



City of Puyallup

Planning Division

333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371

(253) 864-4165

www.cityofpuyallup.org

May 08, 2023

Betsy Dyer
 18215 72nd Ave. S.
 Kent, WA 98032

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM (DRT) LETTER	
DRT #	2
PERMIT #	PLPSP20220108
PROJECT NAME	Wesley Homes Bradley Park Phase 2
PERMIT TYPE	Preliminary Site Plan
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Expansion includes 36-unit Care Center and 44-unit Brownstone with associated storm water facility improvements, water and sewer connections, parking area, landscaping and franchise utilities
SITE ADDRESS	707 39TH AVE SE, Unit: A101, PUYALLUP, WA 98374;
PARCEL #	0419037014;
ASSOCIATED LAND USE PERMIT(S)	P-21-0134 PLDR20230034 PL20230049
APPLICATION DATE	July 11, 2022
APPLICATION COMPLETE DATE	August 15, 2022
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

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

- Additional Submittal Item Required (Critical Area Report): Wetland and/or wetland buffer areas: The proposal is located within 300 ft of a known or suspected regulated wetland. A report from a qualified wetland biologist, meeting the requirements of PMC 21.06.950 and 21.06.530 is required for any lands suspected (mapped or unmapped) or known on a site or a site within 300' of suspected or known wetlands. The report must have been produced in the last 5 years to be valid. The previous report is expired.

APRIL, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: Report not yet received, applicant response indicates report is to be provided. Comment resolution outstanding.

- SITE PLAN: In order to deviate from the front yard build to area setback, a formal variance will be required, and must be approved by the Hearing Examiner. See 01/25/22 email to project architect (Jill Krance) from Planning and Engineering staff.

APRIL, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: the proposed 25 foot setback exceeds the maximum 20.31.027 (2)(C) of 20 feet. There are conflicting responses in the letter back to us stating in some locations the conflict requires setback further than the max due to sight distance and other statements of compliance with the max setback. If the setback is further than 20 feet max, a variance is still required. Supporting evidence of conflicts with sight distance will need to be included in a setback variance application and supported by the traffic engineer.

- CRITICAL AREAS: Please analyze in the updated critical area report the proposed paving the pathway behind the lodge (is this trail in a wetland buffer area?).

APRIL, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: Comment outstanding pending submittal of updated critical areas (wetland) report.

- CRITICAL AREAS: Update the geotechnical report and analysis, focusing on critical areas analysis for the steeply sloped area below the 36 bed care center building (to the west, steep embankment stream channel on the Lowes site). Areas adjacent exceed 40 percent slope as shown in GIS and may have a buffer which the CC building is proposed to be located within, see PMC 21.06.1210. Please submit a geotech report addressing PMC 21.06.530 and PMC 21.06.1210, .1220, .1230, .1240, and .1250 (seismic).

April, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: Please supplement the geotech report to specifically address PMC 21.06.1230 (2)(A - F), addressing each item in detail. Also address .1230 (11), monitoring plan for during and post construction. Address pier design foundations in more detail and presence of seeps on the site.

- SITE PLAN: The project is not compliant with PMC 20.31.027 because the site does not meet the underlying BTA setback.

APRIL, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: The proposed 25 foot setback exceeds the maximum 20.31.027 (2)(C) of 20 feet. A variance is still required. Supporting evidence of conflicts with sight distance will need to be included in a setback variance application.

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.015 (2) (b). Fiber cement is only a high quality material if proposed as a through color fiber cement product. For example, the Board has not approved painted fiber cement board (such as Hardie Board). Here are some examples of fiber cement products which would be approved.
 EQUITONE https://www.equitone.com/en-us/materials-en-us/?gclid=EAlalQobChMln9axvu7D9wIVFBXUAR2adwwBEAAYASAAEgLZN_D_BwE
 SWISS PEARL <https://www.swisspearl.com/products/#facade>
 AMERICAN FIBER CEMENT CORP (CEMBRIT) <https://www.americanfibercement.com/products/patina-design-line/patina/>

April, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: All design review/architectural review pending resolution under final design review permit, which will be approved by the Design Review Board. We are carrying this comment forward as we are awaiting a submittal by the project architect for scheduling with the Board (comment dated 04/11/23)

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.015 (3) (a)(i). The project is not meeting the required transparency required, or has not demonstrated compliance. The Board has approved 30 percent transparency for street facing facades for residential only projects (in lieu of the 60 percent listed in code).

April, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: All design review/architectural review pending resolution under final design review permit, which will be approved by the Design Review Board. We are carrying this comment forward as we are awaiting a submittal by the project architect for scheduling with the Board (comment dated 04/11/23)

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.025 (2) (a). The Board will need to consider the applicant’s argument against 12 first floor ceiling heights. Staff cannot give guidance at this time; the Board may provide flexibility.

April, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: All design review/architectural review pending resolution under final design review permit, which will be approved by the Design Review Board. We are carrying this comment forward as we are awaiting a submittal by the project architect for scheduling with the Board (comment dated 04/11/23)

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.025 (2) (b). The Board has approved 30 percent transparency for street facing facades for residential only projects. Please provide a calculation exhibit for the street facing (39th Ave) façade wall.

April, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: All design review/architectural review pending resolution under final design review permit, which will be approved by the Design Review Board. We are carrying this comment forward as we are awaiting a submittal by the project architect for scheduling with the Board (comment dated 04/11/23)

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.025 (2) (c). The Board will need to consider the applicant’s argument against the front door facing the street. The door does appear to orient at an angle to the street and may meet the standard, but the building is not meeting the underlying setbacks.

April, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: All design review/architectural review pending resolution under final design review permit, which will be approved by the Design Review Board. We are

carrying this comment forward as we are awaiting a submittal by the project architect for scheduling with the Board (comment dated 04/11/23)

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.025 (2) (c). The Board will need to review the strategy for trim throughout. Please note the dimensional requirements for 2 inch trim.

April, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: All design review/architectural review pending resolution under final design review permit, which will be approved by the Design Review Board. We are carrying this comment forward as we are awaiting a submittal by the project architect for scheduling with the Board (comment dated 04/11/23)

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.025 (3). The application is not clear on if the proposal meets the minimum building modulation standards ("required at least every 30 feet along all exterior wall planes and shall be offset at least four feet."). Please specifically address at the time of resubmittal.

April, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: All design review/architectural review pending resolution under final design review permit, which will be approved by the Design Review Board. We are carrying this comment forward as we are awaiting a submittal by the project architect for scheduling with the Board (comment dated 04/11/23)

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.025 (4). How is the street facing façade receiving the greatest amount of attention as outlined in code? The narrative is not specific how the proposal plans to meet this portion of code text.

April, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: All design review/architectural review pending resolution under final design review permit, which will be approved by the Design Review Board. We are carrying this comment forward as we are awaiting a submittal by the project architect for scheduling with the Board (comment dated 04/11/23)

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.025 (5). Blank wall areas will require landscape screening

April, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: All design review/architectural review pending resolution under final design review permit, which will be approved by the Design Review Board. We are carrying this comment forward as we are awaiting a submittal by the project architect for scheduling with the Board (comment dated 04/11/23)

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.025 (6). Please provide the siding coverage percentage break downs as required by code for the structure type based on stories. Address the standard regarding stone cap and or brick sill throughout on each building. Address vertical change in materials standard. Please specify the fiber cement product; the Board has not approved painted fiber cement board (such as Hardie Board). Here are some examples of fiber cement products which would be approved.
EQUITONE https://www.equitone.com/en-us/materials-en-us/?gclid=EAlaIqobChMln9axvu7D9wIVFBXUAR2adwwBEAAYASAAEgLZN_D_BwE
SWISS PEARL <https://www.swisspearl.com/products/#facade>
AMERICAN FIBER CEMENT CORP (CEMBRIT) <https://www.americanfibercement.com/products/patina-design-line/patina/>

April, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: All design review/architectural review pending resolution under final design review permit, which will be approved by the Design Review Board. We are

carrying this comment forward as we are awaiting a submittal by the project architect for scheduling with the Board (comment dated 04/11/23)

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.025 (8). The visibility from the street is not the standard for application of this code section; the roofline modulation is required throughout. Please address change in visible roofline standard and how each new building meets the standard.

April, 2023 UPDATED COMMENT: All design review/architectural review pending resolution under final design review permit, which will be approved by the Design Review Board. We are carrying this comment forward as we are awaiting a submittal by the project architect for scheduling with the Board (comment dated 04/11/23)

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

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

- Wesley Bradley Park residents have expressed concern regarding large trucks using the Lowes private access through the property. It's my understanding that Lowes has an easement right to use this private road. I would recommend the design team review the private easement about possible GVW restrictions. The City does not have authority to restrict access for this private easement.

Correspondence from concerned resident:
I thought I would get your perspective on what has become a hazard with the many trucks from Lowe's using the short road through WBP to exit through our property. There have been an increasing number of (good size) trucks, some with flat beds carrying an assortment of large items. Recently one of the large trucks took a number of maneuvers to get around our Roundabout. The sign on Lowe's side of the short driveway says "Private Property". That doesn't stop them. Our speed limit is 10 mph, and some of the traffic exceeds that. The police said they didn't have the manpower or time to deal with our problem. In the past, the individual who is responsible for Lowe's did not think it was a problem. Do you have anyone you could recommend to come out, view our situation and make recommendations?

CONDITIONS

Development & Permitting Services - Mark Higginson; 2538415559; MHigginson@PuyallupWA.gov

- Submit With Civil Permit Application: GENERAL:
 - At time of civil application, incorporate markups noted on the Preliminary Storm Report dated January 23, 2023.
 - At time of civil application, incorporate markups noted on the Preliminary Civil Plans stamped January 27, 2023.
 - At time of civil application, incorporate the "Conditions" noted in DRT Letter 1, dated November 23, 2022.
 - At time of civil application, ensure 10-ft min clearance between any woody landscaping and wet utilities.

Development & Permitting Services - Janelle Montgomery; 2537703328;

JMontgomery@PuyallupWA.gov

- General: Building Department:
 - Plans will need to be per the applicable adopted codes 2018/2021 for all permits.

Building plans will need to be complete with all building, mechanical, plumbing, energy code items and accessibility requirements that may apply on the plans with all Washington State Amendments.

Additional Submittal Item: Provide a Geo-Tech report for soils with the building permit applications.

The R-2 apartments at Brownstone 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. Did not locate EV parking on site plan.

Accessible parking and access to the public way would be required as well as the accessibility requirements for inside the parking garage. For all accessible requirements we use the 2018/2021 IBC / WAC 51-50 and the ICC A117.1-2009 standard not the ADA.

Provide all exit discharge points and opening protection.

Phase 2 proposed Care Center, I-2 occupancy requires approval from Health Department. The City recommends to request preliminary plan review from the Department of Health provides prior to submitting building plans to assure meets all Health department requirements to avoid delays. The City of Puyallup will not release building permit without Health departments approval.

Engineering Division - Bryan Roberts; 2538415542; broberts@PuyallupWA.gov

- General: TRAFFIC ENGINEERING GENERAL CONDITIONS:

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.

For multifamily developments, impact fees are charged for all dwelling units (not separated) prior to building permit issuance.

Per Puyallup Municipal Code Section 11.08.135, 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.

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 (if applicable) shall be paid directly to the school district in accordance with adopted fee at the time of collection by the district.

For multifamily developments, impact fees are charged for all dwelling units (not separated) prior to building permit issuance.

Per Puyallup Municipal Code Section 11.08.135, 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.

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