



July 17, 2020

Lauren Anderson/Paul Skidmore

Lauren.Anderson@mercergov.org/Paul.Skidmore@mercergov.org

City of Mercer Island

Community Planning & Development

9611 SE 36th Street

Mercer Island, WA 98040

RE: Griffith Mercer Island House Deck Remodel
2443 84th Ave SE
Mercer Island, WA 98040
Permit Number: 1906-185
SUB4-PLANS REVIEW RESPONSE

To Lauren Anderson/Paul Skidmore,

The following are “Jackson Main Architecture” (JMA) responses to the plan review comments raised in the “**SUB-4 Plans Review**” plan review document, sent on **July 9, 2020**. Responses to the review comments are numbered to correspond to the appropriate number in the review comments for the project referenced above.

1. *Please note there have been a number of correction rounds. The plan review fee has been exceeded and additional fees are required. Please contact me prior to submittal to perform a cursory review of the drawings for completeness.*

Response:

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3): Noted.

2. *An updated Site Development Worksheet (not a site plan) was requested in SUB3 and was not provided. Please provide this updated document to reflect the revised lot coverage, hardscape, and lot slope calculations.*

Please use our updated Site Development Worksheet. It breaks down how to calculate lot coverage and hardscape making it easier to calculate versus the older form.

Updated form can be found here: <http://www.mercergov.org/files/SiteDevelopmentWorksheet.pdf>

Response:

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3): Please see attached as well as updated diagrams on sheet A0.01.

3. *Please also provide a proposed site plan. Please clearly illustrate and label what is existing and proposed on this plan.*

Response:

Jackson Main – Larz Hitchcock:

Sheet A0.01 is the Existing Site Plan. Sheet A2.01 shows the new deck and retaining wall. No other work is being done to the site other than these areas.

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):

These plans show everything that is existing and all proposed work that is being performed.

A0.01 - Existing Plan (site)

A1.01 - Demolition Plan (site)

A2.01 - Level 1 Proposed Plan (area of work)

A2.02 - Level 2 Proposed Plan (area of work)

4. *This is being shown as "lot coverage removed" - was there building here? Or was it a walkway? If it's building or as a roof it's lot coverage, if it was uncovered stairs it is hardscape.*

Response:

Jackson Main – Larz Hitchcock:

As shown on the demo plan the existing stoop and stairs are being removed to allow for the new deck.

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):

Diagrams were updated, see sheet A0.01. The stoop demolition was removed from the lot coverage calculations and shown in the hardscape diagrams.

5. *Please provide the following on the new proposed site plan that's being requested: lot coverage & hardscape*

Response:

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):

Diagrams demonstrating lot coverage and hardscape are provided on sheet A0.01.

6. *Please remove this note as it is incorrect. All decks (no matter the spacing) are considered 100% hardscape. The code section referenced here is incorrect, as that only applies to regulated improvements such as schools and religious buildings.*

Please refer to MICC 19.02.020(F) for the residential lot coverage and hardscape requirements.

Response:

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):

Noted. New uncovered deck now included in the hardscape calculations. Please see calculation worksheet and sheet A0.01.

7. *Please provide the TOW and BOW callouts for all new retaining walls or rockeries proposed in required yard setbacks.*

Please refer to MICC 19.02.050 for our retaining wall max height requirements.

Response:

Jackson Main – Larz Hitchcock:

Walls heights are an elevation item and called out on the elevations.

8. *(Pencil notation on plan set.)*

Response:

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):

This portion of the deck currently existing and is directly over the existing garage (i.e. the edge of the existing building extends to gridline 5 from level 1 to level 2. New decking is to improve existing deck in this area. Please also see response to the following question.

9. *Uncovered decks are only allowed to protrude up to 3 feet into any required yard setback. How is this portion of the new deck allowed?*

In addition, only 18 inches of eave overhang is allowed into a required yard setback.

Please revise the plans to comply with the standard. The standard can be found in MICC 19.02.020(C)(3)(a) minor building elements.

Response:

Jackson Main – Larz Hitchcock:

This is an existing condition that covers the garage. We cannot remove and leave garage open to the sky.

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):

In addition, there is no proposed work that violates the MICC 19.02.020(C)(3)(a). There are no new proposed eaves and the new exposed deck does not project farther than 3-ft past the allowable overhang.

10. *Refer to other review comment, as this statement looks to be incorrect and will need to be removed.*

Response:

Jackson Main – Larz Hitchcock:

This is an existing Condition and part of the building that covers corner of garage.

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):

In addition, there is no proposed work that violates the MICC 19.02.020(C)(3)(a). There are no new proposed eaves and the new exposed deck does not project farther than 3-ft past the allowable overhang.

11. *Is this fence and gate proposed? If it isn't existing, please provide the side elevation to illustrate height. Our max height requirements for fences and gates can be found in MICC 19.02.050.*

Response:

Jackson Main – Larz Hitchcock:

This is an Existing Fence and Gate as called out by note 02.05 under the arrow.

12. *Please indicate compliance with MICC 19.02.020(C)(3)(b):*

Hardscape and Driveways. Hardscape and driveways not more than 30 inches above existing grade or finished grade, whichever is lower, may be located in any required yard; provided, that driveways may exceed the 30-inch limit when a permit applicant demonstrates the proposed height is the minimum feasible to meet the standards in MICC 19.09.040.

Response:

Jackson Main – Larz Hitchcock:

This is existing condition. The grade is not being changed in any way..

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):

New improvements to this walkway follows the existing grade, in other words, it does not exceed the 30in above exiting grade at any point.

13. *As requested in SUB3, please show and label the existing and finished grade on all elevations.*

Response:

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):

Noted. Please see sheet A3.01.

14. *Is this a new retaining wall? If so, please provide the height. The height is measured from the existing or finished grade (whichever is lower) to the top of the wall.*

Response:

Jackson Main – Larz Hitchcock:

This is stair- refer to elevation above and plans

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):

The stair does not retain soil to the west. A new retaining wall to replace existing is now shown in plans and elevation. Details of this retaining wall are shown in structural drawings.

15. *Where is this detail located? Callout all details used on this project. Remove all details not applicable to this project. Coordinate with structural.*

Response:

Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):

Bluestone finish is being applied to existing and proposed retaining walls that surround the parking area. These were keynoted on plans and elevations. Please see sheet A2.01 and A 3.01.

16. *Provide structural detail for support of guard. Provide justifying calculations. Confirm deck structure is capable of resisting maximum moment. Provide design where joists are not perpendicular to guard.*

Response:

Jackson Main – Larz Hitchcock:

Structural details and Calculations were provided at the same time as this set of drawings and should be in the same folder. The note refers the viewer to those. Not sure why commenting on this?

(Remaining comments directed to structure have been responded to in the subsequent Structural Response Letter named 'Griffith Res Plan Review LTR-1 2020-07-10.pdf')