



Snohomish County Council

Legislation Text

File #: 2021-1116, Version: 1

Executive/Council Action Form (ECAF)

ITEM TITLE: Motion

Motion 22-009, concerning the County Council's position on a proposed petition method annexation to the city of Arlington; BRB File No. 08-2021 Arlington Lindsay Annexation

DEPARTMENT: Planning and Development Services

ORIGINATOR: Eileen Canola

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION: Ken Klein- 12/28/21

PURPOSE: To review and act on the proposed City of Arlington Lindsay Annexation, BRB file no.

BACKGROUND: The City submitted a notice of intention (NOI) to the Snohomish County Boundary Review Board (BRB) - File No. 08-2021 (Attachment A to Motion), for which the 45-day review period ends on January 20, 2022. The BRB, consistent with its annexation review procedures outlined in Chapter 2.77 SCC, distributed the NOI to County departments including Planning and Development Services (PDS). Per SCC 2.77.040(4) within this 45-day review period, the County Council must determine whether to invoke BRB jurisdiction ('file a request for review'). If BRB jurisdiction is invoked during the 45-day review, by the County or another party, the BRB may hold public hearings and approve, deny, or modify the proposed annexation. BRB decisions must be consistent with Growth Management Act (GMA) provisions including the planning goals and framework for urban growth areas (UGAs) and Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs). State law also defines objectives (RCW 36.93.180) for board review and provides factors (RCW 36.93.170) for board consideration in making its decision. If BRB jurisdiction is not invoked, the annexation would be deemed approved. If the annexation is approved by the BRB either following a public hearing or because no party invokes BRB jurisdiction, the annexation would need to be finalized by City ordinance setting the effective date. The authority of the County Council for reviewing annexations is set forth in Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 36.93.100 and SCC 2.77.040. The proposed annexation is consistent with the GMA, the CPPs, and local comprehensive plans, the factors, and objectives of the BRB, and will have minimal impact to County budget and services. The annexation proposal furthers the GMA goals and CPP policies that cities should be the primary providers of urban services that are existing or planned. The recommendation to the County Council from PDS is to not oppose the annexation and to not invoke the jurisdiction of the BRB.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

| EXPEND: FUND, AGY, ORG, ACTY, OBJ, AU | CURRENT YR | 2ND YR | 1ST 6 YRS |
|--|------------|--------|-----------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL | | | |

| REVENUE: FUND, AGY, ORG, REV, SOURCE | CURRENT YR | 2ND YR | 1ST 6 YRS |
|---|------------|--------|-----------|
| | | | |

| | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL | | | |

DEPARTMENT FISCAL IMPACT NOTES: Click or tap here to enter text.

CONTRACT INFORMATION:

ORIGINAL _____ CONTRACT# _____ AMOUNT _____
AMENDMENT _____ CONTRACT# _____ AMOUNT _____

Contract Period

ORIGINAL START _____ END _____
AMENDMENT START _____ END _____

OTHER DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW/COMMENTS: Approved-Finance, Brian Haseleu 12/27/21