



Date: November 17, 2023

To:

City of Marysville
 Development Services
 80 Columbia Avenue
 Marysville, WA 98270

Response to Comments


Project Name: English Crossing Townhomes

Project File Number: PA23-012

Review Completion: September 14, 2023

CITY COMMENTS	LAND TECH RESPONSE
Planning: Reviewer: Amy Hess, Senior Planner	
1. Please see comments from Jesse Hannahs regarding the Traffic Impact Analysis. Please note that more information related to the final Roundabout design will be forthcoming.	Thank you
2. Please see comments from Don McGhee, Assistant Fire Marshall, regarding hydrant requirements.	Hydrant locations already updated
Site Design	
1. Consistent with MMC_22C±065±040(2)(a)(ii) , Primary building entrance(s) shall face the street unless it is not feasible due to parcel size, topography, environmental conditions, or other factors as determined by the director, and alternate design elements are incorporated into the facade which enliven the streetscape. Units adjacent to 19 th Ave. (175-190, and 222-232) shall have the primary entrance oriented towards 19 th Ave. This is a code requirement and anticipated to be a condition of approval. A landscape buffer in place of this required orientation will not be acceptable as none of the above referenced site conditions make this infeasible, and a landscape buffer does not enliven	It is very unfortunate that some have abused the use of the alternative—Very unfortunate, as this does seriously compromise the livability of these homes by the residents in favor of a drive by view for non-residents—enough said on this subject 😊 We have proposed a sidewalk behind the private space of the townhomes that connects each unit in a building to a stairway to the sidewalk on 19 th . We have proposed this versus the 26 staircases from the individual townhomes as 19 th requires a bioswale for conveyance to meet elevation restrictions on the flat slopes of 19 th Ave. 26 sidewalk crossings of the bioswale would compromise its effectiveness. I do beg to differ on the possibility of a landscape buffer and Architectural Relief not “enliven the

CITY COMMENTS	LAND TECH RESPONSE
<p>the streetscape.</p>	<p>streetscape”. Unfortunately, a bad landscape by one Developer ruined our chance to “prove” this.</p>
<p>2. Consistent with MMC 22C.065.040(2)(a)(iii), Buildings with individual ground floor entries should face the street and/or common open space to the extent possible. This is a code requirement and anticipated to be a condition of approval.</p>	<p>Entries provided.</p>
<p>3. MMC 22C.120.140(2)(a) requires street trees along all City streets and access easements. Street trees shall be installed along all roadways.</p>	<p>Street trees harder to place along these Drive Aisles—do have some where possible— Need to talk about practicality or feasibility of this in these townhome developments.</p>
<p>4. MMC 22C.065.040 (4)(b)(i-iv) - Sidewalks and pathways should be separated from the roadway by planting strips with trees whenever possible. Below are additional details that support/require street trees:</p> <p>Since the project proposes sidewalks that are at the same grade as the street, it is likely that vehicles will be parked on the sidewalks, further necessitating the need for planter strips between the roadway and sidewalk.</p> <p>MMC 22C.065.040(2)(b) requires the development to create a well-defined streetscape to allow for safe movement of pedestrians. With no curb, the planter strips will provide increased safety for pedestrians.</p> <p>MMC 22C.065.040(4)(a)(ii) requires the landscape plan to provide physical separation between vehicular and pedestrian traffic.</p>	<p>We will need to “talk” about this issue and the one above. The closeness of driveways in front of these townhome units just do not provide for “planting strips”—it will primarily be a strip of concrete driveways.</p> <p>These are Drive Aisle are common as designed in this kind of project. The Separated sidewalk and planter would make no sense. With the Townhome driveways so close together, there ends up being no usable planter “box” area Other reviewers are saying the rolled curb as separation is acceptable <i>“The proposed internal access drives should not have the sidewalk adjacent and at grade with the drive aisle. With the sidewalk being adjacent to the drive, either a vertical curb or a rolled curb should be utilized.”</i></p> <p>There is a curb between Drive Aisle and SW.</p> <p>There is a curb proposed between Drive Aisle and Sidewalk. Townhome projects are close to being all driveways with very little actual planter space available. With all the driveways, there would be not landscape strip. This is just not functional with townhomes.</p>
<p>Connectivity</p>	

CITY COMMENTS	LAND TECH RESPONSE
<p>5. Pedestrian connections are required from entries of the units adjacent to 19th Avenue (Units 175-190, and 222-232). Installation of stairs will likely be needed to address the grade change. These connections shall be depicted on the site plan. This is a code requirement and is expected to be a condition of approval.</p>	<p>Issue due to some bad examples of the alternative. We are proposing a stair and sidewalk for each building.</p> <p>Due to slopes on 19th, a bioswale is the only feasible way to convey stormwater along 19th. Having 26 sidewalks crossing that bioswale would compromise its effectiveness.</p>
<p>6. Consistent with MMC 22C.065.130, Street Connectivity, new development in the mixed use zones shall provide an integrated and connected network of streets to provide "direct" walking route options, orientation, a sense of place, and multiple travel route options. Blocks shall be designed to provide vehicular connections at intervals no greater than 600 feet and pedestrian access at intervals no greater than 300 feet (200 feet is preferred). <u>Please add one additional access from Aisle H, between Units 88 and 89 as shown below, to meet this requirement.</u></p>  <p>The diagram is a site plan showing a grid of units and streets. Units 88, 89, and 90 are on the left side, while units 10, 11, and 12 are on the right. Units 120, 122, 222, and 232 are also shown. A 'Proposed Fire Hydrant' is marked with a green circle. 'Biocell B' is a green area with a 'Biocell Elevation 120.50' label. 'Aisle D' is a street at the bottom. A red dashed line indicates a proposed path between units 88 and 89.</p>	<p>Pedestrian Access from Aisle H to sidewalk on 19th has been added</p>
<p>7. Consistent with MMC 22C.065.130, Street Connectivity, internal paths are encouraged to provide access at intervals no greater than 300 feet to improve pedestrian mobility. These pathways shall be constructed to sidewalk standards for local access roads or be designed as multi-use trail per City standards. Pedestrian access ways shall conform to applicable ADA requirements. <u>The EDDS standards referenced in the response letter are not acceptable. As required by the code section above, the internal paths shall be constructed to sidewalk standards for local access roads.</u></p>	<p>There are two kinds of pedestrian facilities on this site. One is for "street connectivity" required paths per the quoted code. There are also the internal paths or "Neighborhood pathways" per EDDS 3-519 designed more for internal resident movements to neighbors or to recreational facilities or to be used just for recreational walking.</p> <p>These do not meet the use requirements of the Multi-use Trail—they are meant for walking and not for bikes.</p> <p>We have added pavement to the surface of these Neighborhood Pathways.</p>

CITY COMMENTS	LAND TECH RESPONSE
Public Works: Reviewer: Jesse Hannahs, P.E. – Traffic Engineering Manager	
1) Traffic impact fees will be required from the City and depending on trip generation/distribution, may be required from the County and State.	Understood
2) A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) will be required. a) Conclusions: i) Intersection of 172 nd ST NE & 27 th Ave NE: 1. WSDOT intersections which prior to a development submittal have an existing historical LOS failure of E, shall be required to mitigate only upon falling below a LOS E. 2. 172 nd ST NE & 27 th Ave NE intersection, to date, does not have an existing historically documented LOS failure. a. TIA shall document Existing 2023 LOS for intersection of 172 nd ST NE (SR 531) & 27 th Ave NE without development. 3. If existing 2023 LOS is documented as D, mitigation to LOS D shall be required as TIS documents that Opening Year intersection LOS will be E.. 4. If existing 2023 LOS is documented as E, mitigation to LOS E shall be required as TIA documents that Horizon Year intersection LOS will be F. ii) Mitigation: 1. Mitigation of 172 nd ST NE & 27 th Ave NE LOS failure could include construction of off-site roadway construction per Comp Plan and Lakewood Sub-Area Plan to complete portion of arterial roadway system. An example would be completion of 169 th PL NE/23 rd Ave NE from 27 th Ave NE to 172 nd ST NE a. Updated TIA with Traffic Modeling would need to be performed to assign/verify traffic shift and subsequent LOS as a result of an arterial roadway completion project. i. Updated TIA would need to evaluate capacity of intersections in which traffic was to be shifted to and from to verify that diversion does not negate LOS standard at any intersections, such as signalized intersection of 27 th Ave NE & 169 th PL NE and that LOS is met at all intersections. ii. Subject modeling shall not include 156 th	TIA Provided per criteria described below.

CITY COMMENTS	LAND TECH RESPONSE
<p>ST NE Interchange.</p>	
<p>3) Frontage improvements shall be required upon 19th Ave NE and 172nd ST NE (including 19th Ave NE roundabout construction) including additional asphalt pavement, curb, gutter, landscape strip, sidewalk and street lighting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 19th Ave NE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Roadway shall be per EDDS Standard Plan 3-201-005 with three lanes including curb/gutter, landscape strip and 5' bike lanes. b. 172nd ST NE (west of 19th Ave NE): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Roadway shall be per EDDS Standard Plan 3-201-005 with three lanes including curb/gutter, landscape strip, 12' multi-use path on both sides and City owned decorative street lighting. c. 172nd ST NE & 19th Ave NE Roundabout: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Roundabout construction should be required as part of development construction given location upon development frontage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Other developments are or are likely to also be required to construct the roundabout including but not limited to "The Lodge 5". 2. Coordination between developers is encouraged to define roundabout design and facilitate construction. 3. City has not yet received full Lodge 5 Civil Plans for review including Roundabout design therefore any preliminary layouts as subject to change based upon Roundabout review. 	<p>Frontage improvement have been proposed.</p> <p>Roadway on 19th per modified section provided earlier due to issue with Lodge Apts improvements</p> <p>This is still tied up in RAB Design which involves the whole 172nd Street Frontage</p>
<p>4) Per EDDS 3-506, street lighting will be required upon all public street frontages as part of civil construction plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Street Lighting on 19th Ave NE and 172nd St NE shall be required as decorative style street light assemblies with LED fixtures to match existing fixtures on each street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) 19th Ave NE shall be designed as Collector Arterial/commercial. ii) 172nd St NE (west of 19th Ave NE) shall be designed as Principal Arterial/Commercial. iii) 172nd St NE (east of 19th Ave NE) shall be designed as Principal Arterial/Commercial. iv) Fixtures would be Lumec Renaissance Series per to be provided City Specification. 	<p>With Civil Design</p>

CITY COMMENTS	LAND TECH RESPONSE
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specification should be requested via emailed to ihannahs@marysvillewa.gov 2. PUD street lighting shall not be installed in Lakewood area upon arterial or connector roadways. v) Lighting design shall incorporate fixture wattage to match those already installed upon each respective roadway. b) Photometric layouts shall be required for design with photometrics consisting of staggered lighting on both sides of each roadway and development to install only street lighting on frontage side of each roadway. 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Channelization and Signing Plan shall be required as part of civil construction plans for all public roadways. 	<p>Will come with Civil Plan and LDA Applications.</p>
<p>Fire District: Reviewer: Don McGhee, Assistant Fire Marshal</p>	
<p><u>The maximum hydrant spacing allowed for MU/MF use is 300' apart. The spacing of fire hydrants shown on the Civil Plan is not adequate, add two more to make spacing work. I have attached the site plan with the desired placement of all hydrants with two hydrants added. A revised site plan will be required for review.</u></p>	<p>Hydrant locations and separation provided as requested.</p>
<p>Road width proposed will meet the 26' requirement with the rolled curb 6" thick sidewalk being installed</p>	<p>Is not the 26' width aisle required when buildings exceed 30' to the eave?</p>
<p>Public Works: Reviewer: Shane Whitney, Civil Plan Review</p>	
<p>The following comments are offered after review of the above referenced revised application. Many of the comments will be same as they will pertain for the life of the project. Any new comments will be in a <i>bold italic font</i>.</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Per MMC 14.03.250, utilities are to be extended along the street frontages of the proposed project. 	<p>Addressed on previous submittal and provided with this submittal.</p>

CITY COMMENTS	LAND TECH RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Sewer main extension of the future trunkline will need to be completed along the projects frontage of 172nd. b) Water mains should end up being extended along 19th Ave prior to this project starting. So if those projects are underway, an extension may not be necessary. c) Storm drainage facilities will need to be provided for the sections of 19th Ave and 172nd Street that will be widened by this project. 	
<p>2. Frontage Improvements: Frontage improvements are required per MMC 12.02A.090 on all projects. Frontage improvements are described as curbs, gutters, and sidewalks; underground storm drainage facilities; patching the street from its preexisting edge to the new curb line; and overlayment of the existing public street to its centerline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The position of the roundabout has not yet been finalized, the project will need to continue working productively with the adjacent projects to get it constructed. 	<p>Understood and RAB has been submitted to WSDOT for their review.</p>
<p>3. Dedication Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It appears that a 15-foot dedication is necessary along 19th Ave to provide a 35-foot half width of right-of-way. Which is consistent with the typical dedication shown on the required road section shown on SP 3-201-004. As the adjacent project should have dedicated additional right-of-way and moved the centerline of the road to the east, as stated above the City is agreeable to a modified section and deleting the planter strip. b. As shown on the supplied drawing additional area is necessary for the roundabout and widening on 172nd. At this time I cannot be specific on the amount of area that will be required. 	<p>As has been provided</p>

CITY COMMENTS	LAND TECH RESPONSE
<p>4. Access: a. Access appears to meet applicable standards.</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>5. Drainage: All projects in the city of Marysville must comply with requirements stipulated under the MMC 14.15.040 and 14.15.050. a. Stormwater drainage: <i>The project has demonstrated the ability to be compliant with all applicable standards. Complete review shall be completed with the civil review portion of the project.</i> b. The maximum allowed impervious surface coverage for the Zoning designation is 85%.</p>	<p>Understood</p>
<p>8. <i>The proposed internal access drives should not have the sidewalk adjacent and at grade with the drive aisle. With the sidewalk being adjacent to the drive, either a vertical curb or a rolled curb should be utilized.</i></p>	<p>We do have a rolled curb</p>