

Freeman Rd Logistics Site Plan Drawing Feedback

Dec 6, 2021

This feedback is provided by Joyce and Steve Asbjornsen owners of parcels 0420201036, 0420205004, and 0420201008. There are three feedback files, one addresses the SEPA Checklist, one file containing a copy of the site plan drawing that is marked up with call-out indicators, and this document.

Observations

This section regards issues observable from the limited drawing of the provided building layout which delivers little feature detail and no elevations. An augmented version of the provided building layout (referred to as Figure 1) is included in the accompanying file, "P-21-0136 Figure 1 - Site Plan with callouts.pdf" included as part of this feedback submission. Figure 1, provides callouts A through F on the submitted building layout highlighting associated issues A through F as follows:

- A: There is an encroachment of the required 30' buffer area around parcel 0420205004 which is in residential use. It is difficult to tell what the object in the dashed red box in Figure 1 is, but it appears to be some form of access to the front of the building. Such an access should not exist within the 30' buffer.

- B1: This appears to be a traffic access for the site connected to 52nd St. E. (now 19th Ave NW) which is a private road. The ROW for 52nd St. E. is an easement belonging to parcel 0420201008. The original easement lists grantees to the easement; however, the list does not include the owner of the 5 acres of parcel 0420201101 which encompasses Vector's southern warehouse. Moreover, the Schenk Business Park exclusively maintains 52nd St E east of Freeman Rd. E.

Because the documents at my disposal do not show a clear right of access for parcel 0420201101 to the easement, it's not clear if Vector would have a legal right to access 52nd St E. There must also be an assignment of road maintenance cost going forward to avoid an unjust burden on Schenk Business Park if they become a relatively small part of the anticipated heavy commercial traffic on 52nd St E.

If Vector cannot establish a right to access 52nd St E, or the warehouse property does not come with an assigned responsibility for future maintenance costs of 52nd St E, their southern access to Freeman Rd E should be completely contained within their property which parallels 52nd St E and does extend all the way to Freeman Rd E.

- B2: Same issues as B1

C1: The placement of a proposed new “50 St E” from Freeman Rd E eastward appears to abut the property boundary of parcel 0420201036 which is in residential use. That violates the required 30’ buffer imposed by the Freeman Road Overlay (FRO). The proposed associated ROW also encroaches 30’ into parcel 0420201036 (see purple highlight associated with callout C1 in Figure 1). Any consideration of creating a new east-west access road must place the ROW north of the 30’ buffer thus placing any new ROW no closer than 30’ from parcel 0420201036. This is especially true since the desire for a new ROW is based on a desire to vacate 19th Ave NW, as illustrated in the drawing. Such a vacation would provide additional usable land to the benefit of the developer and therefore any creation of a new roadbed and ROW should be solely within the developer’s properties. For the record, **we STRONGLY OBJECT to vacating 19th Ave NW and creating the proposed new “50 St E” extension.**

C2: The proposed “20’ Private Alley” designed to accommodate access to the home on parcel 0420201032 is inappropriate on many levels:

- i. Parcel 0420201032 has been zoned commercial and any new access should support commercial use which would require a 30’ or greater access road.
- ii. The parcel is currently in residential use which means the 30’ buffer should extend around any property boundary where there is adjacency to commercial use. The proposed 20’ Private Alley abuts the parcel 0420201032 property line which is a direct violation of the FRO buffer requirement. Any new access route ROW parallel to the western boundary of parcel 0420201032 should be no closer than 30’ from the parcel to allow the required 30’ buffer on the western boundary of the parcel as prescribed by the FRO and extend directly north all the way to the current public access point for the parcel.
- iii. The current access to parcel 0420201032 is via a public road now maintained by the city of Puyallup. Attempting to designate this as a “Private Alley” is an inappropriate attempt to make maintenance of the parcel owner’s access road dependent on either a future warehouse owner(s) or, worse, the property owner. **The property owner’s access to their property via publicly maintained roads must be continued.** Especially since the interest of future warehouse owners in maintaining the “Private Alley” will likely disappear leaving the property owner (a Vietnam Vet.) to absorb potential maintenance costs beyond their means.

D: The site plan shows a 60’ ROW for a proposed extension of 50th St. E. extending from Freeman Rd eastward. The proposal has two critical flaws:

- i. First, the site plan proposes a 60' ROW that places 30' of the ROW on adjacent private property (parcel 0420201036). Since the need for the proposed road is due to the developer's attempt to vacate the existing public road on 49th St E (19th Ave NW) and the developer would benefit from incremental available land if the road is vacated, the developer must absorb all the new ROW from the property they acquire.
- ii. The proposed road abuts the property line for parcel 0420201036. That parcel is in residential use requiring a 30' buffer from the parcel's property boundary per Puyallup's FRO overlay. The entirety of the proposed road and the associated ROW must be at least 30' north of parcel 0420201036 to accommodate the required 30' buffer. Any exceptions regarding landscape buffers associated with existing roads should not apply to new roads that are proposed. Especially when existing roads (19th Ave NW) provide ample service to the developer's properties and the new road is proposed solely for the developer's convenience. Moreover, the new road would bring commercial traffic closer to parcels in residential use putting unnecessary burden on the existing residents while existing access to the developer's properties does not hinder development of those properties and is well established.

E: The southern warehouse in the site plan appears to be positioned so that its western face abuts the required 30' buffer from the residential property to the west. There appears to be no means of servicing or maintaining the western face of the building without encroaching on the buffer nor does there appear to be sufficient access to the buffer for ongoing maintenance of the buffer. Since walkways within the buffer that would allow general access to the buffer area would defeat the intended privacy function of the buffer, the plan should include access to the western face of the warehouse building east of the required 30' buffer.

F: The site's southern end seems to include landscape beds or sidewalks (can't tell what they are from the drawings) that extend into parcel 0420201008 which is not owned by the developer (see purple highlights being pointed to by callout "F"). More than a minor excursion, nearly 50% of beds/sidewalks shown cross into the 52nd St E. ROW. Any landscaping requirements or setbacks required by Puyallup building codes should exist entirely on the Developer's property.