

# Comment Response Memo

1 March 2023

To

City of Mercer Island – Molly McQuire

For the Project

Strand Residence – 2207-019

6950 Maker St

Mercer Island, WA 98040

## General Description

Below are responses to public comments received during the open comment period September 6, 2022, - October 6, 2022. These have been addressed numerically for reference only and not in order of importance or priority.

---

1. Regarding the letter from Elisabeth Green - We understand the accepted City of Mercer Island interpretation of 'existing grade' is "the grade of the lot as it currently sits" more specifically the surveyed grade prior to start of this proposed project (5/27/2021).
2. Regarding letter from Brigid Stackpool and Pamela Faulkner - The geotechnical concerns have been addressed in updated reports and response by Geotech Consultants as well as the statement of risk as required by Mercer Island code. It is our understanding that John Kenney's review of this proposal and the requirement to add trees to the proposed project is in some way related to the comments regarding removed vegetation and tree trimming. More generally this proposal shall meet all requirements of Mercer Island code as part of the permit review process.
3. Regarding letter from Dan Grove –
  1. As stated above we understand the accepted interpretation of existing grade to be the surveyed grade prior to the proposed development.
  2. The proposed project after revisions in response to comments has been reviewed by Geotech Consultants and they have provided a Statement of Risk regarding the proposed development. Temporary shoring is included in the updated permit submittal and takes into account bracing the neighboring rockery to the East.
  3. Similar to comment above regarding trees it is my understanding that John Kenney has reviewed and addressed concerns with vegetation and tree trimming as part of this permit review.
4. Regarding the letter from Zachary Davison (through Dan Grove)
  1. Same response as above regarding existing grade
  2. The project has been modified and the Gross Floor area Calculations are shown in updated permit response documents showing compliance with Mercer Island Code.
  3. Average Building Calculations are shown in the updated permit response documents showing compliance with Mercer Island Code.

4. Maximum Building Height on Downhill Façade is shown on the South Elevation of the updated drawings and is measured at 29'-6" to the top of the wall supporting the roof framing per MICC 19.02.020(E)(2)
5. Similar to comment above regarding trees it is my understanding that John Kenney has reviewed and addressed concerns with vegetation and tree trimming as part of this permit review.
5. Regarding email from Natasha Garcia – Gross Floor area calculations are shown in updated drawings to be in compliance with Mercer Island Code.
6. Regarding letter from Jim and Margaret Miller – Existing grade and height are addressed above and have been documented to show compliance with Mercer Island Code in updated submittal documents. Soil retention and stability of the lot are addressed in updated reports and Statement of Risk by Geotech Consultants. In regards to parking and construction equipment and street access those concerns have been relayed to the contractor so that any impact to neighbors is addressed in advance.
7. Regarding the letter from Jim and Susan Mattison – Gross Floor area calculations are supplied in the updated submittal documents and revisions to the project show compliance with Mercer Island Code regarding GFA and basement exclusion. As stated above we understand the accepted interpretation of existing grade to be the surveyed grade prior to the proposed development. Geotechnical concerns have been addressed in updated reports and Statement of Risk by Geotech Consultants. Stormwater management has been addressed in Civil Drawings by attaching to existing catch basins as shown in updated submittal documents. Similar to comment above regarding trees it is my understanding that John Kenney has reviewed and addressed concerns with vegetation and tree trimming as part of this permit review. In regards to parking and construction equipment and street access those concerns have been relayed to the contractor so that any impact to neighbors is addressed in advance. We have also asked the contractor to provide a CMP.
8. Regarding the letter from Lynn Michael – Geotech Consultants has reviewed the proposed development including revisions that responded to comments from neighbors and the city and they have provided and updated report and Statement of Risk.

Please let me know if there are any questions.

Thank you for your time,



Jeffrey Almeter