be deemed a Finding of Fact, is hereby adopted as such.

**DECISION:**

The requests for a REZONE from R-9600 to R-7200, along with a PRELIMINARY PLAT approval of a 21-lot subdivision utilizing lot size averaging are hereby APPROVED, SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE by the applicant, with the CONDITIONS set forth in Conclusion 6, above.

Decision issued this 16th day of February, 2006.

Robert J. Backstein, Hearing Examiner

**EXPLANATION OF RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL PROCEDURES**

This 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 Examiner’s action on reconsideration would be subject to appeal to the Council.) 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, 2802 Wetmore Avenue, 2nd Floor, Everett, Washington, (Mailing Address: M/S #405, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett WA 98201) on or before **February 27, 2006**. 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 Examiner exceeded his jurisdiction;
(b) the Examiner failed to follow the applicable procedure in reaching his decision;
(c) the Examiner committed an error of law or misinterpreted the applicable comprehensive plan, provisions of Snohomish County Code, or other county or state law or regulation;
(d) the Examiner’s findings, conclusions and/or conditions are not supported by the record;
(e) newly discovered evidence alleged to be material to the Examiner’s decision which could not reasonably have been produced at the Examiner’s hearing; and/or
(f) changes to the application proposed by the applicant 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. Appeals shall be addressed to the Snohomish County Council but shall be filed in writing with the Department of Planning and Development Services, 5th Floor, County Administration Building, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, Washington (Mailing address: M/S #604, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, WA 98201) on or before March 2, 2006 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 and PROVIDED FURTHER that the filing fee shall be refunded in any case where an appeal is 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 are limited to the following:

(a) the Examiner exceeded his jurisdiction;
(b) the Examiner failed to follow the applicable procedure in reaching his decision;
(c) the Examiner committed an error of law or misinterpreted the applicable comprehensive plan, provisions of Snohomish County Code, or other county or state law or regulation; and/or
(d) the Examiner’s findings, conclusions and/or conditions are not supported by the record.

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 this case.

Staff Distribution:

Department of Planning and Development Services: Monica McLaughlin
Department of Public Works: Norm Stone

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.