



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

January 27, 2023

Riley Johnson  
 PO Box 1224  
 Puyallup, WA 98731

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM (DRT) LETTER	
DRT #	4
PERMIT #	P-21-0034
PROJECT NAME	EAST TOWN CROSSING
PERMIT TYPE	Preliminary Site Plan
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN ~ EAST TOWN CROSSING DEVELOPMENT LETTER SENT 2021
SITE ADDRESS	2902 E PIONEER ;
PARCEL #	0420264021;
ASSOCIATED LAND USE PERMIT(S)	P-20-0027 P-20-0042 P-20-0028 L-20-0002 P-20-0077 P-21-0025 P-19-0010 P-20-0031
APPLICATION DATE	April 02, 2021
APPLICATION COMPLETE DATE	
PROJECT STATUS	<b>Active Development Review Team (DRT) review case – resubmittal required.</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.
APPROVAL EXPIRATION	<b>N/A – Active permit application, not approved</b>
CONDITIONS	<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**

**Fire Review** - David Drake; (253) 864-4171; DDrake@PuyallupWA.gov

- Document Cover Letter for Stormwater Design 11-22-22 addressed to Mark Higginson
  1. Due to the complexity of this project, all lanes are fire lanes.
  2. Vaults are required to be fire apparatus rated because they are in the fire lane.
  3. The current proposed "No Outrigger" will not be approved.

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

- Please provide responses to all Traffic comments/responses:

Please note, the draft Development Agreement (P-19-0010) describes frontage improvements will not be constructed east of the E Pioneer driveway (item #5 of the BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY section). Without an approved development agreement authorizing the deviation from PCC 11.08.135, City municipal code will require frontage improvements along the entire length of E Pioneer frontage. Current site plan does not show City Standard frontage improvements east of the E Pioneer driveway. See comments from Mark Higginson for more detail.

City will require a reduced speed school zone to be installed for Shaw Rd Elementary. The City has determined a reduced speed school zone on Shaw Rd is feasible. Design required during civil submittal. Coordinate with Engineering staff regarding equipment specs. Please acknowledge this requirement

Provide AutoTurn analysis for this radius (NBR movement from at Shaw Rd/E Pioneer) to ensure design vehicles can safely maneuver without impacting WBL turn pocket. This analysis was not provided in latest submittal.

The E Pioneer curb alignment does not match Pioneer crossing offset. I estimate the curb alignment needs to shift 2ft toward roadway centerline. This will place the curb at approximately 34ft from centerline. Update preliminary site plan accordingly or provide justification for why this design is not feasible

Per previous comment, ROW dedication on E Pioneer needs clarification. City estimates that only 52.5ft (from centerline) is needed along frontage. However, 56ft (from centerline) is shown. Update preliminary site plan accordingly or provide justification for why this design is not feasible

On the east side of the E Pioneer driveway, the creek alignment needs to shift approximately 2ft south of current location (match offset/alignment on the west side of the driveway). This will avoid conflicts with future frontage improvements. Update preliminary site plan accordingly

Per previous comments, sight distance analysis required at the E Pioneer driveway per City Standards. ESD of 415ft is required at this driveway. Assume 14.5ft setback from the E Pioneer curb alignment (west side only) and 3.5ft driver eye height. It appears there's a pedestrian barricade and a fence that will obstruct sight distance here.

Please reference/respond to Engineering comments (Mark Higginson) regarding the radius design at the E Pioneer driveway.

Per previous comments, the channelization plan for E Pioneer needs to provide the following information:

1. Applicant will need to verify there's adequate ROW to accommodate paved offsite taper.
2. Applicant to verify paved transition will provide adequate utility pole clearance from the travel lane.

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

- **CRITICAL AREAS – STREAM BUFFER MITIGATION PLAN/WETLANDS:** Critical areas:
  - The project cannot be determined to meet the code sections related to mitigation avoidance, avoidance and minimization sequencing and proper/adequate mitigation provided until such time that the preliminary determination on the off site wetland can be fully confirmed and correctly described in the critical area reports. The critical area report and mitigation plan cannot be approved until Habitat Tech can confirm, delineate and rate the wetland area, properly describe the impacts, and then addresses the questions below. The total area of buffer has to be accurately described for the wetland before the city can approve the loss and compensation of a buffer, which is unconfirmed at this point.
  - Avoidance sequencing on page 12 does not address the avoidance criteria directly. The applicant seems to be reducing the 80 ft preliminary wetland buffer to 25 ft for the majority of the western portion of the buffer area – a 60% wetland buffer reduction. How is the avoidance addressed in terms of not taking certain actions or parts of actions? E.g. has the applicant considered a reduction in the number of parking stalls/building envelope and the development in the wetland buffer? The project team has only now preliminarily determined a wetland exists directly on the property line but the project has not been modified as a result of this new finding so its difficult to make a finding that avoidance was undertaken, as required by code.
    - o Some observations on the site plan. Some effort must be taken to acknowledge the wetland and buffer and some re-design of the site must be taken to respond to this issue to demonstrate avoidance and minimization sequencing has been addressed. The site is parked above the minimum by 31 stalls. 41 stalls are located in the potential wetland buffer. Some or all of these parking stalls will need to be eliminated from the buffer in order to address the avoidance sequencing. Further site plan modifications to the open space areas to pull the buildings interior to the site and allow for additional wetland buffer need to be integrated as well. The design of building A needs to be re-considered if the building is in the wetland buffer.
  - No method of construction for the channelization and establishment of a new meandered stream channel within the off-site preliminary wetland area is described in the impact analysis. If the stream channel is proposed to be lengthened and meandered its reasonable to assume substantial grading work will occur throughout the wetland unit to make the grades work for positive flow to Pioneer. Has the project engineer preliminarily determined grades for this area and has the biologist determined if portions of the wetland would be filled/graded and the compensation for that impact? How will hydroperiods and hydrology be maintained during construction and ensured to exist post construction?
  - Its not clear to city staff if the innovative mitigation section is appropriate to be used for the final approval. The project appears to be proposing unavoidable impacts and buffer mitigation for each impacted critical area, which is not an innovative approach. The applicant needs to meet the standard by qualitatively describing measures taken to avoid impacts or not taking certain actions as required by mitigation sequencing code. See above for guidance.
  - Add photos and figures to support description of stream on off site eastern property, where the stream comes from, the location of the pond berm breach, and the proposed re-channelization in the mitigation plan. Add these to page 7-8 of report.
  - Page 8 and page 11 of the report states there will be “no net loss of habitat area”, but does not describe:
    - o Quantity of lost land area related to the preliminary wetland buffer and compensation for it.
  - No special management strategies for reed canary grass are addressed in the management plan. Is 10% or less coverage of RCG reasonable given the current conditions and post construction disturbance?
    - Staff would recommend taking the approach of installing a larger split of pioneering deciduous species of trees in the disturbed mitigation area over conifers. Sitka spruce and doug fir may work but western redcedar will likely not survive a fully disturbed site in full sun. Could the mitigation plan include sequenced installation of conifers when the deciduous material becomes more mature later in the 10 year monitoring plan?
  - Critical area report states modifications to floodplain proposed; is a habitat assessment consistent with 21.07.050 completed, as conditioned from the sewer line project previously be revised?

Where is that located?

- SEPA: The city's Safe Routes to Schools Plan indicates a need to slow and calm traffic on this high speed 5 lane arterial corridor; this project is within the walk distance of Shaw Road elementary - school children are expected to walk to and from the site to attend. The project is anticipated to be required through SEPA to mitigate existing unsafe conditions to allow safe walking for children residing in the area as a result of the project impacts. This may include speed zone signage off site, or some other form of improvements, in coordination with the School District, Public Works and the city Traffic Engineer. Please be aware this is anticipated to be a SEPA mitigation measure.

**Engineering Review** - Mark Higginson; (253) 841-5559; MHigginson@PuyallupWA.gov

- Shouldn't portions of this area be included in the Bypass (excluding stream)? [Storm Plans; Pg 1 of 5]
- Use conventional paving thru the approach. [Storm Plans; Pg 1 of 5]
- To be revised per McInnis letter dated Nov 22, 2022. Facility shall be preliminarily designed, per prior review comments, to ensure the replacement facility is appropriately sized and will not negatively affect the proposed site plan features and structures. [Storm Plans; Pg 1 of 5]
- Min. Vault Height is 7' per Ecology Manual. The City is willing to allow a 5.5' deep vault provided an AMR is submitted to document the revision. [Storm Plans; Pg 1 of 5]
- Verify-Flow Control location? The FC structure location conflicts with the Vault 2/3 release (unless its a flow splitter). [Storm Plans; Pg 1 of 5]
- Min. Vault Height is 7' per Ecology Manual. Due to the size of this vault, the City is unwilling to support an AMR to reduce the height of the vault below 5.5 feet due to maintenance and safety concerns. Would a StormChamber or similar system be an option? Revise accordingly. [Storm Plans; Pg 1 of 5]
- Confirm with groundwater monitoring results (69.8' and 70.6' per Figure A8 in previous storm report). [Storm Plans; Pg 4 of 5]
- See comments in storm report regarding minimum vault height. [Storm Plans; Pg 4 of 5]
- Per Fire Code Official, vault lid must account for fire apparatus outrigger loading anywhere on the vault lid if located within a drive lane. [Storm Plans; Pg 4 of 5]
- Parcel ...054. [Storm Rpt; Pg 1 of 148]
- See review comments ("markups") on this storm report, some of which must be addressed prior to Landuse Approval and some that can be addressed at civil application. Please refer to the DRT Letter "Action Items" for markups that must be addressed for landuse approval. [Storm Rpt; Pg 1 of 148]
- Parcel ...054. [Storm Rpt; Pg 5 of 148]
- Per the WWHM LID Report on Pg 126 of 148, it does not appear that flow durations for Vault 2/3 were included in the LID analysis. See comment on Pg 126. [Storm Rpt; Pg 11 of 148]
- NOTE: At this phase (landuse application) of the project it is not necessary to show MR5 compliance if 100% detention is proposed and the preliminary design meets the stream duration standard. However, it will be necessary to show MR5 compliance at time of civil application. [Storm Rpt; Pg 11 of 148]

- Per prior reviews, the proposed replacement "vault" did not provide equal or better FC and WQ mitigation of the original stormwater pond. Please submit the proposed facility so the City can confirm preliminary sizing in relation to site constraints. In addition, please review BMP T10.40 and BMP D.3, vault design criteria described in the Ecology Manual as applicable. [Storm Rpt; Pg 12 of 148]
- Min. Vault Height is 7' per Ecology Manual. Due to the size of this vault, the City is unwilling to support an AMR to reduce the height of the vault below 5.5 feet due to maintenance and safety concerns. Would a StormChamber or similar system be an option? [Storm Rpt; Pg 12 of 148]
- If the vaults are located within the designated fire lane, the vaults shall be designed to support the full weight of the fire truck apparatus, including outrigger point loading(s). A "designated outrigger area" is not acceptable. [Storm Rpt; Pg 13 of 148]
- Min. Vault Height is 7' per Ecology Manual. The City is willing to allow a 5.5' deep vault provided an AMR is submitted to document the revision. [Storm Rpt; Pg 13 of 148]
- Portions of the site remain in the regulated floodplain. Any proposed work within the regulated floodplain shall adhere to the criteria of PMC 21.07 (comp. storage; structure protection; habitat assessment; etc.). [Storm Rpt; Pg 14 of 148]
- Use conventional paving thru the approach. [Storm Rpt; Pg 25 of 148]
- Verify-Flow Control location? The FC structure location conflicts with the Vault 2/3 release (unless its a flow splitter). [Storm Rpt; Pg 25 of 148]
- Min. Vault Height is 7' per Ecology Manual. The City is willing to allow a 5.5' deep vault provided an AMR is submitted to document the revision. [Storm Rpt; Pg 25 of 148]
- Min. Vault Height is 7' per Ecology Manual. Due to the size of this vault, the City is unwilling to support an AMR to reduce the height of the vault below 5.5 feet due to maintenance and safety concerns. Would a StormChamber or similar system be an option? Revise accordingly. [Storm Rpt; Pg 25 of 148]
- Shouldn't portions of this area be included in the Bypass (excluding stream)? [Storm Rpt; Pg 25 of 148]
- To be revised per McInnis letter dated Nov 22, 2022. Facility shall be preliminarily designed, per prior review comments, to ensure the replacement facility is appropriately sized and will not negatively affect the proposed site plan features and structures. [Storm Report; Storm Plans Sht 1 of 5; Pg 25 of 148]
- ARG replacement facility to be sized correctly per prior review comments and prior to Landuse approval. [Storm Rpt; Pg 27 of 148]
- Min. Vault Height is 7' per Ecology Manual. Due to the size of this vault, the City is unwilling to support an AMR to reduce the height of the vault below 5.5 feet due to maintenance and safety concerns. Would a StormChamber or similar system be an option? [Storm Rpt; Pg 112 of 148]
- Min. Vault Height is 7' per Ecology Manual. The City is willing to allow a 5.5' deep vault provided an AMR is submitted to document the revision. [Storm Rpt; Pg 114 of 148]

- For some reason, Vault 2/3 is not included in the LID Performance Standard Analysis/Report, so the results ("Pass") may not be accurate. [Storm Rpt; Pg 126 of 148]
- NOTE: At this phase (landuse application) of the project it is not necessary to show MR5 compliance if 100% detention is proposed and the preliminary design meets the stream duration standard. However, it will be necessary to show MR5 compliance at time of civil application. [Storm Rpt; Pg 126 of 148]
- The submitted civil plans contain review comments ("markups") that must be addressed prior to landuse approval as well as informational comments that can be addressed at time of civil application. Please refer to the DRT Letter "Action Items" for markups that must be addressed for landuse approval. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part I, Cover Sheet; Pg 1 of 15]
- Revise site plan and frontage per review comments on the following civil sheets. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part I; Site Plan, Pg 5 of 15]
- In addition to Ecology criteria, the storm outlet design is subject to WDFW conditions and approval. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part I; Storm Plan, Pg 13 of 15]
- If this is intended to be a combined water quality and flow control facility, the design must adhere to Ecology criteria outlined in Ecology Manual Vol V for combined facilities, i.e., 2 cell design for WQ, etc. Similarly, the design must meet the WQ treatment and detention volumes of the original, approved, CES design. See prior comments in the Storm Report dated December 15, 2021 as well as review comments on the previously submitted "Storm Detention Plan". Show that the facility is appropriately sized and will fit on the site plan without negatively affecting the proposed development features and structures. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part I; Storm Plan, Pg 14 of 15]
- To be revised per McInnis letter dated Nov 22, 2022. Facility shall be preliminarily designed, per prior review comments, to ensure the replacement facility is appropriately sized and will not negatively affect the proposed site plan features and structures. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part I; Storm Plan, Pg 14 of 15]
- Min. Vault Height is 7' per Ecology Manual. The City is willing to allow a 5.5' deep vault provided an AMR is submitted to document the revision. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part I; Storm Plan, Pg 14 of 15]
- Min. Vault Height is 7' per Ecology Manual. Due to the size of this vault, the City is unwilling to support an AMR to reduce the height of the vault below 5.5 feet due to maintenance and safety concerns. Would a StormChamber or similar system be an option? Revise accordingly. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part I; Storm Plan, Pg 14 of 15]
- At time of civil application, a downstream analysis will be required to ensure there is adequate conveyance capacity between the project site and the Pioneer north ditch. This would include a backwater analysis from the OHWM and include runoff from onsite and offsite basins tributary to the discharge location. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part I; Storm Plan, Pg 14 of 15]
- In addition to Ecology criteria, the storm outlet design is subject to WDFW conditions and approval. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part I; Storm Plan, Pg 14 of 15]
- -Will WDFW allow easterly grass-lined ditch to tie directly to stream (exist'g cond'n) and avoid mixing "clean" ditch runoff and stream with the PGIS frontage?  
-If WDFW does not allow the ditch-to-stream connection, then construct the proposed conveyance pipe to align with the storm main along the frontage as required by City Standards. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part 2; Pioneer Frontage Storm Plan; Pg 4 of 15]
- Stub and cap if WDFW allows ditch connection to stream. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part 2; Pioneer Frontage Storm Plan; Pg 4 of 15]
- See prior review comments in the Preliminary Storm Report dated December 15, 2021, DRT letter dated May 6, 2022, DRT letter dated August 18, 2022, prior plan markups, and the 'Pioneer Frontage Plan' in Part 4 of this submittal for requested frontage revisions and alignment. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part 2; Pioneer Frontage Storm Plan; Pg 5 of 15]



- Confirm-Based on the revised Preliminary Storm Design submitted by McInnis Engineering, it does not appear that this sheet is relevant. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part 2; Pioneer Frontage Storm Notes and Details; Pg 6 of 15 ]
- Existing power pole appears to conflict with the stream culvert. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part 4; Pioneer Frontage Plan; Pg 1 of 9]
- Per City Standards, curb radius must align with future curb extension. If non-standard design is desired, then City Engineer approval must be obtained using the AMR process prior to Preliminary Site Plan approval. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part 4; Pioneer Frontage Plan; Pg 1 of 9]
- Future curb alignment. Revise accordingly. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part 4; Pioneer Frontage Plan; Pg 1 of 9]
- Taper shall comply with City Stds 101.14. Revise accordingly. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part 4; Pioneer Frontage Plan; Pg 1 of 9]
- Depending on the outcome of the City Engineer's decision, if the non-standard curb radius AMR is not approved, then the existing power pole must be relocated to the future planter strip area. If the AMR is approved, there must be a minimum of 4-ft separation between the travel lane and face of pole while meeting City Standard taper requirements. If 4-ft cannot be provided, the power pole must be relocated. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part 4; Pioneer Frontage Plan; Pg 1 of 9]
- Curb alignment does not appear to align with the Pioneer Crossing curb west of Shaw Road. [Prelim. Civil Dwgs Part 4; Pioneer Frontage Plan; Pg 1 of 9]
- If this is intended to be a combined water quality and flow control facility, the design must adhere to Ecology criteria outlined in Ecology Manual Vol V for combined facilities, i.e., 2 cell design for WQ, etc. Similarly, the design must meet the WQ treatment and detention volumes of the original, approved, CES design. See prior comments in the Storm Report dated December 15, 2021 as well as review comments on the previously submitted "Storm Detention Plan". Show that the facility is appropriately sized and will fit on the site plan without negatively affecting the proposed development features and structures. [Storm Plans; Pg 1 of 5]
- The applicant has proposed 100% stormwater detention to serve the project which is a conservative assumption in terms of the viability of the overall project for the Landuse Application. However, it will be necessary to show MR5 compliance (LID Performance Standard or List 2 Feasibility) at time of civil application. [Storm Rpt; Pg 1 of 148]
- If this is intended to be a combined water quality and flow control facility, the design must adhere to Ecology criteria outlined in Ecology Manual Vol V for combined facilities, i.e., 2 cell design for WQ, etc. Similarly, the design must meet the WQ treatment and detention volumes of the original, approved, CES design. See prior comments in the Storm Report dated December 15, 2021 as well as review comments on the previously submitted "Storm Detention Plan". Show that the facility is appropriately sized and will fit on the site plan without negatively affecting the proposed development features and structures. [Storm Report; Storm Plans Sht 1 of 5; Pg 25 of 148]

## CONDITIONS

**Engineering Division** - Mark Higginson; 2538415559; MHigginson@PuyallupWA.gov

- General: See engineering markups on the preliminary site plans that were submitted with ARG's cover letter dated November 22, 2022.

**Traffic Division** - Bryan Roberts; 2538415542; broberts@PuyallupWA.gov

- General: Traffic Impact fees (TIF) will be assessed in accordance with fees adopted by ordinance, per PMC 21.10.

Impact fees are subject to change and are adopted by ordinance. The applicant shall pay the proportionate impact fees adopted at the time of building permit application

Park impact fees shall be charged per new dwelling unit based on its size. Fees are assessed in accordance with fees adopted by ordinance, per PMC 21.10

School impact fees shall be paid directly to the school district in accordance with adopted fee at the time of collection by the District.

Per Puyallup Municipal Code Section 11.08.130, the applicant/owner would be expected to construct half-street improvements including curb, gutter, planter strip, sidewalk, roadway base, pavement, and street lighting. Any existing improvements which are damaged now or during construction, or which do not meet current City Standards, shall be replaced. Based on the materials submitted, the applicant would be expected to construct half-street improvements on the following streets:

- a. E Pioneer is designated as a major arterial roadway, consisting of curb, gutter, 10' planter strips, 8' sidewalks, and City standard streetlights every 150ft.
- b. The east leg of the Shaw/Pioneer intersection was designed to accommodate 5 lanes of traffic (56ft throat) to align with the existing channelization on west side of Shaw Rd. The curb line along the south side of E Pioneer frontage shall continue this alignment heading East (approximately 34ft from centerline). This will require roadway widening to accommodate this alignment.
- c. Sidewalks and planter strips will not be required east the E Pioneer driveway. However, ROW dedication will be required to facilitate future improvements.
- d. A TWLTL is required along the E Pioneer frontage (minimum 75ft on either side of driveway).
- e. Paved transitions off-site will be required for safety reasons.
- f. Shaw Rd is designated as a major arterial. Per our comprehensive plan, this section of Shaw Rd shall be constructed with a shared use path along the entire length of frontage. The dimensions and materials shall match the existing Shaw Rd shared use path constructed between 23rd Ave SE & Manorwood Dr.
- g. As part of these improvements, additional right-of-way (ROW) may need to be dedicated to the City.

During civil review, City staff shall review street tree placement, monument signage, fences, etc. to ensure required sight distance requirements are met.

Site access driveways shall meet our minimum commercial driveway requirements (35ft curb radius, 30ft width). This is could change based on design vehicles used for the AutoTurn.

Site access restrictions:

- a. No SBL movement at traffic signal
- b. E Pioneer Driveway

Driveway can remain full access as shown with the following conditions:

1. Driveway spacing from Shaw Rd remains as shown on the current site plan
2. TWLTL extending 75ft on either side of driveway (within E Pioneer)
3. Entering sight distance standards are met to allow outbound left turns.
4. At the City's full discretion, outbound left turns from the proposed E Pioneer driveway can be restricted in the future. The following statement will be placed on the face of the short plat:
  - a. "At the discretion of the City, the City may restrict outbound left turns from the E Pioneer access in the future. At the request of the City, the Owners, Heirs, Successors and Assigns agree to renovate and/or improve the driveway access in accordance with the City of Puyallup Municipal Code and Engineering Standards."

At the time of civil permit review provide a separate street lighting plan and pavement striping plan (channelization) sheet for the City to review.

- a. Street lighting plan:

- i. City standard streetlights are required every 150ft along E Pioneer frontage.
- ii. E Pioneer (Arterial) will require GE EVOLVE ELR2 Fixtures ERL2-3-23-A3-40-D-Gray-A-VI (City to provide latest part numbers)
- iii. The existing service cabinet at the E Pioneer/Shaw Rd traffic signal has capacity to power the E Pioneer streetlights.
- iv. City would allow new streetlights to be installed on the north side of E Pioneer to avoid overhead utility conflicts.
- v. If the applicant chooses to install streetlights on the south side of E Pioneer, it is the sole responsibility of the design engineer to ensure streetlight design/placement is outside of the 10ft minimum "safe zone" area. The City will not allow streetlights to be within 10ft of the PSE primary for safety reasons.
- vi. Streetlights shall have shorting caps installed with remote photocell located on the service cabinet.
- vii. The existing PSE utility pole mounted streetlight does not meet current City standards and will be removed with installation of City standard streetlights.
- viii. Streetlight design shall provide the following:
  - 1. Provide details on how streetlights will be powered
  - 2. Location of conduit runs
  - 3. Wiring Schedule
    - a. Conduit size and type for each raceway
    - b. Conductors details
  - 4. Pole schedule
    - a. STA & offset for each luminaire
  - 5. Show location of junction boxes
- b. Channelization + signage plan:
  - i. Shaw Rd/E Pioneer traffic signal may require striping and signage modifications based on the design of the E Pioneer frontage/driveway.
  - ii. The new Shaw Rd traffic signal will also require striping and signage modifications.
  - iii. Pavement markings approaching traffic signal shall be thermoplastic

Traffic signal modifications

- a. The Shaw Rd access intersection (signal) will require modifications to accommodate the proposed driveway. The applicant will coordinate with the City's Adaptive Signal Contractor to purchase/install/configure proprietary equipment.
- b. Signal designer will implement modifications to the westbound and eastbound approach:
  - i. Signal heads + phases
  - ii. Flashing yellow arrows
  - iii. Left turn phases
  - iv. Striping/channelization modifications - Channelization shall match the assumptions outlined in the TIA
- c. The applicant will install a new crosswalk at this signal to accommodate pedestrians crossing Shaw Rd. At this location, only one crosswalk will be allowed to cross Shaw Rd.
- d. Crosswalk will be installed on the south leg of the intersections (see additional requirements below).
- e. The required signal/intersection modifications must be fully configured and operational no less than 2 weeks prior to receiving occupancy for any building on-site. Adaptive signal contractor (Rhythm Engineering) will be required to configure the adaptive system on-site.
- f. At the SE corner of the new Shaw Rd access location, adequate ROW must be dedicated, or an easement granted for signal maintenance purposes.

Based on comments received from the school district, this site will not receive bus service for students

attending Shaw Rd Elementary. These students will be expected to walk. Based on the increase volume of elementary age students walking to Shaw Rd Elementary. The City will require the following modifications:

- a. At the new traffic signal, an electronic blank-out sign shall be mounted on the eastbound signal pole that restricts eastbound “right turn on red” vehicle movement when pedestrians are using the crossing
- b. Internal pedestrian paths will need to accommodate safe routing to the traffic signal.
- c. Reduced Speed School Zone along Shaw Rd has been requested by the School District. If the City determines a reduced speed school zone is feasible/warranted for Shaw Rd Elementary, this mitigation will be required (to be installed by the East Town Crossing development).
- D. Coordinate with the City of Puyallup and the Puyallup School District for the preferred off-site bus stop locations

Civil plan set shall provide a detailed channelization plan for all striping & pavement markings in within ROW. All proposed striping shall meet City and MUTCD requirements. Plan shall include signage located in ROW. All City standard details related to pavement markings, striping, sign placement must be provided.

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