

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 09, 2009a
TO: Renton Planning Commission
FROM: David Sherrard, Parametrix
SUBJECT: Renton Shoreline Master Program
Overview
Public Hearing DRAFT
Shoreline Master Program 10-15-09

This Technical Memorandum provides a general overview of the Public Hearing Draft Shoreline Master Program dated October 9, 2009.

The following documents have been transmitted at this time:

- This Overview Memo
- Public Hearing Draft Shoreline Management Program dated 10-09-09
- Draft Shoreline Designation Maps dated 10-09-09
- Matrix of Comments and Responses dated 10-09-09
- All Comments received to date
- Revised Inventory and Characterization dated 10-09-09
- Revised Cumulative Impacts Analysis dated 10-09-09
- Draft Restoration Plan dated 10-09-09

1. General comments on no net loss and ecological enhancement

In his comment letter David Halinen, Attorney, makes the case (summarized on page 3 of his letter) that “.. except to the extent necessary to avoid no net loss of shoreline ecological function, Chapter 173-26 WAC does not direct that local master programs include regulations requiring shoreline restoration or enhancement tin connection with shoreline development of private property.”

This statement is simply not accurate. There are a number of provisions in the Shoreline Guidelines WAC 173-26 that specifically address this. The most directive of which is:

WAC 173-26-241(3)(d)

Master programs should prohibit nonwater-oriented commercial uses on the shoreline unless they meet the following criteria:

(i) The use is part of a mixed-use project that includes water-dependent uses and provides a significant public benefit with respect to the Shoreline Management Act's objectives such as providing public access and ecological restoration... [emphasis added]

Mr. Halinen's approach also does not acknowledge the important perspective that "no net loss" is a criteria applied also on a system-wide or cumulative basis, as succinctly noted in

WAC 173-26-181(8)(d)

Local master programs shall evaluate and consider cumulative impacts of reasonably foreseeable future development on shoreline ecological functions and other shoreline functions fostered by the policy goals of the act. To ensure no net loss of ecological functions and protection of other shoreline functions and/or uses, master programs shall contain policies, programs, and regulations that address adverse cumulative impacts and fairly allocate the burden of addressing cumulative impacts among development opportunities.:

2. General comments on RCW 82.02.020 and court cases on takings

In his comment letter David Halinen, Attorney, makes the case (summarized on page 7 of his letter) that ".RCW 80.02.020 requires both a nexus and rough proportionality for a dedication to fall within the exception. Because both are not present in this case the ordinance violates the state statute."

This is a very complex area of the law. We will not attempt to navigate the complexity of the issue in detail, except to point out the reasons we believe the Planning Commission should not give credence to this argument.

- a) The regulations in the SMP are not "dedications". They are land use regulations adopted under police powers. Dedication is "the deliberate appropriation of land by an owner for any general and public uses." [RCW 58.17.020(3)] Although some land use regulations may be considered by some to be tantamount to dedication, we believe it is important to keep the distinction clear rather than simply to collapse or ignore the distinction.
- b) The relevant criteria for land use regulations as provided in Washington planning statutes is very broad, as indicated in the following.:

RCW 35.63.090

All regulations shall be worked out as parts of a comprehensive plan which each commission shall prepare for the physical and other generally advantageous development of the municipality and shall be designed, among other things, to encourage the most appropriate use of land throughout the municipality; to lessen traffic congestion and accidents; to secure safety from fire; to provide adequate light and air; to prevent overcrowding of land; to avoid undue concentration of population; to promote a coordinated development of the unbuilt areas; to encourage the formation of neighborhood or community units; to secure an appropriate allotment of land area in new developments for all the requirements of community life; to conserve and restore natural beauty and other natural resources; to encourage and protect access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems; and to facilitate the adequate provision of transportation, water, sewerage and other public uses and requirements, including protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater used for public water supplies. Each plan shall include a review of drainage, flooding, and storm water run-off in the

area and nearby jurisdictions and provide guidance for corrective actions to mitigate or cleanse those discharges that pollute Puget Sound or waters entering Puget Sound. [emphasis added]

- c) Constitutional criteria for exercise of “police powers” require that they serve a public purpose and be applied equitably. This is reflected in the fact that land use codes divide cities into districts and treat lands within those districts uniformly. Court cases involving “spot zoning” have cited the equal protection clause of the constitution in observing that singling out a particular parcel for special treatment provides a special privilege that violates the equal protection doctrine (Smith v Skagit). It is also reflected in the statute for variances that provides that a variance “shall not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitation upon uses of other properties in the vicinity and zone..” [RCW 36A.63. 110(2)(a)]
- d) The “nexus” and “proportionality” issues raised by Mr. Halinen are important. In reviewing the proposed SMP, it is important to observe that the burdens placed on properties by buffers are related to the classification of the resource and are approximately the same for most properties not within the Natural and Urban Conservancy Overlay Districts. The relative size of the buffers on the “Old Stoneway” property in relation to lot depth and area is about the same as for single family residences under the sliding scale in 4-3-090.G.1.e.i (former draft 8.01.02.C).
- e) There has been no court case in the State of Washington applying RCW 80.020.020 to buffers to protect critical areas. The use of buffers has been upheld in numerous Growth Management Hearings Board and court cases. The examples Mr. Halinen cites regarding open space requirements are of some relevance, but not directly relevant.
- f) In updating the SMP, the city is obligated to conform with the Shoreline Management Guidelines WAC 173-26. The city does not have the authority to disregard provisions of those guidelines based on constitutional arguments. The city does have the obligation to consider the constitutionality of specific regulations adopted in the SMP as required by WAC 173-26-186(5), however, Mr. Halinen has pointed out no specifics of how the specific regulations proposed do not meet specific constitutional requirements.
- g) The relief requested on the “Old Stoneway Site” is simply a smaller buffer and greater height. This seems to grant that buffer and height regulations are constitutional. The request, however, appears to be similar to “spot zoning” in that it is “for private gain designed to favor a particular individual or group without adequate benefit to the welfare of the community as a whole.”
- h) The change in buffers and height requested does not substantially change the development potential of the property, as indicated in the attached spreadsheet. The amount of development potentially allowed on the contiguous property is in the range of several million square feet. It is unlikely that the full zoning potential of the property could be realized given the potential trip generation (at office use) which would increase the traffic volumes on adjacent SR 169 by 50% or more.
- i) The “Old Stoneway Site” is also subject to floodplains that reduce development potential. The current configuration of floodplains would reduce development potential outside of the Vegetation Management buffer. The proposed buffer provides the opportunity to integrate floodplain capacity into redevelopment of the site which would

include removal of the existing bulkhead and potential regrading to provide flood storage as well as revegetation of the buffer.

3. General comments on criteria for height regulations

In several pages of his comment letter David Halinen, Attorney ,makes the case (see page 10 of his letter) that the single criterion for building height is “.. views from public property or from substantial numbers of existing residences”

This is an incomplete and an inaccurate characterization of the criteria for building height in the statute and in the Shoreline Guidelines-. In fact there are multiple references to aesthetic and other criteria that are relevant to height.

- a) RCW 90.58.320 includes two additional criteria:
 - i) ... except where a master program does not prohibit the same”. This presumes that the master program has addressed the issue and come to some kind of conclusion, and then
 - ii) ...only when overriding considerations of the public interest will be served.

This makes it clear that the public interest, rather than narrow property owner issues are the primary consideration. This leads to other guidance in the statute and Shoreline Guidelines discussed below.

- b) RCW 90.58.020 In the implementation of this policy the public's opportunity to enjoy the physical and aesthetic qualities of natural shorelines of the state shall be preserved to the greatest extent feasible consistent with the overall best interest of the state and the people generally. [emphasis added]
- c) RCW90.58.100(2)(f) The master programs shall include, when appropriate, the following: ...A conservation element for the preservation of natural resources, including but not limited to scenic vistas, aesthetics, and vital estuarine areas for fisheries and wildlife protection; [emphasis added]
- d) WAC 173-26-186(5)(d)(ii)(E) Aesthetic objectives should be implemented by means such as sign control regulations, appropriate development siting, screening and architectural standards, and maintenance of natural vegetative buffers. [emphasis added]
- e) WAC 173-26-211(2)(b)(v) Promote human uses and values that are compatible with the other objectives of this section, such as public access and aesthetic values, provided they do not significantly adversely impact ecological functions. [emphasis added]
- f) WAC 173-26-211(4)(b)(iii) To the greatest extent feasible consistent with the overall best interest of the state and the people generally, protect the public's opportunity to enjoy the physical and aesthetic qualities of shorelines of the state, including views of the water. [emphasis added]
- g) WAC 173-26-211 (4)(d) (iv) Adopt provisions, such as maximum height limits, setbacks, and view corridors, to minimize the impacts to existing views from public property or substantial numbers of residences. Where there is an irreconcilable conflict between water-dependent shoreline uses or physical public access and maintenance of

views from adjacent properties, the water-dependent uses and physical public access shall have priority, unless there is a compelling reason to the contrary. [emphasis added]

- h) WAC 173-26-211 (5)(b) Principles. The intent of vegetation conservation is to protect and restore the ecological functions and ecosystem-wide processes performed by vegetation along shorelines. Vegetation conservation should also be undertaken to protect human safety and property, to increase the stability of river banks and coastal bluffs, to reduce the need for structural shoreline stabilization measures, to improve the visual and aesthetic qualities of the shoreline, to protect plant and animal species and their habitats, and to enhance shoreline uses. [emphasis added]
- i) WAC 173-26-211(6)(b)(i) Prevent impacts to water quality and storm water quantity that would result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions, or a significant impact to aesthetic qualities, or recreational opportunities. [emphasis added]

Application of these concepts to height was discussed in the Technical Memorandum “Regulatory Approach Options Specifics”

Aesthetic issues are one of many considerations balanced in the SMP

4. General comments on the adequacy of information.

Jerry Brennan submitted a letter which is similar to one from Richard Sandaas submitted to the City of Kirkland on July 22, 2009, and in slightly different form on October 3, 2006, and February 7, 2009 which raises numerous questions about the adequacy of the information used in the Inventory/Characterization and as the basis for the Shoreline Master Program.

The Inventory/Characterization is based on the best information available. There are gaps in the scientific knowledge. Delaying preparation of programs for additional information would indefinitely delay any program since scientific information is never complete. Such a delay also would not meet statutory requirement in RCW 90.58.080 to update the SMP by December 1, 2009.

5. Overview of changes in the July 22, 2009 Draft Shoreline Master Program to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations

Three types of revisions have been made to the July 22, 2009 Draft:

- a) Clarification of the text generated by Renton and Consultant staff, some of which result from questions of the Planning Commission and comments at workshop sessions
- b) Revisions in response to comments by the Department of Ecology in their September 30, 2009 letter.
- c) Responses to comments by the public and other agencies

6. Specific changes to the July 22, 2009 Draft SMP

Comprehensive Plan Shoreline Element (Former Section 1) Introduction

Very few comments were received on this section and no substantive changes have been made.

Section 4-3-090.B. (Former Section 3) Regulated Shorelines

This section includes a revision to Shoreline Geographic Environments in Section 5. The Separate “High Intensity” designation for Lake Washington as a Shoreline of Statewide

Significance (SSWS) has been deleted and relevant standards incorporated by reach. This also reflects the lack of a separate residential overlay for Lake Washington.

Comprehensive Plan Shoreline Element (Former Section 4) Goals and Policies

This section is reformatted consistent with Comprehensive Plan sections.

Very minor changes are made to provide clarification.

Section 4-3-090.B. (Former Section 5) Shoreline Geographic Environment Designations

Former Section 5.05 Multi-Family Residential

This designation is eliminated. It will be governed by the “High Intensity Overlay District” and further by zoning. A small area on Lake Washington north of Quendall Terminals is zoned multi family. The small area currently zoned multi-family in the PAA west of the City Limits is proposed to be designated COR.

Former Section 5.06 High Intensity – Lake Washington

This designation is eliminated in preference to providing a single “High Intensity Overlay District”. Provisions previously relating to Lake Washington as a Shoreline of Statewide Significance (SSWS) are preserved in the new overlay. The specific Management Policies are generalized somewhat to provide more general direction to areas not SSWS.

Section 4-3-090.D.5. (Former Section 5.07) High Intensity – Isolated

No changes made. We were concerned about possible questions from Ecology regarding this designation, but they have approved the concept, but not necessarily the geographic application.

Section 4-3-090.E. (Former Section 6) General Development Standards

Changes are relatively minor and respond to comments to provide clarification.

Section 4-3-090.E.9 (Former Section Table 6.09) reflects the elimination of the “Multi-Family Residential” and “High Intensity Lake Washington” overlay Districts.

Section 4-3-090.F. (Former Section 7) Specific Use Regulations

Section 4-3-F.2 (Former Section 7.02) Boat Launching Ramps – clarification is provided that these are allowed only for public launch ramps or in marinas. One commenter suggested that as previously written, any single family lot could have a boat launch.

Section 4-3-090.F.2.7 (Former Section 7.07) Piers and Docks

Minor revisions were made to respond to comments.

Section 4-3-090.G. (Former Section 8) Shoreline Modification

Section 4-3-090.G.1. (Former Section 8.01) Vegetation Conservation

Section 4-3-090.G.1.e.i(Former Section 8.01.02.D) Ecology has stated that the proposed revisions to the sliding scale for single family lots based on lot depth may be unacceptable.

Options include:

- Change back to the previous steps
- Discuss acceptable options with Ecology and revise in a later version

- Keep the present proposal and see if Ecology disallows it in their approval process after city approval

We recommend additional discussions with Ecology to see if we can develop an acceptable system.

Section 4-3-090.G.3. (Former Section 8.03) Dredging

We have made only minor changes.

Comments received from Larry Martin would have the effect of allowing unregulated dredging for existing docks and piers as “maintenance”

We believe that is inappropriate for a number of reasons.

- a) It is contrary to the overall public interest which is the primary objective cited in RCW 90.58 which provides:

In the implementation of this policy the public's opportunity to enjoy the physical and aesthetic qualities of natural shorelines of the state shall be preserved to the greatest extent feasible consistent with the overall best interest of the state and the people generally. To this end uses shall be preferred which are consistent with control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment, or are unique to or dependent upon use of the state's shoreline. Alterations of the natural condition of the shorelines of the state, in those limited instances when authorized, shall be given priority for single family residences and their appurtenant structures...[emphasis added]

The enjoyment of benefits of access to private docks does not have substantial standing when compared to the damage to the natural environment from dredging.

- b) It is contrary to the public interest because dredging in the nearshore areas of Renton in general and the Cedar River and May Creek deltas in particular is likely to damage the extreme sensitivity of the nearshore for a critical lifestage of Chinook Salmon and general importance of to ecological functions.
- c) It is appropriate for the SMP to utilize local information –the findings of the Inventory/Characterization document the potential ecological productivity of the deltas of the Cedar River and May Creek and the desirability of retaining those important natural processes.

The importance of restoration of the Cedar River and May Creek deltas are also documented in the *Final Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish/ Watershed* (WRIA 8) *Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan*. The following are *Conservation Plan* through the following projects

C268 Modifying Cedar River Delta to create more shallow water habitat

C277 Restoration of mouth of May Creek.

The May Creek Basin Action Plan states

In the event that the mill property on the May Creek Delta redevelops in the future, opportunities to enhance May Creek habitat and reduce the need for maintenance dredging should be explored. Although a feasibility study of this option has not been undertaken, it is possible that modifying the May Creek channel could reduce the need for maintenance dredging and provide a unique opportunity to establish an

improved habitat area within the lakeshore commercial area, allowing the realization of environmental and economic benefits.

- d) These delta areas were dredged in the past for flood control, and in the case of Barbee Mill for log storage. The City Surface Water Division has confirmed that dredging of the mouth of the Cedar River is not needed for flood control. In addition, as part of the Barbee Mill subdivision approval, the city required modeling of May Creek assuming re-establishment of the delta and assured that the corridor provided for May Creek and design of bridges would accommodate the 1% flood event.
- e) It is the clear intent of RCW 90.58.020 to preserve natural processes. The formation of deltas is a natural process with clear benefits to the public interest. In the future, the formation of the delta will interfere with a few docks in the area. The docks most affected are:
 - The Barbee Mill boathouse established in the 1950s. This boathouse is non-conforming both because the primary use, the sawmill has been discontinued, and because boathouses have not been allowed since adoption of the first SMP in the 1970s.
 - Several new docks are proposed for the Barbee Mill Subdivision. These docks are being proposed with clear foreknowledge from the Barbee Mill EIS project that the Mill Creek delta will re-form and the depth available for the docks will be substantially reduced.
 - One other shared dock serves four recently created lots and is further south. It will be affected, but not as much as the two examples below.

Such impacts on private docks must be balanced with the clear ecological benefits of allowing this natural process to re-establish. It will take a decade or so for the delta to re-establish in the area previously dredged. There is one existing permit for dredging in the May Creek delta, however, it is for an area of only 10,000 square feet for a limited time period and at the opposite side of the boathouse from the mouth of the stream. The existing permit will allow dredging and use of the moorage facility over the short to medium term and will expire by the time the natural delta formation process is likely to reach the area.

We believe that it is clear that it is in the public interest to substantially restrict dredging in the Cedar River and Mill Creek deltas and include such requirements in the SMP for clear future administration.

New Section 4-10-095 Non-Conforming Uses, Activities and Structures

Section 4-10-095.G Partial Compliance, Alteration of Nonconforming Structure or Site

- This threshold for upgrading site conditions has been changed for single family development to remove the percent of improvement threshold.
- The threshold for floor area triggers to upgrading has been changed to building footprint.
- The square foot increase threshold for non-single-family development has been eliminated to include only a percent. This is in recognition that non-single family structures (such as the Boeing Plant) are very large and should not be subject to the same square foot thresholds as the single family.

The effect of these changes for single-family development is likely to be less frequent imposition of requirements to upgrade:

- Shoreline vegetation to replace lawn and ornamental vegetation along a narrow strip on the shoreline to avoid application of fertilizers and herbicides close to the water and provide limited habitat functions such as shading and foodchain functions
- Bulkheads which have impacts of increasing wave energy and hence the nearshore substrata, as well as limiting the positive contribution of shoreline vegetation
- Over water coverage for docks, which relate to nearshore habitat quality

The elimination of the 50 percent threshold for full compliance represents a change from the standard in the existing code that has been applied to shorelines.

Because single-family residences are about three quarters of the Renton Lake Washington shoreline, this has implications for meeting cumulative no-net-loss criteria.

The October 23, 2008 Tech Memo - Code Overview item 5 addressed cumulative impacts and relates to the findings of the Inventory/Characterization that existing bulkheads, docks, and vegetation management contribute to ecological decline reflected most significantly in declines in salmon populations, specifically nearshore rearing of Cedar River Chinook populations and the precipitous decline in sockeye beach spawning. We also know that pesticides commonly used in lawn maintenance can have an adverse impact on aquatic species. This was also discussed in topic 6 Provisions for existing development

There is no evidence that the factors that have led to a decline in Chinook salmon have reversed.

If single-family development makes less of a contribution to changing the conditions that have led to a decline, a greater contribution may need to be made on publicly owned land, such as Gene Coulon Park, or elsewhere, to improve near shore conditions to compensate. However, shoreline conditions at Gene Coulon Park are less degraded and are near to natural beach conditions in some cases. Given the current higher level of function of public lands, it is not clear that additional measures can effectively compensate for the continued adverse effects of shoreline site conditions on the majority of the shoreline in single family use.

One other factor to consider is the difficulty of accurately characterizing the extent to which this change in the Draft SMP would affect the rate of positive change that otherwise would occur on residential sites. We can reasonably conclude that it would result in less change, but we can't reliably predict a magnitude.

Renton Shoreline Master Program - Sensitivity Analysis - Vegetation Conservation Buffer Areas 10-09-09

OLD STONEWAY SITE

Development Scenarios

Assume Non-Water Oriented Use

		No Development in 200' SMA Jurisdiction	No Development in 100' Vegetation Conservation Buffer	No Development in Halinen 50' SMA Vegetation Buffer	Entire Site Developed No Buffer	Site minus Floodplain
Entire Site		12.54	12.54	12.54	12.54	12.54
Site Area Square Feet	43560	546,242	546,242	546,242	546,242	546,242
Developable Site Area (acres)		5.88	9.21	10.88	12.54	9.56
Developable Site Area (square feet) per Buffer		256,242 KEY	401,242 KEY	473,742	546,242	416,242
Developable Site Area (square feet) per Max Bldg Cover		409,682	409,682	409,682 KEY	409,682 KEY	409,682 KEY
Reduction due to buffer (sq ft)		290000	145000	72500	0	130000 < Floodplain I
Reduction due to buffer (percent)		53%	27%	13%	0%	24%

<< NOTE - FOR THESE SENARIOS BUILDING COVERAGE CONTROLS NOT BUFFER:

SCENARIO 1 All 10 Story Buildings

Assumes full height outside Veg Cons Buffer

MAXIMUM OFFICE USE										
Maximum Lot Coverage		75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%
Maximum Building Coverage per Code		409,682	409,682	409,682	409,682	409,682	409,682	409,682	409,682	409,682
Maximum Area Covered per Buffer		290,000	145,000 < KEY	72,500	0	130,000				
Number of building stories	10									
Total Building Sq Ft Available- Office + Parking		2,562,424	4,012,424	4,096,818	4,096,818	4,096,818	4,096,818	4,096,818	4,096,818	4,096,818
Office Building Sq Ft Area		1,348,500 Base	2,111,300 157%	2,156,000 160%	2,156,000 160%	2,156,000 160%	2,156,000 160%	2,156,000 160%	2,156,000 160%	2,156,000 160%
Parking Spaces (ratio/1,000 next col)	3	4,046	6,334	6,468	6,468	6,468	6,468	6,468	6,468	6,468
Parking Sq Ft Area (sf/space next col)	300	1,213,650	1,900,170	1,940,400	1,940,400	1,940,400	1,940,400	1,940,400	1,940,400	1,940,400
Total FLOOR Area - Office plus Parking Building Area		2,562,150	4,011,470	4,096,400	4,096,400	4,096,400	4,096,400	4,096,400	4,096,400	4,096,400
Total SITE Area Coverage (no stories next)	10	256,215	401,147	409,640	409,640	409,640	409,640	409,640	409,640	409,640

Development Scenarios
Assume Non-Water Oriented Use

**No Development in
 200' SMA Jurisdiction**

**No Development in
 100' Vegetation
 Conservation Buffer**

**No Development in
 Halinen 50' SMA
 Vegetation Buffer**

**Entire Site
 Developed
 No Buffer**

**Site minus
 Floodplain**

<< NOTE - FOR THESE SENARIOS BUILDING COVERAGE CONTROLS NOT BUFFER:

SCENARIO 2 All 10 Story Buildings
 Assumes full height outside Veg Cons Buffer
MAXIMUM COMBINED RESIDENTIAL/OFFICE

		627		627		627		627		627	
Residential Use (50 units/acre)											
Unit size	1,500							\$			
Residential Floor Area		940,500		940,500		940,500		940,500		940,500	
Lot coverage - bldg stories	10	94,050		94,050		94,050		94,050		94,050	
Lot coverage percent		17%		17%		17%		17%		17%	
Parking Spaces (ratio/1,000 next col)	1	627		627		627		627		627	
Parking Area (sf/space next col)	300	188,100		188,100		188,100		188,100		188,100	
Parking Lot coverage (stories next column)	10	18,810		18,810		18,810		18,810		18,810	
Parking Lot Coverage Percent		3%		3%		3%		3%		3%	
Site available for office/other		143,382		288,382		360,882		296,822		303,382	
Percent site available office/other		56%		72%		76%		54%		73%	
Number of stories	10										
Total Building Sq Ft Available- Office + Parking		1,433,824		2,883,824		3,608,824		2,968,218		3,033,824	
Total Office Floor Area		754,000	BASE	1,517,000	201%	1,562,000	207%	1,562,000	207%	1,562,000	207%
Office Lot Coverage		75,400		151,700		156,200		156,200		156,200	
Parking Spaces (ratio/1,000 next col)	3	2,262		4,551		4,686		4,686		4,686	
Parking Area (sf/space next col)	300	678,600		1,365,300		1,405,800		1,405,800		1,405,800	
Parking Lot coverage (stories next column)	10	67,860		136,530		140,580		140,580		140,580	
Total FLOOR Area - Office plus Parking Build	10	1,432,600		2,882,300		2,967,800		2,967,800		2,967,800	
Total SITE Area Coverage		256,120		401,090		409,640		409,640		409,640	
Total Lot Coverage Percent		47%		73%		75%		75%		75%	

72%

Development Scenarios
Assume Non-Water Oriented Use

**No Development in
 200' SMA Jurisdiction**

**No Development in
 100' Vegetation
 Conservation Buffer**

**No Development in
 Halinen 50' SMA
 Vegetation Buffer**

**Entire Site
 Developed
 No Buffer**

**Site minus
 Floodplain**

<< NOTE - FOR THESE SENARIOS BUILDING COVERAGE CONTROLS NOT BUFFER-

SCENARIO 3 All 6 Story Buildings

Assumes full height outside Veg Cons Buffer

MAXIMUM OFFICE USE

Maxumum Lot Coverage		75%		75%		75%		75%		75%	
Maximum Building Coverage per Code		409,682		409,682		409,682		409,682		409,682	
Maximum Area Covered per Buffer		290,000		145,000		72,500		0		130,000	
Area Outside SMA Jurisdiction		256,242									
Number of building stories	6										
Total Building Sq Ft Available		1,537,454		2,407,454		2,458,091		2,458,091		2,458,091	
Office Building Area		840,000	BASE	1,267,000	151%	1,293,700	154%	1,293,700	154%	1,293,700	154%
Parking Spaces (ratio/1,000 next col)	3	2,520		3,801		3,881		3,881		3,881	
Parking Area (sf/space next col)	300	756,000		1,140,300		1,164,330		1,164,330		1,164,330	
Total FLOOR Area - Office plus Parking Building Area		1,596,000		2,407,300		2,458,030		2,458,030		2,458,030	
Total SITE Area Coverage (no stories next)	6	266,000		401,217		409,672		409,672		409,672	
		49%		73%		75%		75%		75%	

SCENARIO 4 All 6 Story Buildings

Assumes full height outside Veg Cons Buffer

MAXIMUM COMBINED RESIDENTIAL/OFFICE

Residential Use (50 units/acre)		627	BASE	627	100%	627	100%	627	100%	627	100%
Unit size	1,500										
Residential Floor Area		940,500		940,500		940,500		940,500		940,500	
Lot coverage - bldg stories	6	156,750		156,750		156,750		156,750		156,750	
Lot coverage percent		29%		29%		29%		29%		29%	
Parking Spaces (ratio/1,000 next col)	1	627		627		627		627		627	
Parking Area (sf/space next col)	300	188,100		188,100		188,100		188,100		188,100	
Lot coverage (stories next column)	6	18,810		18,810		18,810		18,810		18,810	
Parking Lot Coverage Percent		3%		3%		3%		3%		3%	
Site available for office/other		80,682		225,682		234,122		234,122		234,122	
Percent site available office/other		15%		41%		57%		57%		57%	
Number of stories	6										
Total Building Sq Ft Available- Office + Parking		484,094		1,354,094		1,404,731		1,404,731		1,404,731	
Total Office Floor Area		254,600	BASE	712,500	280%	739,390	280%	739,390	280%	739,390	280%
Office Lot Coverage		42,433		118,750		123,232		123,232		123,232	
Parking Spaces (ratio/1,000 next col)	3	764		2,138		2,218		2,218		2,218	
Parking Area (sf/space next col)	300	229,140		641,250		665,451		665,451		665,451	
Parking Lot coverage (stories next column)	6	38,190		106,875		110,909		110,909		110,909	
Total FLOOR Area - Office plus Parking Build	6	483,740		1,353,750		1,404,841		1,404,841		1,404,841	
Total SITE Area Coverage		256,183		401,185		409,700		409,700		409,700	
Total Lot Coverage Percent		47%		73%		75%		75%		75%	

Development Scenarios
Assume Non-Water Oriented Use

No Development in
200' SMA Jurisdiction

No Development in
100' Vegetation
Conservation Buffer

No Development in
Halinen 50' SMA
Vegetation Buffer

Entire Site
Developed
No Buffer

Site minus
Floodplain

<< NOTE - FOR THESE SENARIOS BUILDING COVERAGE CONTROLS NOT BUFFER>>

SCENARIO 5 Sensitivity Analysis Sloped Height - 10 Story

Assumes 1:1 transition in second 100 feet for 100' and 50' buffer

MAXIMUM OFFICE USE

No Change

No Change

Maxumum Lot Coverage		75%		75%		75%		75%	
Maximum Area Available		256,242		401,242		409,682		409,682	
Maximum Area Covered by Buffer		290,000		145,000		72,500		0	
Area outside SMP Jurisdiciton		256,242		256,242		256,242		256,242	
No Stories	10								
Building Sq Ft Available outside SMA		2,562,424		2,562,424	0	2,562,424		2,562,424	
Area between buffer and SMP Jurisd		NA		145,000		153,439		153,439	
Adjusted floores factored for 1:1 slope				6.76		7.84		8.38	
Building Sq Ft Available in 1:1 slope		NA		980,200		1,202,965		1,285,822	
Total Building Sq Ft Available		2,562,424		3,542,624		3,765,389		3,848,246	
Office Building Sq Ft Area		1,348,500	BASE	1,864,000	138%	1,981,500	147%	2,025,000	150%
Parking Spaces (ratio/1,000 next col)	3	4,046		5,592		5,945		6,075	
Parking Sq Ft Area (sf/space next col)	300	1,213,650		1,677,600		1,783,350		1,822,500	
Total FLOOR Area - Office plus Parking Building Area		2,562,150		3,541,600		3,764,850		3,847,500	

SCENARIO 4 Sensitivity Analysis Sloped Height - 6 Story

Assumes 1:1 transition in second 100 feet for 100' and 50' buffer

MAXIMUM OFFICE USE

No Change

No Change

Maxumum Lot Coverage		75%		75%		75%		75%	
Maximum Area Covered per Code		409,682		401,242		409,682		409,682	
Maximum Area Covered per Buffer		290,000		145,000		72,500		0	
Area outside SMP Jurisdiciton		256,242		256,242		256,242		256,242	
No Stories	6	6.00		6.00		6.00		6.00	
Building Sq Ft Available outside SMA		1,537,454		1,537,454		1,537,454		1,537,454	
Area between buffer and SMP Jurisd		NA		145,000		153,439		153,439	
Adjusted floores factored for 1:1 slope		NA		5.36		5.57		5.68	
Building Sq Ft Available in 1:1 slope		NA		777,200		855,169		871,536	
Total Building Sq Ft Available		1,537,454		2,314,654		2,392,623		2,408,990	
Office Building Sq Ft Area		809,000	BASE	1,218,000	151%	1,259,000	156%	1,267,500	157%
Parking Spaces (ratio/1,000 next col)	3	2,427		3,654		3,777		3,803	
Parking Sq Ft Area (sf/space next col)	300	728,100		1,096,200		1,133,100		1,140,750	
Total FLOOR Area - Office plus Parking Building Area		1,537,100		2,314,200		2,392,100		2,408,250	