

August 25, 2023

Chris Beale, AICP
Senior Planner
(253) 841-5418
cbeale@puyallupWA.gov

RE: Civil Comments – Dos Lagos Lot A, B & C
City of Puyallup Permit # P-21-0099
LSE Job No.: 12896

We have completed our responses to the items addressed per plan and report markups from you dated April 5th, 2023, regarding the above-mentioned project. Our item-by-item responses to your comments, as well as the original comment, are presented below to assist with your re-review of the construction documents.

Action Items:

ACTION ITEMS

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

- Modify fence as needed to meet sight distance standards [LOT B Preliminary Plans C1.0]
RESPONSE: Added note that fence that a portion of the fence may need to be removed
- Provide details on where & why streetlight is being relocated [LOT C Preliminary Plans C2.0]
RESPONSE: Street light does not need to be relocated, added note to replace lid with a non-slip lid.
- Per previous comments, remove trees here. Will interfere with SB visibility of signal heads & impact EB right turn on red sight distance. [LOT C Preliminary Plans C2.0]
RESPONSE: Trees removed in this area – see revised planting plan
- Streetlight arm must overhang 3ft from face of curb (over the roadway) per city standards. How long is the proposed arm? Should consider installing streetlights on the south side of 43rd Ave SE to avoid significant overhead utility conflicts. [LOT C Preliminary Plans C2.0]
RESPONSE: Added note with new streetlight arm length.
- During civil review, additional counter measures, signage, striping, c-curb may be necessary to enforce right-in/right-out restriction. [LOT C Preliminary Plans C2.0]
RESPONSE: Acknowledged
- During Civil design, must verify existing streetlight conduit under driveway meets City standards (schedule 80) [LOT C Preliminary Plans C2.0]
RESPONSE: Acknowledged
- Proposed frontage design not consistent with approved AMR. Street trees are shown at back of sidewalk [LOT C Preliminary Plans C2.0]
RESPONSE: See revised landscape plans.

- 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.

RESPONSE: ADA stall provided and EV will be provided in accordance with current code when formal site plans submitted for approval and permit.

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

- Architectural Design Review Comments from first review have not been addressed. Revised building elevations have not been received.
 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)
RESPONSE: See Sheets A4.1.

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.

RESPONSE: The development consists of internal parking and drives, pedestrian scaled environments with plaza's, walkways plantings and lighting. The building features ample glazing at road facing facades and at entrances. The plaza's feature concrete patterns, seating and featured planting. The building has awning and weather protection along the façade adjacent to the plaza. We feel the proposed project meets the intent of this 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.

RESPONSE: Exterior high quality materials called out on sheet A4.1.

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 require 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.

RESPONSE: Ends of building closest to the road set back greater than 10 feet. The building is proposed with a lot of modulation and fenestration which is a great transitional project between the commercial properties to the west and the Affinity .

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).

RESPONSE: Transparency calculations shown on sheet A4.1.

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.

RESPONSE: The building is proposed with plenty of modulation and articulation to avoid any blank wall areas greater than 30ft or 400 sq. ft.

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.

RESPONSE: The proposed buildings have more than two exterior materials. The exterior finishes are all of either real brick or simulated thru color high quality siding.

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.

RESPONSE: The roof line has no ridge line greater than 50ft. Roof slope indicated on exterior elevation sheet stating min. slope to be 3:12.

- SEPA Checklist

1. First Review Comment: Please provide a 4' wide blacktop asphalt pathway from the NE corner of parcel C to the corner of 39th and 5th. Planning is considering this requirement given the wetland parcel A is part of the mixed use site plan with parcel B and C.

Second Review Comment: Please show how the pathway shown on drawing C2.0 (sheet 1 of Preliminary Grading, Storm, and Utilities dated 12/13/2022) connects to the corner of 39th and 5th.

RESPONSE: Added connection point labels and also stations and offsets to the top back of curb.

2. First Review Comment: Per PMC 20.31.026(3), the front yard setback is 12 feet to 20 feet from Build-to-Area (BTA). Additionally, PMC 20.31.027(2)(c) requires new buildings built 12 feet from right-of-way or 20 feet from right-of-way to accommodate an 8 feet plaza. 4 feet of the plaza may extend into the 12 feet type II landscape buffer. Since the required 8 feet plaza may extend into the landscape buffer by 4 feet, the minimum building setback is considered 16 feet instead of 12 feet, unless the plaza is proposed as an outdoor café seating use. Per PMC 20.31.027(2)(c), Outdoor café seating plaza use is allowed to project into the 12 feet landscaping buffer by 6 feet, which allows a minimum building setback of 14 feet instead of 12 feet.

The Lot C building is setback 10-feet from street right-of-way, which is not compliant with the 16-foot setback requirement stated above. Additionally, the 8-foot plaza shall run along the entire width of the building and shall be covered by awning that is at least 6 feet deep. In general, the code is requiring an 8-foot landscaping buffer from public right-of-way, followed by the 8-foot plaza, and then the building being set between 16 and 20 feet. Please revise all site plans to ensure compliance with setback standards and denote on architect plans and landscape plans if any proposed plaza will be used as an outdoor café seating area.

Second Review Comment: Drawing C2.2 (Sheet 3 of Preliminary Grading, Storm, and Utilities dated 12/13/2022) shows the building setback line to be 14.00' from 5th St SE and 14.08' from 43rd Ave SE. Drawing L-3 (Sheet 3 of Conceptual Landscape Plan dated 8/12/2022) shows the building setback line to be 14' from 5th St SE and 14' from 43rd Ave SE. This is not compliant with the 16-foot setback requirement stated in the first review comment.

RESPONSE: Plans updated accordingly.

20.31.027 Site plan design principles.(2)(a) stipulates '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 how this standard is

being

met.

- 3. 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.

RESPONSE: All apartment units provide a minimum of 8ftx10ft decks. The pedestrian plaza is provided along the front of the building; although it is not exactly the full width of the building, the area is a much more useable area for multiple gatherings and/or sitting areas. The plaza area can be used for multiple different types of gatherings.

- 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.

RESPONSE: See attached Arborist report. The only trees to be retained are on the undeveloped portions of Lot B. No significant trees are located within any of the disturbed areas.

- 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, which ever less; however, not less than 6 feet. The following landscape buffers are currently being encroached by off-street parking/paving:
 - d. The Lot B western side yard requires a minimum 6-foot Type III landscape buffer.

Second Review Comment: Updated landscape plan does not show landscape buffer on western side yard for Lot B.

RESPONSE: Updated site plan to include 6' side landscape buffer.

- 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 proposed retaining walls are within 6 feet of lot lines and do not include a Type I visual barrier landscape buffer. Revise plans as necessary. Please note the proposed retaining walls are structures subject to wetland buffer building setback requirements detailed below.

Second Review Comment: The revised civil plans show 'Type III' landscape buffers. Per the standard listed above 'A Type I visual barrier landscape buffer shall be provided in front of all retaining walls, in accordance with the city's vegetation management standards (VMS) manual.'

RESPONSE: Notes regarding the requirement for Type I visual barriers in front of the retaining walls have been added to the landscape plans.

- Parking lot island cannot contain civil utilities, relocate. Island must be 15 feet wide min. [planning, sheet C2.2]

RESPONSE: Relocated the utilities inside of the island to new location. Island width updated to 15' min.

- Does not meet 16 ft min setback [planning, sheet C2.2]
RESPONSE: Plan updated accordingly.

- Does not meet 16 ft min setback [planning, sheet C2.2]
RESPONSE: Plans updated accordingly.

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.
RESPONSE: The site plans clearly identify the ADA stalls. See updated A01. Site plan sheet.

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

- **WATER:**
 1. Water to Parcel C 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.)
RESPONSE: Water Letters are attached with submittal package.

- **STORMWATER:**

Parcel B and Parcel C Preliminary Drainage Report Shared Comments:

 1. Per the conditions of the Short Plat APN 201912305002, Short Plat APN 201912305005, 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.
RESPONSE: Acknowledged, the reports have been updated to reference the 2019 DOE manual.

2. See additional review comments contained in each Drainage Report (Lot B dated November 2022 and Lot C dated December 2022), make appropriate corrections, and resubmit for further review.
RESPONSE: Acknowledged, the Drainage reports have been revised to address review comments made.

- **STORMWATER:**

Parcel C Preliminary Drainage Report Comments:

 1. The submitted MR8 Wetland Protection analysis for Lot C did not comply with the Ecology Manual criteria contained in Appendix I-C. In addition, it appears that Method 1 would be applicable to the parcel since there is legal access to the wetland. Prior to Landuse approval, revise the project constraints as necessary to show compliance with MR8.
RESPONSE: Per previous meeting with Puyallup Engineering, an analysis of the Willows Pond basin and hydroperiod is an acceptable approach.

2. 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?).

RESPONSE: The plans have been revised to propose that more areas are infiltrated and thus, the requirements of MR7 are met. Further verbiage has been added to the MR5 section to better explain how these requirements are satisfied.

3. Confirm that the composite long-term infiltration rate is a corrected rate as outlined by Ecology, Section V-5.4.

RESPONSE: Further information has been added to the reports outlining how the corrected rate was calculated (following the guidelines of Section V-5.4.

- Per the conditions of the Short Plat, APN 201912305002, 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 references accordingly. [Storm Report-Lot B; Pg 1 of 16]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, the reports have been updated to reference the 2019 DOE manual.

- Incorrect reference...should read P-18-0172 and 201912305002.

[Storm Report-Lot B; Pg 4 of 16]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

- Project is not vested, as a result the 2019 Ecology Manual applies. [Storm Report-Lot B; Pg 5 of 16]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, the reports have been updated to reference the 2019 DOE manual.

- Use current manual flow chart, Figure 1-3.1.

[Storm Report-Lot B; Pg 6 of 16]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, the 2019 flow chart is now being used.

- Per the conditions of the Short Plat, APN 201912305005, 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 references accordingly. [Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 1 of 65]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, the reports have been updated to reference the 2019 DOE manual.

- Revise report to comply with Minimum Requirement 8 (MR8)-see comments on Page 8. [Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 1 of 65]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, please refer to the revised MR8 section.

- Project is not vested, as a result the 2019 Ecology Manual applies. [Storm

Report-Lot C; Pg 5 of 65]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, the reports have been updated to reference the 2019 DOE manual.

- Use current manual flow chart, Figure 1-3.1.

[Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 6 of 65]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, the flow chart has been updated to the 2019 version.

- See comments regarding MR8 compliance (Pg 8 of 65). 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 deep layer infiltration of the MR8 overflows possible? [Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 7 of 65]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, please refer to the revised MR8 section.

- At time of civil application, it must be shown that the underlying soils meet treatment criteria (SSC-6).

[Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 8 of 65]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, further information regarding how the soils satisfy SSC-6 will be provided at time of full submittal.

- Per Ecology, 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 C; Pg 8 of 65]

RESPONSE: The plans have been revised to propose that more areas are infiltrated and thus, the requirements of MR7 are met. Further verbiage has been added to the MR5 section to better explain how these requirements are satisfied.

- Refer to the 2019 Ecology Manual criteria, App. 1-C. [Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 8 of 65]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, the reports have been updated to reference the 2019 DOE manual.

- Per MR8, the applicant must comply with the wetland protection criteria. [Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 8 of 65]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, please refer to the revised MR8 section.

- 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]

RESPONSE: Per previous meeting with Puyallup Engineering, an analysis of the Willows Pond basin and hydroperiod is an acceptable approach.

- 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 C; Pg 8 of 65]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, the reports have been updated to reference the 2019 DOE manual.

- Per MR8, the applicant must comply with the wetland protection criteria. [Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 9 of 65]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, please refer to the revised MR8 section.

- Clarify...value should be multiplied by appropriate correction factors per Ecology Section V-5.4. [Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 9 of 65]

RESPONSE: Further information has been added to the reports outlining how the corrected rate was calculated (following the guidelines of Section V-5.4.

- See comment associated with MR4, Pg 7 of 65. [Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 14 of 65]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. Please refer to responses to comments associated with MR4.

- See comments associated with MR4 (Pg 7 of 65) and MR8 compliance (Pg 8 of 65). [Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 15 of 65]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. Please refer to responses to comments associated with MR4 and MR8 compliance.

- Use permeable pavement for access path and sidewalks unless infeasible. (NOTE: Pathways/Sidewalks are non-pollution generating. [Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 15 of 65]

RESPONSE: The plans (and reports) have been revised to increase the amount of permeable pavement proposed.

- Clarify...value should be multiplied by appropriate correction factors per Ecology Section V-5.4. [Storm Report-Lot C; Pg 53 of 65]

RESPONSE: Further information has been added to the reports outlining how the corrected rate was calculated (following the guidelines of Section V-5.4.

- Roof Discharge to the regulated wetland must comply with MR8 criteria per Ecology. [Plans-Lot C; Sht C2.2]

RESPONSE: Discharge from the proposed building roof has been revised to infiltrate and meets the requirements of MR8.

- At time of civil application, no structures (walls, stairs, etc.) shall be constructed over the storm main. [Plans-Lot C; Sht C2.2]

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

CONDITIONS

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

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

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:

- 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.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

2. At time of civil application, infeasibility must be documented for permeable pavement (wet-season hydraulic testing and/or seasonally high groundwater elevation, or other Ecology criteria).

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

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

- Submit With Civil Permit Application: ITEMS REQUIRED PRIOR TO OCCUPANCY: Parcel B:
 1. Recorded public access and utilities easement between 39th Ave SE and the westerly property limits (use City form).
- A DRAFT easement document shall be submitted with the Civil Engineering Permit Application.

Parcel C:

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.
- A DRAFT easement document shall be submitted with the Civil Engineering Permit Application.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

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

- Submit With Civil Permit Application: GENERAL:
 1. Any proposed retaining walls shall be located outside the ROW on private property.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

2. No structures (walls, stairs, etc.) shall be constructed over the top wet utility pipes.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

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).

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

4. Incorporate 2nd 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).

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

5. At time of civil application, incorporate previously acknowledged conditions described in DRT Letter 1 dated December 28, 2021.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

Planning Division - Chris Beale; 2538415418; CBeale@PuyallupWA.gov

- 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 this requirement given the wetland parcel A is part of the mixed use site plan with parcel B and C.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

Planning Division - Chris Beale; 2538415418; CBeale@PuyallupWA.gov

- SEPA Condition: Project shall provide a cultural resource site assessment consistent with DAHP and tribal requirements at the time of civil development permit application.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

Planning Division - Chris Beale; 2538415418; CBeale@PuyallupWA.gov

- 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

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

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. On the 43rd Ave SE frontage, extend conduit & j-box (to the west) to accommodate future streetlight expansion along this street.

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

c. 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.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

We trust that all items have been satisfactorily addressed. Please contact us if anything is missing or incomplete.

Sincerely,

Steve Nelson, P.E.

Professional Engineer

253-848-6608 ext. 107

Cor Kruithof, EIT

253-848-6608 ext. 121