



City of Puyallup

Planning Division

333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371

(253) 864-4165

www.cityofpuyallup.org

May 01, 2023

RONHOVDE ARCHITECTS

<NO STREET ADDRESS>

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM (DRT) LETTER	
DRT #	2
PERMIT #	P-21-0100
PROJECT NAME	DOS LAGOS MIXED USE PROJECT
PERMIT TYPE	Preliminary Site Plan
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	(2) PARCELS: LOTS D & E TO CONTAIN AMENITIES & OFFICES ALONG THE FRONTAGE; APTS FILL THE REMAINING LEVEL;PARKINGLSIDEWALKS;PEDESTRIAN PLAZA;DOG PARK & LANDSCAPING DUE 10.23.21
SITE ADDRESS	3910 5TH ST SE ;
PARCEL #	0419102118;
ASSOCIATED LAND USE PERMIT(S)	P-21-0099 P-20-0088 PR20221559 PR20221560
APPLICATION DATE	September 08, 2021
APPLICATION COMPLETE DATE	
PROJECT STATUS	Active Development Review Team (DRT) review case – resubmittal required. 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	N/A – Active permit application, not approved
CONDITIONS	Active permit application, not approved; 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. 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>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

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

- Proposed trash enclosure location will cause significant sight distance obstructions. Must be relocated to a different location on-site. [Site Plan D, C3.2]
- Needs to be 24ft wide to meet Fire requirements. [Site Plan D, C3.2]
- Coordinate with trash service provider on preferred location [Site Plan D, C3.2]
- Existing Traffic Signal Pole [Site Plan E, C4.2]
- This note is pointing to a vault lid. Are you intending to relocate the existing traffic signal pole?
[Site Plan E, C4.2]
- Possible fence/vegetation removal to mitigate sight distance obstruction at driveway [Site Plan E, C4.2]
- During Civil review, designer will need to verify the existing streetlight pole will provide minimum 3ft overhang into the road from face of curb. [Site Plan E, C4.2]
- Coordinate with Chris Beale on species of trees that will not obstruct sight distance for right on red movement. Per AMR, tree cutouts shall be at back of curb. [Site Plan E, C4.2]
- Proposed frontage design not consistent with approved AMR. Street trees are shown at back of sidewalk [Site Plan E, C4.2]
- -Narrowed 26ft EV only driveway with drop approach instead of radius.
-Gate would need to be electronic/opticom to meet Fire standards.
-Gate to be setback 45ft from edge road to provide adequate queuing for Fire Apparatus (green line)
-During Civil review, gate will be required to have adequate signage/reflectivity [Site Plan E, C4.2]
- Proposed trash enclosure location will cause sight distance obstructions for vehicle navigating parking lot. Must be relocated to a different location on-site. [Site Plan E, C4.2]
- Traffic Scoping:

For LUC 221 (Midrise) Multifamily, please verify the number of livable floors associated with parcel D & E. Has there been any other changes to the 2021 site plan?

Trip generation rates have been approved for both plan "E" & "D", the overall analysis needs to be consolidated into one TIA to be consistent with SEPA. Update routing & driveway access assumptions accordingly.

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

- WATER:
 1. Water to Parcel D and Parcel E is to be provided by Fruitland Mutual Water Company. The applicant shall provide a water availability letter prior to site plan approval for the individual sites. (NOTE: Applicant Response Letter dated December 27, 2022 states the Water Availability Letter was submitted with the second review materials, but it was not in the documentation provided. Please email directly.)

- STORMWATER:

Parcel D and Parcel E Preliminary Drainage Report Shared Comments:

 1. Per the conditions of the Short Plat APN 201912305003, Short Plat APN 201912305004, as well as State vesting criteria, the proposed projects are not vested to prior stormwater regulations. As a result the 2019 Ecology Manual applies. Revise accordingly.
 2. The submitted MR8 Wetland Protection analysis for both Lot D and Lot E did not comply with the Ecology Manual criteria contained in Appendix I-C. In addition, it appears that Method 1 would be applicable to both lots since each has legal access to the wetland. Prior to Landuse approval, revise the project constraints as necessary to show compliance with MR8.
 3. The Ecology Manual also requires that any post-developed flows released above and beyond those necessary for MR8 compliance shall be mitigated per MR5 and MR7 unless infeasible. If determined to be infeasible, the Engineer-of-Record (EoR) shall document why they are unable to meet the requirements of MR5 and MR7 as a result of MR8 compliance (is deep layer infiltration not possible?).
 4. Confirm that the composite long-term infiltration rate is a corrected rate as outlined by Ecology, Section V-5.4.
 5. See additional review comments contained in each Drainage Report (both dated December 2022), make appropriate corrections, and resubmit for further review.

- Per the conditions of the Short Plat, APN 201912305003, and State vesting criteria, the Project is not vested to prior stormwater regulations. As a result the 2019 Ecology Manual applies. At time of civil application, revise accordingly. [Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 1 of 71]
- Revise report to comply with Minimum Requirement 8 (MR8)-see comments on Page 8. [Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 1 of 71]
- Project is not vested, as a result the 2019 Ecology Manual applies. [Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 5 of 71]
- Use current manual flow chart, Figure 1-3.1. [Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 6 of 71]
- See comments regarding MR8 compliance (Pg 8 of 71). Any post-developed flows released above and beyond those necessary for MR8 compliance shall be mitigated per MR5 and MR7 unless infeasible. If determined to be infeasible, the EoR must document why they are unable to meet the requirements of MR5 and MR7 (as a result of MR8 compliance). Is infiltration of the MR8 overflows possible? [Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 7 of 71]
- conveyance ditch...which eventually discharges to the Black Swamp Pothole located in Pierce County. {Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 8 of 71}

(SSC-6); and roof runoff is non-pollution generating.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 8 of 71]

- Please add a comment that states any project discharges tributary to the Black Swamp Pothole shall comply with Pierce County regulations.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 8 of 71]
- This is acceptable for the Black Swamp basin, but additional clarification will be necessary for the Willows Pond basin (roof, plaza, landscape, etc). After showing MR8 compliance, the project must mitigate for MR5 and MR7 unless infeasible. If determined to be infeasible, the EoR shall document why they are unable to meet the requirements of MR5 and MR7 (as a result of MR8 compliance).
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 8 of 71]
- Refer to the 2019 Ecology Manual criteria, App. 1-C.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 8 of 71]
- It does not appear that Method 2 is the correct approach. The provided EnCo wetland assessment (Appendix E) categorized the wetland as a Category II, Depressional wetland. Per Ecology Appendix I-C.4, Method 1 must be used to verify the hydroperiod protections.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 8 of 71]
- Per MR8, the applicant must comply with the wetland protection criteria.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 8 of 71]
- Unless otherwise agreed upon between the City and applicant, revise the preliminary storm report to adhere to current stormwater regulations (2019 Ecology Manual) including MR8 compliance.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 8 of 71]
- Per MR8, the applicant must comply with the wetland protection criteria.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 9 of 71]
- Clarify...value should be multiplied by appropriate correction factors per Ecology Section V-5.4.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 10 of 71]
- conveyance ditch...which eventually discharges to the Black Swamp Pothole located in Pierce County.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 11 of 71]
- confirm...parcel 0419106026?
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 12 of 71]
- No longer applicable.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 12 of 71]
- Clarify...surface area should be Forest for predev condition for MR7 or existing conditions for MR8.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 13 of 71]
- Verify sheet reference..."C1" was not provided with submittal documents.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 13 of 71]
- Please provide an exhibit that delineates the Pre and Post developed basins and associated surface areas identified.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 13 of 71]
- "Forest" used for Predeveloped MGS model (as per Ecology reqts).
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 13 of 71]
- At time of civil, provide supporting documentation that the underlying soil meets the Soil

Suitability Criteria for Treatment (SSC-6) per the Ecology Manual.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 14 of 71]

- See comment associated with MR4, Pg 7 of 71.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 14 of 71]
- See commentst associated with MR4 (Pg 7 of 71) and MR8 compliance (Pg 8 of 71).
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 14 of 71]
- At time of civil, provide supporting documentation that the underlying soil meets the Soil Suitability Criteria for Treatment (SSC-6) of the Ecology Manual.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 15 of 71]
- Clarify...value should be multiplied by appropriate correction factors per Ecology Section V-5.4.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 59 of 71]
- Should read 0419033037
[Plans-Lot D; Sht C3.0]
- Roof Discharge to the regulated wetland must comply with MR8 criteria per Ecology.
[Plans-Lot D; Sht C3.0]
- Clarify what document revised these distances from those shown on Short Plat APN 201912305003.
[Plans-Lot D; Sht C3.1]
- Should read 8501150183
[Plans-Lot D; Sht C3.1]
- Unless conveying PUBLIC stormwater, the proposed easement should be private and for the benefit of the upstream private property. If an existing easement does not exist, one shall be negotiated and recorded prior to Occupancy.
[Plans-Lot D; Sht C3.1]
- Unless conveying PUBLIC stormwater, the proposed easement should be private and for the benefit of the upstream private property. If an existing easement does not exist, one shall be negotiated and recorded prior to Occupancy.
[Plans-Lot D; Sht C3.2]
- Roof Discharge to the regulated wetland must comply with MR8 criteria per Ecology.
[Plans-Lot D; Sht C3.2]
- Per the conditions of the Short Plat, APN 201912305004, and State vesting criteria, the Project is not vested to prior stormwater regulations. As a result the 2019 Ecology Manual applies. At time of civil application, revise accordingly.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 1 of 60]
- Revise report to comply with Minimum Requirement 8 (MR8)-see comments on Page 8.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 1 of 60]
- Project is not vested, as a result the 2019 Ecology Manual applies.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 5 of 60]
- Use current manual flow chart, Figure 1-3.1.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 6 of 60]
- See comments regarding MR8 compliance (Pg 8 of 60). Any post-developed flows released above and beyond those necessary for MR8 compliance shall be mitigated per MR5 and MR7 unless infeasible. If determined to be infeasible, the EoR shall document why they are unable to meet the requirements of MR5 and MR7 as a result of MR8 compliance.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 7 of 60]
- Per Ecology, any post-developed flows released above and beyond those necessary for MR8

compliance shall be mitigated per MR5 and MR7 unless infeasible. If determined to be infeasible, the EoR must document why they are unable to meet the requirements of MR5 and MR7 (as a result of MR8 compliance). Is infiltration of the MR8 overflows possible?
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 8 of 60]

- Per MR8, the applicant must comply with the wetland protection criteria.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 8 of 60]
- Refer to the 2019 Ecology Manual criteria, App. 1-C.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 8 of 60]
- It does not appear that Method 2 is the correct approach. The provided EnCo wetland assessment (Appendix E) categorized the wetland as a Category II, Depressional wetland. Per Ecology Appendix I-C.4, Method 1 must be used to verify the hydroperiod protections.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 8 of 60]
- Unless otherwise agreed upon between the City and applicant, revise the preliminary storm report to adhere to current stormwater regulations (2019 Ecology Manual) including MR8 compliance.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 8 of 60]
- Per MR8, the applicant must comply with the wetland protection criteria.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 9 of 60]
- Clarify...value should be multiplied by appropriate correction factors per Ecology Section V-5.4.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 9 of 60]
- Clarify...surface area should be Forest for predev condition for MR7 or existing conditions for MR8.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 12 of 60]
- Please provide an exhibit that delineates the Pre and Post developed basins and associated surface areas identified.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 13 of 60]
- See comment associated with MR4, Pg 7 of 60.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 13 of 60]
- At time of civil, provide supporting documentation that the underlying soil meets the Soil Suitability Criteria for Treatment (SSC-6) per the Ecology Manual.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 13 of 60]
- See commentst associated with MR4 (Pg 7 of 60) and MR8 compliance (Pg 8 of 60).
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 13 of 60]
- At time of civil, provide supporting documentation that the underlying soil meets the Soil Suitability Criteria for Treatment (SSC-6) of the Ecology Manual.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 14 of 60]
- Clarify...value should be multiplied by appropriate correction factors per Ecology Section V-5.4.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 48 of 60]
- Roof Discharge to the regulated wetland must comply with MR8 criteria per Ecology.
[Plans-Lot E; Sht C4.2]

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

- Lot E
 1. Proposed Gates will not work. There is no room for Fire Apparatus queuing. Minimum queuing for Fire is 45'. Traffic may require more.
 2. Fire hydrant location does not work. Move fire hydrant and F.D.C. northeast across the drive aisle to parking island. Roughly 30-35' away.
 3. 26' fire lane required. Show dimensions on plan.
- Lot D
 1. 26' fire lane required. Show dimensions on plan.
 2. Move F.D.C. and fire hydrant closer to fire lane. F.D.C. should be facing the fire lane.

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

with slopes of less than three feet vertical to 12 feet horizontal, the following methods shall be used:

- a. The height of the visible roofline must change at least four feet if the adjacent roof segments are less than 50 feet in length.
- b. The height of the visible roofline must change at least eight feet if the adjacent roof segments are 50 feet or more in length.
- c. The length of a sloped or gabled roofline must be at least 20 feet, with a minimum slope of three feet vertical to 12 feet horizontal. The building elevations are missing roof slope callouts to ensure compliance with these standards. Provide revised building elevations to ensure roof modulation compliance.

- 1. First Review Comment: Per PMC 20.31.026(15), each upper floor dwelling unit requires a minimum of 10-foot by 8-foot private open space. Clearly indicate the private open space for each dwelling unit on site plans and provide a narrative describing how the private open space requirements are being met.

Second Review Comment: Please submit a floor plan for each level that shows how this standard is being met.

- 2. First Review Comment: Per PMC 20.31.027(4), at least one building entrance for an individual building (or individual tenant space) shall face each public street frontage or be located within 50 linear feet from public street frontage.
 - a. The Lot D building entrance is located more than 50 linear feet from public street frontage.
 - b. The Lot E building entrance is located more than 50-feet from 39th Avenue SE.
 - c. Revise site plans to ensure compliance with these requirements.

Second Review: Please show on plans that the building entrance is located within 50 linear feet from public street frontage.

- 3. Per PMC 20.31.027(2) All site developments shall have a pedestrian-oriented plaza space in front of the building at least eight feet deep running the full width of the building. This area shall be covered by awnings covering at least six feet of the plaza space. Please show on plans the awnings covering at least six feet of the plaza space.
- 4. First Review Comment: The City GIS shows existing trees located within the development footprint which are not denoted on the site plans, preliminary landscape plans, or other documents. To ensure compliance with Vegetation Management Standards regarding significant tree protection, the planting plan shall denote all existing trees with Diameter-at-Breast Height (DBH) and indicate if the tree is to be removed or retained. If your site includes any significant trees, then you must include a tree risk assessment completed by a certified arborist and provide the critical root protection zone for any retained significant trees on the grading plan.

Second Review Comment: Updated landscape plan shows significant trees that will be retained and significant trees that will be removed with development. Please submit a tree risk assessment completed by a certified arborist and provide critical protection zone for any

retained significant trees on the grading plan.

- 5. First Review Comment: Per PMC 25.58.005(2), the perimeter of all sites shall be landscaped the full depth of the required setback or 12 feet, whichever is less; however, not less than 6 feet. The following landscape buffers are currently being encroached by off-street parking/paving:

Revise all site plans to ensure compliance with minimum landscape buffer requirements.

Second Review Comment: Per PMC 20.58.005(2) the perimeter of all sites shall be landscaped the full depth of the required setbacks for the subject site, or 12 feet, whichever is less; however, in no event shall a perimeter landscaping buffer be smaller than six feet. For Lot D please show how the interior side yard (west) meets this standard (6 feet) and how the rear yard meets this standard (10 feet).

- 6. First Review Comment: Per PMC 25.58.005(2)(a)(ii), all retaining walls shall be setback from any rear or side yard a minimum of 6-feet, and the maximum retaining wall height within 30 feet of side and rear lot lines is 6 feet and shall include a Type I visual barrier landscape buffer. The site plans do not denote the retaining wall height. Revise plans to ensure compliance with this standard.

Second Review Comment: Note a Type 1 visual barrier landscape buffer is required for the retaining walls from rear and side yards.

Building Review - Janelle Montgomery; (253) 770-3328; JMontgomery@PuyallupWA.gov

- Accessible parking and access to the public way would be required as well as the accessibility requirements to the building. The R-2 apartments and Occupancy B are required to have the infrastructure in place for charging stations per IBC section 429 Washington State amendments and will need to be shown on the plans. Provide minimum accessible parking including required accessible EV parking at the building. Based on historical timeline of preliminary site plan to a complete building application appears this building permit may be applied for after June 30, 2023. Please be aware July 1, 2023 forward Washington State will adopt the 2021 I-codes with Washington State Amendments and 2021 WSEC. See Section 429 of the 2021 IBC for Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure to determine the number of EV parking stalls that will be required under 2021 Code cycle as there are significant changes, reference Table 429.2.

CONDITIONS

Development & Permitting Services - Bryan Roberts; 2538415542; broberts@PuyallupWA.gov

- General:

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

- Submit With Civil Permit Application: ITEMS REQUIRED PRIOR TO CIVIL PERMIT APPROVAL:
Parcel E:

1. There is an existing 60-ft easement which conflicts with the proposed building layout. Provide supporting documentation that verifies that the proposed project does not interfere

with existing easement rights (Easement Releases; Grantee acknowledgment letters; etc).

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

- Submit With Civil Permit Application: ITEMS REQUIRED PRIOR TO OCCUPANCY:

Parcel D:

1. Recorded private stormwater easement associated with the existing Black Swamp conveyance system. Easement shall be between the ownership of Parcel 0419033037 and Parcel 0419102107.
2. Recorded public access and utilities easement between 3rd St SE and 39th Ave SE (use City form).

Parcel E:

1. Recorded public utility easement for the existing storm conveyance line between 5th St SE and Willows Pond (use City form). Minimum easement width is 40-ft per current City Standards.
- A DRAFT easement document shall be submitted with the Civil Engineering Permit Application.

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

- Submit With Civil Permit Application: GENERAL:

1. The proposed project shall be designed to ensure that landscaping trees are located a minimum of 10-ft from any public utility and any onsite lighting or other permanent structures are located outside the limits of any public utility easement(s).
2. Incorporate 2nd REVIEW comments as noted on the Parcel D Preliminary Plans (Sheets C3.0-C3.2) and Parcel E Preliminary Plans (Sheets C4.0-C4.2).
3. At time of civil application, incorporate previously acknowledged conditions described in DRT Letter 1 dated December 28, 2021.

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 11.08.135 the applicant/owner would be expected to construct half- street improvements including curb, gutter, 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.

- a. Half-street grind & overlay may be necessary based on the roadway condition at the time of

civil review.

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. Streetlights shall have shorting caps installed with remote photocell located on the service cabinet.

b. Streetlight design shall provide the following:

i. Provide details on how streetlights will be powered

ii. Location of conduit runs

iii. Wiring Schedule

1. Conduit size and type for each raceway

2. Conductors details

iv. Pole schedule

1. STA & offset for each luminaire

v. Show location of junction boxes

A 30-foot commercial driveway will be required for site access.

Driveway & parking lot cannot exceed 10% grade.

AutoTurn analysis will be required to ensure site driveways and internal circulation can accommodate the largest anticipated design vehicle. Submit at the time of civil review.

Sincerely,

Chris Beale

Senior Planner

(253) 841-5418

CBeale@PuyallupWA.gov