



November 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2022

City of Marysville  
Attn: Emily Morgan  
Community Development  
80 Columbia Ave  
Marysville, WA 98270

Project Name / File No.: Brodie / PA22-023  
Applicant: JM1 Holdings, LLC  
Project Description: 45 Lot PRD-Subdivision  
Re: Response to 1<sup>st</sup> Review Comments

Dear Emily Morgan,

This letter serves as the Applicant's formal response to the 1<sup>st</sup> review comments received on August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022 to our recent application materials submitted to the City of Marysville. To ensure that each of the comments have been responded to, we have incorporated each of the City's comments along with the Applicant's response to each below.

**BINDING SITE PLAN / PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMENTS**

1. Include File Number PA22-023 on all future correspondence, in addition to all site, civil and landscape plans.  
**Applicant's Response: The file number has been added to all plans associated with the submittal as requested.**
2. The proposed lot and tract configurations on **sheet CS-01 and sheet CS-04 of the site plan** do not match.  
**Applicant's Response: See the revised preliminary plat map and the proposed civil plans. All sheets are consistent with tract and lot configurations.**
3. On **sheet CS-01 of the site plan**, the below figures are provided. However, these totals do not match the wetland buffer reductions and additions figures provided in the supplemental Critical Area Study and Buffer Mitigation Plan. Revise figures accordingly.

<u><b>WETLAND BUFFER AVERAGING CALCULATIONS</b></u>	
WETLAND BUFFER REDUCTION:	5,539 SF
WETLAND BUFFER ADDITION:	5,556 SF
NET:	17 SF

**Applicant's Response: The buffer averaging calculations are shown on revised plans. They match the buffer averaging provided by the critical areas study.**

4. To aid in quick reference and review, provide a table within the site plan that includes details for Tracts 990 – 999, including tract size and proposed use.  
**Applicant's Response: A table has been placed on the preliminary plat map that provides tract designations, sizes and uses for reference.**

5. The provided plans (civil, landscaping, and site) appear to include multiple retaining walls throughout the proposed development.

5.1. Please clarify how compliance with MMC [22D.050.030\(4\)](#) is to be satisfied if the proposed retaining walls exceed 4 ft. in height. If the walls are to be terraced, the terraced sections are required to be separated by a 2 ft. landscaping bed. If terracing is required, add the 2 ft. landscaping bed to the landscaping plans.

**Applicant's Response: None of the proposed walls that are greater than 4' in height are seen from the ROW. Coordination with the planning department has been done to further clarify the requirements of this and as such, no additional tiering has been proposed.**

5.2. Provide call out details for said walls and include wall symbols in legend.

**Applicant's Response: Wall symbols have been included in the legends throughout the resubmittal documents.**

6. Per Section A.1.1, Residential Subdivision Design of the East Sunnyside Whiskey Ridge Design As proposed, Lots 1 – 5 would not meet this requirement. Reconfigure lots to alleviate rear yards abutting 60<sup>th</sup> Street NE and demonstrate how pedestrian access can be provided from the front façade of the dwelling unit to the public sidewalk on 60<sup>th</sup> Street NE. Currently it appears retaining walls are proposed on the southern portion of the Lots 3 – 5 that would not allow orientation and pedestrian connection to 60<sup>th</sup> Street NE.

**Applicant's Response: The grading of lots 4 and 5 is such that they are lifted too high above the corresponding rear entrance to 60<sup>th</sup> Street (4'+) for an entrance to work. Grade at the rear of lot 3 can be made to work and a break in the wall has been provided.**

7. Provide clarification for the proposed “water quality” facilities within Tracts 991 and 999. The provided drainage report states that detention vaults are proposed in those tracts while the provided critical area study mentions the facility would be dispersion trenches.

**Applicant's Response: The water quality facilities for the project have been relocated. A perfilter water quality treatment unit is proposed within Tract 998 just downstream of the detention vault. The stormwater flow discharges from the vault, travels through the perfilter for treatment and then discharges to a dispersion trench within the outer 25% of the revised critical area buffer.**

7.1. **NOTE:** Per MMC 22E.010.100(10), only *stormwater facilities, such as biofiltration swales and dispersion facilities*, may be located in the outer 25% of wetland buffers. Therefore, if detention vaults are proposed, the facilities would not be allowed within the associated wetland buffer.

**Applicant's Response: The site plan has been revised. The proposed detention vault is located within Tract 998 and only the dispersion trench for the detention vault is located within the outer 25% of the wetland buffer.**

8. Prior to recording the **FINAL BSP** the applicant shall be required to provide **FINAL** restrictive covenants as required by [MMC 22G.080.120](#) and including provisions to address parking enforcement, together with a statement from a private attorney as to the adequacy of the same to fulfill the requirements of the PRD code.

**Applicant's Response: Please note that Applicant is not processing a BSP, but a preliminary plat per the revised application materials submitted on June 29, 2022. The Applicant shall provide Final CCRs to the City prior to recording of the Final Plat.**

9. The following are the impact fees that apply to this project:

Impact Fee Type	Impact Fee Rate
Traffic*	\$6,300 per SFR
Parks**	\$1,684 per SFR
Schools (Lake Stevens)**	\$9,788 per SFR

\* Fees due prior to recording of final plat

\*\* Impact fees vest at building permit submittal and shall be paid prior to building permit issuance

**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**

## OPEN SPACE CALCULATION COMMENTS

10. Tract 998 proposes to include a portion of the proposed wetland buffer addition. This 644 sq. ft. buffer addition area will need to be relocated outside of the tract and not north of the proposal vault. Suggest moving the vault further north and incorporating the required buffer addition, south of Tract 998. Critical areas and their buffers must be incorporated into separate tracts; revise plans to remove that area from Tract 998 and include this buffer addition into Tract 999.  
**Applicant's Response: The site plan has been revised such that the detention vault lies within Tract 998. All wetland buffer addition is located outside of Tract 998.**
11. The provided plans appear to include proposed landscaped areas into the active open space area calculation of Tract 998; revise calculations to exclude the proposed Tract 998 buffer landscaping from the dedicated active open space area.  
**Applicant's Response: The site plan has been revised such that the wetland buffer area is outside of Tract 998 and the active open space area.**
12. As proposed, Tract 998 does not appear to meet the open space requirements of MMC 22G.080.100(4), specifically: *(f) be situated and designed to be observable by the public; and (g) be accessible and convenient to all residents within the development.*  
12.1. Additionally, with the removal of the 644 sq. ft. of wetland buffer addition as well as the tract buffer landscaping, it appears that the proposed active open space area of Tract 998 would be deficient.  
Please demonstrate Guidelines, configurations where residential lots back up to any street other than SR9 are prohibited. Lot configurations where side yards face the street area acceptable.  
**Applicant's Response: The open space that meets the active open space requirements for the PRD application is located within Tract 998. Calculations of the open space can be found on the preliminary plat map as well as within the landscape plans.**

## LANDSCAPING COMMENTS

13. On **Sheet L-1 of the provided Landscape Plan**, there is a wetland area depicted on proposed Lot 2 – 5. The provided Critical Area Study does not include said wetland; please provide clarification on the presence of the wetland area.  
**Applicant's Response: Per the information provided at the meeting held on August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2022 at 8:30 am, the wetland information shown on sheet L-1 was left from the initial reconnaissance and GIS mapping performed by Wetland Resources, Inc. as part of the feasibility study on the property. The feasibility study is performed very conservatively depicting a "worse case scenario". However, upon purchase of the property, Wetland Resources Inc. returned to the property and did an official delineation where it was determined that the area was not categorically found to be a critical area.**

**As requested, the information has been removed from the subject plan sheet, and**

**consistency has been verified throughout all plans and reports.**

14. A final landscape plan shall be required to be approved, prior to civil construction plan approval, and designed to comply with the applicable provisions outlined in [MMC Chapter 22C.120, Landscaping and Screening](#). **Specifically, please revise the Landscaping Plan to include:**

14.1. Incorporate the mitigation planting plan prepared by Wetland Resources to allow for a cohesive planting plan for the proposed development.

**Applicant's Response: Mitigation planting has been incorporated per request, but the landscape contractor should reference Wetland Resources report and planting plan. It is not the best practice to combine these plans based on previous projects because it causes confusion and duplications and creates questions of who is responsible for answering questions regarding the mitigation areas. Requesting this on future projects should be reevaluated.**

14.2. Typical side view of perimeter landscape areas

**Applicant's Response: See response to 14.4 below, a 6' fence will be provided along the west side of the easement and existing vegetation is to be retained. Existing vegetation is not on the survey and therefore a cross-section has not been provided.**

14.3. Location of precast vault lids need to be shown as well as proposed access to said lids.

**Applicant's Response: This can be found within the civil plans. Specifically, see the sheet SD-01 from the civil plans for the location of the vault lids within the open space areas.**

14.4. Based on the project site's proximity to SR 9, the provisions of section [MMC 22C.120.150](#) would apply. Revise plans to include either Option 1 or Option 2 for landscaped screening.

**Applicant's Response: The Applicant has worked with both PUD and the City regarding the 20' buffer area, which is encumbered by a utility easement between PUD and the City of Marysville. As the easement cannot be released and the easement is unable to be planted within, the Applicant has proposed to construct a 6' cedar fence along the west boundary of the easement/buffer and has agreed to leave all existing vegetation within the easement in place to provide as much screening as possible.**

**It is believed that the above proposal should be supported under MMC 22C.120.150(c): *Other alternative screening methods will be considered by the city if the method provides a viable long-term option to effectively screen the highway from development and add visual interest from the highway corridor. (Ord. 2852 § 10 (Exh. A), 2011).***

#### **CRITICAL AREA REVIEW COMMENTS**

15. On pg. 101 of the Wetland Resources Critical Area Study and Buffer Mitigation Plan, the table outlining Buffer Additions and Reductions need to be switched to match the areas of buffer modifications as proposed on the mitigation plan map.

**Applicant's Response: The buffer averaging areas have been revised based on the current lot layout. Buffer Additions and Reductions are now consistent in the Critical Area Study and on the attached maps.**

16. Per MMC 22E.010.370, split rail fencing (or similar) and signage must be installed along the entire boundary of Tract 999; revise plans to demonstrate compliance with the provision.

**Applicant's Response: The split rail fence has been extended to the edges of the Wetland A. This wetland is ponded for much of the year, so the fence is not extended through the wetland itself.**

## CONCURRENT REZONE APPLICATION COMMENTS

17. The provided Rezone Narrative appears to have inaccurate information. Revisions for the following is needed:

17.1. The site is said to not be located near wetlands, however, there are multiple wetlands on site.

**Applicant's Response: The rezone narrative has been updated accordingly.**

17.2. The site is located in the Marysville School District; the site is within the Lake Steven School District.

**Applicant's Response: The rezone narrative has been updated accordingly.**

18. With the desired rezone to Medium Density Multifamily (R-18), a base density of 18 dwelling units per acre would be allowed. However, the development is only proposing at a density of 4.5 dwelling units per acre. As proposed, this minimized density would not meet the intent of the R-18 zoning district and is therefore, a challenge to be supported by staff.

18.1. The development is proposing all lots being detached single family residential, while the development would allow for other residential dwelling units, such as multi-family townhomes or duplexes. Attached single family dwellings would be better suited for the R-18 zoning district.

**Applicant's Response: The Applicant has revised the request for rezone to R-6.5, to better match the density being provided onsite. Please find submitted herewith revised documents reflecting the change in request.**

19. The following Goals and Policies of the Marysville Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element encourage the development of diverse housing potential and presently, have not been adequately demonstrated with the proposed development:

- **LU-24** - *Distribute higher densities in appropriate locations. Locate in residential areas where they will not detract from the existing neighborhood character. Locate near employment and retail centers, and to transportation corridors as appropriate.*
- **LU-25** - *Encourage a range of housing types and densities, including small lot single family, zero lot line developments, cluster housing, townhouses, duplexes, triplexes, apartments (high and low density, including garden), accessory dwelling units, and mobile home parks. Increase the opportunities for home ownership through the availability of these housing types.*
- **Multifamily Goal 20** - *Provide housing choices, reflecting the range of household types, lifestyles, incomes, and the desire to rent or own a home.*
- **Multifamily Goal 21** - *Provide housing that is pleasant and appropriately located. The location should allow residents access to services and facilities in the immediate area. The locations should also acknowledge the character of the surrounding neighborhood so multi-family can blend or be compatible with it.*

**Applicant's Response: The rezone narrative has been revised and resubmitted to demonstrate how the rezone meets the above listed Goals and Policies of the Marysville Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element.**

The R-18 zoning district is listed as Medium Density Multifamily. While detached single family dwellings units are an allowed use, the Marysville Comprehensive Plan encourages multifamily developments compatible with established single family neighborhoods. Desired areas to incorporate multifamily into single family neighborhoods *utilize, as possible, natural stream and topographic changes to buffer and separate multifamily developments.*

Based on the existing site conditions, the subject property is ideal for a multifamily development.

**Applicant's Response: The Applicant has revised the request for rezone to R-6.5, to better match the density and housing type being provided onsite. Please find submitted herewith**

revised documents reflecting the change in request.

**Kacey Simon, Civil Plan Reviewer**

**1. Existing utilities:**

a. Sanitary sewer: Sewer is currently located along 83<sup>rd</sup> Ave NE and can be found on record drawing RD293.

**Applicant's Response: Noted.**

b. Water: a 16" ductile iron water main is currently located along 87<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and will need to be extended to 60<sup>th</sup> ST NE.

**Applicant's Response: Noted. Connection has been proposed.**

c. Storm: There is not any storm currently fronting the proposed project.

**Applicant's Response: Noted. Storm collection is proposed by the project.**

2. Per MMC 14.03.250, utilities are to be extended along the street frontages of the proposed project.

a. All utilities will need to extend along the project frontage.

**Applicant's Response: Noted.**

3. **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.

a. 60<sup>th</sup> ST NE is classified as a Collector Arterial. From the western boundary of the project through the intersection of future 87<sup>th</sup> AVE NE, 60<sup>th</sup> ST NE shall be improved to SP 3-201-004. East of the future intersection, 60<sup>th</sup> ST NE shall be to SP 3-201-007 *with a full cul-de-sac at the eastern terminus. This project will only be responsible for the northern half of the cul-de-sac.*

**Applicant's Response: The required portion of the cul de sac with curb and gutter has been proposed with the sidewalk terminating at the cul-de-sac.**

b. 87<sup>th</sup> Ave NE will need to be constructed in accordance with SP 3-201-008 of the EDDS including 2 lanes with a 5' planter and 12' multi-use paths on both sides.

**Applicant's Response: Per coordination with City staff, the proposed road section for 87<sup>th</sup> Ave NE is acceptable with a 12' multi-use path along the west side.**

**4. Dedication Requirements:**

a. The applicant's surveyor will need to establish what the half width is of 60<sup>th</sup> St NE and ensure there is 35' of right of way.

**Applicant's Response: The half width of 60<sup>th</sup> St NE is proposed to be constructed per the section found on sheet RD-07. There is 35' of available ROW so no dedication will be required.**

b. 87<sup>th</sup> Ave NE from 60<sup>th</sup> ST NE to the north will also be required to be constructed as part of this subdivision. This street will require a 60' dedication.

**Applicant's Response: Per coordination with City staff, the proposed road section for 87<sup>th</sup> Ave NE is acceptable with a 12' multi-use path along the west side. This includes a**

dedication of 57'.

- c. The new internal roads will require a 50' right-of-way dedication.

**Applicant's Response: Noted. Please see sheet RD-07 for sections.**

- d. *A 10' utility easement will be needed on lot 31 instead of the proposed 4.5' easement.*

**Applicant's Response: The site plan has been revised such that this comment no longer applies. A 10' utility easement has been shown along the back edge of ROW.**

5. **Access:**

- a. No direct lot access is permitted to 60<sup>th</sup> St NE as it is an arterial (EDDS 3-301) and none is proposed.

**Applicant's Response: Noted.**

- b. The minimum width of a residential driveway is 12-feet and the maximum is 26-feet. Curb cuts shall be limited to a 20 foot maximum.

**Applicant's Response: Noted.**

- c. Per EDDS 3-302 bullet 5: A minimum corner clearance of 50 feet shall be maintained from the nearest edge of any access point to the edge of traveled way. When minimum corner clearances cannot be attained, the Engineer may require investigation to substantiate whether or not left turns should be prohibited into or out of the access point. See standard plan 3-301-001 dimension A.

**Applicant's Response: Noted. Project meets this requirement.**

- d. The new roads shall be constructed to SP 3-201-006.

**Applicant's Response: Noted.**

- e. *The proposed alley (TRACT 993) needs to have a 20' radius.*

**Applicant's Response: Emergency access vehicle radii for the alley can be seen on the face of the Preliminary Plat.**

- f. *If TRACT 992 is proposed for lot access it does not meet the design standard intended for an auto court as it serves more than 6 lots. This tract also does not qualify as an alley since it terminates at a dead end.*

**Applicant's Response: The site plan has been revised such that auto court is no longer proposed.**

6. **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: The city has adopted the 2012 Ecology Manual as amended in 2014. Projects above the 2,000 square feet threshold must comply with requirements stipulated in Volume I, Chapter 2 of the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington.

- i. *It appears the information submitted in the drainage report conflicts throughout the report. Please verify the proper drainage pattern. Information conflicts between what is stated under Minimum Requirement #4 and "Task 2" – Drainage Basin and flow path*

*information stated under "Task 3".*

**Applicant's Response: This has been clarified in the drainage report. Flow from the site drains north and west with an eventual discharge to Ebey Slough.**

- b. The maximum allowed impervious surface coverage for the Zoning designation is 85%.

**Applicant's Response: Noted. As the zoning designation has been revised with the revised rezone application, the maximum impervious per lot has been modeled for 70%.**

Standard Comments:

7. Survey control datum NAVD-88 and NAD-83 are required to be used. Civil construction plans will not be accepted in any other datum.  
**Applicant's Response: Noted.**
8. Trench restoration is to be completed in accordance with section 3-703 of the EDDS. A full lane or full street overlay may be required.  
**Applicant's Response: Noted.**
9. The onsite grading and placement of any retaining walls must be compliant with section 22D.050.030 of the MMC.  
**Applicant's Response: Noted.**
10. A right of way use permit for all work proposed within City right of way is required. Cost for the ROW permit is \$250.00. ROW permit fees must be paid before right of way permit issuance.  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**
11. The applicant is responsible for identifying any existing well or septic systems on site or on adjacent properties. If there are any existing septic systems on site they need to be decommissioned based on the Snohomish Health District standards. If there are any wells on site they need to be decommissioned based on Department of Ecology standards.  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**
12. Engineering construction plan review fees will be due prior to release of approved civil construction plans. Engineering construction plan review per MMC 22G.030.020:  
Residential = \$250.00 per lot or unit (for duplex or condominium projects),  
\$2000.00 minimum for first two reviews, \$120.00/hour for each subsequent review.  
Multiple residential/commercial/industrial = \$250.00 base fee + \$135.00 per hour.  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**
13. Engineering construction inspection fees will be due prior to project final or building final whichever comes first.  
Engineering construction inspection fees per MMC 22G.030.020:  
Residential = \$250.00 per lot/unit (for duplex or condominium projects),  
\$2000.00 minimum  
Multiple residential/commercial/industrial = \$250.00 base fee + \$135.00 per hour.  
Bond administration fee = \$20.00/lot or unit, with a minimum amount being \$250.00  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**



14. **All civil construction plan submittals are to be routed directly to Kacey Simon, Civil Plan Reviewer.** The first *civil construction* plan submittal is to consist of a plan set, a copy of the drainage report, and a copy of the geotechnical report. **Once the documents are ready to be submitted, we will provide you a link to where the materials can be uploaded to.**

a. Review timing:

- i. First review = 5 weeks
  - ii. Second review = 3 weeks
  - iii. Third review = 3 week
  - iv. Subsequent reviews will be 3 weeks.
- Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**

15. Please be advised these comments are in reference to specific items and do not imply a full review of the proposed application. Additional comments which may change the design requirements will be provided during the civil construction plan review process.  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**

#### **Brad Zahnow, Development Services Technician**

##### **Residential Utility Capital Improvement Fees**

Capital utility fees are assessed in accordance with the attached rate sheet. The "City" rates will be applicable to this project.

**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**

##### **Recovery (Latecomer) Fees**

No recovery fees are applicable to this project.

**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**

##### **Utility Main Fees**

No utility main fees are applicable to this project.

**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**

##### **ULID/LID Fees**

No ULID/LID fees are applicable to this project.

**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**

#### **Kim Bryant, Water Operations Supervisor; Tim King, Utility Construction Lead II; Ryan Keefe, Water Operations Lead II**

1. Water meters are not shown on plans;

**Applicant's Response: Please see the civil plans that have been submitted with the submittal documents for this detail.**

2. Water details not shown;

**Applicant's Response: Please see the civil plans that have been submitted with the submittal documents for this detail.**

3. Size of water main not called out on plans;

**Applicant's Response: Please see the civil plans that have been submitted with the submittal documents for this detail.**

4. Plans show water main connecting to 83rd Ave NE. Connection needs to be to 16” water main on 87th Ave NE with 12” water main, continue 12” water main east on 60th St NE then along Road A to end. A hydrant assembly will be needed at the end of Road A;  
**Applicant’s Response: This configuration has been shown in the plans as requested. A 12” main connects to the existing 16” main within 87<sup>th</sup> Ave NE with a reducer. A 12” main then runs the length of the project along 87<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and 60<sup>th</sup> St.**
5. The looping water main within the development can be 8”.  
**Applicant’s Response: Noted. Looped water main through Road B is 8”.**

**Brooke Ensor, NPDES Coordinator**

1. This project received a complete application determination on June 30, 2022 and is vested to the 2012 Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, as amended in 2014 until July 1, 2027.  
**Applicant’s Response: Acknowledged.**
2. Tract 991 should have a curb cut and small pull out for vehicular access.  
**Applicant’s Response: Configuration of the site has been revised. Vehicular access is provided to Tract 998 where the water quality and detention facilities are located for the site.**
3. There should be a gate or other walking access route to the vault outfall/dispersion trench.  
**Applicant’s Response: A minimal disturbance hogfuel trail is proposed that goes to the dispersion trench for maintenance purposes.**
4. All precast vault lids should be brought to the ground surface in Tract 998. Please show the lid locations on the landscaping plans.  
**Applicant’s Response: This can be found within the civil plans. Specifically, see the sheet SD-01 from the civil plans for the location of the vault lids within the open space areas.**
5. For residential projects triggering minimum requirements #6 Runoff Treatment and #7 Flow Control, the stormwater facility lot will be dedicated to the HOA when there are park amenities on the lot. The HOA will be responsible for maintaining the landscaping and park amenities. The City will receive an easement to complete inspection and maintenance.

Tract 991 should be dedicated to the City if there are no other amenities planned for that lot.

**Applicant’s Response: Noted. These items will be handled at the final plat stage.**

**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.
  - a. Per ILA with City of Lake Stevens, Impact fees may be required for construction of Soper Hill Road & 87th Ave NE Roundabout if Trip Generation/Distribution will include trips through intersection during PM Peak.
    - i. Per TIA based upon City Comprehensive Plan Traffic distributions, development trips will not transverse through intersection of 87th Ave NE & Soper Hill RD.  
**Applicant’s Response: Acknowledged.**

2. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) will be required.
  - a. TIA is acceptable with development to generate 45 PM Peak Hour trips.  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**
  
3. Per Comprehensive Plan, the collector arterial of 87th Ave NE shall be extended between 60th ST NE and 64th ST NE (SR 528) through the subject development parcels.
  - a. 87th Ave NE Roadway (Road A):
    - i. Designated as Collector Arterial roadway with two lanes including curb, gutter, landscape strip, 12' multi-use paths on both sides and City owned decorative street lighting  
**Applicant's Response: Per coordination with City staff, the proposed road section for 87<sup>th</sup> Ave NE is acceptable with a 12' multi-use path along the west side. This includes a dedication of 57'.**
    - ii. EDDS Standard Plan 3-201-004  
**Applicant's Response: Per coordination with City staff, the proposed road section for 87<sup>th</sup> Ave NE is acceptable with a 12' multi-use path along the west side. This includes a dedication of 57'.**
    - iii. 12' Multi-Use paths shall be installed upon both sides of roadway.
      - 1) 5' sidewalk on east side of roadway should not be acceptable.  
**Applicant's Response: Per coordination with City staff, the proposed road section for 87<sup>th</sup> Ave NE is acceptable with a 12' multi-use path along the west side. This includes a dedication of 57'.**
  - b. Internal Residential Roads:
    - i. Road Cross-section:
      - 1) Remove dimensions showing parking on one side and instead dimension to indicate 14' to center from each curb.  
**Applicant's Response: These callouts have been added as requested.**
  
4. Frontage improvements shall be required upon 60th ST NE
  - a. Designated as Collector Arterial roadway with three lanes including two-way left turn lane and 5' bike lanes including curb, gutter, landscape strip, 5' sidewalks and PUD Street lighting.
    - i. EDDS Standard Plan 3-201-004  
**Applicant's Response: Road section has been updated as requested. Coordination with the City has been done and the proposed road section has been deemed to be acceptable.**
  
5. Per EDDS 3-506, street lighting will be required.
  - a. Street Lighting upon 87th Ave NE from Soper Hill RD to 64th ST NE (SR 528) shall including City owned decorative street lighting to match installations within the vicinity.
    - i. Product shall be Lumec Renaissance series per City requirements.  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged. Details regarding decorative street lighting are provided within civil submittal.**
    - ii. Contact myself at [jhannahs@marysvillewa.gov](mailto:jhannahs@marysvillewa.gov) for City specs, details, sample plans, etc.  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged. Details regarding decorative street lighting are provided within civil submittal.**

- iii. Full street lighting plans shall be required as part of civil construction plans including all design elements required of public agency owned street lighting design.  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged. Details regarding decorative street lighting are provided within civil submittal.**
- b. Street Lighting upon residential street(s) shall be PUD installed fiberglass pole installation type street lighting.
  - i. Residential street(s) shall be designed as collector arterial utilizing 100 watt equivalent LED fixtures.  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**
  - ii. Spacing of fixtures should be approximately 180'-220'.  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**
  - iii. As part of civil construction approval proposed PUD street lighting locations will be provided by the City to the developer for submission to PUD and incorporation into the PUD site electrical plans.  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged. Applicant will work with PUD on the street lights once locations are provided by the City.**
  - iv. Contact Eddie Haugen of Snohomish County PUD at (425) 783- 8276 or wehaugen@snopud.com for more information regarding PUD street lighting.  
**Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.**
- 6. A signing and channelization plan shall be required as part of civil construction plans.
  - a. Signing:
    - i. Stop sign with street name signs upon SB approach of Road A to 60th ST NE.  
**Applicant's Response: This can be found on sheet CH-01 in the civil plan set.**
    - ii. No Outlet sign upon Road A north of 60th ST NE.  
**Applicant's Response: This can be found on sheet CH-01 in the civil plan set.**
    - iii. Street name signs at all intersections and 90 degree roadway curves.  
**Applicant's Response: This can be found on sheet CH-01 in the civil plan set.**
    - iv. No parking (symbol) with arrow signs on either side of alley entrance/exits to enable emergency vehicle and garbage collection access.  
**Applicant's Response: This can be found on sheet CH-01 in the civil plan set.**
    - v. No parking (symbol) with arrow signs on outside or 90 degree curves, 15'-20' prior to and after 90 degree curve to enable garbage collection access.  
**Applicant's Response: This can be found on sheet CH-01 in the civil plan set.**
    - vi. Type IV Object Markers centered in each of NB/SB lanes at roadway end with Future Roadway connection sign upon centerline.
      - 1) Barricades shall not be approved/installed.  
**Applicant's Response: This can be found on sheet CH-01 in the civil plan set.**

Please note the application materials have been updated to reflect the change in the rezone from R 18 to R 6.5. As such the applicant has utilized MMC 22C.090 to gain one bonus unit through RDI. Further details are provided on the preliminary plat.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide the responses to the 1<sup>st</sup> review comments. If you have

any questions, please contact me at (360) 926-6770.

Respectfully,  
JM1 Holdings, LLC  
By: Land Pro Group, Inc., Applicant's Representative

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Rochelle Smith". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "R" and "S".

By: Rochelle Smith, PM