



September 26, 2020

Lauren Anderson/Paul Skidmore

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

City of Mercer Island

Community Planning & Development

9611 SE 36<sup>th</sup> Street

Mercer Island, WA 98040

RE: Griffith Mercer Island House Deck Remodel  
2443 84<sup>th</sup> Ave SE  
Mercer Island, WA 98040  
**Permit Number: 1906-185**  
**SUB5-PLANS REVIEW RESPONSE**

To Andrew Leon/Paul Skidmore,

The following are “Jackson Main Architecture” (JMA) responses to the plan review comments raised in the “**SUB-5 Plans Review**” plan review document, updated on the portal on August 19<sup>th</sup> and September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020. Responses to the review comments are numbered to correspond to the appropriate number in the review comments for the project referenced above.

1. *Page 1 (G0.00):*

*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. (7/6/2020 Paul Skidmore)*

**Response:**

**Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3) (responded 7/21/2020): Noted.**

*Please contact me directly to discuss the remaining issues. (8/19/2020 Paul Skidmore)*

**Response:**

**Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3): JMA has made multiple attempts to contact reviewers to discuss remaining issues. Please contact me when the resubmittal package has been received to review the submittal package at the following number: 425-312-4656.**

2. *Page 3 (A0.01):*

*Please provide a site plan, drawn to scale, showing the proposed conditions of the lot. The site plan needs to show the entire lot, as well as all proposed lot coverage. (9/8/2020 Andrew Leon)*

**Response:**

**Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3): A site plan, drawn to scale, showing proposed conditions of the lot has been added to the set. Sheet A0.01 has been modified to only show the existing site conditions. Sheet A0.02 has been added to show the entire lot as well as all proposed lot coverage and site diagrams.**

3. *Page 6 (A2.02)*  
*Retaining walls setbacks are limited to 6 feet in height for fill slopes and 12 feet in height for cut slopes. Please provide the maximum height of this retaining wall. (9/9/2020 Andrew Leon)*

**Response:**

**Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):** The retaining wall that was tagged in the correction document is existing to remain with new bluestone thin-set tile cladding. None of the retaining walls that are existing or proposed exceed 6 feet in height from the finish grade. Please see sheets A2.01, A3.01 and A4.01 for added notations for maximum retaining wall heights.

4. *Page 8 (A3.01)*  
*Please show and label the existing and finished grade on the elevations. (9/9/2020 Andrew Leon)*

**Response:**

**Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):**

A note was added in the general sheet notes to read “All existing and proposed finished grade elevations are to considered equal unless noted otherwise”. Areas where the proposed finished grade differs from the existing is now shown on elevation 2/A3.01 and keynotes 2.53 and 2.54 have been added for clarification.

5. *Page 10 (A8.01)*  
*Where is this detail located? Callout all details used on this project. Remove all details not applicable to this project. Coordinate with structural. (7/6/2020 Paul Skidmore)*

**Response:**

**Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3) (responded 8/19/2020):**

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.

*Okay, I see in the key notes bluestone finish. But where does this specific detail occur? Is the intent to construct CMU retaining walls? What is the required reinforcement? Is this supposed to represent the existing construction? Clarify. (8/18/2020 Paul Skidmore)*

**Response:**

**Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):**

This detail occurs at all retaining walls that flank the driveway. Keynotes 3.07 and 3.08 were updated to reference detail 4/A8.01. See sheet A3.01. The majority of these retaining walls are to remain as CMU walls and clad with the bluestone finish. All new retaining walls are to be cast-in-place concrete walls. The detail was modified to reflect this as well as any required mortar beds.

6. Page 10 (A8.01)

*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.  
(8/19/2020 Paul Skidmore)*

**Response:**

**Jackson Main – Larz Hitchcock (responded 7/9/2020):**

**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?**

*Provide all details included in the structural calculations on the drawings. Callout all details used within the drawings.*

*The calculations assume a rigid beam is used to support the railing. What's stopping the beam from "rotating out"? Particularly where joists run parallel to the railing. Refer to deck tip sheet for prescriptive framing framing and attachment options here:*

*<https://mybuildingpermit.com/sites/default/files/inline-files/2015%20Tip%20Sheet%205%20Basic%20Decks%209-18-18.pdf>*

**Response:**

**Jackson Main – Sara Vernia (JMA3):**

**Note added to detail 1/A8.01 to reference structural plan on sheet S2.1. Blocking has been added to areas where joists run parallel to the railing. See sheet S2.1.**

**(Remaining comments directed to structure have been responded to in the subsequent Structural Response Letter named 'Griffith Res Plan Review LTR-2 2020-09-23.pdf')**