

TITLE IV - DOCKET AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN *updated 03.12.2014*

DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS TITLE IV DOCKET				
Initiated by/ Assigned to	Date	Form	Amendment Request	Technical /Policy
Staff			Evaluation and Consideration of Property Maintenance Standards in Downtown <i>Review the International Building Maintenance Code (IBC), as adopted by the City, in order to identify sections the City may wish to modify in order to encourage Downtown property owners to maintain their properties in a manner that is not detrimental to surrounding properties. Additionally, this docket item would consider other ways Title IV could be modified for the same purpose and establish a boundary for the Downtown Core.</i>	P
Staff			Marijuana <i>Council adopted a moratorium on accepting applications for medical and/or recreational marijuana business licenses or permits. The purpose of the moratorium is to provide the City time to: develop understanding of Liquor Control Board rules and implications of those rules, study potential impacts of the new land uses, evaluate and consider how other jurisdictions are regulating, and determine what is right for Renton. It will also allow the City to adequately provide public participation. Specifically for this work program, the City will determine what land uses the new marijuana related uses most closely match, consider appropriateness of additional regulations, and hear from public on both of these issues.</i>	P
Laureen	11.30.10	Email	Footnotes clean up <i>Some notes have been deleted but are still being referenced in the standards tables. Also, look at the viability of Note 28 related to setback averaging. Look at Footnote 26, no longer makes sense.</i>	T
Phil Olbrechts/Garmon Newsom	05.12.12 05.01.13 02.03.14	Email	Hearing Examiner Code Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Appeal Period: Code doesn't set time limits for appeals of most HEX decision to the City Council or address whether reconsideration tolls the appeal period.</i> • <i>Decision: Allow the Hearing Examiner to make oral decisions, in addition to written decisions [See Northshore Investors, LLC v. Tacoma Decision]</i> • <i>Time Allowed for Making Decisions: Establish maximum 10 days period within which HEX is required to render a decision, consistent with State RCW.</i> 	P

 Ongoing/Already Initiated

 Staff Recommendation for Docket #10/Work Program 2014

Angie	05.23.12	Email	Home Agriculture <i>Amend home agricultural sales to comply with Cottage Food Operation law. Also check home occupations</i>	T
John Owen/Angie	09.23.13	Email	Applicability for Additions and Modifications in Design Districts <i>Establish thresholds for when additions and mod shall comply with requirements in Design Districts.</i>	P
Jennifer	01.16.14	Email	Residential Setbacks for Garages <i>The current setback for primary structures is 15 feet. There is no longer a requirement for a 20-foot setback for garages and should be reviewed.</i>	P
Staff			Private Roads Standards <i>Currently, City code allows up to six individual lots to access off of a private road, essentially a driveway, to simply provide a drivable surface without additional improvements (curb cuts, sidewalks, street lighting ...). The number of lots accessing those private roads should be re-evaluated. Also address the "maximum number of driveways" provisions should also be amended for clarification</i>	P
Staff			Maximum Lot Area, Building Coverage, and Impervious Surface Area <i>Re-evaluate minimum lot areas to more closely relate to the density for residential zones and re-evaluate provisions for maximum building coverage and maximum surface area.</i>	P
Staff			Utilities, Open Space, and Critical Areas in Tracts <i>Identify clear parameters for subdivisions that would require, utilities, open space, and critical areas be placed into tracts instead of easements. The placement of these items in tracts provides for ease of maintenance by the City and/or HOA and enhanced protection of critical areas.</i>	P
Staff/AT&T			AT&T Network Expansion <i>The City of Renton has received a request to consider amendments to the Renton Municipal Code to revise the permitting requirements for wireless communications facilities. New technology and increasing demand for wireless service have created the need to update these elements of the code. The issues to be addressed by the amendments include adding language to allow efficient permitting of new small cell technology, addressing the new federal legislative requirements for municipalities regarding wireless communications facilities, and updating the use provisions in all zones to address height, setback and screening of wireless communications facilities.</i>	P
Staff			Sprinklers <i>Consider require sprinklers for new homes in formal plats of 10 lots or more.</i>	

Vanessa			Retaining Walls <i>Currently, there are no regulations regarding retaining walls in the code, except in the fence regulations. Review how high retaining walls can be and provide restrictions as it relates to setbacks and/or front, side, or rear yards.</i>	P
Jennifer			Tree Removal <i>Re-evaluate the number of trees a property owner can cut in a 12-month period without a permit. Currently, if the property is less than 35,000 square feet, up to 3 trees can be removed in a 3-month period. If the property is larger than 35,000 square feet, then up to 6 trees can be removed. This has resulted in large numbers of trees being removed without any City oversight.</i>	P
Vanessa			Lot Line Adjustments <i>Provide clarity in the lot line adjustments rules that boundary line adjustment cannot circumvent other aspects of City code.</i>	P
Rocale	03.06.12	Email	Parking Requirements <i>Modify the parking requirements (RMC 4-4-080) through the site plan review process</i>	P
Staff	N/A		Design standards for development based on the type of use <i>Currently, the design standards based on locational criteria, by zone or overlay. This item would explore applying design standards based on use, for example a retail business or office building. The manner in which the standards are currently applied gives the benefit of design standards to some areas, while other areas do not receive this benefit. Additionally, this would make the design standards easier to understand and administer.</i>	P
Chip	08.05.10	Email	Outdoor storage <i>The code is ambiguous regarding what is considered outside storage and where it is or is not appropriate. Additionally, regulations for "Bulk Storage Facilities" constitute a large portion of our code, yet have not been needed in 2 decades. Should we consider streamlining if not eliminating these storage-related regulations?</i>	P
Staff	N/A		Retaining Walls <i>Improve the aesthetic appearance of retaining walls by providing standards for different types of walls considering height, location, treatment, and landscaping.</i>	P
Jennifer/Chip	01.06.11	Email	Public Facilities Permit <i>A new Public Facilities Permit would allow greater flexibility to authorize City facilities in proximity to where services from the facility are delivered to the public. The current system allows certain types of City facilities in certain zone classifications. A new Public Facilities Permit could be permitted outright,</i>	P

			<i>administratively, or through a public hearing process depending on the public facility's location, zone and impact to surrounding land uses irrespective of zoning classification.</i>	
Rocale/Chip	09.27.10	Email	Density bonuses in the R-14, RM-U, and COR zones <i>Review the provisions for density bonuses and establish a direct correlation to the bonus criteria and the number of bonus units allowed.</i>	T
Neil	01.12.12	Email	Alternative Energy <i>Update code to encourage installations of alternative energy facilities in locations/situations which the city deems desirable</i>	P
Rocale	03.06.12	Email	Landscape Standards Exemptions <i>Include zones that can be reduced to zero from the exemption for a 10 foot landscape strip (RMC 4-7-070F) to eliminate the need for a modification from the landscaping standards</i>	P
Laureen	04.18.12	Email	Modifications Subsection <i>Amend RMC 4-2-115 by adding a new subsection "Modifications" that references RMC 4-9-250D and clarifies that the appropriate means for modifying the Residential Design and Open Space Standards is a "modification".</i>	P
Larry Warren	04.20.12	Email	Non-conforming Rules <i>Ensure that non-conforming rules are consistent with State law.</i>	T
Laureen	06.29.12	Email	Easements <i>Easements being created via short plats. Customers confused about where or if they have an access easement to a lot that is purchased in a short plat (interior lot with no direct access to a public street). The recording of the short plat map itself does not create an actual easement.</i>	T
Neil Watts	03.06.13	Email	Model Homes <i>Consider removing the need for a Temporary Use Permit for model homes</i>	P
Rocale	03.21.13	Email	Minor Plat Modification <i>Create a formal process to change from a Preliminary Plat to a Short Plat</i>	P
Neil	05.16.13	Email	Gates on Driveway and Private Streets <i>Prohibit or restrict fencing and gates across driveways and private streets</i>	P
Jan	08.01.13	Email	Re-addressing Newly Annexed Properties <i>Review the process in place to re-address newly annexed properties so properties do not have to change address upon annexation.</i>	P
Laureen	09.16.13	Email	Public Notice Process Submittal Requirements for PUDs <i>Review timing of public notice and increase number of copies in submittal requirements to include enough utility plan sets and road cross sections at final stage</i>	P

Boyd Speer	12.04.13	Email	Electric Vehicle Charging Stations <i>Require all new homes to be pre-wired for electric vehicle charging stations</i>	P
Jennifer, as requested by Graffiti Task Force	01.16.14	Email	Graffiti on Signs <i>Graffiti "tags" are not allowed on signs, even if the sign was created for a business as a mural and the artist is a tagger.</i>	P
Staff			Tree Conservation and Management <i>Revise the tree regulations for existing developed and vacant parcels, new development, and public property. The focus of the work is to protect existing trees, specify replacement ratios for removed trees on-site and provide for the use of off-site receiving areas; allow for payment of fee in-lieu to replace trees. In addition, evaluate requirements for tree cutting and tree/vegetation maintenance permits, and consider exemptions.</i>	P
Submittal Standards				
Laureen	09.07.10	Written	<i>Consider requiring a survey as a submittal requirements for some land use applications and require title report</i>	P
Rocale	01.20.10	Email	<i>Add Design Checklist to the Submittal Requirements if located in a design district</i>	T
Chip	02.11.10	Email	<i>Remove submittal standards from code and establish as a handout and post on the web in order to keep current and provide reasonable public access.</i>	T
Laureen	10.01.09	Email	<i>Overall plan sheet set for short/full plats. Move to Submittal Standards.</i>	T
Laureen	04.02.10	Email	<i>Add text to submittal requirements due to adoption of new Storm Drainage Regulations</i>	T
Rocale	05.25.11	Email	<i>Submittal Checklists reference the older manual for the Drainage Report requirements. It should be changed from 1990 to 2009.</i>	
Stacy	07.22.11	Email	<i>Remove the requirements from home occupations that the applicant is responsible for providing current mailing labels.</i>	
Laureen	07.24.13	Email	<i>Add tree retention worksheet</i>	
Administrative Code Interpretations (to be created)				
Staff			Rounding Provisions <i>Currently the City allows density calculations to be rounded. For example, in the R-8 zone the subdivision of a 10,250 square foot parcel would be allowed because the resulting density of 8.4995 is rounded down to 8. Without rounding, to achieve a density of 8, a lot would need to be 10,890 square feet in order to be subdivided. This is a difference of 640 square feet. Previous to adopting this provision, subdivision was not available for these types of parcels. Removing this provision from the Code would restore that status to those parcels.</i>	T
Rocale	12.19.13	Email	Variances for Critical Areas	P

			<i>Review RMC 4-3-050N which allows for variances if the strict application of the code cannot be met for Critical Area Regulations. RMC 4-9-250 B and D are silent and as a result precludes variances for some impacts to critical areas.</i>	
Jennifer	06.10.10	Email	Definitions for construction waste and demolition waste that was deleted from the code <i>Critical Area Regulations prohibit landfills with certain types of construction/ demolition waste in Aquifer Protection Areas. However, the definitions of construction and demolition waste were previously deleted from the Code. This item seeks to reinstate those definitions.</i>	T
Kris	05.04.10	Email	Small Wind Turbines <i>Establish where small wind turbines are allowed and standards to provide guidance on definitions, setbacks, height limits, and other related code sections.</i>	P
Phil Olbrechts	05.01.12	Email	Hearing Examiner Evidence <i>Conflict between the "limited new evidence" rule of Reg Reform and the reconsideration provision of the RMC. See Seelig HEX decision, 05.01.2012.</i>	T
Administrative Code Interpretations (Housekeeping Items)				
Rocale	06.07.12	Email	RMC 4-2-110B refuse and recycle requirement sited twice in the table. One reference should be removed	T
Rocale	07.12.12	Email	Review RMC 4-2-115F.1 to see if underlined statement was meant to be added to the code. Minimum of four (4) lot sizes (minimum of four hundred (400) gross square feet size difference) for at least every four (4) abutting street fronting lots,	T
Vanessa	08.22.12	Email	RMC 4-8-080 refers to subsection H, which has been repealed. Possible housekeeping item	T
Laureen	08.31.12	Email	Add road/sidewalk cross section-type graphics to the code	T
Erika	09.17.12	Email	Update code to reflect "substantial development" threshold increase to \$6,416	T
Jerry	09.27.12	Email	Update code to remove sections that refer to the Real Estate Sign Kiosk Program	T
Laureen	10.23.12	Email	Amend Fee Schedule Brochure to provide for two levels of CUP fees (Administrative: \$1,000 and Hearing Examiner: \$2,000)	T
Laureen	12.27.12	Email	Update code to reference FEMA approved Cedar River Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) maps. Update flood hazard section to align with current FEMA flood area terminology.	T
Rocale	02.25.13	Email	Place alley language in street standards instead of in subdivision regulations	
Laureen	04.11.13	Email	Review conflicts between the code and street improvement plans which are not consistent with code standards	T
Elizabeth	05.02.13	Written	Remapping of contiguous open space corridor	T

Rocale	08.21.13	Email	There are references in the UC-N2 zone to street classifications that do not exist. Review when surface parking is required and when it is not.	T	
Jerry	10.18.13	Email	Reclass a stream from Class 4 to Class 3 for the Roman Short Plat	T	
Rocale	10.21.13	Email	Remove references to the P-suffix with special requirements for properties as there is no longer a map for P-suffix properties	T	
Vanessa	11.19.13	Email	Update RMC-4-4-030B Adoption by Reference to include Plans that have been adopted	T	
Vanessa	12.19.13	Email	Update titles for Shoreline Environments in RMC 4-9-070H per new SMP names	T	
Jennifer	01.16.14	Email	Codifier Errors: "Recreational facilities, outdoor" are allowed in the RM, IM, and IL zones, but not the IH The notes for Mini, Micro, and Macro wireless facilities have been transposed	P	
Administrative Code Interpretations (from January 2014 to Current)					
CI-38, Landscaping, fencing, pond slopes, and other standards for stormwater tracts and easements and ownership and maintenance responsibility for stormwater facilities.					
CI-45, Removal of footnote 11 which provides for reduced lot dimensions in the R-4 zone when subdivisions cannot achieve a density of 4 dwelling units per square acre.					
CI-46, Determination of which fee schedule is used to calculate the School Impact Fees for a building permit.					
Processing and Administrative Improvements (Not Requiring Code or Plan Amendment)					
Staff	N/A		Mapping PUDs and Development Agreements on the Zoning Map <i>Currently, there is not a way to cross reference properties with PUD or DA's which specify uses and entitlements.</i>	T	H
Laureen	11.29.10	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omit Chapter 2 illustrations which no longer contain useful numerical data and incorrectly depict existing standards • Reduce number of use table notes 	T	L
Adriana	01.14.10	Email	Annual docket process to update Critical Areas maps, tracking system for wetlands inventory, and critical areas reports for permit applications <i>Provide guidance for the annual update of wetland and stream maps that staff and the public rely on, based on studies submitted with development and/or environmental review applications.</i>	T	L
Erika	07.27.09	Email	Dispensation of City property <i>Improve process and conditions in dispensing City property and which department should review.</i>	T	L
Staff	N/A		Revise Table of Contents to reflect figure list <i>The current code does not accurately represent the figure citations.</i>	T	L
Jennifer	06.01.11	Email	<i>Consider revising the Administrative Conditional Use Permit from \$2,000 to \$1,000</i>		

Jennifer	06.01.11 Email	Establish the Landscape Inspection Fee for inspecting drought tolerant landscaping installations		
----------	----------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE				
Streamline zone classifications				
<i>Renton has more than 20 zoning classifications. Ideas about zoning have changed, with few zones serving single purposes. As Renton’s land use policies have evolved, there have been major overhauls of some and minor tweaks of others. This has resulted in some zones being very similar to each other, and others that have limited applicability. Consideration of all the zoning classifications should be initiated with the following questions in mind:</i>				
<i>- Is the zone appropriately classified and named? This will evaluate zones that now provide mixed-uses instead of a single purpose. It will specifically look at multi-family residential zones, commercial zones, center zones, and industrial zones.</i>				
<i>- Is the zone necessary to achieve the applicable land use policies? Could another zone do the same job, or a better job? Can zones be combined for a better affect? This will examine all zones.</i>				
Land Use Designations				
<i>Create a stronger policy relationship between the land use designations and zone classifications that implement them</i>				
Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Natural Resources				
<i>Update Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Natural Resources Plan and associated Element</i>				
RM Policies				
<i>Examine the RM policies, purpose, and criteria for zoning CN, R-14, and RMF</i>				
PAA Boundary				
<i>Designate the portion of the Fairwood annexation area that was added by the BRB at King County’s request</i>				
<i>Amend Land Use Element, Centers chapter to reflect PSRC language “Regional Growth Center” and amend as needed for the checklist by PSRC</i>				
Transportation Element				
Utilities Element				
<i>Conflict between the definition of Utility and the Utilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan</i>				
CDBG: Housing & Community Profile				
<i>Develop demographic, housing, and community information and data on the City’s population and potential annexation areas to support guidance on discussion of Direct Entitlement options for Community Development Block Grant funding.</i>				
Multi-Family Rezone				
<i>A thin row of CA zoned condos and apartments (north of NE 5th St) should be considered for CPA and rezone. Not appropriate for property owners to start a commercial use that would be allowed in the CA zone in their condos. The multi-family properties south of NE 5th should be considered. Several projects have had to use the PUD to make the CA work for parcels that proved challenging to fit the requirements of the zone. This should also be considered as part of this CPA.</i>				
<i>Correct split zoned lot (RC and R-8) caused by a lot line adjustment for the BPA Maple Valley Substation</i>				
<i>Evaluate downzone of the South Renton neighborhood</i>				
Affordable Housing (for both Development Regulations and Comprehensive Plan)				

Add “affordable housing” to definitions. Also, different definitions are used for “affordable” or “low income” housing for Waived Fees and Multi-Family Housing Property Tax Exemption incentive programs. There is also a possible conflict in the code regarding affordable housing bonus in the R-14 zone

CITY CENTER COMMUNITY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

1.1.1 Update existing design standards for the City Center to ensure new development will fulfill the vision.

1.1.2 Create cohesive urban design standards for the public realm that include standards for gateways, wayfinding, street trees, street lighting, pedestrian-scaled lighting, landscaping, street furniture, utilities, and public art.

2.2.3 Initiate a sidewalk café case study and develop tailored regulations to encourage sidewalk cafes in Downtown.

4.2.1 Consider rezoning the intact, single-family area of the South Renton neighborhood.

3.1.1 Complete a conceptual plan for the civic node

6.11.1 Establish priority bicycle improvements consistent with the Trails and Bicycle Master Plan within City Center subarea.