



City of Puyallup  
**Planning Division**  
 333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371  
 (253) 864-4165  
 www.cityofpuyallup.org

April 8, 2022

STOF WA  
 9401 FARWEST DR SW  
 TACOMA, WA 98498-1919

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM (DRT) LETTER	
PERMIT #	P-21-0049
PROJECT NAME	PIERCE COLLEGE MASTER PLAN
PERMIT TYPE	Master Plan
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	MASTER PLAN REVIEW FOR PIERCE COLLEGE - SEPA
SITE ADDRESS	1601 39TH AVE SE, PUYALLUP, WA 98374;
PARCEL #	0419023011;
ASSOCIATED LAND USE PERMIT(S)	
APPLICATION DATE	May 12, 2021
APPLICATION COMPLETE DATE	
<b>PROJECT STATUS</b>	<b><u>Active Development Review Team (DRT) review case – resubmittal required.</u></b> Please address review comments below and resubmit revised permit materials and by responding in writing to the remaining items that need to be addressed.
<b>APPROVAL EXPIRATION</b>	<b>N/A</b> – Active permit application, not approved
<b>CONDITIONS</b>	<p><b>Active permit application, not approved;</b></p> <p>Pursuant to PMC 20.11.022 regarding inactive applications, any and all pending land use applications or plat applications shall be deemed null and void unless a timely re-submittal is made to the City within 1 year of issuance of this Development Review Team (DRT) comment letter.</p> <p>DRT review letters typically identify requested corrections, studies or other additional required pieces of information necessary to demonstrate conformance with the City’s adopted development standards and codes.</p> <p>Subsequent applicant re-submittals shall make a good faith effort to respond to each request from this letter in order for the application to remain active.</p> <p>The failure to provide timely responses or lack of providing the requested material(s) within the 1-year window following DRT comment letter issuance shall be grounds for expiration, thus deeming the pending application null and void with or without a full or partial refund of application fees.</p>

## HOW TO USE THIS LETTER

This review letter includes two sections: **“Action Items”** and **“Conditions”**.

The **“Action Items”** section includes all items that the applicant must address to comply with the Puyallup Municipal Code (PMC) and city standards. Items listed in under **Action Items** require a resubmittal under this permit for further review by the Development Review Team (DRT); your application is not approved. Please make those updates to the proposed plans and resubmit for review. Please include a response letter outlining how you have revised your proposal to meet these items for ease of plan check by DRT members.

The **“Conditions”** are items that will govern the final permit submittal(s) for the project. Please be aware that these conditions will become conditions of the final permits and/or recommendations to the Hearing Examiner, if applicable.

If you have questions regarding the action items or conditions outlined in this letter, please contact the appropriate staff member directly using the phone number and/or email provided.

---

## ACTION ITEMS

**Planning Review** - Chris Beale; (253) 841-5418; CBeale@PuyallupWA.gov

- The following corrections will need to be integrated into the Master Plan between now and the public hearing with Planning Commission. Please contact city staff directly with revisions to the Master Plan document (Planning) and for the traffic report (WSDOT safety analysis).
- The existing condition chapter should integrate and centralize further maps regarding natural resources, utilities, critical areas. The map inserted in the January resubmittal (page
  - A figure showing known critical areas throughout the site should be provided with a discussion. Steep slopes, habitat areas, erosion hazards, soils mapped, proximity to wells and wellhead protection zones, flood areas, streams and riparian buffers. These can just be GIS data maps with short descriptions of the critical areas in narrative.
- In order for the Master Plan to meet the consistency with Comprehensive Plan (PMC 20.88.030 (1)(A)), the Master Plan needs to acknowledge the needs of the larger community expressed in the South Hill Neighborhood Plan regarding pedestrian safety and mobility. The campus plays an important role in the geography of the city’s vehicular and public transit transportation network, pedestrian transportation network, safe routes to schools (PSD), community trails/recreation and access to community park space. The Master Plan needs to acknowledge that partnerships with the College, Puyallup School District and the City of Puyallup to seek grants, support capital projects and plan for improvements consistent with city planning documents should be pursued and are critically important to the neighborhood.
- Chapter 4. Add a consolidated table that provides the proposed development standards when compared to PMC 20.44.020.

Public Facility (PF) zone development standards	Proposed Master Plan development standards
Minimum lot size: none.	
Minimum lot width: none.	
Minimum lot depth: none.	
Minimum front yard setback: 20 feet, or same as the most restrictive abutting zone, whichever is greater; or as otherwise established through a conditional use permit or master plan.	
Minimum rear yard setback: 20 feet, or as required in PMC 20.26.500, whichever is greater; or as otherwise established through a conditional use permit or master plan.	
Minimum side yard setback: 20 feet, or as required in PMC 20.26.500, whichever is greater; or as otherwise established through a conditional use permit or master plan.	
Minimum landscaped setback along common boundary with any R zone (see PMC 20.44.020 (7))	
Maximum building height: same as the most restrictive abutting zone at the required setback line; building height may be increased one and one-half feet for each additional foot of setback up to a maximum height of 50 feet; or as otherwise approved through a conditional use permit or master plan	
Landscape buffers – PMC 20.58.005 and VMS design manual	Andy: I would anticipate the 100 foot perimeter buffering to be listed here, and compliance with other requirements in PMC 20.58.005 and the city's VMS design manual listed here.
Performance standards for PF zone – see PMC 20.44.025	Master Plan will comply with PF zone performance standards as shown in PMC 20.44.045

- Section 4.6 design standards. A table needs to be inserted in this section relating proposed standards back to PMC 20.26.300.

Non-residential design standard	Proposed Master Plan review standard
PMC 20.26.300 (1). Building wall and roof modulation	[list master plan proposed design standard OR allow PMC code to govern]
PMC 20.26.300 (1)(a). Wall plane proportions	
PMC 20.26.300 (1)(b). Horizontal modulation	
PMC 20.26.300 (1)(c). Roofline modulation	
(2) Building Wall and Facade Articulation.	
(3) Site Plan Design Principles.	This section will require documentation of all subsections (A – F)
(4) Siding Materials.	
(5) Achieving Building Design Variety.	

- Chapter 4. Given that the College does not wish to terminate/sunset the concomitant agreement at this time, please add a subsection in this chapter describing the concomitant agreement and the relationship to the Master Plan. Please ensure that the recording #s and dates of active concomitant agreements are listed, as well as the standards in the concomitant agreement the govern the property and their relationship to the Master Plan. Add the agreements to the appendix of the document as well. Staff would like to add a statement in the Master Plan that the city would prefer to integrate the terms of the concomitant agreement into a single Master Plan document and terminate the agreement prior to the next Master Plan update approval.
- Section 5.1. State in narrative or a new table how new parking will be phased in parallel to or tied to new development. For example, new parking is being proposed with the STEM building to address parking needs. Also reference that custom parking ratios and phasing plan is authorized/allowed by PMC 20.44.035 to meet parking demand needs somewhere in this section narrative. We need to establish the relationship of new development to the parking provided to make clear findings under approval criteria (PMC 20.88.030 (F)).
- Chapter 8, page 50, Wetland Buffers. This needs clarity that buffers are not approved as 50' in this Master Plan approval, and that wetland reports will be required to be updated at the time of site development or permitting for any structure or site improvement within 300' of known or suspected wetlands. At the time of wetland report review for new development, new buffer widths will be established.

**Traffic Review** - Bryan Roberts; (253) 841-5542; broberts@PuyallupWA.gov

- Applicant must respond to previous WSDOT comments:

11) Can you provide your Synchro files used for this TIA?

Comment Response: Updated synchro files can be delivered to City if requested

WSDOT RESPONSE:

Could you provide us the updated synchro files?

13) MP25.50-25.76 is identified as CAL/CAC and MP25.48 is identified as IAL. Safety analysis is required.

Comment Response: This comment is assumed to be related to SR 161. As this is a regional facility and the City has no authority to require mitigation that is disproportionate to project impacts, no analysis or project mitigation can be required.

WSDOT RESPONSE:

The City Comprehensive Plan Goal T-5 seeks to create a roadway network that efficiently and safely moves people and goods. The Washington State Strategic Highway Safety Plan (Target Zero) signed by the Governor provides a goal of zero deaths and serious injuries on Washington roadways by 2030. The TIA failed to consider safety as part of the analysis and consider city and statewide safety goals. The TIA failed to provide minimum required content for state highway analysis in accordance with WSDOT Design Manual Section 320.10(1). Required content includes a safety performance analysis. See WSDOT Design Manual Chapter 320 and 321 for more information.

Portion of SR 161 has been identified by WSDOT Collision Analysis Location (CAL) and Corridor (CAC) between mile posts 25.50 and 25.76. In addition, an Intersection Analysis Location (IAL) is identified at mile post 25.48 otherwise known as SR 161 at 35th Ave SE. These are locations that experience higher levels of fatal and serious injury frequency and represent a higher priority safety area for potential safety improvements. This identification is supported by a collision density map in the City of Puyallup's Comprehensive Plan (Map 7-8). The college expansion impacts this portion of SR 161.

The college expansion is expected to create 1458 (TIA Table 3) new daily trips to the area transportation system including state routes. Based upon the peak hour distribution it appears the total vehicle impact to SR 161 is nearly 650 vehicles with 20% to 25% of the 1458 vehicles directly affecting the identified safety priority areas on SR 161.

Based upon available information there may be a probably significant adverse environmental safety impact associated with this project. Additional analysis as previously requested is required to determine the level of impact and mitigation (if necessary).

Prepare a safety analysis in accordance with WSDOT Policy to evaluate the safety impacts of college expansion on the safety of State Route 161.

## CONDITIONS

**Engineering Division** - Jamie Carter; 2534353616; JCarter@puyallupwa.gov

- General: The proposed Master Plan is considered "A Common Plan of Development" which requires all proposed areas of site disturbance to be included in the stormwater thresholds. Minor

improvements and additions must be included in the sizing of proposed stormwater facilities, either directly or indirectly. Revise paragraph 6. Master Plan, Section 7, Page 40.

**Engineering Division** - Jamie Carter; 2534353616; JCarter@puyallupwa.gov

- General: Clarify between the 9 wetland 'areas' and actual number of wetlands (11). All documents must be consistent.

Sincerely,  
Chris Beale  
Senior Planner  
(253) 841-5418  
CBeale@PuyallupWA.gov