

December 17, 2025

Rachael N. Brown  
City of Puyallup  
Planning Division  
333 S. Meridian  
Puyallup, WA 98371

**RE:**

Responses to Comments  
South Hill Business & Technology Center  
City File No. PLBSP20230028  
CSG Project No. 18111

Dear Rachael:

We have revised the plans and technical documents for the above-mentioned project in accordance with your comment letter dated December 10, 2025. Enclosed are the following documents for your review and approval:

1. Revised Binding Site Plan map dated December 18, 2025

The following outline provides each of your comments in italics exactly as written, along with a narrative response describing how each comment was addressed:

**City Comment Letter**

**Corrections**

Engineering Review – Mark Higginson – (253) 841-5559 – [Mhigginson@puyallupwa.gov](mailto:Mhigginson@puyallupwa.gov)

*Verify-Sheet 16? [SITE PLAN - RESUB 5; 2025\SITE PLAN - RESUB 5.pdf; pg. 5]*

**Response:** This typo has been corrected.

*No improvements described. [SITE PLAN - RESUB 5; 2025\SITE PLAN - RESUB 5.pdf; pg. 16]*

**Response:** The Grant of Public Pedestrian Easement note 'F' on Sheet 16 has been revised to generally describe the improvements to be constructed at the time of the next building permit for a new building on the property.

Engineering Traffic Review – Bryan Roberts – (253) 841-5542 – [broberts@puyallupwa.gov](mailto:broberts@puyallupwa.gov)

- Proposed crossing location shifted only ~125ft vs 175ft-200ft per the previous comment (see below). There is no citation regarding MUTCD compliant signage at this uncontrolled, mid-blockmarked crosswalk.

Comment responses state the new crosswalk was relocated 175ft.

Previous comment:

The proposed pedestrian path alignment is using the existing internal marked crosswalk @ segment L8 (see below). Based on the existing internal road geometry, the crossing should be relocated ~175-200ft farther north to improve sight distance. Additionally, this new crossing location would avoid the shaded area within the curved segment. MUTCD complaint signage should be included at uncontrolled crossing.

SITE PLAN page 16 [SITE PLAN - RESUB 5; 2025\SITE PLAN - RESUB 5.pdf; pg. 16]

**Response:** The sidewalk crossing location has been shifted north ~100ft. This easement is detailed and dimensioned on Sheet 16.

- Show updated crosswalk location 175ft-200ft NW of the existing location or provide a note that references pedestrian easement alignment modifications on sheet 16. Also, update easement alignment on sheet 5.

SITE PLAN page 12 [SITE PLAN - RESUB 5; 2025\SITE PLAN - RESUB 5.pdf; pg. 12]

**Response:** The updated crosswalk location has been depicted and labeled on Sheet 12.

- Note "F" needs to include specific language describing what improvements are required. Paved pedestrian path, relocated marked crosswalk, MUTCD complaint signage, etc.

Comment responses state that the pedestrian path will be a paved surface and MUTCD complaint signage will be provided at the relocated crosswalk.

SITE PLAN page 16 [SITE PLAN - RESUB 5; 2025\SITE PLAN - RESUB 5.pdf; pg. 16]

**Response:** The Grant of Public Pedestrian Easement note 'F' on Sheet 16 has been revised to generally describe the improvements to be constructed at the time of the next building permit for a new building on the property.

### Conditions

#### Planning Division

Public notice sign must be posted on site in a publically visible location.

**Response:** The public notice sign was posted on site on May 24, 2021.

*Signed Affidavit must be provided.*

**Response:** The signed affidavit of sign posting signed and dated May 24, 2021 was previously provided.

*Future landuse and building permits will be required to conform to PMC 20.35.031 Business park design standards*

**Response:** Acknowledged.

*(2) Surveying and Monumentation. In order to ensure the establishment and preservation of land surveys, and ensure accurate and consistent standards and procedures for surveying and monumentation, the following requirements shall apply:*

*(a) All surveying and monumentation shall be performed in accordance with Chapter 58.09 RCW and city requirements;*

**Response:** All surveying and monumentation shall be performed in accordance with Chapter 58.09 RCW and city requirements.

*(b) Permanent survey control monuments shall be provided at all controlling corners of the subdivision, at the intersection of centerlines of roads within and adjacent to the subdivision, and at the angle points and points of curvature in each street;*

**Response:** Acknowledged. All lot & tract corners will be set upon final approval. No public roads or private road tracts are proposed within this Binding Site Plan.

*(c) Permanent survey control monuments located within areas subject to flooding shall include the elevation of the top of the monument;*

**Response:** Acknowledged. Any monuments set within areas subject to flooding will include the elevation of the top of the monument.

*(d) Every lot corner shall be permanently marked in accordance with standard surveying practices;*

**Response:** All surveying and monumentation shall be performed in accordance with Chapter 58.09 RCW and city requirements.

*(e) The city may also require the boundaries of any delineated critical area to be surveyed and permanently marked in accordance with the city's monumentation standards;*

**Response:** Acknowledged.

*(f) If any land proposed for subdivision under this title is contiguous to a meandering body of water, the meander line shall be reestablished, the line shown on the face of the drawing, and permanently marked in accordance with the city's monumentation standards; and*

**Response:** Acknowledged.

*(g) Any monument or other permanent survey markers disturbed by construction or other activities shall be reestablished in accordance with the requirement contained in this section*

**Response:** Acknowledged.

Engineering Division

*Legal Dept to review BSP and CCRs prior to final approval per JBeck email dated 06/30/23. (MH)*

**Response:** Our understanding is that the Legal Department has reviewed the BSP. The applicant does not propose to adopt CC&R's in connection with this application.

Traffic Division

*Prior to new construction building permit issuance or significant change of use TI, the following will be required:*

- *Based on previous EIS & Concomitant agreement, must provide a determination on the overall quantity of vested vehicle trips to this site.*

**Response:** This BSP application does not seek entitlement for any future development or change of use on the property. It is merely intended to establish new legal lots on the overall site. As such, this information will be appropriate in the future in connection with a possible building permit or entitlement permit for any lots on the property but is not required at this time to review and approve the BSP. The applicant acknowledges for the record that the City will expect such information in connection with a future building permits or entitlement permits for any lots on the property.

- *Provide a trip generation estimate based on your current use & proposed future buildout. This estimate must be based on published rates in the ITE trip generation manual (using building sq ft).*

*City policy requires the project trips to be estimated using the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation, 11th Edition. In general, trip generation regression equations shall be used when the R2 value is 0.70 or greater. For single-family units and offices smaller than 30,000 SF, use ITE's Trip Generation, average rate. The project trips shall be rounded to the nearest tenth.*

**Response:** See prior response.

- *The applicant shall conduct a traffic analysis to determine impacts of a proposed full buildout of site. Analysis shall include a detailed summary of all building permits and/or off-site improvements associated with this site since original construction was completed. This summary shall include all previous mitigation and/or traffic impact fees paid.*

**Response:** See prior response.

*The City has adopted a City-Wide Traffic Impact Fee of \$4,500 per PM peak hour trip. Final fees will be calculated and assessed by the City at the time of building permit issuance.*

**Response:** Acknowledged.

*During the Civil review process, this commercial development shall provide an autoturn analysis for the largest anticipated vehicle that would access the site. Curb radii and entrance dimensions shall be increased as necessary to allow vehicles to access the site without encroaching into adjacent lanes of traffic.*

**Response:** Acknowledged.

*Internal access road must meet minimum fire standards*

**Response:** Acknowledged.

*Add a 1ft no access easement along 39th Ave SE. All vehicles must access from existing driveway locations on 39th Ave SE. Adjust accordingly to accommodate new access easement on the SW corner of Lot 7/Tract B to allow for the future reconstruction/realignment of the eastern 39th Ave SE driveway. The existing eastern 39th Ave SE driveway does not meet City spacing standards or alignment requirements for Major Arterials. In the future, this driveway may need to be realigned with the southern commercial driveway to accommodate increased volume (maybe even signalized).*

**Response:** This easement has been graphically depicted and labeled on Sheets 14 & 15.

We believe that the above responses, together with the enclosed revised plans and technical documents, address all the comments in your letter dated December 10, 2025. Please review the enclosed at your earliest convenience. If you have questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Kimberly Anderson

Civil Project Manager

425.656.7483 | kanderson@core-states.com

KA/kb

18111c.013

enc: As noted