

July 10, 2020

Mr. Robin Murphy AIA LEED AP
Principal
Jackson Main Architecture, P.S.
311 First Ave South
Seattle, WA 98104

SUBJECT: 2486 84th Ave SE
Mercer Island, Washington
RE: Plan Review Comments
Griffith Residence Deck Expansion

Dear Robin:

The following are our responses to The City of Mercer Island's plan review comments for the above referenced project.

Sheet S1.1 General Notes and Index

1. Bookmarks for the structural sheets will be provided by the architect when assembling the final PDF set.

Sheet S2.1 Plans

1. This note has been revised to call out detail 6/S4.2, only. The detail occurs at the GLB bearing on the new retaining wall.
2. Per arch elevations, and new section 2/A4.01, grade will be 15" below top of deck. Per IBC 1015.2, a guard is only required where elevation difference is over 30".
3. Please see revised section 2/S4.1. The only connection between the deck and existing construction is at the GLB. The joist is approximately 4" clear from the existing wall, and the deck cantilevers less than 4". A gap is noted between the existing deck and siding.
4. See new detail 7/S4.1.
5. There is a post in this location. Plan has been revised to clarify this.
6. The concrete stoop is to be demolished per the architectural drawings. Per new architectural section 2/A4.01. New retaining walls will be constructed as noted. Please see new detail 6/S4.2.
7. Please see detail 3/S4.1, as noted on plan. Note has been revised for clarity.
8. There is an existing retaining wall to remain on grid B. Please see detail 4/S4.2 for the post/footing at the existing wall.
9. Detail cut has been added to plan for the new retaining wall at the south side of the driveway. Please see calculation on page 54.

Sheet S4.1 Details

1. Please see revised details 1/S4.1 & 11/S4.1. Full depth blocking has been added.
2. Please see lateral load calculations, starting on page 57. Note straps added to details 1, 2, 8, 9 & 12 on S4.1.
3. See revised details 2/S4.1, 3/S4.1 and 10/S4.1
4. This is existing construction. Actual condition is not known. Second rim has been noted to be blocking if/as required for 3" thickness.

Mr. Robin Murphy
July 10, 2020
Page 2 of 2

5. Individual laminations have been removed.
6. Table loads were not used. See calculation on page 49.
7. Please see new detail 6/S4.1.
8. See comment #2 for this sheet.
9. This references demolition noted on S2.1 and A1.01. See arch for final grading. See comment #2 for sheet S2.1 for railing issue.
10. See revised details 1/S4.1 and 2/S4.1 for post caps.
11. Details have been revised to eliminate the powder driven fasteners. See revised details 2/S4.1 and 9/S4.1

Sheet S4.2 Details

1. This detail occurs at the existing retaining wall on grid B. Plan has been clarified.
2. Please see revised plan. Section (1/S4.2) has now been cut at the new retaining wall at the south edge of the driveway.

Please let me know if we can answer any questions or be of further assistance.

Sincerely,



Theodore D McDonald, P.E., S.E., Sr. Project manager
Seattle Structural PS Inc.
TMcDonald@SeattleStructural.com

TDM/