

# REPORT and DECISION of the SNOHOMISH COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER PRO TEM

DATE OF DECISION: February 21, 2007

PLAT/PROJECT NAME: *ROSE PARK*

APPLICANT/  
LANDOWNER: George Brewer

FILE NO.: 05 119914 SD

TYPE OF REQUEST: **PRELIMINARY PLAT** of five acres into 10 lots

DECISION (SUMMARY): **APPROVE** subject to Conditions

## BASIC INFORMATION

GENERAL LOCATION: The property is located at 12701 175<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE, Monroe, WA

ACREAGE: 5.02 acres

DENSITY: 2.19 du/ac (gross)  
3 du/ac (net)

NUMBER OF LOTS: 10

AVERAGE LOT SIZE: 18,483 square feet

MINIMUM LOT SIZE: 18,000 square feet

ZONING: R-7200

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:  
General Policy Plan Designation: Urban Low Density Residential (4-6 du/acre)

UTILITIES:  
Water: Roosevelt Water Association, Inc.  
Sewage: On-site septic systems

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Snohomish

FIRE DISTRICT: No. 3

SELECTED AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Department of:

Planning and Development Services: Approve subject to conditions

Public Works: Approve subject to conditions

## **INTRODUCTION**

The applicant filed the Master Application on May 18, 2006. (Exhibit 1)

The Hearing Examiner (Examiner) made a site familiarization visit on February 5, 2007, in the morning.

The Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) gave proper public notice of the open record hearing as required by the county code. (Exhibits 26, 27 and 28)

A SEPA determination of nonsignificance was made on January 8, 2007. (Exhibit 25) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on February 6, 2007, the 48<sup>th</sup> 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 6, 2007 at 11:00 a.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.

The hearing concluded at 11:13 a.m.

**NOTE:** Audio tapes of this 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. The project would comply with park mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66A SCC (Title 26A SCC) by the payment of \$1361.22 for each new single-family home.
4. 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 Page 4, Exhibit 40)

5. School mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66C SCC (Title 26C SCC) have been reviewed and set forth in the conditions.
6. 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).
7. The site has been determined to be an “unsewered urban enclave”, as it is in an Urban Growth Area but connection to a public sewer is not economically or technically feasible due to manmade or natural barriers. Accordingly, Applicant has proposed on-site sewer systems, which has been approved by the City of Monroe, the area’s sewer purveyor.
8. Public water will be available for this development as well as electrical power.
9. 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. The proposed use, single-family detached developments, is essentially compatible with existing single-family detached developments on larger lots. Since the property is within an UGA policies were adopted to promote urban densities of development, and a comparison with the present lower density character much of the area is inappropriate since the present density of development in much of the surrounding area is inconsistent with both the adopted comprehensive plans and the present zoning.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. The aerial photograph (Exhibit 14) very clearly and effectively shows the location of the proposal and how it would fit into the surrounding area.
13. 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 plat has been reviewed for conformance with criteria established by RCW 58.17.100, .110, .120, and .195. Such criteria require that the plat conform with applicable zoning ordinances and comprehensive plans, and make appropriate provisions for the 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.
5. The request should be approved subject to compliance by the applicant with the following Conditions:

### **CONDITIONS**

- A. The preliminary plat received by PDS on January 16, 2007 (Exhibit 23A) shall be the approved plat configuration. Changes to the approved plat are governed by SCC 30.41A.330.
- B. Prior to initiation of any further site work; and/or prior to issuance of any development/construction permits by the county:
  - i. All site development work shall comply with the requirements of the plans and permits approved pursuant to Condition A, above.
  - ii. An acceptable easement for the construction of a road to the proposed development shall be in-place across Tract 997 of the Plat of Roosevelt Ridge Estates.
  - iii. The applicant shall provide a legally binding agreement with the City of Monroe that must be recorded with the property records of the county and in a form acceptable to the director, in which the property owner agrees to: to annexation of the subject property by the City of Monroe when proposed, prompt connection with sanitary sewers when they become available, and participation without protest in any sewer LID Utility LID, including agreement to pay any connection fees and monthly charges assessed by the City of Monroe, LID or ULID.
- 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 Snohomish School District No. 201 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 the one existing parcel. Lot 1 shall receive credit."
  - ii. Chapter 30.66B SCC requires the new lot mitigation payments in the amounts shown below for each single-family residential building permit:

\$1,588.62 per single family residence or \$3,177.24 per duplex for mitigation of impacts on county roads paid to the county,

\$75.75 per single family residence or \$151.50 per duplex for transportation demand management paid to the county,

These payments are due prior to or at the time of building permit issuance for each single family residence or duplex. Notice of these mitigation payment obligations shall be contained in any deeds involving this subdivision or the lots therein. Once building permit has been issued all mitigation payments shall be deemed paid.

- iii. The developer shall pay the County \$1,361.22 per new dwelling unit as mitigation for parks and recreation impacts in accordance with Chapter 30.66A SCC; provided, however, the developer may elect to postpone payment of the mitigation requirement until issuance of a building permit for that lot. The election to postpone payment shall be noted by a covenant placed on the face of the recorded plat and included in the deed for each affected lot within the subdivision.

D. Prior to recording of the final plat:

- i. The proposed public road provided to the development across Tract 997 of the Plat of Roosevelt Ridge Estates shall have been established as a public road.
- ii. Pedestrian Facilities shall be constructed to the specifications of the DPW throughout the development [EDDS].
- iii. Pedestrian Facilities shall be constructed to the specifications of the DPW from the entrance to Roosevelt Ridge Estates near the intersection of 128<sup>th</sup> Place SE and 178<sup>th</sup> Drive SE to the farthest school bus stop location at the intersection of 178<sup>th</sup> Drive SE and 130<sup>th</sup> Place SE [RCW 58.17.110].

E. In conformity with applicable standards and timing requirements:

- i. The detention system landscape planting plan received January 16, 2007 (Exhibit 24) shall be implemented. All required detention facility landscaping shall be installed in accordance with the approved landscape plan.

F. All development activity shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 30.63A SCC.

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.

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

**DECISION:**

The request for approval of the **PRELIMINARY PLAT** of *Rose Park* is hereby APPROVED, SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE by the applicant, with the CONDITIONS set forth in Conclusion 5, above.

Decision issued this 21<sup>st</sup> day of February, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gordon Crandall, Hearing Examiner Pro-Tem

<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 **March 5, 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 **March 7, 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 this case.

Staff Distribution:

Department of Planning and Development Services: Darryl Eastin

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.