

REPORT and DECISION of the SNOHOMISH COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER

DATE OF DECISION: February 22, 2007

PLAT/PROJECT NAME: *STONEWATER CREEK #2*

APPLICANT/
LANDOWNER: Spadafora Construction & Development

FILE NO.: 06 103836 SD

TYPE OF REQUEST: **REZONE** from Residential-8400 (R-8400) to Residential-7200 (R-7200) and a 47 lot **PRD SUBDIVISION**

DECISION (SUMMARY): **APPROVED** subject to conditions

BASIC INFORMATION

GENERAL LOCATION: The property is located at 12409 25th Avenue SE, Everett, WA

ACREAGE: 8.81

DENSITY: 5.33 du/ac (gross)
6.95 du/ac (net)

NUMBER OF LOTS: 47

AVERAGE LOT SIZE: 3,587 square feet

MINIMUM LOT SIZE: 3,133 square feet

OPEN SPACE: 37,186 square feet

ZONING: CURRENT: R-8400
PROPOSED: R-7200

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:

General Policy Plan Designation: Urban Low Density Residential

UTILITIES:

Water: Silver Lake Water District
Sewage: Silver Lake Water District

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Everett

FIRE DISTRICT: No. 7

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 July 14, 2006. (Exhibit 1)

The Hearing Examiner (Examiner) made a site familiarization visit on February 5, 2007 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 21, 22 and 23)

A SEPA determination of nonsignificance was made on December 27, 2006. (Exhibit 20) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on February 8, 2007, the 77th 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 8, 2007 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.

The hearing concluded at 1:28 p.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. Three comment letters were received from the public expressing concerns for traffic, wetlands and sanitary sewers.

4. A forested Category 3 wetland is located in the northeast portion of the site, and a Category 1 wetland associated with Ruggs Lake is in the northeast corner. Both will remain undisturbed and protected with Native Growth Protection Area (NGPA) buffers in accordance with Chapter 30.62 SCC (Chapter 32.10 SCC) Critical Area Regulations.
5. The project would comply with park mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66A SCC (Title 26A SCC) by the payment of \$1244.49 for each new single-family home.
6. 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 2, Exhibit 22) Special attention must be paid to the adjoining streets. 25th Avenue NE must be upgraded with current urban standard frontage improvements, and questions concerning the intersection of 25th Avenue NE and the unopened right-of-way for 124th Street NE must be resolved.
7. School mitigation requirements under Chapter 30.66C SCC (Title 26C SCC) have been reviewed and set forth in the conditions.
8. 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).
9. The Snohomish County Health District has no objection to this proposal provided that public water and sewer are furnished and with the understanding that the existing onsite sewage systems will be abandoned in accordance with health district regulations.
10. Public water and sewer service will be available for this development as well as electrical power.
11. 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 will be the case here.
12. The proposal has been evaluated by PDS for compliance with the Planned Residential Development provisions of Chapter 30.42B.SCC. The proposal is consistent with these provisions.
13. 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.
14. 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.

15. 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. 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.

The proposal satisfies these criteria.

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

CONDITIONS

- A. The preliminary plat/PRD official site plan received by PDS on October 26, 2006 (Exhibit 12A) shall be the approved plat configuration and PRD official site plan. SCC 30.42B.220 governs changes to the planned residential development official site plan; changes to the approved plat are governed by SCC 30.41A.330.
- B. Prior to initiation of any 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. The platlor 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.

- iii. A final mitigation plan based on the Critical Area Study and Wetland Mitigation Plan Stonewater Creek II prepared by Wetland Resources revised October 25, 2006 (Exhibit 15 A & 15B) shall be submitted for review and approval during the construction review phase of this project.
- iv. A detailed landscape and recreational facilities plan shall have been submitted to and approved by PDS. The plan shall be prepared in general conformance with Exhibits 14 A-D and in conformance with all required landscape standards for perimeter, streetscape and open space treatment, and shall include a significant tree retention plan.
- v. PRD covenants, deeds and homeowners' association bylaws and other documents shall have been submitted to and approved by PDS guaranteeing maintenance of open space, community facilities, private drives, and all other commonly-owned and operated property. The documents shall have been reviewed by and accompanied by a certificate from an attorney that they comply with Chapter 30.42B SCC requirements prior to approval by PDS. To ensure permanent, ongoing maintenance of landscape areas, landscape maintenance covenants shall be prepared by the applicant and submitted together with documents otherwise required for maintenance of site improvements pursuant to SCC 30.42B.250.

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

- i. "The dwelling units within this development are subject to park impact fees in the amount of \$1,244.49 per newly approved dwelling unit pursuant to Chapter 30.66A. Payment of these mitigation fees is required prior to building permit issuance; provided that the building permit has been issued within five years after the application is deemed complete. After five years, park impact fees shall be based upon the rate in effect at the time of building permit issuance."
- ii. "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 nine existing parcels. Lots 1 through 9 shall receive credit."
- iii. "Chapter 30.66B SCC requires the new lot mitigation payments in the amounts shown below for each single-family residential building permit:
 \$2,169.19 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 Snohomish County Code.
 \$292.48 per lot to Snohomish County for the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) as fee mitigation of project impacts on state highways.
 These payments are due at the time of building permit issuance for each single-family residence. Notice of these mitigation payments shall be contained in any deeds involving this subdivision of the lots therein. Once building permits have been issued all mitigation payments shall be deemed paid."
- iv. 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 30.91N.010 are allowed when approved by the County.”

- v. “All open space shall be protected as open space in perpetuity. Use of the open space tracts within this subdivision is restricted to those uses approved for the planned residential development, to include open play areas, picnic areas, recreation trail system, drainage facilities, benches and required landscape improvements as shown on the approved site plan and the approved landscape plan. Covenants, conditions and restrictions as recorded with the plat, and as may be amended in the future, shall include provisions for the continuing preservation and maintenance of the uses, facilities and landscaping within the open space as approved and constructed.”

D. Prior to recording of the final plat:

- i. Construction of urban standard frontage improvements on 25th Ave SE shall have been completed.
- ii. The developer shall have completed the improvements to 124th Street SE pursuant to any agreement between the County and the developer.
- iii. 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 platlor 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.

- iv. The final mitigation plan shall be completely implemented.
- v. A bond or other guarantee of performance shall have been submitted to and accepted by PDS to assure compliance with the provisions of SCC 30.42B.125.

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

Nothing in this 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 a **REZONE** and **PRD SUBDIVISION** are hereby APPROVED, SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE by the applicant, with the CONDITIONS set forth in Conclusion 5, above.

Decision issued this 22nd day of February, 2007.

Gordon Crandall, Hearing Examiner Pro-Tem

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 **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, 2nd 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 8, 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: Paul MacCready

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.

