



City of Puyallup

Planning Division

333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371

(253) 864-4165

www.cityofpuyallup.org

November 23, 2022

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

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM (DRT) LETTER	
DRT #	1
PERMIT #	PLPSP20220108
PROJECT NAME	Wesley Homes Bradley Park Phase 2
PERMIT TYPE	Preliminary Site Plan
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Expansion includes 36-unit Care Center and 44-unit Brownstone with associated storm water facility improvements, water and sewer connections, parking area, landscaping and franchise utilities
SITE ADDRESS	707 39TH AVE SE, Unit: A101, PUYALLUP, WA 98374;
PARCEL #	0419037014;
ASSOCIATED LAND USE PERMIT(S)	P-21-0134
APPLICATION DATE	July 11, 2022
APPLICATION COMPLETE DATE	August 15, 2022
PROJECT STATUS	<u>Active Development Review Team (DRT) review case – resubmittal required.</u> 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>
------------	---

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.

HOW TO USE THIS LETTER

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

The **“Action Items”** section includes all items that the applicant must address to comply with the Puyallup Municipal Code (PMC) and city standards. Items listed in under **Action Items** require a resubmittal under this permit for further review by the Development Review Team (DRT); your application is not approved. Please make those updates to the proposed plans and resubmit for review. Please include a response letter outlining how you have revised your proposal to meet these items for ease of plan check by DRT members.

The **“Conditions”** are items that will govern the final permit submittal(s) for the project. Please be aware that these conditions will become conditions of the final permits and/or recommendations to the Hearing Examiner, if applicable.

If you have questions regarding the action items or conditions outlined in this letter, please contact the appropriate staff member directly using the phone number and/or email provided.

ACTION ITEMS

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

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

Response: Grette is in preparation of preparing a wetland verification report in response to this comment. According to the information provided during a Teams meeting on October 26, 2022 with project team members (Dan Balmelli, Jill Krance, Steve Nornes, Kevin Anderson, and Chad Wallin) and City staff (Chris Beale), the City is requesting a verification report to demonstrate that the previously identified wetlands have not significantly changed since the 2013 delineations.

Please note that the approved Wetland Delineation, Habitat Assessment, and Final Mitigation Plan (Soundview 2017) included both Phase I and Phase II project elements and the approved Plan established modified wetland buffer boundary. This application (Phase II) is adhering to the modified buffers established in the approved Plan.

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

Response: ISA – The Brownstone building plan has been revised to meet the front yard/BTA setbacks along 39th Avenue SE.

- PARKING: Please establish how the parking ratios proposed relate to the required ratios in PMC 20.55.010. The application uses terms that do not relate back to the parking ratios in a way that can be verified. What type of residential or care type are brownstone and assisted living, are they both residential unit types? What is the difference between skilled nursing and assisted living and which parking ratios is the applicant saying applies to each? Is independent living just age restricted retirement homes?

Response: ISA - Terminology definitions and the applicable section of the PMC to which they correlate have been added to Summary notes on the A0.1 Architectural Site Plan.

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

Response: Grette is in preparation of a wetland verification report. As noted above, the approved Wetland Delineation, Habitat Assessment, and Final Mitigation Plan (Soundview 2017) included both Phase I and Phase II project elements and established

modified wetland buffer boundary. Phase II is adhering to the modified buffers established in the approved Plan. The proposed trail is situated outside of the approved modified wetland buffer. Please refer to the submitted site plans for more detail.

- CRITICAL AREAS: PMC 21.06.840 requires a 10-foot setback from edges of critical area buffers. The feature marked as a ditch behind Lowes is a regulated stream body. Please rate the stream as a type based on code and apply the stream buffer, plus the 10-foot setback.

Response: Project team members (Dan Balmelli, Jill Krance, Steve Nornes, Kevin Anderson, and Chad Wallin) and City staff (Chris Beale) participated in a Teams meeting on October 26, 2022 to discuss the City's pre-application meeting comments (dated January 13, 2022). During this meeting a 2002 letter (dated May 2, 2002) prepared by the City's community development director was reviewed. In summary, this letter concludes that the City determined that the drainage way behind the Lowes building was intentionally created and not subject to the City's critical area standards (i.e., a non-regulated feature). In conclusion of the October 26, 2022 meeting, the City informed the project team that the drainage way behind the Lowes building would be viewed as a non-regulated feature for consistency with the City's 2002 determination.

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

Response: Terra – See attached Geotechnical Report Addendum

- LANDSCAPING: Is the applicant proposing to eliminate all landscaping requirements for the street frontage area on 39th Ave SE? Or retain and integrate the existing trees and vegetation? Sheet L-2 does not show any cross hatched area on that site frontage. An arborist will need to assess and propose tree protection measures for existing vegetation, which should be retained. Preliminary internal review indicates Traffic Engineering may require the bermed and vegetated area of site frontage to be graded due to sight distance concerns, which is allowed, and if that is the case, no arborist report will be required.

Response: Landscape plan along 39th Ave SE is updated to show proposed landscape design. The existing berm and trees along this ROW are proposed to be removed due to sight distance concern.

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

Response: ISA – The Brownstone building plan has been revised to meet the front yard/BTA setback.

- SITE PLAN: Staff does not understand the reference “city please advise on phase 1 bus shelter” shown on the architectural site plan. The bus shelter pad call out on your site plan appears to be on private property. There was a finding and condition of the previous approval that the developer purchase a shelter for the ROW pad on 39th Ave SE. The site plan shows a pad interior to the site with the call out asking us to advise. Please clarify.

Response: ISA – Please disregard the statement regarding City advisory to bus shelter.

- OPEN SPACE: PMC 20.31.026 requires 10’ X 8’ upper floor patio spaces for dwelling units. This would apply to the independent retirement brownstones. What are the dimensions of the patios provided?

Response: ISA – Main floor patios and upper floor decks at the Brownstone are 9’ x 10’.

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.015 (2) (b). Fiber cement is only a high-quality material if proposed as a through color fiber cement product. For example, the Board has not approved painted fiber cement board (such as Hardie Board). Here are some examples of fiber cement products which would be approved. EQUITONE https://www.equitone.com/en-us/materials-en-us/?gclid=EAlalQobChMIn9axvu7D9wIVFBXUAR2adwwBEAAYASAAEgLZN_D_BwE SWISS PEARL <https://www.swisspearl.com/products/#facade> AMERICAN FIBER CEMENT CORP (CEMBRIT)<https://www.americanfibercement.com/products/patina-design-line/patina/>

Response: ISA – Noted.

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

Response: ISA – Please see calculations on Sheet

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

Response: ISA – Noted. Any flexibility to make these residences feel more “homey” is greatly appreciated.

- DESIGN REVIEW: PMC 20.52.025 (2) (b). The Board has approved 30 percent transparency for

street facing facades for residential only projects. Please provide a calculation exhibit for the street facing (39th Ave) façade wall.

Response: ISA – Please see calculations on Sheet

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

Response: ISA – The Brownstone building plan has been revised to meet the front yard/BTA setback. A portion of this building has been extended toward the street to meet the setback requirement. Please note, the 20’-0” setback is not achievable due to the AASHTO requirements for traffic. Therefore, the building has been placed as close as possible at approximately 25’ from the property line. Please see the Architectural Site Plan.

The balance of the building along 39th Ave. is inline per the definition of BTA, per PMC 20.31.025 Table per footnote (1), to the Phase 1 Brownstone and the next closest building to the east of the Wesley site – the parking lot of the Kaiser Permanente building. Please see the Vicinity Map on the Architectural Site Plan.

The front door on the “tower” has remained the same and a more pronounced 1st floor with larger window, awnings, and lighting have been added for a more commercial/retail feel. Access for residents to use the Plaza has also been added. This building remains to be a stand-alone independent Seniors use as allowed per PMC and the doors are planned to be secured for use by residents only.

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

Response: ISA – As noted in the narrative, only the corrugated metal siding areas were planned with minimal J-trim at openings. As part of the corrugated metal siding system, the color will match the siding color (dark brown to match Phase 1). Therefore, elevations have been updated to show the 2” minimum J-trim but is planned to be part of the building envelope as needed to meet this ordinance.

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

Response: ISA – The Brownstone building includes sunrooms at nearly all units which provide building modulation, similar to Phase 1. Each sunroom projects approximately 11’-0” from the main face of the building and each sunroom is 13’-0” wide. Adjacent to the sunroom are roof covered patio/decks which provide a layered, or screened effect. The Care Center also modulates around all sides of the building with most offsets being

more than 8 feet. Please see the enclosed plans.

Multiple elements such as the use of columns, banding, porches, recesses, brackets, window boxes, bays, canopies, arch details, and the use of color all work together to provide variation in the façade while accentuating the overall modulation. Buildings will be similarly colored to the previous phase to keep the Wesley campus brand.

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

Response: ISA – The façade facing the street is provided with a large stone tower and storefront windows emulating a retail facade – this is completely unique to the campus and will serve as a beacon-gateway for this campus’ main entry. The common area of the building plan has been rotated out to come out as close to the street as possible so that a “mini” retail appearance behind the tower could be utilized with large glass areas, canopies/awnings and lighting.

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

Response: ISA/Barghausen – Noted. Due to the steep slope on the west side of the Care Center, concrete foundation walls (with cast stone texture similar to the Phase 1 Brownstone) below the lower level will be blank. Landscape screening on these walls is shown, see 4/A3.1.

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

SWISS PEARL <https://www.swisspearl.com/products/#facade> AMERICAN CEMENT CORP (CEMBRIT) FIBER
<https://www.americanfibercement.com/products/patina-design-line/patina/>

Response: ISA – Please see the elevation sheets. Stone caps are already included in the façade design as the transition between stone and other siding materials. Material percentage breakdowns have been updated from the previous submission.

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

Response: ISA – The sloped rooflines at both buildings are heavily modulated at the roof's edge (we interpret this edge as the visible roofline) on all sides of the building. At the Brownstone, sunrooms march along at each unit protrude from the main roof by about 11' with gables and covered porches. The Care Center has larger gable and elements over the building offsets with the heights of the eaves varying nearly 4 feet.

Building Review - Janelle Montgomery; (253) 770-3328; JMontgomery@PuyallupWA.gov

- Apartments are required to have Type A & B units for accessibility, and this will need to be clearly depicted on the plans.

Response: ISA – Noted. The Brownstone specific accessible units have not yet been determined, but will be shown when submitted for building permit. Per the building code for Group R-2 Occupancy, 2% of the units will be Type A, all others will be Type B. For the Brownstone therefore, one unit will be designated as Type A for accessibility.

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

Response: ISA/Terra – Acknowledged

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

Response: ISA – Correct, the building will be designed per these standards.

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

Response: ISA – Acknowledged and already in process.

- The truss specs will be required with the truss engineers' stamps and a layout that matches the submitted plans at the time of submittal.

Response: ISA – Acknowledged

- All electrical is permitted by the Washington State Department of L & I.

Response: ISA – Acknowledged

- The R-2 apartments at Brownstone are required to have the infrastructure in place for charging

stations per IBC section 429 Washington State amendments and will need to be shown on the plans. Did not locate EV parking on site plan.

Response: ISA – Please see the enclosed garage level plan for EV parking stalls. Please note, these EV stalls are included in the parking summary on the Architectural Site Plan as well.

- Provide all exit discharge points and opening protection.

Response: ISA – Acknowledged. Exit discharge and opening protection will be included as part of the building permit application.

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

Response: ISA – Acknowledged.

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

Response: ISA – Acknowledged.

- Provide updated allowable area calculations per 2018/2021 Codes, verify current adopted code depending on application timeline.

Response: ISA – Acknowledged.

- Please reach out to me if I can answer any other questions in relationship to Building code items for this project. No other Building items at this time.

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

- 1. The current gravel path around the existing Lodge building "called out as asphalt on the plan" will be required to extend around the proposed addition to the Lodge. This will require the current path to be paved and extend to the entrance behind Lowes. This will be nonnegotiable as it will be utilized as a fire fighter access around the building.

Response: ISA – Acknowledged, please see the site plan for path expansion.

2. A fire hydrant will be required on the SW corner entrance by Lowes by the proposed "option for low access".

Response: ISA/Barghausen – A fire hydrant is added on the SW corner entrance by Lowes.

3. Conditions may be changed based on Planning and Engineering review comments.

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

- Provide a minimum 10-ft separation between any structures and the watermain. Typically, at all points.
[Plans; Sht C7]

Response: Barghausen – Comment acknowledged.

- Verify-based on the City's independent comparison btwn Ph1 and Ph2 it does not appear that the existing Lodge Building was accounted for in calculations provided on the Developed Basin Map. See additional comments on the Developed Basin Map. [Storm Rpt; Pg 5 of 532]

Response: Barghausen – The original detention pond was designed for 2.5ac roof drain to the pond along with 0.75ac roof drain bypass the pond to provide for wetland hydrology and 3.49ac of impervious surface for a total of 6.74 ac impervious surface. The total roof and pavement areas for Phase 1 and Phase 2 that are tributary to the pond, as shown on the developed basin map, are 2.55-acres roof and 3.26 acres of pavement, totaling 5.81 acres which does not exceed the assumption used to size the pond.

- Verify-based on the City's independent comparison btwn Ph1 and Ph2 it does not appear that the existing Lodge Building was accounted for in calculations provided on the Developed Basin Map. See additional comments on the Developed Basin Map. [Storm Rpt; Pg 21 of 532]

Response: Barghausen – Please see above response. We have recalculated all new and existing impervious area updated the basin map.

- Provide a basin map specific to the Phase2 scope of work. [Storm Rpt; Pg 23 of 532]
- Verify- this does not appear to account for the existing Lodge footage (50,891sf). [Storm Rpt; Pg 23 of 532]

Response: Barghausen – The provided Phase 1 and 2 basin map delineates the specific areas.

- Confirm-The Phase 1 storm analysis indicates that the storm pond was sized for 5.99ac hard surface area which equates to 260,924sf. Adding in the existing Lodge Building to the Legend above results in Total Impervious Area of 282,206sf resulting in a potentially undersized storm pond.
[Storm Rpt; Pg 23 of 532]

Response: Barghausen – Storm drainage analysis indicate 5.99ac of hard surface along with 0.75ac of roof drain tributary to the wetland for total of 6.74ac which is the same as your number of 282,206sf(6.47ac)

- The applicant has anticipated using the existing stormwater detention facility constructed during Phase 1 to serve the proposed Phase 2 project. However, based on the City's independent comparison between Phase 1 stormwater design and the proposed Phase 2 project, it does not

appear that the existing Lodge Building was accounted for in the hard surface area comparisons provided on the 'Developed Basin Map'. For example, the Developed Basin Map indicates total building area to be 97,798sf and total hard surface area to be 231,315sf, but the City's takeoff calculates 149,896sf of building area and total hard surface area of 282,206sf. If this is indeed the case, the existing storm facility may be undersized and require rework which must be documented in the preliminary storm plan.

Response: Barghausen – The basin map is updated and as indicated.

- In addition to the submitted Developed Basin Map indicating full buildout of the site, provide a developed basin map specific to the Phase 2 project which clearly identifies the quantity of disturbed surface areas (landscape/lawn; hardscape; roof; etc).

Response: Barghausen – A basin map showing areas for Phase I and Phase II is added to storm report.

- At time of civil application, the geotechnical engineer shall evaluate the infiltration capability of the soils (existing or import) below proposed hardscape areas considering the Ecology Manual permeable pavement feasibility criteria of 0.3 in/hr infiltration rate.

Response: Barghausen – Geotechnical engineer has evaluated infiltration feasibility and determined that project site soils does not support any infiltration. Please refer to Memo form Geotechnical engineer.

- The proposed Brownstone site plan indicates a conflict with the existing 12-in watermain. City regulations require a minimum separation of 10-ft between the watermain and any structure. Revise the site plan accordingly.

Response: Barghausen – Existing 12" water main is going to be relocated to provide 10' separation from proposed building addition.

- Provide existing easement recording numbers where noted on the preliminary civil plans.

Response: Barghausen – Existing easement recording number is added to plans.

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

- Per previous comment, sight distance analysis is required at 39th Ave SE driveway (horizontal + vertical). The existing berm located on the eastern frontage interfere with entering sight distance and must be regraded to meet City ESD standards.

Response: TENW – Barghausen- A sight distance exhibit is provided to show lowering of existing berm and vegetation along sight line.

-Identify all trees to be removed that obstruct sight distance.

Response: TENW – Trees at the top of existing berm are called to be removed.

-Bus shelter along 39th Ave SE not possible due to sight distance conflict. Improvements to existing curb/gutter/sidewalk are not anticipated along 39th Ave SE frontage. City inspectors will evaluate roadway condition to determine if half-street paving is necessary.

Traffic scoping document is approved.

Response: ISA/Barghausen/TENW – Bus shelter is relocated outside of sight distance triangle to west side of intersection. See Architectural Site Plan.

CONDITIONS

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

- **General: GENERAL:**

- Engineered plans must follow the latest regulations and standards set forth in the Puyallup Municipal Code (PMC), the City Standards for Public Works Engineering and Construction (design standards), and the current City adopted stormwater manual at the time of civil permit application [PMC 21.10.040].

The comments provided below are intended to assist the applicant with incorporating City requirements into the project design documents but should not be considered an exhaustive list of all necessary provisions from the PMC, design standards, or the Ecology stormwater manual.

Response: Barghausen – The fire flow and domestic flow requirements and the design of the water main was reviewed and determined that the 12-inch water main is sufficient to provide fire protection and domestic needs for the project unless the fire flow requirements have changed.

- Comments regarding design and construction of new utilities and road improvements are provided for the applicant's information and use. Unless specifically noted, construction of these infrastructure improvements is not a condition of land use approval. However, infrastructure improvements must be approved and permitted prior to issuance of the first building permit associated with the project. [RCW 58.17.120 and 19.07.080]

Response: Barghausen – Comment Acknowledged.

- In accordance with recent revisions to RCW 19.27 and RCW 19.122, any project within 100-ft of a major utility transmission line (hazardous liquid or gas) shall provide notice to the utility operator. Prior to permit issuance, provide written documentation from the operator/owner of the Northwest Pipeline LLC (Williams Gas Main) that the proposed development is acceptable as designed.

Response: Barghausen – Project proponents are in contact with Northwest Pipeline to

obtain design approval.

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

• **General: WATER:**

- There is an existing 12-in ductile iron water main serving the project site. The applicant shall confirm that the existing system is sufficient to provide the domestic and fire flows necessary to serve both the existing and proposed facilities located on the site. [PMC 16.08.040, 14.20.010 & CS 301.2]

Response: Barghausen – The existing 12" water system was determined adequate for phase one development. Unless the fire flow requirements have changed or the existing available fire flow has changed, the system should be adequate for phase two.

- The domestic service line and fire system service line shall have separate, independent connections to the supply main. [PMC 14.02 & CS 302.3(4)]

Response: Barghausen – Domestic and fire line system is designed to have separate, independent connection to existing 12" sully line serving the project.

- The applicant shall be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the proposed water system located on private property.

Response: Barghausen – Comment acknowledged.

- Any existing services that are to be abandoned at this site shall be disconnected at the main, the corp. stop removed, and the service plugged to city standards. [PMC 14.02.120(f)]

Response: Barghausen – A note in this regard is added to plan set.

- The applicant shall be responsible to provide and install the water meters required to service the new facilities. Domestic service water meters shall be located within the public ROW unless prior approval is granted by the City. (Water service stub for the Phase 2 Brownstone installed during Phase 1). [PMC 14.02.120(f) & CS 301.3]

Response: Barghausen – Comment acknowledged.

- Water pipe and service connections shall be a minimum of 10-feet away from building foundations and/or roof lines.

Response: Barghausen – All water pipes and service connections are proposed to be adjusted as necessary to maintain 10' separation from building foundation.

- The applicant is required to provide backflow protection on any new domestic line(s) in accordance with City Standards. The minimum level of protection would be a double check valve assembly (DCVA). However, the City requires a reduced pressure backflow assembly

(RPBA) for any use considered to be a high-hazard as outlined in WAC 246-290-490 Table 9. -The backflow device shall be located outside the building, immediately downstream of the water meter. [PMC 14.02.220(3) & CS 302.2]

Response: Barghausen – Project proposes to install (RPBA) to provide backflow protection for new domestic services.

- Fire hydrants and other appurtenances such as DDCVA and PIV shall be placed as directed by the Puyallup Fire Code Official. Fire hydrants shall be placed so that there is a minimum of 50-feet of separation from hydrants to any building walls. [PMC 16.08.080 & CS 301.2, 302.3]

Response: Barghausen – Comment acknowledged.

- The fire sprinkler double detector check valve assembly (DDCVA) may be located either inside, or outside, of the building. At the time of Civil permit application, the fire sprinkler supply line shall be designed, and shown on the plan, into the building to the point of connection to the interior building riser. Provide plan and elevation detail(s) where the riser enters the building with dimensions, clearances, and joint restraint in accordance with NFPA 24. [CS 302.3, CS 303]

Response: Barghausen – Fire sprinkler DDCVA are proposed to be inside of building in sprinkler room as shown on plans.

- The Fire Department Connection (FDC) shall be located no closer than 10-feet and no further than 15-feet from a fire hydrant. (NOTE: If the project is utilizing a fire booster pump, the FDC must connect to the sprinkler system on the discharge side of the pump in accordance with NFPA regulations.) A post indicator valve (PIV) shall be provided for the fire sprinkler system in advance of the DDCVA. [CS 302.3]

Response: Barghausen – Fire Department connection is located with 10 to 15' of a fire hydrant.

- For each "residential" building, a water system development charge (SDC) will be assessed based on the number of "residential" units in the facility. Current SDC's as of this writing are \$4,260.00 for the first residential unit and \$3,195.00 for each additional unit per building. [PMC 14.02.040, 14.10.030]

Response: Barghausen/Wesley – Comment acknowledged.

- If the buildings will contain congregate care living units without cooking facilities located in each living unit, then such congregate care residence areas of the building will be assessed at the rate of \$4,260.00 per every six beds or portion thereof. [PMC 14.02.040, 14.10.030]

Response: Barghausen/Wesley – Comment acknowledged.

- For each commercial building, including common/administrative facilities associated with a residential use (office, clubhouse, hallways, pool areas, etc.), a water system development charge (SDC) will be assessed based on the number of plumbing fixture units as defined in the Uniform Plumbing Code. Current SDC's as of this writing are \$4,260.00 for the first 15 fixture units and an additional charge of \$285.42 for each fixture unit in excess of the base 15 plumbing fixture units. [PMC 14.02.040]

Response: Barghausen/Wesley – Comment acknowledged.

- Water connection fees and systems development charges are due at the time of building permit issuance and do not vest until time of permit issuance. [PMC 14.02.040, 14.10.030]

Response: Barghausen/Wesley – Comment acknowledged.

- To obtain credit towards System Development Fees for any existing fixture units, the applicant shall provide the City evidence of the existing plumbing fixtures prior to demolition or removal. A written breakdown of the removed fixture types, quantities, and associated fixture units shall accompany the building permit application and be subject to review and approval by the City. [PMC 14.02.040]

Response: Barghausen/Wesley – Comment acknowledged.

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

- **General: SANITARY SEWER:**

- The proposed sanitary sewer system shall be designed and constructed to current City Standards. [PMC 14.08.040, 14.08.120]

Response: Barghausen - Sanitary sewer system for this project has been design and constructed with phase I and side sewer stubs are provided for new buildings.

- A separate and independent side sewer will be required from the public/private main to each building site. Side sewers shall be 6-inch minimum diameter with a 0.02 foot per foot slope. (Sewer service stub for the Phase 2 Brownstone and Phase 2 Wellness Center installed during Phase 1). [PMC 14.08.110 & CS 401(6)]

Response: Barghausen - A separate and independent side sewer is designed from main to each building per City standards.

- Side sewers shall have a cleanout at the property line, at the building, and every 100 feet between the two points. [PMC 14.08.120 & CS 401(7)]

Response: Barghausen - Side sewer stub will be extended with cleanout at face of building.

- Sewer main pipe and service connections shall be a minimum of 10-feet away from building foundations and/or roof lines.

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged

- Grease Interceptors are required for all commercial facilities involved in food preparation. If food preparation facilities are proposed now, or in the future, the applicant shall install an external grease interceptor in accordance with the current edition of the Uniform Plumbing Code adopted by the City of Puyallup, Puyallup Municipal Code, and City standard details. [PMC 14.06.031(3) & CS 401(5), 402.3]

Response: Barghausen/ISA – A proposed location of a second grease interceptor for this facility is noted/shown on the Architectural Site Plan. Final design to be detailed with final construction drawings.

- The construction of a trash enclosure will require the enclosure pad to be elevated to prevent stormwater run-on. If a sewer area drain is proposed for any trash enclosure, then the entire enclosure shall be covered to prevent stormwater run-on and inflow into the sewer system.

Response: Barghausen/ISA - Trash enclosure will be designed to be self-contained and connected to sewer main.

- Drainage for the underground parking shall be connected to the sanitary sewer system through an oil-water separator. [PMC 14.06.031 & CS 402.2]

Response: Barghausen - Underground parking drainage will be designed to connect to sewer system with an oil/water separator.

- All private oil-water facilities shall be maintained in accordance with Puyallup Municipal Code 14.06.031. Under this Title, records and certification of maintenance shall be made readily available to the City for review and inspection, and must be maintained for a minimum of three years. If the owner fails to properly maintain the facility, the City, after giving the owner notice, may perform necessary maintenance at the owner's expense. [PMC 14.06.031 & CS 402.2]

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged.

- For each "residential" building, a sanitary sewer system development charge (SDC) will be assessed based on the number of "residential" units in the facility. Current SDC's as of this writing are \$5,890.00 for the first residential unit and \$4,417.50 for each additional unit. [PMC 14.10.010, 14.10.030]

Response: Barghausen/Wesley - Comment acknowledged.

- If the buildings will contain congregate care living units without cooking facilities located in each living unit, then such congregate care residence areas of the building will be assessed at the rate of \$5,890.00 per every six beds or portion thereof. [PMC 14.02.040, 14.10.030]

Response: Barghausen/Wesley - Comment acknowledged.

- For each commercial building, including common/administrative facilities associated with a residential use (office, clubhouse, hallways, pool areas, etc.), a sewer system development charge (SDC) will be assessed based on the number of plumbing fixture units as defined in the Uniform Plumbing Code. Current SDC's as of this writing are \$5,890.00 for the first 15 fixture units and an additional charge of \$394.63 for each fixture unit in excess of the base 15 plumbing fixture units. [PMC 14.02.040]

Response: Barghausen/Wesley - Comment acknowledged.

- Sewer connection fees and systems development charges are due at the time of Building permit issuance and do not vest until time of permit issuance. [PMC 14.10.010, 14.10.030]

Response: Barghausen/Wesley - Comment acknowledged.

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

- **General: STORMWATER/ EROSION CONTROL:**

- Stormwater design shall be in accordance with PMC Chapter 21.10 and the Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington ("Ecology Manual") as adopted by the City Council at the time of project application. The City has currently adopted the 2019 Ecology Manual.

Response: Barghausen - Storm drainage facility for this project was designed based on 2005 DOE Manual, the phase two proposal will be designed per 2019 Ecology manual.

- The original Phase 1 project was designed using the 2005 Ecology Manual. At that time, the Phase 2 NPDES permit "encouraged", but did not mandate the use of OnSite Stormwater BMPs (MR5). However, the current Ecology Manual requires the implementation of MR5 BMPs to the Maximum Extent Feasible. At the time of civil application, the applicant shall provide an OnSite Stormwater BMP feasibility analysis in accordance with the requirements of the Ecology Manual. This may require additional wet-season infiltration testing to justify a finding of infeasibility depending on the location of any proposed BMP.

Response: Barghausen - Please refer to Geotechnical engineer memo regarding feasibility of onsite storm water BMP. It is determined that site soils are not conducive to infiltration.

- In addition to the comment above, at time of civil application the applicant will need to justify the feasibility of hardscape permeable pavement considering the depth to groundwater and the Ecology Manual criteria of 0.3in/hr infiltration rate.

Response: Barghausen - Please refer to infeasibility analysis by Geotechnical engineer.

- At the time of civil application, incorporate review comments noted in the Preliminary Storm Report dated June 14, 2022 into the permanent stormwater site plan.

Response: Barghausen - Review comments on Preliminary storm report is incorporated into Storm water site plan.

- The Phase 1 project incorporated specific stormwater constraints to ensure protection of downstream wetlands. The proposed Phase 2 project shall incorporate/retain the Phase 1 improvements designed to protect the wetlands or provide an updated hydrologic analysis which ensures the wetland's hydrologic conditions, hydrophytic vegetation, and substrate characteristics are maintained. See Ecology Manual Volume I, Minimum Requirement 8.

Response: Barghausen - Wetland hydrology was designed and constructed with phase one of this project. Phase II shall maintain and protect the constructed wetland hydrology.

- Development and redevelopment projects are required to employ, wherever feasible, Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMPs) to meet the design criteria set forth in PMC 21.10.190, the Ecology Manual Volume I, Minimum Requirement 5; Volume III, Chapter 3; and Volume V, Chapter 5.

Response: Barghausen - In accordance with Geotechnical analysis LID BMPs are not feasible for this development.

- Preliminary feasibility/infeasibility testing for infiltration facilities/BMPs shall be in accordance with the site analysis requirements of the Ecology Manual, Volume I, Chapter 3, specifically:
 - Groundwater evaluation, either instantaneous (MR1-5), or continuous monitoring (MR1-9), during the wet weather months (December 21 through April 1).
 - Hydraulic conductivity testing:
 - i. If the development meets the threshold to require implementation of Minimum Requirement #7 (flow control); or, if the site soils are consolidated; or, if the property is encumbered by a critical area, then Small Scale Pilot Infiltration Testing (PIT) during the wet weather months (December 21 through April 1) is required.
 - ii. If the development does not meet the threshold to require implementation of Minimum Requirement #7; or, is not encumbered by a critical area; and is located on soils unconsolidated by glacial advance, grain size analyses may be substituted for the Small Scale PIT test at the discretion of the review engineer.
 - Testing to determine the hydraulic restriction layer.
 - Mounding analysis may be required in accordance with Ecology Volume III Section

3.3.8.

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged.

- If infiltration facilities/BMPs are anticipated, the number of infiltration tests shall be based on the area contributing to the proposed facility/BMP, e.g., one test for every 5,000 sq. ft of permeable pavement, or one test for each bioretention cell.

Response: Barghausen - Infiltration is not feasible.

- At the time of civil permit application, the applicant is responsible for submitting a permanent storm water management plan which meets the design requirements provided by PMC Section 21.10. [PMC 21.10.190, 21.10.060]
 - When using WWHM for analysis, provide the following WWHM project files with the civil permit application:
 - Binary project file (WHM file extension)
 - ASCII project file (WH2 file extension)
 - WDM file (WDM file extension)
 - WWHM report text (Word file)

Response: Barghausen - All storm water management design was incorporated into phase one of project and submitted to city for total buildup of project. No new WWHM files are required for this phase of project.

- Upon submission of the geotechnical infiltration testing, appropriate long-term correction factors shall be noted for any areas utilizing infiltration into the underlying native soils in accordance with the Ecology Manual, Volume III, Chapter 3. Provide the long-term infiltration rate calculation in the stormwater report.

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged

- Water quality treatment of stormwater shall be in accordance with the Ecology Manual, Volume 1, Minimum Requirement 6; and Volume 5, Runoff Treatment.

Response: Barghausen - Water quality treatment for this project was designed with the use of wetland pond which meets criteria for enhanced water quality per Ecology Manual.

- Trench dams shall be provided at the property line for utilities located below infiltrative facilities including, but not limited to, permeable pavements and bioretention facilities. Reference City Standard Detail 06.01.10.

Response: Barghausen - No new utilities are proposed with this phase of project that is located below infiltrative facilities.

- All storm drains shall be signed as follows:
 - a) Publicly maintained stormwater catch basins shall be signed using glue-down markers supplied by the City and installed by the project proponent.
 - b) Privately maintained stormwater catch basins shall be signed with pre-cut 90ml torch down heavy-duty, intersection-grade preformed thermoplastic pavement marking material. It shall read either "Only Rain Down the Drain" or "No Dumping, Drains to Stream". Alternatively, the glue-down markers may be purchased from the City for a nominal fee.

Response: Barghausen - No new storm water catch basin is proposed with this phase of project.

- All private storm drainage facilities shall be covered by a maintenance agreement provided by the City and recorded with Pierce County. Under this agreement, if the owner fails to properly maintain the facilities, the City, after giving the owner notice, may perform necessary maintenance at the owner's expense. (Phase 1 Stormwater Agreement, AFN 201903120138, may be acceptable for Phase 2 pending the outcome of MR5 feasibility analysis.)

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged.

- A Stormwater Systems Development fee will be assessed for each new equivalent service unit (ESU) in accordance with PMC Chapter 14.26. Each ESU is equal to 2,800 square feet of 'hard' surface. The current SDC as of this writing is \$3,560.00 per ESU.

Response: Barghausen/Wesley - Comment acknowledged.

- Stormwater Systems Development fees are due at the time of site development permit or in the case where no site development permit is required, at the time of building permit issuance for the individual lot(s); and the fees do not vest until the time of site development permit issuance, or at the time of building permit issuance in the case where a site development permit is not required.

Response: Barghausen/Wesley - Comment acknowledged.

- A Construction Stormwater General Permit shall be obtained from the Department of Ecology if any land disturbing activities such as clearing, grading, excavating and/or demolition will disturb one or more acres of land, or are part of larger common plan of development or sale that will ultimately disturb one or more acres of land.

Response: Barghausen - A Construction Stormwater General Permit will be applied for this phase of project.

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

- **General: STREET:**

- Existing public utilities that are in conflict with any proposed improvements shall be relocated as necessary to meet all applicable City, State, and Federal requirements.

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged, existing utilities that are in conflict with proposed improvement shall be relocated to meet standards.

- Existing private utilities (gas, telcom, cable, etc...) that are in conflict with City maintained right-of-way and utilities shall be relocated outside of the travelled road section, i.e., behind the curb under the sidewalk area.

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged.

- Any curb, gutter, sidewalk, or other existing improvements which currently do not meet City Standards, or are damaged during construction, shall be replaced. [PMC 11.08.020]

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged, a note in this regard is added to plan set.

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

- **General: GRADING:**

- A Grading Plan conforming to all requirements of PMC Section 21.14.120 will be required for this project. The Plan shall be prepared by a Civil Engineer licensed in the State of Washington. [PMC 21.14.070]

Response: Barghausen - A detail grading plan shall be prepared at the time of civil permit application.

- A geotechnical report conforming to all requirements PMC Sections 21.14.150 and 21.14.160 will be required for this project. The Report shall be prepared by a Civil Engineer or Engineering Geologist licensed in the State of Washington. Prior to final acceptance of this project, the author of the Report shall provide certification to the City the project was constructed in accordance with the recommendations contained in the report.

Response: Terra - See attached Geotechnical Report Addendum

- Cross sections may be required at various points along the property lines extending 30-feet beyond the project limits to assure no impact from storm water damming or runoff. [PMC 17.42 & CS 502.1]

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged.

- At the time of civil permit application, the following notes shall be added to the first

sheet of the TЕСP:

-“At any time during construction it is determined by the City that mud and debris are being tracked onto public streets with insufficient cleanup, all work shall cease on the project until this condition is corrected. The contractor and/or the owner shall immediately take all steps necessary to prevent future tracking of mud and debris into the public ROW, which may include the installation of a wheel wash facility on-site.”

-“Contractor shall designate a Washington Department of Ecology certified erosion and sediment control leadperson, and shall comply with the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared for this project.”

-“Sediment-laden runoff shall not be allowed to discharge beyond the construction limits in accordance with the Project’s NPDES General Stormwater Permit.”

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged, a note in this regard is added to preliminary plan set.

- RCW 19.122 requires all owners of underground facilities to notify pipeline companies of scheduled excavations through the one-number locator service if proposed excavation is within 100 feet. Notification must occur in a window of not less than 2 business days but not more than 10 business days before beginning the excavation. If a transmission pipeline company is notified that excavation work will occur near a pipeline, a representative of the company must consult with the excavator on-site prior to excavation.

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged, a note in this regard is added to plan set.

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

- **General: MISC:**

- All proposed improvements shall be designed and constructed to current City Standards. [PMC 14.08.040, 14.08.120, 17.42]

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged.

- Civil engineering drawings cannot be accepted until Planning Department requirements have been satisfied, including but not limited to, SEPA, Preliminary Site Plan approval, CUP, and/or Hearing Examiner conditions.

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged.

- Civil engineering drawings will be required for this project prior to issuance of the first building permit. Included within the civil design package shall be a utility plan overlaid with the proposed landscaping design to ensure that potential conflicts between the two designs have been addressed.

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged.

- At the time of civil application, submit electronic files in PDF format, through the City's Permit Portal. Contact the Permit staff via email at PermitCenter@ci.puyallup.wa.us for the initial project submittal.

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged.

• Civil engineering plan review fee is \$470.00 (plus an additional per hour rate of \$130.00 in excess of 5 hours). The Civil permit shall be \$300.00 and the inspection fee shall be 3% of the total cost of the project as calculated on the Engineering Division Cost Estimate form. [City of Puyallup Resolution No. 2098]

Response: Barghausen/Wesley - Comment acknowledged.

• Benchmark and monumentation to City of Puyallup datum (NAVD 88) will be required as a part of this project.

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged.

• Engineering plans submitted for review and approval shall comply with City Standards Section 1.0 and Section 2.0, particularly:

- Engineering plans submitted for review and approval shall be based on 24 x 36-inch sheets.
- The scale for design plans shall be indicated directly below the north arrow and shall be only 1"=20' or 1"=30'. The north arrow shall point up or to the right on the plans.
- Engineering plan sheets shall be numbered sequentially in this manner: Sheet 1 of 20, Sheet 2 of 20, etc. ending in Sheet 20 of 20.

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged.

• All applicable City Standard Notes and Standard Details shall be included on the construction plans for this project. A copy of the City Standards can be found on the City's web site under City Engineering, Development Engineering.

Response: Barghausen - Comment acknowledged.

- Prior to Acceptance/Occupancy, Record Drawings shall be provided for review and approval by the City. The fee for this review is \$200.00. Record Drawings shall be provided as follows:
 - In accordance with City Standards Manual Section 2.3.
 - Electronic version of the record drawings in the following formats:
 1. AutoCAD Map 2007 or newer in State Plane South Projection
 2. PDF

Response: Barghausen/Wesley - Comment acknowledged.

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

- **General: TRAFFIC ENGINEERING GENERAL CONDITIONS:**

Traffic Impact fees (TIF) will be assessed in accordance with fees adopted by ordinance, per PMC 21.10. Impact fees are subject to change and are adopted by ordinance. The applicant shall pay the proportionate impact fees adopted at the time of building permit application

Response: Wesley - Comment acknowledged.

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

Response: Wesley - Comment acknowledged.

School impact fees shall be paid directly to the school district in accordance with adopted fee at the time of collection by the district.

Response: Wesley - Challenge this payment; it was not paid for phase I.

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

Response: Wesley - Comment acknowledged.

Per Puyallup Municipal Code Section 11.08.135, the applicant/owner would be expected to construct half-street improvements including curb, gutter, planter strip, sidewalk, roadway base, pavement, and street lighting. Any existing improvements which are damaged now or during construction, or which do not meet current City Standards, shall be replaced.

Response: Wesley - Comment acknowledged.

Planning Division - Gabriel Clark; 2537703330; GClark@puyallupwa.gov

- General: Sign Posted On Site must be provided.

Planning Division - Gabriel Clark; 2537703330; GClark@puyallupwa.gov

- General: Signed Affidavit must be provided.

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

DRT Letter
November 23, 2022

Case PLPSP20220108
Page **24** of **15**