



City of Puyallup

Planning Division

333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371

(253) 864-4165

www.cityofpuyallup.org

November 13, 2023

Les Seifert

14900 Interurban Ave S, Suite 138

TUKWILA, WA 98168

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM (DRT) LETTER	
DRT #	3
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; PARKING, SIDEWALKS, PEDESTRIAN PLAZA, DOG PARK & LANDSCAPING
SITE ADDRESS	3910 5TH ST SE ;
PARCEL #	0419102107; 0419102118; 0419106026; 0419106027; 0419106028; 0419106029;
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	<p>Active permit application, not approved;</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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> <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. 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>
-------------------	---

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

- The updated trash enclosure location still causing sight distance obstructions. Must be relocated to a different location on-site. [Site Plan D, C3.2]
- Drive isle width has not been updated to 24ft wide per comment responses [Site Plan D, C3.2]
- Coordinate with trash service provider on preferred location [Site Plan D, C3.2]
- Relocate base to maintain 12ft mast arm. 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]
- Per AMR, tree cutouts shall be at back of curb. A separate AMR application/review is necessary if cutouts are placed as shown. Prior to resubmittal, I would recommend a quick meeting with Engineering/Planning to discuss tree species or alternative shrubs in this area. [Site Plan E, C4.2]
- What is this small extruded area here? [A0_1-rev Site Plan - PARCEL D]
- Why is this driveway labeled as right-in/right-out? This location can be full access [A0_1-rev Site Plan - PARCEL D]
- For 26ft wide EV access, use drop approach standard detail 01.02.18

Per previous comments, EV 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. During Civil review, gate will be required to have adequate signage/reflectivity. Bollards are not allowed, see additional comments from FIRE. [Site Plan E, C4.2]

- During civil submittal, streetlight design will assume 12ft arms for streetlights. Position foundations accordingly [Site Plan E, C4.2]
- Per previous comments, 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]

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

- **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.
- **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 both the cover and stormwater separation reqts using perforated pipe.
[Plans-Lot D; Sht C3.2]
- 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 D; Pg 8 of 98]
- 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 D; Pg 8 of 98]
- 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 D; Pg 9 of 98]
- See comment previous page regarding cover and separation requirements.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 10 of 98]
- 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 D; Pg 10 of 98]

- 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 D; Pg 10 of 98]
- See comments under MR5 and MR7.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 16 of 98]
- See comments under MR5 and MR7.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 30 of 98]
- See comments under MR8.
[Storm Report-Lot D; Pg 45 of 98]
- 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 E; Pg 8 of 84]
- 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 E; Pg 8 of 84]
- 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 E; Pg 9 of 84]
- 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 E; Pg 9 of 84]
- 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 E; Pg 9 of 84]
- See comments under MR5 and MR7.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 15 of 84]
- See comments under MR5 and MR7.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 19 of 84]
- See comments under MR8.
[Storm Report-Lot E; Pg 32 of 84]

appear that there is adequate space in the pavement section to meet both the cover and stormwater separation and reqts using perforated pipe.
[Plans-Lot E; Sht C4.2]

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

- Parcel D –
 - Based on the auto-turn it looks like 3rd Street SE will be closed off? What is the intent for the Northside of the drive aisle?
Remove Right in Right out, no traffic calming devices will be allowed at the South entry/exit. Islands, pork chops, or right in right out will not be allowed.
 - The fire lane "3rd Street" will be required to have a 26' width. The fire hydrant will need to be moved closer to fire lane and requires a 26' minimum clearance in front per IFC Appendix D.
 - 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. Show dimensions on site plan.
 - Auto-turn does not show what fire apparatus was used. Provide Auto-turn using our current fire truck. Email ddrake@puyallupwa.gov for specs.
- Parcel E –
 - Required second exit/entrance issues.
 - Because of traffic line of site issues, they are requiring an Electronic Gate. The electronic gate will require Opticom with manual override. With this requirement the gate will need to be able to que a fire truck outside of the property. Queuing of 45' required on other side of gate. A manual gate will not be allowed. This is a nonnegotiable and a requirement.
 - In the notes the gate was removed because of this requirement and bollards were added in the traffic notes. This will not be allowed. Bollards will not be approved.
 - If traffic does not require a gate Fire will approve with the following conditions.
No gate required.
No traffic calming devices will be allowed at the East entry/exit. Islands, pork chops, or right in right out will not be allowed.
Entrance/exit shall have no fire apparatus impediments blocking access.
 - Move west fire hydrant to the other side of fire lane. Move North into parking island facing fire lane. The F.D.C will need to be within 10-15' of this fire hydrant.
 - Fire Lane required to be 26' width to meet IFC Appendix D fire hydrant lane requirements. Show dimensions on site plan.
 - 10% maximum grade along fire lane.
 - 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

NOVEMBER, 2023 COMMENT: Architectural design review will occur with the Board. These items will remain outstanding until Board issues approval.

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 does not consider Hardi plank siding as a high-quality material. Code is specific about material types. Be prepared to offer a different material type, review code and apply the % of materials allowed and use materials specified.
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.
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 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.

***PER CORRECTION LETTER RESPONSE ACCESSIBLE HANDICAP PARKING PROVIDED EV WILL BE INCORPORATED TO MEET CODE AT THE TIME OF BUILDING PERMIT.

Conditions

Condition Category	Condition	Department	Condition Status
Submit	ITEMS REQUIRED PRIOR TO CIVIL PERMIT	Engineering	Open

Condition Category	Condition	Department	Condition Status
With Civil Permit Application	<p>APPROVAL:</p> <p>Parcel E:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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). 	Division	
Submit With Civil Permit Application	<p>ITEMS REQUIRED PRIOR TO OCCUPANCY:</p> <p>Parcel D:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Recorded private stormwater easement associated with the existing Black Swamp conveyance system. Easement shall be between the ownership of Parcel 0419033037 and Parcel 0419102107. Recorded public access and utilities easement between 3rd St SE and 39th Ave SE (use City form). <p>Parcel E:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A DRAFT easement document shall be submitted with the Civil Engineering Permit Application. 	Engineering Division	Open
Submit With Civil Permit Application	<p>GENERAL:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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). Incorporate 2nd REVIEW comments as noted on the Parcel D Preliminary Plans (Sheets C3.0-C3.2) and Parcel E Preliminary Plans (Sheets 	Engineering Division	Open

Condition Category	Condition	Department	Condition Status
	<p>C4.0-C4.2).</p> <p>3. At time of civil application, incorporate previously acknowledged conditions described in DRT Letter 1 dated December 28, 2021.</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 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. Streetlights shall have shorting caps installed with remote photocell located on the service cabinet.</p>	Traffic Division	Open

Condition Category	Condition	Department	Condition Status
	<p>b. Streetlight design shall provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide details on how streetlights will be powered ii. Location of conduit runs iii. Wiring Schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduit size and type for each raceway 2. Conductors details iv. Pole schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. STA & offset for each luminaire v. Show location of junction boxes <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>		
Submit With Civil Permit Application	At time of civil, correct reference to read 8501150183. [Plans-Lot D; Sht C3.1]	Engineering Division	Open
	At time of civil application, 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.	Development & Permitting Services	Open

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