

CITY OF RENTON

NOV 13 2015

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER FOR THE CITY OF RENTON

RE: Longacres Business Center Phase II)	FINAL DECISION
Site Plan and Street Modification)	
LUA15-000630, MOD, SA-H)	
)	

Summary

The applicant requests site plan approval and approval of a street modification for two (2) standalone buildings totaling 260,000 square feet at a site north of the intersection of SW 27th St and Naches Ave SW. One building will be a three-story 113,00 square foot general office use building and the other building will be a three-story 147,000 square foot general office building. The site plan and street modification are approved with conditions.

Testimony

Clark Close, Senior City of Renton Planner, summarized the staff report. In response to examiner questions, Mr. Close clarified that at a minimum the applicant would comply with the 1990 stormwater manual but was also voluntarily complying with some current stormwater standards. Mr. Close also noted that there was conflicting evidence on whether the project site is in a flood zone and that the applicant is being required to provide compensatory flood mitigation to avoid any potential problems. Vanessa Dolbee, current planning manager, identified the factors that would be reviewed in a biological assessment required by staff recommended conditions of approval.

1 **Exhibits**

2 Exhibits 1-32 identified in the "Exhibits" lists within and accompanying the staff report were
3 admitted into the record during the hearing. The staff report was admitted as Ex. 33, the City's core
4 planning maps, located at the City's website, were admitted as Ex. 34. Amended staff recommended
5 Condition No. 12 was admitted as Ex. 35.

6 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

7 **Procedural:**

8 1. Applicant. Molly Carson.

9 2. Hearing. A hearing was held on the application on October 27, 2015.

10 3. Project Description. The applicant requests site plan approval and approval of a street
11 modification for two (2) standalone buildings totaling 260,000 square feet at a site north of the
12 intersection of SW 27th St and Naches Ave SW. One building (Building C) will be a three-story
13 113,00 square foot general office use building and the other building (Building D) will be a three-
14 story 147,000 square foot general office building. The project site is 17.38 acres in size, is vacant
15 and is relatively flat with a six-foot increase in overall grade. The project as approved by this
16 decision is depicted in Ex. 4, 5 and 6 as amended by Ex. 32 and the conditions of approval.

17 The street modification request is a requested modification to RMC 4-6-060. At the time of vesting
18 RMC 4-6-060 required 8 feet of landscaping, 8-foot wide sidewalks, a right of way width of 103 feet,
19 and an 8-foot parking lane along Oakesdale Ave SW. The applicant requests that they be allowed to
20 retain the existing 6-foot landscaping strips, 6-foot wide sidewalks, 90 feet of right of way and no
21 parking lane.

22 4. Adequacy of Infrastructure/Public Services. The project will be served by
23 adequate/appropriate infrastructure as conditioned by this decision. The adequacy of infrastructure
24 and services is more specifically addressed as follows:

25 A. Water and Sewer Service. Sewer and water are provided by the City of Renton. City
26 sewer and water mains are available along Naches Avenue for connection.

B. Fire and Police. The City of Renton will provide fire and police service. Fire and police
department staff have determined that existing facilities are adequate to serve the
development.

1 C. Drainage. The applicant has submitted a preliminary drainage report, Ex. 13, that staff
2 has found to be acceptable for site plan review. The applicant proposes to convey project
3 stormwater to a detention/wet pond located on a development tract to the north.

4 D. Parks/Open Space. City development standards do not impose any park or open space
5 requirements for commercial uses and no legal justification is found in the administrative
6 record.

7 E. Off-Site Transportation. No significant off-site transportation impacts are anticipated and
8 no off-site mitigation beyond traffic impact fees is necessary. The applicant submitted a
9 Traffic Impact Analysis completed by TENW (dated August 21, 2015; Exhibit 15). The
10 results of the traffic study establish that the project will not lower the level of service of
11 affected intersections below adopted standards.

12 G. Parking (vehicular and bicycle). Parking meets vested City parking standards. The
13 applicant is proposing 365 compact stalls (17%), 677 standard stalls (81%), and 21 ADA
14 stalls (2%) for a total of 1,063 parking stalls. Based on the parking regulations, Building
15 C would have a required minimum stall count of 339 and a maximum stall count of 509,
16 and Building D would have a required minimum stall count of 441 and a maximum stall
17 count of 662. Together the two buildings would have a minimum off-street parking stall
18 requirement of 780 and a maximum stall requirement of 1,171. The proposed 1,063 stalls
19 fall within the minimum and maximum parking regulations of the code. So that the
20 parking is located on the same lot as the structure, a condition of approval requires that
21 the applicant complete a lot combination into a single lot or a lot line adjustment, such
22 that the required parking is on the same lot as each structure, pursuant to the minimum
23 code standards per building. Should the applicant choose to complete a lot line adjustment
24 with more than one lot, a condition of approval requires that a cross access agreement
25 and/or a shared parking agreement be provided with the development.

26 Bicycle parking is encouraged for the development by vested development standards.
The staff report recommends a condition requiring 40 bicycle parking stalls, which has
been adopted by this decision.

H. Vehicular Access and Internal Circulation. The proposal provides for safe and efficient access and circulation for all users. City public works staff have reviewed the proposal and found it to provide for safe and efficient access and circulation. The limited number of intersections and driveway access points will increase vehicle and pedestrian safety by reducing the amount of pedestrian and vehicle cross-over from an arterial street. All public access will be

1 provided from either SW 27th St at Naches Ave SW or from Oakesdale Ave SW (roughly
2 between SW 27th St and SW 23rd St). The site access driveway on Oakesdale Ave SW
3 will be a full access driveway in order to allow all turn movements and be configured with
4 separate outbound left and right turn lanes. A center two-way left turn lane exists on
5 Oakesdale Ave SW which would provide a left turn lane for traffic entering the site and a
6 center refuge lane for traffic exiting the site. The site plan includes several 24-foot wide
7 through driveway aisles, around perimeter and portions of the interior of the site.
8 Pedestrian connections from the street to each of the two buildings will be provided if all
9 conditions of approval are met. There is also pedestrian linkage between the nearby light
10 rail station and the project site, as depicted in Ex. 5. All public entries open to the
11 sidewalk surrounding the exterior building elevations and not into an internal driveway or
12 drive aisle which promote safety and efficiency. The accessible stalls are proposed as the
13 nearest stalls to the front entrances for easier access.

14 As determined in the staff report, the applicant is also taking special measures to protect
15 landscaping from damage by vehicles and/or pedestrian traffic by providing defined
16 pedestrian and vehicular areas.

17 I. Refuse and Recycle Enclosure. The proposal provides for adequate refuse and recyclable
18 areas. The staff's analysis of applicable requirements, located at p. 1 of the staff report, is
19 adopted by reference.

20 J. Recreation. The primary open space on the subject site is located in the hardscape
21 between the two structures at the center of the site. The roughly 132-foot wide space
22 between the two buildings includes landscaping, walkways and patio areas. The open
23 space has the potential to serve as a distinctive focal point from within the site. Proposed
24 and conditioned landscaping would provide passive recreation opportunities for Group
25 Health employees.

26 K. Transit and Bicycles. The subject site is located just south of Sound Transit's Tukwila
train station. The new office buildings would be within walking and biking distance from
this transportation hub. A bicycle lane provides bicycle access to the project site and as
previously discussed the proposal is conditioned to provide for bicycle parking.

5. Adverse Impacts. There are no significant adverse impacts associated with the project as
conditioned by this decision. Adequate infrastructure serves the site as determined in Finding of Fact
No. 4. Impacts are more specifically addressed as follows:

A. Compatibility. No
compatibility issues are evident from the record. The project is generally bounded by CO
zoning on all sides except the west property line, which is BNSF Railroad in the City of
Tukwila (TUC-TOD Tukwila Urban Center – Transit Oriented Development). The buildings
will be located towards the center of the project site with surface parking areas located around

1 most sides of the two buildings. The proposed buildings would have a combined footprint of
2 86,500 square feet, resulting in a building lot coverage of approximately 11.4% across the
3 combined property. The proposal would not be an over scale structure or exhibit
4 over concentration of development as the proposal does not exceed maximum height, lot
5 coverage, and setback requirements. The scale, height and bulk of the proposed building are
6 also appropriate for the scale of the 17.38-acre site. The applicant has achieved compatibility
7 with the surrounding uses through substantial setbacks and proposed landscaping.
8 Additionally, the Green River Valley Wildlife Habitat Corridor, combined with the perimeter
9 landscape area along the east and west property lines, creates a 30-foot wide onsite landscape
10 buffer that not only makes 4% of the site to suitable area for wildlife but also serves to create
11 compatibility with surrounding properties.

12 B. Views. There are no territorial views for which to maintain visual accessibility for on-site
13 buildings. No view corridors of neighboring properties to shorelines or Mt. Rainier would be
14 adversely affected. No comments were submitted from adjacent properties regarding views.

15 C. Lighting. The applicant did not provide an on-site lighting plan. A condition of approval will
16 require the applicant to provide a lighting plan that adequately provides for public safety
17 without casting excessive glare on adjacent properties at the time of building permit review.
18 Down-lighting shall be used in all cases to assure safe vehicular movement in an area where
19 pedestrians could be walking. The conditions of approval require that the lighting plan shall
20 be submitted to, and approved by, the Current Planning Project Manager prior to building
21 permit approval.

22 D. Screening of Mechanical Equipment and Refuse/Recycling Area. The application has roof
23 mounted mechanical equipment on both structures that will be screened around all sides,
24 approximately 8 feet above the top of the parapet, in order to minimize the impacts on the
25 pedestrian environment and adjacent uses. Compliance with vested rooftop screening
26 requirements will be verified at the time of building permit construction. It's unclear from the
record whether the refuse and recycling area will be screened from view so screening of that
amenity will be made a condition of approval.

E. Privacy and Noise. Given
the surrounding commercial uses and zoning, the proposal is not anticipated to create any
significant noise or privacy impacts. Existing noise within the vicinity of the subject site is
primarily composed of vehicles on the abutting streets (SW 27th St and Oakesdale Ave
SW), the rail line located immediately west of the site, and the Tukwila Sounder Station
located northwest of the proposed campus style buildings. It is anticipated that most of the
noise impacts would occur during the construction phase of the project. The site is
surrounded by commercial development; therefore, the temporary noise impacts are
anticipated to be minimal and limited in duration, and are not anticipated to be more
impactful than the existing rail noise.

1 The applicant has submitted a Construction Mitigation Plan (Exhibit 18), which provides
2 measures to reduce construction impacts such as noise, control of dust, traffic controls, etc.
3 Based on the provided construction mitigation description, the applicant has indicated that
4 construction is anticipated to begin in December of 2015 and complete in June 2017. At this
5 time, the applicant has indicated that construction work would occur from 6:00 am to 10:00
6 pm Monday through Friday and from 6:00 am to 6:00 pm on Saturday. The project's first
7 phase was granted approval of the requested construction schedule and hours for Longacres
8 Business Center Phase I. No public complaints have been received by the City for work
9 outside the approved construction hours. The City of Renton is anticipating approval of the
10 requested construction schedule and work hours for Longacres Business Center Phase II.
11 Also, no excessive levels of noise are expected to be generated during the operation of the
12 completed project.

8 Due to the requirement and need for parking, it is a challenge to limit the paved and/or
9 impervious surfaces on the site. While there is an exceptional amount of parking the lot has
10 been sufficiently landscaped. The applicant is also taking special measures to protect
11 landscaping from damage by vehicles and/or pedestrian traffic by providing defined
12 pedestrian and vehicular areas. If all conditions of approval are met, there will be adequate
provisions for privacy and noise reduction by building placement and the use of
landscaping.

13 F. Natural Systems/Critical Areas. There are no natural systems or critical areas on-site except
14 for a potential flood zone and a high seismic area, low erosion hazard area and low landslide
15 hazard area. The flood insurance rate map (FIRM) for the property identifies a 100-year
16 floodplain, Zone AE, in close proximity to the northwestern property boundary, which may
17 extend onto the property. The base flood elevation shown on the FIRM for Zone AE is 16 feet
18 above mean sea level. Southern portions of the site are located within Zone X, outside the
19 100-year or 500-year flood zones. According to the Flood Plain Hazard Data Map, the 100-
20 year flood plain encroaches roughly 4,400 square feet onto the northwest portion of the site
21 (northwest of Building C) and 44,000 square feet within the stormwater detention pond
(Exhibit 8). The applicant is proposing to fill 2,500 cubic feet of fill within the northwest
22 portion of the site and remove approximately 250,000 cubic feet of the 100-year flood plain
23 from the stormwater pond. As such, the applicant is proposing compensatory volume in the
24 footprint of the combination wetpond in Tract B, at the elevations above the overflow
25 detention line. Staff have determined that this compensatory mitigation is adequate to
26 mitigate against any impacts to potential development in a flood zone.

22 As noted in the staff report, based on the soil and groundwater conditions onsite, the site
23 would be mapped as a high seismic hazard, a low erosion hazard area and a low landslide
24 hazard area. The applicant has prepared a geotechnical report that has been reviewed and
25 approved by staff, Ex. 11, which contains recommendations to assure safe construction in
these geological hazardous areas that are imposed by the conditions of approval.

25 G. Landscaping and tree retention. The applicant's preliminary landscaping and tree
26 retention proposal has been found to comply with City standards by staff as conditioned

1 by this decision. The staff's analysis of applicable requirements, located at p. 8 of the
2 staff report, is adopted by reference.

3 H.

Provision for Light and Air.

4 The proposal provides for adequate provision of light and air. The proposed buildings would
5 be located central to the site with surface parking areas located along the perimeter of the site.
6 The larger setbacks of the building from the property line will provide for flow of sunlight,
7 winds, vehicle and pedestrian movement through most of the site. Prevailing winds in the area
8 are from the southwest during most of the year (fall, winter and spring) as well as the
9 direction of sunlight. The structures would cast various degrees of shade along the north
10 elevations throughout most of the day. The applicant should take measures to provide
11 ornamental lighting within the vicinity of the entrances and along the north elevations in order
12 to adequately illuminate the area for pedestrians and bicyclists. The lighting plan required by
13 the conditions of approval will include ornamental lighting.

14 Proposed landscaping has been strategically placed on site in order take advantage of sun
15 exposure from the south and west most times of the year, and would likely only be shaded at
16 certain times of the day during the winter months.

17 **Conclusions of Law**

18 1. Authority. RMC 4-9-200(B)(1)(a) requires Level 1 site plan review for all development in the
19 CO zone, subject to various exceptions that don't apply to this proposal. RMC 4-9-200(D)(3)(b)
20 requires a public hearing before the hearing examiner because the proposed gross floor area exceeds
21 100,000 square feet. RMC 4-8-080(G) classifies hearing examiner site plan review as Type III
22 permits and modifications as Type I permits. The site plan and modification requests of this proposal
23 have been consolidated. RMC 4-8-080(C)(2) requires consolidated permits to each be processed
24 under "the highest-number procedure". The site plan has the highest numbered review procedures,
25 so the site plan and modification requests must be processed as Type III applications. As Type III
26 applications, RMC 4-8-080(G) grants the Examiner with the authority to hold a hearing and issue a
final decision on them, subject to closed record appeal to the City Council.

2. Zoning/Comprehensive Plan Designations. The subject property is zoned Commercial Office
(CO) and has a comprehensive plan land use designation of Employment Area Valley.

3. Review Criteria. Site plan review standards are governed by RMC 4-9-200(E) and (F) as
vested under a development agreement applicable to the project, Ex. 19. Modification criteria are
governed by RMC 4-9-250(D), as vested under the development agreement of Ex. 19. Applicable
criteria are quoted below in italics and applied through corresponding conclusions of law. The
criteria of RMC 4-9-200(F) are not quoted but instead summarized within the Conclusions of Law
due to their excessive length.

1
2 **Site Plan**

3 **RMC 4-9-200(E):** *The Reviewing Official shall review and act upon site plans based upon*
4 *comprehensive plan considerations and the following criteria...:*

5 **1(a):** *Conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, its elements and policies;*

6 4. The proposal is consistent with applicable comprehensive plan policies and zoning
7 regulations as outlined in Finding 20(a) of the staff report, which is adopted by this reference as if set
8 forth in full, including the findings and conclusions.

9 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(1)(b):** *Conformance with existing land use regulations;*

10 5. The proposal is consistent with all applicable land use regulations as outlined in Finding
11 20(b) of the staff report, which is adopted by this reference as if set forth in full, including the
12 findings and conclusions.

13 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(1)(c):** *Mitigation of impacts to surrounding properties and uses;*

14 6. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 5, the proposal will not create any significant adverse
15 impacts, including any impacts to surrounding uses. As detailed in Finding of Fact No. 5, the
16 proposal is fully compatible with adjoining uses, does not impair any views, does not impair privacy
17 or generate unreasonable amounts of noise and light and has all mechanical equipment and the like
18 screened from view. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 4, off-site traffic and stormwater
19 impacts are fully mitigated as well.

20 7. RMC 4-9-200(F)(1) also provides for more detailed standards governing impacts to
21 surrounding properties and uses. Those standards are met by the proposal as well. In summary, the
22 proposal will not negatively interfere with use and enjoyment of surrounding properties and uses
23 because the proposal is fully compatible with surrounding properties and uses as determined in
24 Finding of Fact No. 5(A). The proposal does not create any undesirable scale impacts because as
25 determined in Finding of Fact No. 5(A) the proposal is fully compatible with surrounding uses. The
26 proposal provides for appropriate transition and linkage to surrounding uses and infrastructure
because the site provides for safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation as determined in
Finding of Fact No. 4(H) and is accessed by a bicycle lane as noted in No. 4(L) and has pedestrian
access to the nearby Tukwila Sounder station as shown in Ex. 5. Perimeter landscaping serves as
effective buffering of the large parking areas of the proposal as shown in the landscaping plans, Ex.
5. The buildings are appropriately situated on the project site by centering them towards the middle
in order to provide for maximum separation of the relatively large buildings from surrounding uses.
No views are impaired by the proposal as determined in Finding of Fact No. 5(B). Refuse and
recycle areas as well as mechanical equipment will be screened from view as required by City standards
as determined in Finding of Fact No. 5(J). As determined in Finding of Fact No. 5(C), excessive

1 glare and lighting will be adequately mitigated through staff approval of a lighting plan required by
2 the conditions of approval.

3 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(1)(d):** *Mitigation of impacts of the proposed site plan to the site;*

4 8. All impacts to the proposed site have been mitigated by the staff recommended conditions of
5 approval adopted by this decision and the measures initially proposed by the applicant. As outlined
6 in Finding of Fact No. 5(F), the only critical areas on site are a potential flood plain zone and low
7 geologically hazardous areas, which will be fully mitigated by compensatory flood storage, a
8 biological assessment and adoption of the recommendations in the applicant's geotechnical report,
9 Ex. 11. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 5(G), trees will be retained and replaced on-site to the
10 extent required by City development standards.

11 9. RMC 4-9-200(F)(2) also
12 provides for more detailed standards governing impacts to surrounding properties and uses, which are
13 met by the proposal as conditioned. In summary, building placement and spacing provides for
14 adequate privacy and noise reduction and for adequate passage of light and air as determined in
15 Finding of Fact No. 5(E) and 5(H) and for adequate accommodation of views as determined in
16 Finding of Fact No. 5(B). Structures are properly concentrated in the center of the site in order to
17 maximize separation of the buildings from adjoining properties as determined in Finding of Fact No.
18 5(A). Existing vegetation is retained to the extent required by the City's tree retention standards as
19 determined in Finding of Fact No. 5(G). No other vegetation retention is required or necessary. As
20 noted in the geotechnical report prepared for the project, Ex. 11, the project area is relatively flat with
21 only a 6-foot grade change so topography does not play a major role in dictating cut and fill plans.
22 Erosion impacts are addressed by conditions recommended in the geotechnical report for the project
23 as well as City development standards applicable to clearing and grading permits. Impervious
24 surfaces are difficult to limit due to the parking required of the proposal. Project site plans show that
25 the proposal limits impervious surface to that necessary to accommodate parking and other
26 requirements for the proposed buildings. There is no restriction on total amount of impervious
surface imposed by vested zoning regulations. As determined in the staff report, the applicant is also
taking special measures to protect landscaping from damage by vehicles and/or pedestrian traffic by
providing defined pedestrian and vehicular areas. The proposal provides for adequate passage of
light and air as determined in Finding of Fact No. 5(H).

21 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(1)(e):** *Conservation of area wide property values;*

22 10. Given the compatibility of the site with surrounding uses and the absence of adverse impacts
23 as determined in Finding of Fact No. 5, in the absence of any evidence that the proposal will
24 adversely affect property values it is determined that the proposal adequately conserves area wide
25 property values as required by the standard quoted above.

26 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(1)(f):** *Safety and efficiency of vehicle and pedestrian circulation;*

1 11. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 4(H), the proposal provides for safe and efficient
2 vehicle and pedestrian circulation.

3 12. RMC 4-9-200(F)(3) also provides for more detailed standards governing circulation and
4 access. In summary, as determined in Finding of Fact No. 4(H), the proposal provides for safe and
5 efficient vehicle and pedestrian circulation as required by RMC 4-9-200(F)(3)(a), (f) and (i). As
6 detailed in Finding of Fact No. 5(H), the 17.38-acre site only has two vehicular access points, which
7 limits ingress and egress movements as contemplated by RMC 4-9-200(F)(3)(b). RMC 4-9-
8 200(F)(3)(c) requires the consolidation of access points with adjoining properties when feasible and
9 RMC 4-9-200(F)(3)(d) requires the coordination of access on a block-wide basis. The conditions of
10 approval require internal access roads to connect to adjoining parcels as depicted in Ex. 32 in order to
11 reduce the need for additional access points as contemplated in RMC 4-9-200(F)(3)(c) and to
12 coordinate access points as contemplated in RMC 4-9-200(F)(3)(d). RMC 4-9-200(F)(3)(e)
discourages access points onto arterials. The project access points are on Naches Ave SW and
Oakesdale Ave SW, neither of which are arterials. RMC 4-9-200(F)(3)(g) requires separation of
loading and delivery areas. The staff report does not address loading and delivery areas. The
conditions of approval require separation of loading and parking areas to the extent feasible with site
constraints. RMC 4-9-200(F)(3)(h) requires provision for transit and bicycle access. As noted
previously, the Tukwila Sounder station is located just north of the project. The conditions of
approval require bicycle parking and the applicant is proposing a bicycle shelter.

13 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(1)(g):** *Provision of adequate light and air;*

14 13. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 5(H), the proposal provides for adequate light and air.

15 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(1)(h):** *Mitigation of noise, odors and other harmful or unhealthy conditions;*

16 14. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 5(E) the proposal will not generate any unreasonable
17 noise. As a proposed general office building, there is nothing inherent in the use or any indication in
18 the record that the proposal would generate any odors or create any other harmful or unhealthy
19 conditions, given the findings of Finding of Fact No. 5 that the proposal will not create any
significant adverse impacts.

20 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(1)(i):** *Availability of public services and facilities to accommodate the proposed
use; and*

21 15. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 4, as conditioned the proposal is served by adequate
22 public services and facilities.

23 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(1)(j):** *Prevention of neighborhood deterioration and blight.*

24 16. As is evident from the building elevations, Ex. 6, the applicant proposes a high quality office
25 park development that involves a substantial financial investment. There is nothing in the record to
26 suggest that the project could contribute to or harbor any neighborhood deterioration or blight.

1
2 **Modifications**

3 **RMC 4-9-250(D)(2):** *Whenever there are practical difficulties involved in carrying out the*
4 *provisions of this Title, the Department Administrator may grant modifications for individual cases*
5 *provided he/she shall first find that a specific reason makes the strict letter of this Code*
6 *impractical, that the intent and purpose of the governing land use designation of the*
7 *Comprehensive Plan is met and that the modification is in conformity with the intent and purpose*
8 *of this Code, and that such modification:*

- 9 *a. Will meet the objectives and safety, function, appearance, environmental protection and*
10 *maintainability intended by the Code requirements, based upon sound engineering judgment;*
11 *b. Will not be injurious to other property(ies) in the vicinity;*
12 *c. Conforms to the intent and purpose of the Code;*
13 *d. Can be shown to be justified and required for the use and situation intended; and*
14 *e. Will not create adverse impacts to other property(ies) in the vicinity.*

15 13. The criteria above are met for the requested modification identified in Finding of Fact No. 3
16 for the reasons identified at pages 23-25 of the staff report.

17 **DECISION**

18 The site plan and street standard modification identified in Finding of Fact No. 3 are approved,
19 subject to the following conditions:

- 20 1. The applicant shall comply with the one (1) mitigation measure issued as part of the
21 Determination of Nonsignificance-Mitigated (DNS-M), published on September 25, 2015.
22 2. The applicant shall maintain the proposed 32-foot wide private access roadway width as
23 provided for in the approved binding site plan, as follows and showing in Exhibit 32:
24 a. Along the main entrance from Oakesdale Ave SW to the first drive isle located
25 immediately east of Building D (approximately 391 feet). This east/west connection
26 shall include two 12-foot travel lanes with a center 8-foot wide raised planter island.
The center planter island may include breaks to allow for vehicular circulation.
b. Along the north/south driveway isle located immediately east of Building D
(approximately 380 feet). This driveway isle shall provide a direct connection to the
north and south property lines. The walking trail, landscaping and parking shall be
revised to allow future road connections for site-to-site vehicle access ways to allow a
smooth flow of traffic across abutting CO lots (or to Lots 18 & 20) without the need to
use a public street.

1 c. Along the east/west driveway isle located immediately south of Building C, west of
2 Naches Ave SW (approximately 212 feet).

3 d. Along the north/south driveway isle located immediately west of Building C
4 (approximately 300 feet). This driveway isle shall provide a direct connection to the
5 north property line. The walking trail and landscaping shall be revised to allow future
6 road connections for site-to-site vehicle access ways to allow a smooth flow of traffic
7 across abutting CO lots (or to Lot 8) without the need to use a public street. A final
8 site plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager
9 prior to building permit approval.

10 3. The applicant shall be required to submit a detailed landscape plan that complies with RMC
11 4-8-120 to the Current Planning Project Manager prior to construction permit approval.

12 4. The applicant shall be required to add a minimum of 40 bicycle parking spaces onsite.
13 Bicycle parking shall be provided for secure extended use and shall protect the entire bicycle
14 and its components and accessories from theft and weather. A final bicycle parking analysis
15 and bicycle parking plan shall be submitted to, and approved by, the Current Planning Project
16 Manager prior to building permit approval.

17 5. The applicant shall be required to submit a conceptual sign package which indicates the
18 approximate location and size of all exterior building signage. Proposed signage shall be
19 compatible with the building's architecture and exterior finishes. Signage shall comply with
20 RMC 4-9-200(F)(4). The conceptual sign package shall be submitted to, and approved by,
21 the Current Planning Project Manager prior to building permit approval.

22 6. The applicant shall be required to obtain and record the actual elevation (in relation to mean
23 sea level) of the lowest floor for the new structure. A flood elevation certificate shall be
24 submitted by the applicant to the Current Planning Project Manager prior to the building's
25 finished floor construction. The finished floor elevation would be required to be verified by a
26 preconstruction elevation certificate at the time of construction of a substantial structural
element of the finished floor (i.e., foundation form for the concrete floor). An as-built
elevation certificate would be required to be provided prior to issuance of final occupancy.

7. The applicant shall be required to submit a biological assessment or BA, as required by the
National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The applicant shall be required to comply with
any unanticipated mitigation recommendations from the assessment. The BA shall be
submitted to the Current Planning Project Manager prior to construction permit approval.

8. The applicant shall provide a lighting plan which will adequately provide for public safety
without casting excessive glare on adjacent properties at the time of building permit. The plan
shall indicate the location of exterior/ornamental lighting to be attached to the building, and
any surface parking lighting, including specifications of the light fixtures. In the plan the
applicant should take measures to provide ornamental lighting within the vicinity of the
entrances and along the north elevations in order to adequately illuminate the area for

1 pedestrians and bicyclists. The lighting plan shall be submitted to, and approved by, the
2 Current Planning Project Manager prior to building permit approval.

3 9. The applicant shall complete a lot combination or a lot line adjustment prior to building
4 permit approval. A cross access agreement and/or a shared parking agreement shall be
5 completed if the development is divided into two or more separate lots. If a cross access
6 and/or parking agreement is proposed, the document shall be reviewed and approved
7 concurrently with the two lot combination and approved by the Current Planning Project
8 Manager. The agreement shall be recorded concurrently with the lot combination.

9 10. The applicant shall provide direct pedestrian connections from Building D to the proposed
10 perimeter walking trail. In addition, the applicant shall provide a 5-foot wide paved walking
11 trail from Oakesdale Ave SW to Building D. Final approval of materials and/or patterns shall
12 be reviewed by the Current Planning Project Manager prior to building permit approval.

13 11. The applicant shall complete the on-site 12-inch water main loop around Buildings C & D by
14 connecting the water main to the existing onsite 12-inch water main and extending the south
15 portion of the 12-inch looped water main to the intersection of Naches Ave SW and SW 27th
16 St. This 12-inch water main extension shall be installed prior to final building occupancy of
17 Longacres Business Center Phase I.

18 12. The applicant shall amend the Boeing Longacres Property Second Amended Binding Site
19 Plan (*Exhibit 3*) to reflect the approved Longacres Business Center Phase II Site Plan. The
20 applicant shall submit a timeline by which the reconfiguration of the lots and transportation
21 system will be amended and the next amendment to the binding site plan shall be approved by
22 the City of Renton and recorded prior to building permit issuance.

23 13. The applicant shall separate proposed loading and delivery areas (if any) from parking and
24 pedestrian areas as required by RMC 4-9-200(F)(3)(g) to the extent feasible and consistent
25 with site constraints. All modifications necessary to accommodate the required separation
26 shall be submitted to, and approved by, the Current Planning Project Manager prior to
building permit approval.

1 14. The refuse and recycling area shall be screened from view as required by RMC 4-9-
2 200(F)(1)(g).

3 DATED this 10th day of November, 2015.

4
5 
6 Phil A. Olbrechts

7 City of Renton Hearing Examiner

8
9 **Appeal Right and Valuation Notices**

10 RMC 4-8-080 provides that the final decision of the hearing examiner is subject to appeal to the
11 Renton City Council. RMC 4-8-110(E)(14) requires appeals of the hearing examiner's decision
12 to be filed within fourteen (14) calendar days from the date of the hearing examiner's decision.
13 A request for reconsideration to the hearing examiner may also be filed within this 14 day appeal
14 period as identified in RMC 4-8-110(E)(13) and RMC 4-8-100(G)(9). A new fourteen (14) day
15 appeal period shall commence upon the issuance of the reconsideration. Additional information
16 regarding the appeal process may be obtained from the City Clerk's Office, Renton City Hall –
17 7th floor, (425) 430-6510.

18 Affected property owners may request a change in valuation for property tax purposes
19 notwithstanding any program of revaluation.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26