



City of Puyallup

Planning Division

333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371

(253) 864-4165

www.cityofpuyallup.org

October 30, 2023

Les Seifert

14900 Interurban Ave S, Suite 138

TUKWILA, WA 98168

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM (DRT) LETTER	
DRT #	3
PERMIT #	P-21-0099
PROJECT NAME	DOS LAGOS MIXED USE PROJECT
PERMIT TYPE	Preliminary Site Plan
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	(3) PARCESLS: LOT A,B, & C: COMBINED LOTS TO BUILD 5 STORY BUILDING;PARKING SIDEWALKS;PEDESTRIAN PLAZA;DOG PARK & UNDERGROUND VAULT STORM SYSTEM
SITE ADDRESS	3910 5TH ST SE ;
PARCEL #	0419102118; 0419106024; 0419106030; 0419106031;
ASSOCIATED LAND USE PERMIT(S)	P-21-0100 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.

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. 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.

The City has completed the review of the above-mentioned permit submittal. All of your review comments, conditions, and redlined plans can be found on the [City's permit portal](#). Redlined plans can be found on the City's Permit Portal in the "Reviews" section under "Documents Returned for Corrections". Below please find the permit submittal review comments from your review team and re-submittal instructions. Should you have any questions regarding the review comments, please contact the plan reviewer associated with the comment listed below.

Re-submittal Instructions

To resubmit, you must respond to all comments in a written response letter and submit a letter of transmittal. Letter of transmittal and response letter must be submitted to the 'Correction Response Letter' item listed in the submittal items list. Avoid using "upload additional docs" unless there is NO submittal item available for your document. Please Note: If you do not resubmit as instructed your re-submittal will be rejected. If you have any questions about how to resubmit, please contact the permit center at permitcenter@puyallupwa.gov.

- 1 Log in to your permits portal and navigate to the [status page](#) for this permit. Under the 'Upload Documents' section, select 'click here to upload document'.
- 2 For each submittal item listed re-submit a new version of the submittal item by clicking the "New Version" button next to the file name of the original file submitted. DO NOT click the 'browse' button unless the document you are submitting for that submittal item is not a new version of the originally submitted document.
- 3 Click 'Upload Documents' at bottom of the page.

How to use this letter

This review letter includes two sections: **“Corrections”** and **“Conditions”**.

The **“Corrections”** 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.

Corrections

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

- Per previous comments, remove trees here. Will interfere with SB visibility of signal heads & impact EB right turn on red sight distance.
PSP and landscaping plan still showing trees in this area
[LOT C Preliminary Plans C2.0]

- Traffic Scoping:

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

Please update the traffic scoping worksheet with EV charging station trips. Based on recent development in the City of Puyallup (4 stalls), Transpo Group assumed 10 daily trips/stall, 1.5 trips/stall during the AM peak hour, 2 trips/stall during the PM peak hour. No pass-rates were assumed. Please apply these rates to your current 6 stall proposal. Explanation provided below:

Programmatic Consideration Use of EV Stalls.

The proposal includes 4 stalls with 2 charging units (i.e., there can be a vehicle on each side of the unit). Each unit includes 2 plugs total allowing for charging the most common connection configurations (CHAdeMO and Tesla style). The plug types are specific to the vehicle so there can only be one vehicle at a station charging at a time with the specific plug type (e.g., if you have Leaf you need the CHAdeMO plug type and if someone else is using that type you will have to wait or find another station.) Therefore, there can only be 2 of one kind of vehicle charging at any given time, limiting the usage. Additionally, typical charge times range between 20-40 minutes. Given these limitations, we are anticipating the 4 stalls to provide an average of 20 total charges per day (i.e., 5 charges per stall per day), which equates to a weekday daily trip generation rate of 10 trips/plug (or 40 EV trips for the site per day). We distributed these daily trips assuming 2 trips/stall in the PM peak hour (i.e., 8 EV trips with the 4 stalls) and 1.5 trips/stall in the AM peak hour (i.e., 6 EV trips with the 4 stalls). This equates to ~35 percent of daily trips occurring during the peak hours. This is conservative relative to the gas station which estimates only 12 percent of daily trips occurring during the peak hours.

Other EV Data.

The trip generation study Charging Electric Vehicles in Smart Cities: An EVI-Pro Analysis of Columbus, Ohio (National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2018) included review of EV stall usage in Seattle. The study showed there were 2.22 sessions/day/plug or 4.44 trips/day/plug. For the proposed project with 4 plugs, the study indicates that there would be 17.76 total daily trips or less trips than the programmatic estimate. There were no peak hour data in the 2018 study; however, if it was assumed 35% of the daily trips occurred during the peak hours (consistent with the programmatic estimate above) then with the lower daily trip rates from the 2018 study there would be less peak hour trips projected. As such, use of the programmatic estimate is conservative relative to the 2018 study and was the basis of analysis.

Once the traffic scoping worksheet has been approved for Site plan "B", the TIA will

need to be updated with this information. Vehicle trips generated by site plan "C" & "B" must be evaluated as one project/TIA per SEPA.

- Prior to civil submittal, please coordinate with City staff regarding the placement and type of Streetlights. City standard 12ft arms are preferred. If possible, offset will need to be modified to avoid 17ft arms.
- Use AutoTurn to size RIRO channelization device appropriately that will allow an ambulance to complete an outbound left turn without driving over the curb.
[LOT C Preliminary Plans C2.0]
- City of Puyallup has not received an updated traffic scoping document for this project that includes trips generated by the proposed EV charging stations. Once the traffic scoping worksheet is reviewed, a written response would be sent to the applicant's traffic engineer outlining the scope of the project's Traffic Impact Study (TIS).

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

- Parcel B – no issues
- Parcel C –
 - With the current site plans changes review as follows
 - 10% maximum grade
 - Shrink parking island back down to original size. 22.2' wide fire lane will not be allowed. Fire Lane is required to be a 26' considering this is being used as a fire truck turn-around and the main fire lane on a dead-end. Approval will be given with a 26' wide leg in the loading zone. Show dimensions on site plan.
 - Show the location for F.D.C. A fire hydrant is required to be within 10-15' of F.D.C. Do not block either item with a parking stall.
 - Notice: for future submittals and Civils. No traffic calming devices will be allowed at the entry. Islands, pork chops, or right in right out will not be allowed.
 - Auto-turn does not show what fire apparatus was used. Provide Auto-turn using our current fire truck. Email ddrake@puyallupwa.gov for specs.

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

- Architectural Design Review

OCTOBER, 2023 COMMENT: Architectural design review will occur with the Board. The anticipated date of review is 11/02/23.

PREVIOUS COMMENTS:

1. Provide revised building elevations to address the below design review requirements. Please itemize the applicable code requirements in a narrative letter, providing callouts on the elevations and a narrative report from the architect demonstrating compliance with the architectural standards described in the narrative. (PMC 20.52)
2. The design narrative did not address PMC 20.52.015(1) design principles. Please revise the design review narrative to address this code section.
3. Per PMC 20.52.015(2), the use of high-quality building materials shall be incorporated in the building design. The Design Review Board will not consider Hardi plank siding as a high-quality material on street facing elevations. Code is specific about material types. Be prepared to offer a different material type.
4. Per 20.52.025(1), the upper floor stepback of a building three stories or taller shall be a minimum of 10-feet. Alternatively, a total 10-foot step may be accommodated over multiple stories (e.g., seven feet on third floor, three feet on upper floor). In your design response, you stated that you are meeting this through eliminating decks on the upper floors. PMC 20.31.026(15) requires a 10-foot by 8-foot private deck is required for all upper story units. A variance may be required to deviate from PMC 20.31.026(15). Additionally, it has been staff experience that the Design Review Board would not support deviating from the upper floor setbacks through the removal of outdoor private space. Be prepared to offer a different alternative.
5. Per PMC 20.52.025(2)(b), the ground floor of street facing façade shall consist of at least 60 percent visual transparency between 2 feet and 8 feet. It appears that the southeast facade may be compliant but there are no calculations to confirm compliance. It isn't clear if the northeast and southwest elevations are also compliant. Revise the drawings as necessary and provide transparency calculation for the northeast, southeast, and southwest building facades. Please note, that as you are addressing the transparency requirements, ensure that the windows are also compliant with PMC 20.52.025(2)(d).
6. PMC 20.52.025(5) applies to blank walls. The provided building elevations do not appear to have areas over 30 feet in length or 400 sq. ft. in area without building articulation or openings. No revision is required at this time, but please review this section as you further develop the building elevations.
7. Per PMC 20.52.025(6), the proposed buildings shall have a minimum of 30 percent of the building façades with a minimum of two exterior materials. PMC requires the use of metal paneling, brick, decorative faux stone, masonry, and masonry veneer for a minimum of 60% of the exterior face, excluding gables, windows, doors,

and related trim. Revise drawings as necessary, provide the needed callouts and calculations, and update the design review narrative.

8. Per PMC 20.52.025(6), If the continuous roofline exceeds 50 feet in length on a roofline 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.

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 site plan does not clearly identify required accessible parking. Provide minimum accessible parking including required accessible EV parking at the building. The six EV parking provided off site can contribute to the total quantity of number required. 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.

***PER COMMENT RESPONSE LETTER; SITE PLAN IDENTIFY ADA STALLS (A01) EV PARKING IS SHOWN OFF SITE. WAC 51-50-0429 SECTION 429.4 OF 2018 REQUIRES ONE ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE FOR ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACES. THE 2021 ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIRES 10 % ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACES, ROUNDED TO NEXT WHOLE NUMBER SHALL BE EV CHARGING STATIONS. (SEE COMPLETE WAC 51-50-0429 FOR ALL ACCESSIBLE REQUIREMENTS IN 2021 CODE). ACCESSIBLE EV CHARGING STATIONS REQUIRE TO MEET ACCESSIBLE ROUTE TO BUILDING. REFERENCE SECTION 502.4.1 LOCATION IN THE ICC A117.1-2009 AND SECTION 1104 - ACCESSIBLE ROUTE IN 2018/2021 IBC. UPDATE SITE PLAN REFLECTING ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS WITH ACCESSIBLE ROUTE TO BUILDING.

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

- 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 C; Pg 8 of 65]

- At time of civil application, no structures (walls, stairs, etc.) shall be constructed over the storm main.

[Plans-Lot C; Sht C2.2]

- Per prior comment-Revise report to comply with Minimum Requirement 8 (MR8)-see comments on Page 10.

[Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 1 of 95]

- Clarify-pipes under driving surfaces require 3ft min cover (1ft for ductile). Does not appear that there is adequate space in the pavement section to meet separation and cover reqts using perforated pipes.

[Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 8 of 95]

- To ensure viability of the proposed storm design and prior to Landuse Approval, provide elevation of the restrictive layer (wet-season high groundwater or soil layer) and include the investigation in the geotech section.
[Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 8 of 95]
- As mentioned on the prior page, it does not appear that there is adequate space in the pavement section to comply with cover and separation requirements. Additional clarification is needed to ensure the proposed design can meet regulations and effectively infiltrate the project runoff to avoid the MR7 threshold.
[Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 9 of 95]
- Per prior comment...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 C; Pg 10 of 95]
- Per meeting on April 11, 2023, the City suggested analyzing the wetland using the overall tributary basin rather than solely the runoff from the project site. To the City's recollection, it was never agreed to forego the Method 1 analysis which is mandated by the Ecology Manual.
[Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 10 of 65]
- See comments under MR5 and MR7.
[Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 16 of 95]
- See comments under MR5 and MR7.
[Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 20 of 95]
- See comments under MR8.
[Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 38 of 95]
- Clarify-pipes under driving surfaces require 3ft min cover (1ft for ductile). Does not appear that there is adequate space in the pavement section to meet separation and cover reqts using perforated pipe.
[Plans-Lot C; Sht C2.2]
- Show connection to sewer. May need to relocate enclosure to make connection. Per prior comment-See City Standards Section 208 for trash enclosure requirements.
[Plans-Lot C; Sht C2.2]

Conditions

Condition Category	Condition	Department	Condition Status
SEPA Condition	Project shall provide an ADA compliant pathway from lot C the NE corner of parcel C to the corner of 39th and 5th. Planning will implement	Planning Division	Open

Condition Category	Condition	Department	Condition Status
	this requirement given the wetland parcel A is part of the mixed use site plan with parcel B and C.		
SEPA Condition	Project shall provide a cultural resource site assessment consistent with DAHP and tribal requirements at the time of civil development permit application.	Planning Division	Open
SEPA Condition	If Lot A wetland or associated wetland buffer is disturbed by any proposed land disturbance activities (grading, retaining, wall, etc.), a new wetland critical area report may be required if the previous critical area report is more than 5-years old. A new critical area report may alter the wetland buffer widths. A mitigation plan may be required	Planning Division	Open
Submit With Civil Permit Application	<p>ITEMS REQUIRED PRIOR TO CIVIL PERMIT APPROVAL (submit with Civil Application):</p> <p>Parcel B:</p> <p>1. As previously noted, parcels, 0419106025 and 0419106024 contain existing stormwater facilities serving the adjacent Parcel 0419102095. Prior to civil application approval, the Dos Lagos project shall meet the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any proposed site improvements shall be located outside of the existing stormwater facilities serving Parcel 0419102095 or, the existing stormwater facilities shall be redesigned and reconstructed to provide equal or better performance. - The applicant shall provide acknowledgement from the ownership of Parcel 0419102095 that any proposed site improvements do not interfere with the use and maintenance of the existing stormwater facilities serving Parcel 0419102095. - The applicant shall execute and record a private stormwater access and maintenance easement in favor of Parcel 0419102095. 	Engineering Division	Open

Condition Category	Condition	Department	Condition Status
	<p>Parcel C:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It must be shown that the underlying soils meet treatment criteria (SSC-6) associated with the permeable pavement. 2. Clarify the interaction between the proposed retaining wall and the permeable pavement (hydrostatic pressure; wall drainage vs. reservoir storage; etc). 3. Frontage improvements shall extend to the property line. 4. No structures (walls, stairs, etc.) shall be constructed over the storm main. 5. Overflow facilities shall be provided at the low points of the proposed permeable pavement areas to prevent surface runoff and safe discharge to the downstream storm system. 		
<p>Submit With Civil Permit Application</p>	<p>ITEMS REQUIRED PRIOR TO OCCUPANCY:</p> <p>Parcel B:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recorded public access and utilities easement between 39th Ave SE and the westerly property limits (use City form). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A DRAFT easement document shall be submitted with the Civil Engineering Permit Application. <p>Parcel C:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recorded public access and utilities easement associated with public stormwater conveyance through the site (use City form). Minimum easement width is 40-ft per current City Standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A DRAFT easement document shall be submitted with the Civil Engineering Permit Application. 2. Register infiltration trench(es) as UIC prior to Occupancy. 	<p>Engineering Division</p>	<p>Open</p>
<p>Submit With Civil</p>	<p>GENERAL:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any proposed retaining walls shall be 	<p>Engineering Division</p>	<p>Open</p>

Condition Category	Condition	Department	Condition Status
Permit Application	<p>located outside the ROW on private property.</p> <p>2. No structures (walls, stairs, etc.) shall be constructed over the top wet utility pipes.</p> <p>3. 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).</p> <p>4. Incorporate all applicable REVIEW comments as noted on the Parcel B Preliminary Plans (Sheets C1.0-C1.2) and Parcel C Preliminary Plans (Sheets C2.0-C2.2).</p> <p>5. At time of civil application, incorporate applicable REVIEW conditions described in prior DRT Letters.</p>		
	<p>Traffic Impact fees (TIF) will be assessed in accordance with fees adopted by ordinance, per PMC 21.10.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>School impact fees shall be paid directly to the school district in accordance with adopted fee at the time of collection by the District.</p> <p>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</p>	Traffic Division	Open

Condition Category	Condition	Department	Condition Status
	<p>damaged now or during construction, or which do not meet current City Standards, shall be replaced.</p> <p>a. Half-street grind & overlay may be necessary based on the roadway condition at the time of civil review.</p> <p>At the time of civil permit review provide a separate street lighting plan and pavement striping plan (channelization) sheet for the City to review.</p> <p>a. On the 43rd Ave SE frontage, extend conduit & j-box (to the west) to accommodate future streetlight expansion along this street.</p> <p>b. Streetlights shall have shorting caps installed with remote photocell located on the service cabinet.</p> <p>c. Streetlight design shall provide the following:</p> <p>i. Provide details on how streetlights will be powered</p> <p>ii. Location of conduit runs</p> <p>iii. Wiring Schedule</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduit size and type for each raceway 2. Conductors details <p>iv. Pole schedule</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. STA & offset for each luminaire <p>v. Show location of junction boxes</p> <p>A 30-foot commercial driveway will be required for site access.</p> <p>Driveway & parking lot cannot exceed 10% grade.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For Lot B - East of the commercial access on 39th Ave SE, a portion of the existing fence must be modified to meet distance standards</p>		

Condition Category	Condition	Department	Condition Status
	<p>During Civil review, show location of existing streetlights on 5th St SE.</p> <p>During Civil design, must verify existing streetlight conduit under driveway meets City standards (schedule 80)</p> <p>During civil review, additional counter measures, signage, striping, c-curb may be necessary to enforce right-in/right-out restriction on 5th St SE</p>		
Submit With Civil Permit Application	<p>Existing trees to be retained must be clearly marked on the final clearing and grading plan, and final landscape plan. Tree protection fencing and signage shall follow the city standard detail, see appendix 20.5. Standard detail shall be included on all plan sets with vegetation which is scheduled for retention and protection. All critical root protection zones (CRPZ) shall be shown on plan sets in diameter from the center of the tree. In determining tree CRPZ, the following standards shall be used. In establishing the extent of the Critical Root Protection Zone (CRPZ) for individual significant trees, groupings of significant trees, a stand of significant trees, or a heritage tree the following formula shall be used: Individual tree diameter (in inches) X 2, converted into feet = CRPZ, in diameter (Example: 20" tree X 2 = 40' CRPZ diameter). The following minimum performance standards shall be used to determine the extent of allowable impacts to the CRPZ of significant trees: For significant trees, a minimum of 50 percent of the critical root zone must be preserved at natural grade, with natural ground cover. The protection zone may be irregular. The plan set shall provide a total square footage of CRPZ area and show the % of disturbance area. For heritage trees, a minimum of 75 percent of the critical root zone must be preserved at natural grade with natural ground cover. The protection</p>	Planning Division	Open

Condition Category	Condition	Department	Condition Status
	<p>zone may be irregular. The plan set shall provide a total square footage of CRPZ area and show the % of disturbance area. No cut or fill greater than four (4) inches in depth may be located closer to the tree trunk than ½ the CRPZ radius distance. (Example, 20-inch DBH tree has a 40' CRPZ area (in diameter) - meaning no cut or fill greater than 4" in depth is allowed within 20' of the tree trunk). No cut or fill within the distance from the tree which is three (3) times the trunk DBH is allowed. (Example, 20-inch DBH tree X 3 = 60", meaning no cut is allowed within 60-inches of a tree which has a 20-inch diameter trunk). These criteria represent minimum standards for determining whether or not a tree may be required to be retained. Greater impacts may be allowed, provided that all design alternatives have been proven unfeasible and that a pre-conditioning and after care mitigation program is established. See section 10.1 of the VMS, and referenced appendices for more information.</p>		
Submit With Civil Permit Application	Landscape plan is required for lot B. Perimeter landscaping will be required for the charging station lot.	Planning Division	Open

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