

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: Mission Healthcare)
Conditional Use and Site Plan) FINAL DECISION
LUA15-000736, ECF, SA-H, CU-A)
)
)
)
)

Summary

The applicant has applied for a conditional use permit and site plan approval for the construction of a new 55,400 square foot, three story convalescent center containing 60 beds to be used for short term rehabilitation services to be located at the southeast corner of SE 174th St and 106th Place SE. The site plan and conditional use permit applications are approved subject to conditions.

Testimony

Rocale Timmons, senior planner for City of Renton, summarized the proposal.
Laura Bartenhagen, project engineer, noted that the applicant is limited to eight foot retaining walls while the adjoining McDonalds has much taller retaining walls. The applicant is proposing thirteen foot retaining walls.
Ms. Timmons noted that retaining walls are necessary for the project because there's a grade change of 30 feet from east to west. There is a very large 20-25 foot retaining wall along Benson as asserted by the applicant. Since the construction of that retaining wall, the City has adopted standards limiting

1 retaining wall height to eight feet. Staff is recommending that the applicant comply with the eight foot
2 standard. The standard can be met by terracing in this case.

3 **Exhibits**

4 The December 8, 2015 Staff Report Exhibits 1-16 identified at Page 2 of the staff report were
5 admitted into the record during the hearing. .

6 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

7 **Procedural:**

8 1. Applicant. Careage Inc..

9 2. Hearing. A hearing was held on the application on December 8, 2015 at 11:00 am in the City
10 of Renton Council Chambers.

11 3. Project Description. The applicant has applied for a conditional use permit and site plan
12 approval for the construction of a new 55,400 square foot, three story convalescent center containing
13 60 beds to be used for short term rehabilitation services to be located at the southeast corner of SE
14 174th St and 106th Place SE. The site currently contains an espresso stand which is proposed for
15 removal. Access is proposed via 106th Pl SE with an additional connection to the neighboring
16 commercial property to the east. The proposal includes 56 surface parking stalls to the south
and east of the building. The proposed development is within 50 feet of a coal mine hazard.
The project site is 76,615 square feet in area.

17 The existing site is relatively flat with a slope from the east to the west sides of the project site. The
18 pervious portion of the parcel is generally pasture with an existing coffee stand and access road. The
19 topography of the site slopes from approximately 380 feet on the east side of the property to
20 approximately 350 feet on the west side of the site. The steepest slope on the site is approximately
21 10% along the eastern half of the property. The applicant is proposing several retaining walls ranging
22 in height from 2 to 13 feet in order to support grade changes on the east and west sides of the building
23 primarily for parking. RMC 4-4-040(E)(1) limits the maximum height of retaining walls to 8-feet. At
24 the hearing, the applicant argued for retaining wall heights that exceed 8 feet on the basis that an
25 adjoining property has higher retaining walls. However, RMC 4-4-040(E)(1) was adopted in early
26 2015 and there was no 8 foot height limit in place when the retaining wall on the adjoining property
was constructed. The examiner has no authority to waive the requirements of RMC 4-4-040(E)(1)
absent the application for a variance. Therefore, as recommended by staff, a condition of approval
requires the applicant to revise the site and grading plans in order to comply with the maximum
retaining wall heights.

1 4. Adequacy of Infrastructure/Public Services. The project will be served by adequate
2 infrastructure and public services as follows:

3 A. Water and Sewer Service. Water and sewer service will be provided by Soos Creek
4 Water and Sewer District. Sewer and water certificates of availability will be
5 required prior to the issuance of any construction permits.

6 B. Fire and Police. The City of Renton will provide fire and police service. Fire and police
7 department staff have determined that existing facilities are adequate to serve the
8 development as conditioned with the payment of fire impact fees.

9 C. Drainage. Public works staff have determined that the preliminary design and technical
10 drainage review submitted by the applicant is consistent with adopted city standards. The
11 drainage review is entitled "Technical Information Report," ("TIR") prepared by ESM
12 Civil, dated October 7, 2015 (Exhibit 6). The project is required to comply with the
13 2009 King County Surface Water Manual and the City of Renton Amendments to the
14 KCSWM, Chapter 1 and 2. Stormwater detention and water quality treatment would
15 be provided within a combined detention/water quality vault under the parking lot
16 located in the southwest corner of the site. The combined detention/water quality
17 vault would discharge west to the existing stormwater conveyance system in the
18 intersection of SE 174th Street and 106th Place SE in the project's northwest corner
19 frontage. The stormwater drainage conveyance system will be sized as part of the
20 final TIR to convey the 25 year design storm event and to contain the 100 year
21 design storm event. The approximate vault footprint is 40 feet wide by 125 feet long.
22 Additional water quality treatment would be provided by modular
23 wetlands/stormwater biofiltration systems for any flow that bypasses the primary
24 water quality vault.

25 D. Parks/Open Space. As conditioned, the proposal complies with applicable open space
26 requirements and is therefore considered to provide for adequate open space. The project
site is located within Design District "D" and is therefore subject to the District "D" open
space requirements of RMC 4-3-100(E). As discussed in the staff report, those standards
require a total amount of open space of at least 1% of the site area and 1% of building
area. The combined site and building area for the proposal is 132,015 square feet, which
results in a minimum open space requirement of 1,320 square feet. The proposed
development includes approximately 1,575 square feet of pedestrian-oriented
exterior recreation areas and common open space within the courtyard for resident
use and approximately 1,000 square feet of landscaped common open space along
the pedestrian approaches to the building entrances. These recreation and common
open spaces are proposed to be provided with concrete paths, path lighting and
seating areas.

1 In terms of serving as distinctive project focal points and providing for adequate areas for
2 passive and active recreation by the occupants/users of the site, the applicant needs to
3 provide additional information. The primary southern entrance would be sheltered by a
4 connector canopy to a covered vehicle drop-off for use by the skilled nursing residents and
5 their families. The elevations submitted by the applicant do not include details for the
6 urban amenities such as seating areas, lighting fixtures, public art, or vertical landscaping.
7 While the plans do indicate color stamped concrete in this area, additional details are
8 needed to ensure the proposal establishes a quality pedestrian experience along the street
9 and at the entrances for the building. Therefore, as recommended by staff, a condition of
10 approval requires the applicant to submit a detailed common open space/plaza plan which
11 includes specifications for pedestrian amenities that add to the pedestrian experience and
12 the human scale intended for the development.

13 Any applicable park impact fees would be assessed during building permit review.
14 Compliance with the City's park impact fee ordinance sets the standard for adequate
15 provision for parks.

- 16 E. Transportation. Public works staff have determined that the preliminary design for traffic
17 circulation and improvements satisfies applicable city standards. The applicant
18 submitted a Traffic Impact Analysis ("TIA") prepared by Concord Engineering, dated
19 October 21, 2015 (Exhibit 8). The provided TIA was found by staff to meet the intent
20 of the TIA guidelines and is generally acceptable for preliminary review with
21 recommendations for minor revisions which are not anticipated to change the
22 likelihood of significant adverse impacts. It is anticipated that the proposed
23 development would generate approximately 422 average daily trips with 31 AM
24 peak-hour trips and 41 PM peak-hour trips. The TIA established to the satisfaction of
25 staff that the level of service of potentially affected intersections will not be lowered
26 as a result of the project. Access is proposed via 106th Place SE with an additional
connection to the neighboring commercial property to the east. The project will
utilize the three existing driveways as access points to the surrounding street
network. No additional access points are proposed as a part of the project.

As conditioned, public works staff have also determined that the proposal promotes
safe and efficient pedestrian and vehicular circulation through the shared access
points and also provides desirable transitions and linkages between uses, streets,
walkways and adjacent properties. The proposed pedestrian circulation system
helps to promote a walkable, pedestrian oriented, community and would provide
eventual linkages to SE Carr Rd and 108th Ave SE. Existing vehicular connections to
abutting uses are established. However, it appears the site plan does not provide
code required connections to neighboring properties (specifically to the east) or to
the sidewalk proposed along SE 174th St. As recommended by staff, a condition of
approval requires the applicant to provide additional pedestrian connections to the
circulation system.

1 F. Schools. As a senior care facility, it is not anticipated that the proposal will create any
2 increased demand for school services or facilities.

3 G. Refuse and Recycling. RMC 4-4-090 sets the standard for adequate refuse and recycling
4 facilities. Under this standard, a minimum of 2 square feet per 1,000 square feet of
5 building gross floor area is required for recyclable deposit areas and a minimum of 4
6 square feet per 1,000 square feet of building gross floor area is required for refuse
7 deposit areas for a total of 324 feet for the project. The applicant is proposing to
8 locate the refuse and recycle utility along the southern façade of the structure with
9 an area totaling 388 square feet, which complies with the requirements of the code.
10 However, the proposed elevations do not specify the proposed materials for the
11 refuse and recycle enclosure. Therefore as recommended by staff a condition of
12 approval requires the applicant to submit revised elevations notating proposed
13 materials for the refuse and recycle enclosure. The enclosure shall be made of
14 masonry, ornamental metal or wood and shall be compatible the primary materials
15 of the structure.

16 H. Parking. The City's parking standards set the standard for adequacy of parking. As noted
17 at p. 7 of the staff report, RMC 4-4-080 requires a minimum of 56 parking spaces for the
18 proposal. The proposal includes 56 parking spaces as required.

19 Per RMC 4-4-080F.11 the number of bicycle parking spaces shall be 10% of the
20 number of required off-street parking spaces. Based on the proposal which requires
21 a minimum 56 vehicle parking stalls, 6 bicycle parking stalls are required to be
22 provided. The applicant is proposing bicycle rack, with 6 bicycle parking stalls, near
23 the service/staff entrance.

24 5. Adverse Impacts. There are no significant adverse impacts associated with the proposal.
25 Adequate infrastructure serves the site as determined in Finding of Fact No. 4. Impacts are more
26 specifically addressed as follows:

27 A. Aesthetics. According to the staff report, the proposal will not adversely affect view
28 corridors to shorelines and Mount Rainer. As noted previously, the project is subject to
29 Design District "D" design guidelines, which provide detailed standards as to project
30 design, including building materials, site configuration and transitions to adjoining uses.
31 As detailed in the staff report, with recommended conditions adopted into this decision
32 staff have found the proposal to be consistent with these design guidelines. Similarly, the
33 staff report also finds consistency with the City's landscaping standards. Since the
34 proposal will not adversely affect view corridors and is consistent with the City's detailed
35 design and landscaping standards, it is determined that the proposal will not create any
36 significant aesthetic impacts.

Roof-mounted mechanical equipment is located behind pitched mansard roof forms in
order to prevent visibility from the street. The applicant did not provide details for surface

1 equipment and/or screening identified for such equipment. As such, as recommended by
2 staff, a condition of approval requires the applicant to provide a detailed screening plan
3 identifying the location and screening provided for surface and roof mounted equipment.

4 The staff report does not identify whether loading areas will be located at the facility and it
5 is unclear whether any are proposed. The conditions of approval will require that loading
6 areas be located, designed and screened to minimize views from surrounding properties.

7 B. Compatibility. The proposed use is compatible with the scale and character of the
8 neighborhood. Surrounding uses are composed of a storage and dental office, a
9 McDonald's, a chiropractor office and multi-family housing. The proposed use is of
10 less intensity than these uses and will not involve any buildings that are significantly
11 out of scale with these uses.

12 C. Light and glare. The application narrative indicates that building lighting will be utilized
13 to complement the architecture of the building and to provide for safe vehicular and
14 pedestrian circulation. Light and glare from the site would primarily consist of street
15 lighting, security lighting, exterior lighting and headlights from vehicles entering or
16 leaving the site. However, a lighting plan was not provided with the application. The
17 conditions of approval require a lighting plan that demonstrates compliance with City
18 lighting standards, which include avoiding unnecessary light spillage onto adjoining
19 properties.

20 D. Noise. The City's noise regulations, Chapter 8-7 RMC, sets the legislative standard for
21 noise impacts and will adequately regulate noise when construction is completed. It is
22 anticipated that most of the noise impacts would occur during the construction
23 phase of the project. The applicant has submitted a Construction Mitigation Plan
24 that provides measures to reduce construction impacts such as noise, control of dust,
25 traffic controls, etc. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the
26 City's noise ordinance regarding construction hours. Incidental noise may be
generated by ambulances arriving and departing, and deliveries, when the
trucks'/vans' backup signals sound. However, the drop off/pick-up area has been
located on the structures southern façade, which is located approximately 250 feet
from the neighboring multi-family units.

E. Critical Areas and Natural Features. The proposed development is within 50 feet of a coal
mine hazard. There are no other critical areas located on site. According to a Coal Mine
Hazard Study submitted by the applicant, prepared by Golder Associates, dated
February 24, 2015, the subject site is located in a medium coal mine hazard zone as
defined by RMC 4-3-050 (Exhibit 7). Medium coal mine hazards are defined as areas
where mining workings are deeper than two-hundred feet for steeply dipping seams,
or deeper than 15 times the thickness of the seam or workings for gently dipping
seams. The site is not underlain by any mapped or known coal mine workings.
However, due to the proximity of the adjacent coal seam, development on the site

1 may potentially be affected by mining related subsidence. Given the age of the mine
2 workings and other factors it is likely that any subsidence that occurred as a result of
3 the abandoned mines would have already occurred and a low risk of regional or
4 trough subsidence exists on the site. The report however recommends potential
5 measures in order to mitigate the low risk, which include: the avoidance of
6 settlement of sensitive exterior building finishes (stucco); the increase of the fall of
7 gravity utilities; and the increase of stiffness of foundation element. Therefore, the
8 Environmental Review Committee (“ERC”) imposed a mitigation measure requiring a
9 narrative within the final geotechnical report, discussing any measures employed in
10 the final site/building design which serve to mitigate the low coal mine subsidence
11 risk. If no measures are employed, the applicant shall provide justification for the
12 exclusion of additional measures.
13 As mitigated by the ERC, it is determined that potential coal mine hazards are
14 sufficiently addressed to avoid significant adverse impacts.

15 **Conclusions of Law**

16 1. Authority. RMC 4-9-200(B)(2) requires site plan review for all development in the CA zone.
17 RMC 4-9-200(D)(b) requires site plan review by the hearing examiner for this project because it
18 involves over 25,000 square feet of building area in the CA zone. RMC 4-2-060 provides that
19 convalescent centers may be authorized in CA zones by administrative conditional use permit. RMC
20 4-3-100 grants approval authority for design review to staff unless hearing examiner review is
21 required. All three of the aforementioned permits/approvals have been consolidated. RMC 4-8-
22 080(C)(2) requires consolidated permits to each be processed under “the highest-number procedure”.
23 Site Plan Review (Hearing Examiner) is a Type III permit (RMC 4-8-080(G)) with approval authority
24 granted to the Hearing Examiner. The site plan Type III review is the “highest-number procedure”
25 and therefore must be employed for the design review, conditional use and site plan approval.

26 2. Zoning/Comprehensive Plan Designations. The subject property is within the Commercial
Mixed Use (CMU) Comprehensive Plan land use designation, the CA zoning classification, and
Design District ‘A’.

3. Review Criteria. Conditional use criteria are governed by RMC 4-9-030(D) and site plan
review standards are governed by RMC 4-9-200(E)(3). Applicable standards are quoted below in
italics and applied through corresponding conclusions of law. Design D review criteria are addressed
through the conditional use and site plan criteria requiring compliance with City development
standards

4 **Conditional Use**

*The Administrator or designee or the Hearing Examiner shall consider, as applicable, the following
factors for all applications:*

1 **RMC 4-9-030(C)(1): *Consistency with Plans and Regulations:*** *The proposed use shall be*
2 *compatible with the general goals, objectives, policies and standards of the Comprehensive Plan, the*
3 *zoning regulations and any other plans, programs, maps or ordinances of the City of Renton.*

4 4. As conditioned, the proposal is consistent with all applicable comprehensive plan policies and
5 development and design standards as outlined in Findings of Fact No. 17,18, 19 and 22 of the staff
6 report, adopted by this reference as if set forth in full. As noted in Finding of Fact No. 3 of this
7 decision, the applicant proposes a 13 foot high retaining wall, which is not compliant with the eight
8 foot retaining wall height limit of RMC 4-4-040(E)(1). The conditions of approval require the
9 applicant to revise its proposal in order to conform to RMC 4-4-040(E)(1).

10 **RMC 4-9-030(C)(2): *Appropriate Location:*** *The proposed location shall not result in the*
11 *detrimental overconcentration of a particular use within the City or within the immediate area of the*
12 *proposed use. The proposed location shall be suited for the proposed use.*

13 5. Staff noted in the staff report that the proposed location would not result in the
14 overconcentration of convalescent services in the project area and there is nothing in the record to
15 suggest anything to the contrary.

16 **RMC 4-9-030(C)(3): *Effect on Adjacent Properties:*** *The proposed use at the proposed location*
17 *shall not result in substantial or undue adverse effects on adjacent property.*

18 6. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 5, as conditioned, there are no adverse impacts
19 associated with the proposal, so it will not result in substantial or undue adverse effects on adjacent
20 property.

21 **RMC 4-9-030(C)(4): *Compatibility:*** *The proposed use shall be compatible with the scale and*
22 *character of the neighborhood.*

23 7. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 5, the proposed use is compatible with the scale and
24 character of the neighborhood.

25 **RMC 4-9-030(C)(5): *Parking:*** *Adequate parking is, or will be made, available.*

26 8. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 4(H), the proposal includes parking that is consistent
with applicable parking standards, which sets a legislative standard for adequate parking.

RMC 4-9-030(C)(6): *Traffic:* *The use shall ensure safe movement for vehicles and pedestrians and*
shall mitigate potential effects on the surrounding area.

9. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 4(E), the proposed pedestrian and vehicular circulation
improvements provide for safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation. As further detailed
in Finding No. 4(E), the proposal will not lower level of service below adopted levels, so no adverse
circulation impacts to the surrounding area are anticipated.

1 **RMC 4-9-030(C)(7): Noise, Light and Glare:** *Potential noise, light and glare impacts from the*
2 *proposed use shall be evaluated and mitigated.*

3 10. As conditioned, as determined in Finding of Fact No. 5, the proposal will not result in any
4 adverse light, noise or glare impacts.

5 **RMC 4-9-030(C)(8): Landscaping:** *Landscaping shall be provided in all areas not occupied by*
6 *buildings, paving, or critical areas. Additional landscaping may be required to buffer adjacent*
7 *properties from potentially adverse effects of the proposed use.*

8 11. As shown in the site plans for the proposal, Ex. 1-3, all undeveloped portions of the site are
9 landscaped. Further, as shown in Ex. 1-3 the proposal incorporates significant perimeter landscaping
10 in order to buffer adjacent properties. The criterion is met.

11 **Site Plan**

12 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(3): Criteria:** *The Administrator or designee must find a proposed project to be in*
13 *compliance with the following:*

14 **a. Compliance and Consistency:** *Conformance with plans, policies, regulations and approvals,*
15 *including:*

16 **i. Comprehensive Plan:** *The Comprehensive Plan, its elements, goals, objectives, and*
17 *policies, especially those of the applicable land use designation; the Community Design*
18 *Element; and any applicable adopted Neighborhood Plan;*

19 **ii. Applicable land use regulations;**

20 **iii. Relevant Planned Action Ordinance and Development Agreements; and**

21 **iv. Design Regulations:** *Intent and guidelines of the design regulations located in RMC 4-*
22 *3-100.*

23 12. As concluded in Conclusion of Law No. 4 and as conditioned, the proposal is consistent with
24 the City's comprehensive plan, development regulations and design standards.

25 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(3)(b): Off-Site Impacts:** *Mitigation of impacts to surrounding properties and*
26 *uses, including:*

i. Structures: *Restricting overscale structures and overconcentration of development on a*
particular portion of the site;

ii. Circulation: *Providing desirable transitions and linkages between uses, streets,*
walkways and adjacent properties;

1 **iii. Loading and Storage Areas:** *Locating, designing and screening storage areas,*
2 *utilities, rooftop equipment, loading areas, and refuse and recyclables to minimize views*
3 *from surrounding properties;*

4 **iv. Views:** *Recognizing the public benefit and desirability of maintaining visual*
5 *accessibility to attractive natural features;*

6 **v. Landscaping:** *Using landscaping to provide transitions between development and*
7 *surrounding properties to reduce noise and glare, maintain privacy, and generally*
8 *enhance the appearance of the project; and*

9 **vi. Lighting:** *Designing and/or placing exterior lighting and glazing in order to avoid*
10 *excessive brightness or glare to adjacent properties and streets.*

11 13. As conditioned, the criteria quoted above are met. While the proposed structure is
12 concentrated in one area, the northwest portion of the site, the scale and bulk of the structure is
13 intended to articulate at varying widths and depths. The applicant is also proposing canopies,
14 enhanced landscaping and street furniture which enhance the pedestrian experience. While the
15 applicant has incorporated design elements to reduce the apparent bulk of the building, additional
16 elements should be incorporated into the design in order to break the monotony of the street facing
17 façades and comply with the intent of this standard. Therefore, as recommended by staff a condition
18 of design approval requires the applicant to submit revised elevations depicting additional design
19 elements.

20 As determined in Finding of Fact No. 4(E), the proposal provides for desirable transitions and
21 linkages between uses, streets, walkways and adjacent properties.

22 As determined in Findings of Fact No. 4 and 5, proper screening and/or design location will be
23 implemented to conceal refuse and recyclable areas and equipment. It is unclear if loading areas are
24 proposed or what will be done to conceal them from view, so the conditions of approval will require
25 the issue to be addressed during construction review.

26 As determined in Finding of Fact No. 5, the proposal will not adversely impact any views of
27 significant natural features.

28 As determined in Finding of Fact No. 5(A), the City's landscaping standards assure that the proposal
29 will minimize the aesthetic impacts of the project, which includes providing transitions between
30 development and surrounding properties to reduce light and glare, maintain privacy, and generally
31 enhance the appearance of the project. The proposal is also of a type to not create any significant
32 noise impacts and any such impacts will be adequately mitigated by the City's noise regulations as
33 determined in Finding of Fact No. 5. Lighting impacts are also addressed by the conditions of
34 approval to ensure no significant adverse light impacts.

1 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(3)(c): On-Site Impacts: Mitigation of impacts to the site, including:**

2 *i. **Structure Placement:** Provisions for privacy and noise reduction by building placement,*
3 *spacing and orientation;*

4 *ii. **Structure Scale:** Consideration of the scale of proposed structures in relation to natural*
5 *characteristics, views and vistas, site amenities, sunlight, prevailing winds, and pedestrian*
6 *and vehicle needs;*

7 *iii. **Natural Features:** Protection of the natural landscape by retaining existing vegetation*
8 *and soils, using topography to reduce undue cutting and filling, and limiting impervious*
9 *surfaces; and*

10 *iv. **Landscaping:** Use of landscaping to soften the appearance of parking areas, to provide*
11 *shade and privacy where needed, to define and enhance open spaces, and generally to*
12 *enhance the appearance of the project. Landscaping also includes the design and*
13 *protection of planting areas so that they are less susceptible to damage from vehicles or*
14 *pedestrian movements.*

15 14. The criterion quoted above are met. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 5, the proposal has
16 been well designed to provide for privacy and noise reduction. There is nothing in the record to
17 reasonably suggest that the scale, spacing and orientation of the project could be modified to
18 provide for more privacy and noise reduction without unreasonably interfering with the utility of the
19 project. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 5, the proposal does not create any adverse aesthetic
20 impacts and is fully compatible with adjoining uses. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 4, the
21 proposal provides for safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation and is well integrated
22 into adjoining vehicular and pedestrian improvements, thus providing for a well-integrated project
23 scale and design with vehicular and pedestrian needs. As further determined in Finding of Fact No.
24 5, as conditioned, the landscaping for the proposal provides for better aesthetics and helps define
25 parking areas and open spaces. There is nothing in the record to reasonably suggest that the scale of
26 the project is incompatible with sunlight, prevailing winds or natural characteristics.

20 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(3)(d): Access and Circulation: Safe and efficient access and circulation for all**
21 **users, including:**

22 *i. **Location and Consolidation:** Providing access points on side streets or frontage streets*
23 *rather than directly onto arterial streets and consolidation of ingress and egress points on*
24 *the site and, when feasible, with adjacent properties;*

25 *ii. **Internal Circulation:** Promoting safety and efficiency of the internal circulation system,*
26 *including the location, design and dimensions of vehicular and pedestrian access points,*
drives, parking, turnarounds, walkways, bikeways, and emergency access ways;

*iii. **Loading and Delivery:** Separating loading and delivery areas from parking and*
pedestrian areas;

1 As conditioned below, the site plan and conditional use permit applications as depicted in Exhibit 2
2 satisfy all applicable permitting criteria for the reasons identified in the findings and conclusions of
3 this decision. The site plan and conditional use permit are subject to the following conditions:

- 4 1. The applicant shall comply with the mitigation measures issued as part of the
5 Determination of Non-Significance Mitigated, dated November 2, 2015.
- 6 2. The applicant shall revise the landscape plan to include additional interior parking lot
7 landscaping to break continuous parking aisles and reflect compliance with the retaining
8 wall requirements of the code. The revised landscape plan shall be submitted to, and
9 approved by, the Current Planning Project Manager prior to construction permit approval.
- 10 3. The applicant shall provide a detailed screening plan identifying the location and
11 screening provided for surface and roof mounted equipment. The screening plan shall be
12 submitted to, and approved by, the Current Planning Project Manager prior to building
13 permit approval.
- 14 4. The applicant shall be required to revise the site and grading plans in order to comply
15 with the maximum retaining wall heights. The revised site and grading plans shall be
16 submitted to, and approved by, the Current Planning Project Manager prior to building
17 permit approval.
- 18 5. The applicant shall submit a detailed common open space/plaza plan which includes
19 specifications for pedestrian amenities that add to the pedestrian experience and the
20 human scale intended for the development. The plan shall be submitted to, and approved
21 by, the Current Planning Project Manager prior to building permit approval.
- 22 6. The applicant shall submit revised elevations notating proposed materials for the refuse
23 and recycle enclosure. The enclosure shall be made of masonry, ornamental metal or
24 wood and shall be compatible the primary materials of the structure. The revised
25 elevations shall be submitted to, and approved by, the Current Planning Project Manager
26 prior to building permit approval.
7. The applicant shall submit a revised site plan connecting the interior pedestrian network
to SE 174th St sidewalk. The revised site plan shall be submitted to, and approved by, the
Current Planning Project Manager prior to construction permit approval.
8. The applicant shall revise the site plan to depict a differentiation in materials for all
pedestrian connections within parking areas and/or drive aisles on site. The revised site
plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager prior to
building permit approval.
9. The applicant shall submit revised elevations depicting added architectural detailing
elements including lighting fixtures, contrasting materials, or special detailing along the
northern and western facades (amenities such as outdoor group seating, benches, transit
shelters, fountains, or public art shall be provided). The revised elevations shall be
submitted to and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager prior to building
permit approval.

- 1 10. The applicant shall submit a materials board subject to the approval of the Current
2 Planning Project Manager prior to building permit approval. Acceptable materials
3 include a combination of brick, integrally colored concrete masonry, pre-finished metal,
4 stone, steel, glass, cast-in-place concrete, or other high quality material.
- 5 11. The applicant shall be required to submit a conceptual sign package which indicates the
6 approximate location of all exterior building signage. Proposed signage shall be
7 compatible with the building's architecture and exterior finishes and contributes to the
8 character of the development. The conceptual sign package shall be submitted to, and
9 approved by, the Current Planning Project Manager prior to sign permit approval.
- 10 12. The applicant shall provide a lighting plan that adequately provides for public safety
11 without casting excessive glare on adjacent properties; at the time of building permit
12 review.
- 13 13. All proposed loading areas shall be separated from parking and pedestrian areas and shall
14 be located, designed and screened to minimize views from surrounding properties.

15 DATED this 22nd day of December, 2015.

16 
17 Phil A. Olbrechts

18 City of Renton Hearing Examiner

19 **Appeal Right and Valuation Notices**

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

Affected property owners may request a change in valuation for property tax purposes
notwithstanding any program of revaluation.