

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: Renton Technical College)
Site Plan and Modifications) FINAL DECISION
LUA14-000997)

Summary

The applicant requests site plan approval and approval of three development standard modifications for the renovation of the Renton Technical College Automotive Complex. Three buildings would be renovated and one building replaced. The applicant also requests three modifications for parking stalls, street frontage improvements on Kirkland Ave NE, and refuse and recycling areas. The street frontage and refuse and recycling area modifications are approved and the site plan is approved with conditions. The parking stall modification is sent back to staff for review since there is insufficient information in the record to evaluate that request.

Testimony

Kris Sorensen, associate planner, stated that the application is to renovate the Renton Technical College’s Automotive Complex. The site is located In the Highlands Community area. The land use designation is Light Industrial IL, and the site is within the commercial corridor. The campus is made up of four parcels for a total of approximately 30 acres. There are four buildings which compromise the K complex, and the complex is approximately 3.5 acres. Three of these building would be renovated and one building, K3, would be demolished. A new 17,600sqft building will be constructed. There are mature vegetated areas on the K complex site, and the applicant proposes to keep 53 trees. The applicant is requesting three modifications. These modifications are for the refuse and recycling

1 area, the number of parking stalls, and street improvements along Kirkland Avenue. No public or
2 agency comments were received for the project. The environmental committee issued a determination
3 of non-significance mitigated with three mitigation measures. The appeal period commenced on
4 August 29th and ended on September 12th. No appeals were filed. Additional landscaping will be
5 added around the border of the site. There will also be more pedestrian walkways. There will be seven
6 trees removed around K3 when it is demolished. The parking stalls will be reconfigured, but the
7 number will remain at eight. The new K3 building will be one story. The garage area would have
8 glazed doors and meets LED standards. The height of the tallest point of the new building would be
9 29ft.

10 According to Mr. Sorensen, the proposal complies with Renton's Comprehensive Plan if all conditions
11 are met. It also meets the zoning development standards of the light industrial zone. In regard to
12 critical areas, there are some steep slopes where the drive aisle enters the K-complex. The proposal is
13 compliant with all critical area regulations if all conditions are met. Additionally, the plan meets the
14 standards for site plan review set out in RMC 4-7-200. For the refuse and recycling area modification,
15 the applicant is requesting a reduction to 210sqft based on historic need. For the parking stall
16 modification, the applicant provided the number of new stalls based on new traffic and trips; however,
17 Renton bases parking stalls on the number of new employees and students. Staff needs more
18 information to answer the parking stall modification request. For the street frontage improvement
19 request, the applicant proposes not to provide additional right-of-way or landscape planters on
20 Kirkland. There are existing improvements including plantings and sidewalks along Kirkland, thus
21 staff supports this modification request. In regard to public services, the required services have all
22 indicated sufficient resources exist to furnish services to the project if fees are provided. A drainage
23 plan in compliance with the King County 2009 Stormwater Manual was submitted as part of the
24 proposal. Staff recommends approval of the application subject to five conditions.

25 Barry Baker, Director of Planned Operations for Renton Technical College, testified that the project is
26 an opportunity to update a 20-year-old facility. The renovations will create more service area for
hands-on learning. In regard to parking, the College is in the process of redeveloping and creating a
Master Plan. Part of this Plan includes a review of parking and traffic issues. The College is in the
early stages of a project which will create 20-30 new parking stalls near the K-complex. Additionally,
City of Renton Transportation recently created 57 new parking spaces on Monroe near the College.
There are plans for nine more spaces to be added on Monroe.

Matt Lane, architect, stated that his firm plans to relay the comments from the city about parking spaces
to the traffic engineer for the project.

Vanessa Dolbee, Renton Planning Manager, noted that the applicant requested a parking modification
using trip counts rather than the city's standard of number of students and employees. If there are no
new students or employees, no new parking stalls are necessary.

Exhibits

The October 1, 2014 staff report Exhibits 1-24 identified at page 2 of the staff report itself were
admitted into the record during the hearing. Exhibit 25 was admitted at the hearing as the staff

1 power point.

2
3 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

4 **Procedural:**

- 5 1. Applicant. Renton Technical College.
- 6 2. Hearing. A hearing was held on the application on October 7, 2014.
- 7 3. Project Description. The applicant requests site plan approval and approval of three development
8 modifications for the renovation of the Renton Technical College Automotive Complex. Three buildings
9 would be renovated and one building replaced. The applicant also requests three modifications for
10 number of parking stalls, street frontage improvements on Kirkland Ave NE, and the size of the required
refuse and recycling areas.

11 The Automotive Complex is also known as the K buildings or K complex. Buildings K1, K2 and K4
12 would be renovated. K3 will be demolished and replaced by a new 17,600 square foot building. The K
13 complex site is 145,200 sf and would continue to be used for automotive instruction and training in the
14 Automotive programs. The renovated site would have a net gain of about 4,000 square feet of
15 impervious surface area. Vehicle access would stay the same through the college campus and on-site.
Site work includes utilities, pedestrian, landscape, and entry plazas with earthwork that includes
excavations, cuts, and fill.

16 The applicant requests three modifications to parking standards, refuse and recycling standards, and
17 street standards for Kirkland Ave NE. For the automobile parking standards modification, the applicant
18 requests that the minimum number of stalls required for the site per RMC 4-4-080 be reduced from what
19 it has calculated to be an additional 19 parking stalls for the complex as the stalls would not be needed
20 for PM hour students when there is available parking in the larger campus parking area. For the refuse
21 and recycling standards, the applicant requests that the collection area size as required per 4-4-090 be
22 reduced where the complex is not in need of the minimum area required by the code and would provide
23 an adequate collection area size based on historical needs of the Automotive complex site. For the street
standards, the applicant requests a waiver and modification from the required street width and frontage
improvements for Kirkland Ave NE, per RMC 4-6-060, to not provide additional right-of-way because
street frontage improvements already exist and additional right of way is not needed.

24 The overall Renton Technical College is comprised of four properties, with surface parking in the eastern
25 portion of the overall campus and approximately one dozen different buildings that provide instruction
and programming for students on the more westerly side of the overall campus.

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

4 A. Water and Sewer Service. Sewer and water are provided by the City of Renton.

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

8 C. Drainage. City staff have determined that the conceptual drainage plan complies with the
9 2009 King County Surface Water Design Manual, the City's applicable stormwater
10 development standards. The site will only add 4,000 square feet of impervious surface over
11 current site conditions and pollution generating surface would decrease by 2,000 square feet
12 due to the enclosure of surface area by added building space. For these reasons staff have
13 found that no added flow control measures are necessary. A temporary erosion and
14 sedimentation control plan has been designed with best management practices that would
15 prevent or reduce pollution of water caused by construction activities. The mitigated
16 determination of nonsignificance, Ex. 20, also requires compliance with the applicant's
17 Technical Information Report, Ex. 5, in order to mitigate against erosion impacts to water
18 quality.

19 D. Parks/Open Space. City development standards do not impose any park or open space
20 requirements for colleges and there is no evidence of any need for additional off-site park
21 improvements in the record so none can be required of the proposal. Additionally, there are a
22 number of pedestrian focused open spaces. These pedestrian focused areas include two entry
23 plazas for the complex, one at the north side of the new K3 building and at the southern edge
24 of the renovated K1 building and an outdoor courtyard area between K3 and K1 buildings
25 with connecting pedestrian pathways (Exhibit 4). Therefore, the proposed site plan
26 landscaping and pedestrian entries and courtyard incorporate open spaces to serve as
distinctive project focal points and provide adequate areas for recreation by the occupants of
the site.

E. Off-Site Transportation. No significant off-site transportation impacts are anticipated and no
off-site mitigation beyond traffic impact fees is necessary. A traffic analysis was prepared by
TENW concluding that no off-site mitigation is necessary. The report was reviewed and
approved by staff. The report concluded that the proposal was generate an additional 19
peak pm trips and 0 peak am trips. Traffic impact fees required by City code will cover the
proposal's proportionate share impact to traffic system improvements.

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

G. Parking (vehicular and bicycle). The applicant has proposes 8 vehicle parking stalls in the K complex that includes one ADA stall with other vehicle parking areas available on the larger college campus (Exhibit 4). The applicant also seeks a modification to the required parking stalls for the proposal, which the applicant claims to be 19 stalls. The staff report correctly notes that the applicant has based its estimate of required bicycle and vehicular parking spaces on trip generation, whereas city code (specifically RMC 4-4-080) bases parking on the type of use proposed. The conditions of approval require the applicant to provide staff with the information it needs to determine parking based upon use as required by City code and also require the applicant to acquire approval of a modification from staff if the proposed 8 stalls are not sufficient to meet code requirements. As conditioned, the proposal will provide for adequate parking.

H. Vehicular Access and Internal Circulation. Given the existing internal circulation elements and the proposed elements with the new location for on-site parking spaces and the pedestrian circulation system improvements, the proposal is anticipated to maintain safe and efficient pedestrian and vehicular access as well as safe and efficient internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation.

As stated in the project narrative (Exhibit 8), the design intent of the renovation is to ensure a physically safe environment for students, faculty and visitors and is designed to mitigate pedestrian and vehicular conflicts through the enhancement of pedestrian pathways, signage, and visual color cues that highlight pedestrian areas to alert drivers to their presence. Pedestrian pathways throughout the complex are proposed with delineation by either a change in paving texture or striping.

The K complex has a number of existing pedestrian, bikeways, and vehicular access points that connect with the larger college campus internal circulation networks. Although it is unknown if there is an official bicycling network throughout the college campus, it is anticipated that bicyclists use the internal drive aisles and walkways to access different areas of the campus.

Vehicular access to the site from Kirkland Ave NE is limited to fire and other emergency services, with gates at the access points where traffic is not allowed as traffic to and from the college campus is consolidated primarily to Monroe Ave NE. There are no changes proposed to the internal college campus access streets. The K complex has an existing internal

1 vehicular circulation route around the K3 building that provides access to all the buildings,
2 where automobiles can be easily delivered or moved from one garage to another.

3 The internal pedestrian circulation system connects parking areas on the Technical College
4 campus, the different K complex buildings, sidewalk along the easterly boundary of the K
5 complex, and other sidewalks and pathways from the southerly, northerly, and easterly
6 subareas of the college campus (Exhibit 4). To promote greater circulation efficiency for
7 pedestrians, an new north south pedestrian connection is proposed as part of the renovation,
8 through the K1 building as an interior building corridor, to provide greater connection within
9 the K complex buildings

10 I. Landscaping. The K complex has mature, existing, maintained, landscaping including a mix
11 of mature trees, and groundcover around the site and along the Kirkland Ave NE street
12 frontage. Additionally, new landscaping is proposed as part of the site renovation. Staff have
13 reviewed the proposed landscaping and found it to be consistent with City code requirements.

14 J. Refuse Enclosure. The applicant proposes a 210 square foot refuse and recycling area. RMC
15 4-4-090 requires 378 square feet. This decision approves a modification request for the
16 refuse/recycling area as recommended by staff.

17 K. Recreation. Proposed recreation space would include interior community spaces, decks,
18 patios, and other outdoor recreation areas resulting in a total of 13,330sf of area. The
19 proposal complies with the requirements of the King County Code.

20 L. Transit and Bicycles. Transit and bicycle facilities are available on and near the site. There
21 are multiple bus routes that run along the borders of the Technical College, King County
22 Metro routes 111, 105 and 908. These bus routes provide connections around the
23 neighborhood and to transit centers for connections to other regional bus lines. As part of the
24 City's bicycle network, Monroe Ave NE on the east side of the Technical College is
25 identified as a shared roadway facility for bicyclists. The Technical College has bicycle
26 parking areas, and specifically for the K complex renovations, there are two bike racks
proposed at the northern area of the K3 building. Therefore, the existing site with the
proposed renovations is anticipated to continue providing transit and other alternate forms of
travel into and out of the site.

5. Adverse Impacts. There are no significant adverse impacts associated with the project. Few
adverse impacts are anticipated since the proposal only serves to renovate an existing campus and only
add 4,000 square feet of impervious surface. Adequate infrastructure serves the site as determined in
Finding of Fact No. 4. Impacts are more specifically addressed as follows:

- 1 A. Compatibility. Only one of the four buildings subject to the application will be replaced and
2 it will be similar in scale and design to the existing surrounding buildings. No significant
3 change in compatibility with surrounding uses is anticipated.
- 4 B. Views. According to the staff report, the proposal would not affect any view corridors,
5 including view corridors to shorelines or Mt. Rainier.
- 6 C. Lighting. The applicant did not provide an on-site lighting plan. A condition of approval will
7 require the applicant to provide a lighting plan that adequately provides for public safety
8 without casting excessive glare on adjacent properties at the time of building permit review.
9 Down-lighting shall be used in all cases to assure safe vehicular movement in an area where
10 pedestrians could be walking. The lighting plan shall be submitted to, and approved by, the
11 Current Planning Project Manager prior to building permit approval.
- 12 D. Screening. Landscaping has been incorporated into the site plan in order to screen parking
13 areas. Staff have also found that the refuse and recycling area provides for adequate
14 screening. The applicant has not provided sufficient information for staff to determine if
15 rooftop equipment will be adequately screened. The conditions of approval require the
16 applicant to provide plan sets showing any rooftop equipment or structures that may require
17 screening per City code, where the submitted elevations do not show rooftop equipment, and
18 such equipment shall be submitted to the Current Planning Project Manager, for review and
19 approval prior to Construction Permit issuance.
- 20 E. Privacy and Noise. There are effectively no proposed openings along the westerly facades on
21 the Kirkland Ave NE side of the K4 and K1 buildings which reduces potential noise from the
22 Automotive training facility during the day and evening classes into the residential area
23 (Exhibit 6) and creates greater privacy for the Automotive complex.

24 The elevations of the buildings to be renovated and new proposed building have large side
25 wall openings primarily through glass garage doors on the facades directed towards the new
26 K3 building (Exhibit 6). The orientation of the large garage door openings are primarily
focused internally to the Automotive complex, where the garage doors can be opened to
move vehicles in and out and provide for privacy and noise reduction from one building to
another as Automotive programming occurs throughout the day and evening. This internal
focus provides less opportunity for noise to project outward towards the residential
neighborhood across Kirkland Ave NE and to other areas of the college campus.
Additionally, the internal focus provides privacy for the users of the site. Staff finds that the
new K3 structure placement and improvements to the buildings being renovated provide
provisions for privacy and noise reduction within the site and overall college campus.

- 27 F. Natural Systems Features. Natural systems and features are protected on-site by not
28 expanding building footprints into the on-site sloped areas, through the reuse of the existing
29 building footprint area for the new building, and by limiting the areas of cut and fill and
30 retention of much of the existing mature vegetation. The only critical areas on site are steep
31 slopes. No structural work is proposed within the steep slopes area with the exception of

1 landscaping improvements, where additional groundcover, shrubs, and trees would be
2 planted (Exhibit 18).

3 There are minimal areas of the existing mature vegetation proposed for removal. Cut and fill
4 is limited to small areas of the site. There are existing slopes on the site, primarily along the
5 easterly and westerly sides of the site, along the K2 building easterly façade and K4 westerly
6 façade. Those buildings are not proposed for expansion into the steep slopes next to the
7 buildings. For building K1, 600 sf would be excavated for a new complex entrance at the
8 south of the building (Exhibit 8). Approximately 1,600 sf of cut into the slope along the
9 campus access drive at the northeast corner of the site would be excavated for vehicle display
10 plazas and landscape walls. Approximately 400 cubic yards of soil would be moved as part
11 of proposed grading work.

12 Of the existing 60 significant evergreen and deciduous trees inventoried on the site 53 would
13 be retained. The primarily evergreen trees with upwards of 24-inch diameter along the east
14 and western boundaries of the site will be kept.

15 The site will have an additional 4,000 sf of impervious surface compared to the existing
16 conditions (Exhibit 22). Given the size of the K complex site at approximately 145,200 sf,
17 an increase in 4,000 sf is not a significant reduction in the amount of impervious surface,
18 where much of the existing site that is impervious will continue to stay impervious.

19 G. Loading Areas. The activity of students working on vehicles and moving vehicles from
20 garage bay to bay or around the complex is screened from the surrounding properties as the
21 work and garage areas are focused internally to the site, around the circular drive. It is not
22 anticipated that the proposal loading or storage areas for vehicles within the four buildings
23 would have significant impacts on the views from surrounding properties, including the other
24 buildings on the college campus.

25 **Conclusions of Law**

26 1. Authority. RMC 4-9-200(B)(2) requires site plan review for all development in the IL zone.
RMC 4-9-200(D)(2)(c)¹ arguably requires a public hearing before the hearing examiner because there is

¹ The staff report notes that hearing examiner review is required for this reason, but RMC 4-9-200(D)(2)(c) only requires site plan review for proposals adjoining residentially zoned property if the proposal is a “commercial or industrial” project. The college campus arguably does not fit into these categories, but it certainly is similar in terms of scope and type of impacts. Given the absence of any objection from the applicant, the proposal is considered to be subject to hearing examiner review pursuant to the requirements of RMC 4-9-200(D)(2)(c). It is also noted that RMC 4-9-200(D)(2)(a) allows the administrator to require hearing examiner review for site plans that have “unresolved concerns”. Given the similarity of scale and impact of the proposal to similarly sized commercial and industrial projects where hearing examiner review would be required, examiner review is justified under RMC 4-9-200(D)(2)(a) as well.

1 adjoining residentially zoned property. RMC 4-8-080(G) classifies hearing examiner site plan review as
2 Type III permits and modifications as Type I permits. The site plan and modification requests of this
3 proposal have been consolidated². RMC 4-8-080(C)(2) requires consolidated permits to each be
4 processed under “the highest-number procedure”. The site plan has the highest numbered review
5 procedures, so the site plan and modification requests must be processed as Type III applications. As
6 Type III applications, RMC 4-8-080(G) grants the Examiner with the authority to hold a hearing and
7 issue a final decision on them, subject to closed record appeal to the City Council.

8 2. Zoning/Comprehensive Plan Designations. The subject property is zoned Light Industrial (IL)
9 and is comprehensive plan designation is Commercial Corridor (CC).

10 3. Review Criteria. Site plan review standards are governed by RMC 4-9-200(E)(3). Modification
11 criteria are governed by RMC 4-9-250(D). Applicable criteria are quoted below in italics and applied
12 through corresponding conclusions of law.

13 **Site Plan**

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

16 *a. Compliance and Consistency: Conformance with plans, policies, regulations and approvals,
17 including:*

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

21 *ii. Applicable land use regulations;*

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

23 *iv. Design Regulations: Intent and guidelines of the design regulations located in RMC 4-
24 3-100.*

25 4. The proposal is consistent with applicable comprehensive plan policies and zoning regulations as
26 outlined in Finding 18(a)-(b) of the staff report, which is adopted by this reference as if set forth in full,
including the findings and conclusions. The design guidelines of RMC 4-3-100 do not apply to projects
proposed for the IL zone. See RMC 4-3-100(B)(1)(b).

² As discussed in other parts of this decision, the requested modification to parking stall requirements has been
“unconsolidated” and re-delegated to staff since the applicant has not provided sufficient information to evaluate that
request.

1
2 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(3)(b): Off-Site Impacts: Mitigation of impacts to surrounding properties and**
3 *uses, including:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

18 5. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 4 and 5, the proposal will not create any significant off-site
19 impacts, including the impacts specifically addressed in the criteria above.

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

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

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

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

iv. Landscaping: Use of landscaping to soften the appearance of parking areas, to
provide shade and privacy where needed, to define and enhance open spaces, and
generally to enhance the appearance of the project. Landscaping also includes the design

1 *and protection of planting areas so that they are less susceptible to damage from vehicles*
2 *or pedestrian movements.*

3 6. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 4 and 5, the proposal will not create any significant on-site
4 impacts, including those specifically addressed in the criteria above.

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

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

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

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

15 *iv. Transit and Bicycles: Providing transit, carpools and bicycle facilities and access; and*

16 *v. Pedestrians: Providing safe and attractive pedestrian connections between parking*
17 *areas, buildings, public sidewalks and adjacent properties.*

18 7. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 4, the proposal provides for adequate access and circulation
19 as required by the criterion above.

20 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(3)(e): Open Space:** *Incorporating open spaces to serve as distinctive project*
21 *focal points and to provide adequate areas for passive and active recreation by the occupants/users*
22 *of the site.*

23 8. The proposal provides for adequate open space as required by the criterion above as determined
24 in Finding of Fact No. 4.

25 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(3)(f): Views and Public Access:** *When possible, providing view corridors to*
26 *shorelines and Mt. Rainier, and incorporating public access to shorelines.*

 9. As determined in Finding of Fact No. 5, no view corridors to shorelines or Mt. Rainier are
 adversely affected. No shorelines are in the vicinity for purposes of requiring public access.

RMC 4-9-200(E)(3)(g): Natural Systems: *Arranging project elements to protect existing natural*
 systems where applicable.

1 10. Natural systems will not be adversely affected by the proposal as determined in Finding of Fact
2 No. 5.

3 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(3)(h): *Services and Infrastructure: Making available public services and***
4 ***facilities to accommodate the proposed use.***

5 11. The project is served by adequate services and facilities as determined in Finding of Fact No. 4.

6 **RMC 4-9-200(E)(3)(i): *Phasing: Including a detailed sequencing plan with development phases***
7 ***and estimated time frames, for phased projects.***

8 12. The project is not phased.

9 **Modifications**

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

16 *a. Substantially implements the policy direction of the policies and objectives of the*
17 *Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element and the Community Design Element and the*
18 *proposed modification is the minimum adjustment necessary to implement these policies and*
19 *objectives;*

20 *b. Will meet the objectives and safety, function, appearance, environmental protection and*
21 *maintainability intended by the Code requirements, based upon sound engineering judgment;*

22 *c. Will not be injurious to other property(ies) in the vicinity;*

23 *d. Conforms to the intent and purpose of the Code;*

24 *e. Can be shown to be justified and required for the use and situation intended; and*

25 *f. Will not create adverse impacts to other property(ies) in the vicinity.*

26 13. The criterion above are met for the requested modification to street frontage requirements for the reasons identified at pages 16-17 of the staff report. The criterion above area also met for the requested modification to the area required for the refuse and recycling area for the reasons identified at pages 8-9 of the staff report. As discussed in Finding of Fact No. 4, the applicant has provided insufficient information to evaluate its request for modification to the required number of parking stalls so that issue has been re-delegated to staff by the conditions of approval.

27 **DECISION**

28 The site plan, street standard modification and refuse/recycling area modification are approved subject
29 to the following conditions:

- 1 1. The applicant is subject to the mitigation measures as determined by the Environmental
2 Review Committee's decision August 25, 2014.
- 3 2. The applicant shall be required to provide a lighting plan that adequately provides for public
4 safety without casting excessive glare on adjacent properties at the time of building permit
5 review. Down-lighting shall be used in all cases to assure safe vehicular movement in an
6 area where pedestrians could be walking. The lighting plan shall be submitted to, and
7 approved by, the Current Planning Project Manager prior to building permit approval.
- 8 3. The applicant shall provide a bicycle and vehicle parking stall analysis based on the criteria
9 used for quantifying the number of vehicle and parking spaces required in the City code, and
10 provide an updated parking plan that shows the number of bicycle parking spaces required
11 and vehicle parking stalls, that will be reviewed and approved by the Current Planning
12 Project Manager, prior to Construction Permit issuance.
- 13 4. The applicant shall provide a lot coverage analysis for the overall Technical College
14 campus.
- 15 5. The applicant shall provide plan sets showing any rooftop equipment or structures that may
16 require screening per City code, where the submitted elevations do not show rooftop
17 equipment, and such equipment shall be submitted to the Current Planning Project Manager,
18 for review and approval prior to Construction Permit issuance.

19 DATED this 21st day of October, 2014.

20 
21 Phil A. Olbrechts

22 City of Renton Hearing Examiner

23 **Appeal Right and Valuation Notices**

24 RMC 4-8-080 provides that the final decision of the hearing examiner is subject to appeal to the
25 Renton City Council. RMC 4-8-110(E)(14) requires appeals of the hearing examiner's decision to
26 be filed within fourteen (14) calendar days from the date of the hearing examiner's decision. A
request for reconsideration to the hearing examiner may also be filed within this 14 day appeal
period as identified in RMC 4-8-110(E)(13) and RMC 4-8-100(G)(9). A new fourteen (14) day
appeal period shall commence upon the issuance of the reconsideration. Additional information
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.

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