

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER FOR THE CITY OF PUYALLUP

Phil Olbrechts, Hearing Examiner

RE: Normandy Heights Planned Residential Development, Conditional Use and Master Site Plan PLPMP20240053	FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DECISION.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------

INTRODUCTION

RM Homes has applied for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) via submission of a conditional use application and a master site plan application. The proposed PRD is comprised of 25 single family residential lots on 7.3 acres located at 2007 Shaw Rd. The applications are approved subject to conditions.

The proposal drew numerous concerns. Those concerns are addressed in Findings of Fact (FOF) 5 and 6 at pages 3-7 of this decision. As detailed in the findings, all the concerns have already been addressed in the City’s development standards. Traffic congestion along Shaw Road is still within the City’s adopted congestion (level of service) standards. Fortunately, however, the City has ambitious and detailed plans to add lanes to Shaw Road as development is added along it. The Applicant’s stormwater controls have been designed to prevent any increases in off-site stormwater flows in line with the City’s stormwater standards. The proposal won’t be adversely affecting any wildlife protected by City regulations. Coyote and deer are not protected species.

ORAL TESTIMONY

A computer-generated transcript of the hearing has been prepared to provide an overview of the hearing testimony. The transcript is provided for informational purposes only as Appendix A.

EXHIBITS

Exhibits 1-42 listed in the Exhibit List prepared by staff were admitted during the hearing. The Applicant’s PowerPoint was admitted as Exhibit 43,

FINDINGS OF FACT

Procedural:

1. Applicant. RM Homes, 2913 5th Ave NE, Suite 201, Puyallup, WA 98372.
2. Hearing. The Hearing Examiner conducted a hearing on the application at 2:00 pm on December 9, 2025 at the William S Stoner Council Chambers, 5th Floor, Puyallup City Hall (333 S Meridian).

Substantive:

3. Site/Proposal Description. RM Homes has applied for a PRD via submission of a conditional use application and a master site plan application. The proposed PRD is comprised of 25 single family residential lots on 7.3 acres located at 2007 Shaw Rd. The existing site is vacant with a small cleared area and is otherwise forested.

The PRD includes the following departures from the requirements of the underlying RS-10 zoning district:

Development Standard	Proposed Modification	Min Required in RS-10 Zone
Minimum lot area	5,165 square feet	10,000 square feet
Front setback (Primary Residence)	10 ft	25 ft
Rear setback (Primary Residence)	10 ft	25 ft
Interior side setback (Primary Residence)	5 ft	5 ft (Sum of 16 ft)

Front setback (Garages)	20 ft	25 ft
Rear Yard Positioned Garages	20% of Garages; Lots 1-5	N/A
Interior side setback (Primary Residence)	5 ft	5 ft (Sum of 16 ft)
Lot Coverage	45 %	40 %
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	0.65	0.45

1 4. Characteristics of the Area. The property to the north is forested,
undeveloped land and to the west is a Category IV wetland. Single-family residences
2 are located to the south. Adjoining to the east is an undeveloped tract of another PRD.

3 5. Adverse Impacts. No adverse impacts are anticipated from the proposal.
A SEPA¹ Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance (MDNS) was issued on
4 November 12, 2025. Pertinent impacts are addressed as follows:

5 A. Critical Areas. The proposal conforms to the City’s critical area regulations and
so is found to adequately protect the environmentally sensitive areas of the project
6 site.

7 The project site is constrained by three critical areas: (1) a Category III wetland;
8 (2) a Type II stream; and (3) a landslide hazard area. The site is not located in any
FEMA floodplain. Each critical area is addressed in more detail below:

9
10 1. Wetland and Stream. The wetland and stream were delineated and
classified in the Applicant’s Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat
11 Assessment Report, prepared by Soundview Consultants. Ex. 14. The
report was subject to revision from peer review, most notably changing the
12 category of stream from Type III to Type II and the associated buffer from
50 feet to 100 feet. Ex. 2. The Category III wetland is approximately 2,560
13 square feet (0.06 acre) in size onsite and is located on the northeastern
portion of the subject property, extending further offsite to the north. The
14 Type II stream flows through the wetland. The wetland was assigned a
standard 80-foot buffer. The stream was assigned a 100² foot buffer. Both
15 buffers are subject to an additional ten-foot building setback. The stream
and wetland along with required buffers are all placed in a critical areas tract
16 where no development is proposed.

17
18 The Puyallup Tribe submitted a comment requesting additional buffering to
Deer Creek. City staff testified that they had consulted with the Tribe and
19 the Tribe was satisfied with mitigation measures added by the City that are
adopted by this decision.

20
21 2. Landslide Hazard Area. The project site is encumbered with landslide
hazard areas composed of isolated slopes that exceed 40 percent grade. The
22 Applicant has submitted a geotechnical report that concludes that pursuant
to PMC 21.06.1240.1a(iii), slopes with a vertical elevation of more than 10
23 feet but less than 25 feet may utilize a buffer that is equal to the height of

24
25 ¹ “SEPA” is the State Environmental Policy Act, Chapter 43.21C RCW.

² Section 5.2 of the report assigns a 100 foot buffer while Section 6.1 assigns a 50 foot
buffer. The staff report identifies the buffer as 100 feet and that is what is incorporated
into the final plat design.

1 the slope divided by two. The slope authorized by PMC 21.06.1240.1a(iii)
2 is contingent upon the finding that there are no other factors that pose a
3 slope stability risk. The Applicant's geotechnical engineers found no such
4 risk. See Ex. 17-19. The slopes and associated buffers are located in Tracts
5 C and D , which are not subject to any proposed development.

- 6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
- B. Compatibility. The proposal is compatible with surrounding development. As identified in FOF No. 4, the only side of the proposed PRD not adjoining forested area is single-family development to the south. That area is separated by 23rd Ave SE. The lots to the south are in the same RS-10 zone. A continuous canopy of landscaping trees will be located along the perimeter of the project site along 23rd Ave. See Ex. 6. Architectural, landscaping, and open space performance standards help ensure compatibility. Given these factors, the smaller lot sizes authorized by the PRD are not found to create any aesthetic compatibility problems with the homes to the south. All other impacts are sufficiently addressed as identified in FOF No. 5 and 6.

One commentator testified that he hoped that the project site could be redivided in the future to accommodate higher densities to provide for more middle housing. There are no restrictions on re-division that apply to long (greater than four lots) plats. Of course, any redivision would require the filing of a plat amendment, which in turn could require modifications to required infrastructure improvements. The plat amendment would also have to conform to all applicable zoning code standards. The proposal currently has a density 3.9 dwelling units/acre and the maximum density currently allowed is 4 dwelling units per acre.

- C. Wildlife. Concerns were raised about impacts to wildlife such as deer and coyote. Those species are not protected by the City's critical areas ordinance so no protective measures are required. The state's overall strategy under the Growth Management Act is to generally protect wildlife and associated habitat is to direct growth to urban developed areas where infrastructure can most efficiently serve high density development. This strategy prevents urban sprawl into rural areas, where wildlife such as deer and coyotes will then be less adversely affected by new development. Coyote and deer habitat will be preserved in the areas adjoining the stream and wetlands of the project site.

One commentator also noted the presence of barred owls at the project site. While those birds may be protected in some parts of the country under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act as asserted by the commentator, City regulations only require protection for threatened, endangered or sensitive species. See PMC 21.06.1010. Barred owls are not listed as threatened, endangered or sensitive species. See WAC 220-610-00 and 220-200-100. According to staff testimony a reconnaissance was conducted by a biologist to ascertain whether

1 any protected species had habitat on site and none was found. Tr. 20³. The
2 Applicant also noted in a comment response, Ex. 37, that the barred owls were
viewed by the public commentator in a tract of the proposal that will not be
developed.

3
4 6. The proposal will be served by appropriate and adequate public services and
infrastructure as detailed below:

5 A. Drainage: The proposal provides for adequate and appropriate drainage
6 facilities because they have been designed in accordance with the City's
stormwater standards as verified by City staff in their review of the Applicant's
7 preliminary stormwater plan, Ex. 20.

8 The project's stormwater controls was subject to the 2024 version of the
9 Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western
Washington. The Manual incorporates stringent water quality control measures
10 as required by the Washington State Department of Ecology that incorporates
all known, available and reasonable methods of stormwater prevention, control
11 and treatment (AKART) that applied at the time the manual was updated in
2024. See RCW 90.52.040 and RCW 90.48.010. Those standards include
12 requiring that off-site flows generated by the proposal do not exceed forested
predeveloped conditions of the project site. They also include stringent
13 requirements designed to protect water quality.

14 To meet the City's stormwater regulations, the Applicant proposes to convey
15 runoff from pollution-generating hard surfaces to a stormwater vault located in
Tract D of the project site. The project will be collecting the developed drainage
16 from the roadway and rooftops in catch basins and convey the flows directly to
the detention vault. From that vault, it goes to a water quality treatment device
17 which further cleans the water. The water will then drain through a pipe system
up to the edge of the wetland buffer into a dispersion outlet that feeds the water
18 into the wetland and associated stream. Tr. 21. The conveyance system for this
19 project site are sized that the 25-year storm event must fully be conveyed.

20 One person at the hearing testified that the area is subject to extensive ground
21 water flows that has caused downstream flooding. The commentator believed
that this flooding was caused by developments completed as recently as just a
22 couple years ago. The City's Engineer noted that the City's stormwater
regulations require engineered modelling that establishes that proposed
23 stormwater control facilities will limit off-site flow rates to forested,
predeveloped conditions. Tr. 18-19. The modelling results in the Applicant's
24 preliminary drainage report, Ex. 20, has established to the satisfaction of the

25

³ "Tr. ____" is a reference to the page number of the Appendix A transcript.

1 City's engineering staff that this standard is met. As noted previously, the
2 City's stormwater standards based upon AKART engineering standards as
3 developed by the Washington State Department of Ecology. In the absence of
4 any evidence showing error in the report's analysis or shortcomings in the
5 methodology required by the City's stormwater manual, the evidence as
6 presented in the record of this proceeding establishes that the proposal will not
7 increase off-site flows, at least up to 25-year storm events.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
B. Transportation: The proposal provides for adequate and appropriate
transportation facilities.

The proposal is estimated to generate 22.56 PM peak-hour trips as determined
in the submitted traffic impact analysis. Ex. 10. City staff did not find this trip
generation to necessitate a traffic study or any off-site traffic mitigation.
Proportionate share mitigation to the City's street network will be paid with
traffic impact fees, due during building permit review as governed by Chapter
21.20 PMC.

According to the Final Development Review Team (DRT) letter, Ex. 21, the
Applicant will be required to make half street improvements to Shaw Road,
including curb, gutter, planter strip, sidewalk, roadway base, pavement, and
street lighting. The letter also notes that Crystal Ridge Dr SE is classified as a
minor collector and shall consist of a 34' street face of curb to face of curb with
curb, gutter, 5ft sidewalk, 7.5ft planter strip and streetlights. The City will
require streetlights along Crystal Ridge frontage.

The Final DRT letter also requires that the internal road system will be
composed of proposed Roads A and B. All internal streets shall consist of a 28'
street face of curb to face of curb with curb, gutter, 5ft sidewalks, 5.5ft planter
strip and streetlights. The maximum grade for City streets is 10%. On street
parking shall be restricted to one side of the street.

Multiple concerns were raised about traffic congestion on Shaw Road. The city
Engineer testified that Shaw Road currently meets the congestion standard
adopted by the City Council, specifically Level of Service E⁴. Tr. 18. The City
Engineer further testified that the City has been planning to accommodate

⁴ Transportation level of service (LOS) standards are most often based upon intersection delay with LOS
A being no delay and at the other end of the graded spectrum LOS F with the longest intersection delays.
City Councils must often adopt low LOS standards because (1) the state and federal constitution prohibit
a city from making developers pay for more than their proportionate share of intersection improvements;
(2) the Growth Management Act (GMA, Chapter 36.70A RCW) requires cities to pay for any
improvements necessary to meet LOS if the developer share isn't enough; (3) the GMA requires cities
subject to the GMA (which includes Puyallup) to accommodate new development for population
increases assigned by the state; and (4) cities often don't have enough tax revenues to pay for high LOS
standards.

1 added traffic to the road as development is added. New projects are being
2 required to dedicate additional roadway width to Shaw Road so the road can be
3 widened as congestion worsens. Shaw Road from 20th to 23rd will be developed
4 into a four-lane road with an ability to convert it into a five lane road. Another
5 traffic light will also likely be added at the intersection of Shaw and 20th street
6 once additional development is added to the north of the project site. Traffic
7 studies have been conducted to time the improvements with added congestion.
8 The city is waiting for federal funding to do the improvements.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

D. Parks and Open Space: The proposal provides for adequate parks and open space.

The proposal provides for four open space tracts, Tracts A, C, D and E. Potential landslide hazard areas are placed in Tract D/E as protected open space. Tract C contains the wetlands and stream and associated buffers of the project site.

The only open space requirement applicable to PRDs is that “...at least five percent of the total gross parcel area shall be devoted to amenity areas for active use by residents...” See PMC 20.40.025(4)(b). A centralized active recreation area is provided in Tract D and includes a children’s play structure, benches, an ADA-accessible picnic table, pathways, and landscaped gathering areas. The staff report identifies that these facilities exceed the minimum 5% active recreation space requirement. 5% of the 7.3 acre project site is 15,899 square feet. The most detailed information on the recreational area is apparently Sheet L3 of the landscape plans, Ex. 6.

E. Water and Sewer: The proposal appears to provide for adequate and appropriate sewer and water.

The Applicant has prepared preliminary plans showing the proposed layout of utility facilities. Ex. 7, Sheet 4. City staff have determined that the proposed facilities meet applicable codes. Water and sewer service will be provided by the City of Puyallup.

E. Schools and Walking Conditions to Schools: As conditioned, the subject site is served by adequate and appropriate school facilities and safe walking conditions to and from school.

The Applicant will be required to pay school impact fees during building permit review. These fees are designed to assure that the Applicant mitigates for its proportionate share demand to school facilities. The site is located within the Shaw Road Elementary, Kalles Junior High and Puyallup High School attendance areas. The district plans to provide school bus service for students

1 attending all three schools. A new school bus stop will be installed on Crystal
2 Ridge Dr. SE to ensure safe walking conditions to and from school.

3 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

4 **Procedural:**

5 1. Authority of Hearing Examiner. PMC 20.80.005 and 20.85.005 authorize
6 the hearing examiner to hold a hearing and issue final decisions on conditional use
7 permit applications. PMC 20.40.035 authorize the hearing examiner to hold a hearing
8 and issue final decisions on master site plan applications.

9 **Substantive:**

10 2. Zoning Designation. The property is currently zoned RS-10 - Low urban
11 density single-family residential zone.

12 3. Review Criteria. The staff report identifies that the application under
13 review is for a Planned Residential Development. Curiously, the PMC doesn't have
14 any criteria for PRD approval. Instead, the PMC requires a "master site plan" and
15 conditional use permit application for PRD review. The "master site plan" criteria are
16 actually only applicable to PRDs. Consequently, the staff report in practical terms
17 provided for greater clarity about the purpose of the Applicant's "master site plan"
18 application by calling it a PRD application instead of confusing the public with the
19 "master site plan" term.

20 To further confuse matters, the City's PRD ordinance doesn't explicitly identify that
21 projects meeting PRD (or more accurately "master site plan") standards don't have to
22 conform with the bulk and dimensional standards of the underlying zoning district.
23 Waiver of bulk and dimensional standards is why Applicants apply for PRDs. The
24 City's PRD ordinance only indirectly identifies that bulk and dimensional standards
25 may be waived in provisions such as PMC 20.40.005, which identifies that the purpose
of PRDs is to provide for design flexibility to facilitate creative design to meter meet
the policies of the comprehensive plan and PRD 20.40.025(2), which provides that
"*[a]ll yard setbacks, building heights, lot coverages and floor area ratios shall be
subject to those established on the approved master site plan, or if not specified shall
default to the standards of the underlying zone.*"

Preliminary Plat

PMC 19.08.030: *(1) The hearing examiner, before approval is given, shall inquire into the public use and interest proposed to be served by the establishment of a subdivision and dedication. The examiner shall determine if the design reflects existing site conditions and the city development standards, and if appropriate provisions are made for, but not limited to, the public health, safety, and general welfare, for open*

1 spaces, drainage ways, streets, alleys, other public ways, water supplies, sanitary
2 wastes, parks, playgrounds, sites for schools and schoolgrounds, and shall consider all
3 other relevant facts and determine whether the public interest will be served by
4 approval of the subdivision and corresponding dedications. If the examiner finds that
5 the proposed plat is consistent with the city's comprehensive plan and development
6 standards, and makes appropriate provisions for the public health, safety, and general
7 welfare as described above, and that the public use and interest will be served by the
8 platting of such subdivision, then it shall be approved. If the examiner finds that the
9 proposed plat does not make such appropriate provisions or that the public use and
10 interest will not be served, then the examiner may disapprove the proposed plat.
11 Dedication of land may be required as a condition of subdivision approval and shall
12 be clearly shown on the final plat.

13 (2) A proposed subdivision site may be disapproved because of flood, inundation, or
14 marshy conditions. Construction of protective improvements may be required as a
15 condition of approval, and such improvements shall be noted on the final plat.

16 (3) No plat shall be approved covering any land situated in a flood control zone, as
17 provided in Chapter 86.16 RCW, without the prior written approval of the Department
18 of Ecology of the state of Washington. (Ord. 2591 § 2, 1999).

19 4. Criterion met. Appropriate provision is made for all necessary infrastructure for
20 the reasons identified in FOF No. 6. The proposal is in the public interest because it
21 creates no significant adverse impacts as identified in FOF No. 5, provides for
22 appropriate infrastructure as identified in FOF No. 6 and provides for the reasonable
23 use of land. The proposal is not located in any flood zone and its wetlands are
24 segregated and buffered from development in Tract C.

25 **Master Site Plan**

PMC 20.40.045(1): *Comprehensive Plan Compatibility.* The development density and
design shall be consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the comprehensive
plan.

5. Criterion met. The proposal implements and is consistent with the comprehensive
plan policies identified at pages 8-9 of the staff report. Those policies encourage
efficient use of land for residential use, innovative development techniques, infill and
a wide range of housing types.

PMC 20.40.045(2): *Density.* The overall density of the project shall not exceed the
maximum development density of the zone in which the PD is proposed.

6. Criterion met. The underlying RS-10 zone permits up to 4 dwelling units per acre.
The proposal includes 25 lots on 6.44 net acres, yielding 3.9 du/acre.

1 **PMC 20.40.045(3):** *Preservation of Natural Features. Critical areas and other*
2 *significant and desirable natural features such as steep slopes, drainage courses,*
3 *unique stands of vegetation, riparian areas and water bodies are to be retained and*
4 *integrated into the site design.*

5 7. Criterion met. All critical areas—including Wetland A, its 80-ft buffer, Stream Z
6 (Deer Creek), its 100-ft buffer, and landslide hazard slopes—are preserved in protected
7 tracts (Tracts A, C, and D).

8 **PMC 20.40.045(4):** *Common Recreational Amenities. Common recreational facilities*
9 *such as play fields, swimming pools, tennis courts, trails, saunas or exercise rooms*
10 *should be included in the project site design in keeping with the scale and needs of the*
11 *project.*

12 8. Criterion met. As identified in FOF No. 6C, a centralized active recreation area is
13 provided in Tract D and includes a children’s play structure, benches, an ADA-
14 accessible picnic table, pathways, and landscaped gathering areas. These facilities
15 exceed the PMC’s minimum 5% active recreation space requirement and are scaled
16 appropriately to a 25-lot residential development.

17 **PMC 20.40.045(5):** *Common Architectural Theme. All buildings and structures in the*
18 *project site area are to share a common architectural theme that ensures compatibility*
19 *among interior land uses. This theme shall also be compatible or complementary with*
20 *adjacent development, or shall be adequately screened or buffered from such adjacent*
21 *development.*

22 9. Criterion met. The applicant states that the homes will share a unified architectural
23 character, including coordinated façade design, roof forms, and materials. PMC
24 20.40.025 imposes numerous lot specific standards that help provide for uniformity.
25 Conformance to PMC 20.40.025 is made a condition of approval. Perimeter lots are
buffered by open space tracts and critical area tracts, which provide screening where
architectural compatibility is less relevant. The development’s scale and design are
generally consistent with nearby single-family neighborhoods.

PMC 20.40.045(6): *Adjoining Land Use Compatibility. The project site design shall*
be laid out in a manner which ensures compatibility and harmony with adjoining land
uses exterior to the subject project. Lot sizes along common boundary lines with other
residential uses shall be at least 75 percent of the minimum lot size of the underlying
zone.

10. Criterion met. No lots abut any adjoining residential properties. The lots on the
east side of the project site are separated from the homes on the adjacent lot by an open
space tract (Tract E of the adjoining lot). Other common boundaries are buffered with
critical area tracts (C) or streets. The project layout provides visual and physical
compatibility with surrounding single-family land uses.

1 **PMC 20.40.045(7):** *Streets. All public and private streets within the project site area shall comply with city design standard.*

2 11. Criterion met. As determined in by the City’s Development Review Team and
3 detailed in FOF No. 6B, Road A and Road B are designed to full City public street
4 standards, including sidewalk, planter strip, curb/gutter, and street tree requirements.
5 The private alley (Tract B) meets City private drive standards. Final compliance will
6 be verified during civil engineering review.

6 **Conditional Use**

7 **PMC 20.80.010(1):** *Each determination granting a conditional use permit shall be*
8 *supported by written findings of fact showing specifically wherein all of the following*
9 *conditions exist:*

10 (1) *That the use for which the conditional use permit is applied for is specified by this*
11 *title as being conditionally permitted within, and is consistent with the description*
12 *and purpose of the zone district in which the property is located;*

13 12. Criterion met. PDRs are conditional uses in the RS-10 zone per PMC 20.20.015.

14 PMC 20.20.005 provides as follows:

15 *The RS single-family residential zones are intended to reserve appropriate*
16 *areas for low density residential living at a broad range of densities consistent*
17 *with the Puyallup Comprehensive Plan. They further intend to protect the*
18 *public health, safety and general welfare by ensuring adequate access to light,*
19 *air, privacy and open space; minimizing traffic congestion and utility*
20 *overload; protecting residential properties from noise, direct illumination,*
21 *unsightliness, odors, smoke and other objectionable influences; and,*
22 *facilitating the provision of public facilities and services commensurate with*
23 *anticipated population and dwelling unit densities.*

24 The proposed use meets the intent of the RS-10 zone as quoted above. The proposed
25 development is a low density for an urban growth area and all impacts have been
adequately minimized.

26 **PMC 20.80.010(2):** *That the granting of such conditional use permit will not be*
27 *detrimental to the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare, will*
28 *not adversely affect the established character of the surrounding neighborhood, and*
29 *will not be injurious to the property or improvements in such vicinity and/or zone in*
30 *which the property is located;*

31 5. Criterion met. The criterion is met for the reasons identified in FOF No. 5.

1 **PMC 20.80.010(3):** *That the proposed use is properly located in relation to the other*
2 *land uses and to transportation and service facilities in the vicinity; and, further, that*
3 *the use can be adequately served by such public facilities and street capacities without*
4 *placing an undue burden on such facilities and streets;*

5 6. Criterion met. The criterion is met. As determined in FOF No. 5B, the proposal is
6 compatible with surrounding uses. As determined in FOF No. 6, the proposal will be
7 served by adequate and appropriate public facilities, including transportation facilities.

8 **PMC 20.80.010(4)** *That the site is of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed use*
9 *and all yards, open spaces, walls and fences, parking, loading, landscaping and other*
10 *such features as are required by this title or as are needed in the opinion of the hearing*
11 *examiner are properly provided to be compatible and harmonious with adjacent and*
12 *nearby uses;*

13 7. Criterion met. The Applicant's plat map, Ex. 7, shows sufficient size to
14 accommodate all bulk and dimensional standards imposed by the City's zoning code
15 as modified by this PRD review.

16 **PMC 20.80.010(5)** *That the granting of such conditional use permit will not be*
17 *contrary to the adopted comprehensive plan, or to the objectives of any code,*
18 *ordinance, regulation, specifications or plan in effect to implement said comprehensive*
19 *plan.*

20 8. Criterion met. The proposal meets all applicable review criteria for PRD and
21 conditional use review as documented in the Conclusions of Law of this decision. The
22 City's Development Review Team has also reviewed conformance to all development
23 standards for this level of review and recommended approval. Further development
24 code compliance will be conducted during building permit and other construction
25 permit review.

20 DECISION

21 Based upon the conclusions of law above, the requested conditional use and master site
22 plan applications are approved subject to the following conditions:

- 23 1. All conditions as outlined in City of Puyallup Final Development Review Team
24 (DRT) Letter dated October 31, 2025.
- 25 2. All SEPA Mitigation Measures outlined in MDNS Issued November 12, 2025.
3. Tract D (except the areas designated as 'active amenity areas') shall be planted with
Type III landscaping.
4. The outlet for the storm collection system shall not extend into the buffer area and
shall be dispersed in some fashion - to be determined during civil review - as to avoid
rilling and erosion in the vegetated buffer.

1 5. All development at the project site shall conform to the design standards imposed
2 by PMC 20.40.025.

3 Dated this 23rd day of December, 2025.

4 *Phil Olbrechts*

5

Phil Olbrechts,
6 City of Puyallup Hearing Examiner

7 **Appeal Right and Valuation Notices**

8 This decision may be appealed to the City of Puyallup Appellate Hearing Examiner by
9 filing a petition for review with the City of Puyallup Planning Director as regulated by
10 PMC 2.54.150 et. seq.

11 Affected property owners may request a change in valuation for property tax purposes
12 notwithstanding any program of revaluation.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25