**CITY OF MERCER ISLAND**

**COMMUNITY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

9611 SE 36TH STREET | MERCER ISLAND, WA 98040

PHONE: 206.275.7605 | [www.mercergov.org](http://www.mercergov.org)

# Pre-Application Meeting (PRE20-018)

*An Intake Screening is required in addition to a Pre-Application Meeting. A Pre-Application Meeting does not replace the required Intake Screening. This meeting is to provide guidance and information include prior to formal submittal.*

## Summary:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Site Location: | 7216 93rd Ave SE | | | | |
| Lot Size: | **39,145 SF (0.90 acres)** | | **Zoning:** | R-8.4 (Single Family) | |
| Brief Project Description: | **3-lot short plat proposing removal of existing SFR and development of three new homes** | | **Documents Provided:** | Application, Narrative & Questions, Arborist report, tree inventory, site plan | |
| Applicant Information: | | | | | |
| Name: | | | Email: | | Phone: |
| Matt Glaser | | | matt@mccullougharchitects.com | | 206-779-3608 |
| Second Pre-application Meeting Required: | | Recommended | **Click for explanation if necessary** | | |

## Applicant Questions:

1. Are there any issues with these shapes of the proposed lots?

*Response:Proposed Lot 20 doesn’t have adequate access. Lots 21-22 should be narrowed to provide the required driveway width. The shape of Lot 21 does not meet code. See Planner notes below. Consider hammerhead design for turnaround as discussed in meeting.*

1. Verify designation of front, rear and side yards

*Response: See Planner comments below.*

1. Confirm lot 20 qualifies as a flag lot and can utilize the increase in allowed lot coverage and reduction in required landscape area

*Response: Per MICC 19.02.020(F)(3)(3)(ii)(b), an increase in lot coverage is allowed if the driveway occupies more than 25% of the lot area. It appears that this does not. Please see additional information pertaining to proposed access and driveway in Planner notes below.*

1. Is there a minimum separation for driveways along 93rd Ave?

*Response: The distances between private driveways shall be reviewed and evaluated by a project traffic engineer hired by the applicant. The project traffic engineer shall determine the minimum clearances.*

1. Is there a minimum separation required from the driveway to the utility pole on lot 22? *Response: The clearance between the driveway and existing utility pole shall be reviewed and evaluated by a project traffic engineer hired by the applicant. The project traffic engineer shall determine the minimum clearance.*
2. Confirmation of 8’ driveway width

*Response: This width is 12 feet below the required fire access standard as listed above. Minimum standards for this road shall be 20 feet without application of a fire code alternative. Fire code alternatives are only evaluated at time of building permit submittal. Fire code alternatives must be requested to mitigate adopted prescriptive code due to extenuating circumstances. It appears on the plans that the driveway may be able to be widened.*

*Added planner note…you cannot create your own hardship with a new development. The short plat will need to be designed to provide for the minimum width of access for a new lot.*

1. Review of fire department requirements for driveway design exceeding 150 feet. (Since driveways are not private access roads, are they regulated as such? Homes will be sprinklered) *Response: The IFC defines fire apparatus access road in section 202. Driveways are considered private access roads and will be evaluated as such. If the driveway (access road) is less than 150’ from the furthest part of the building (as one would walk) then the main road may be considered as the fire access. (An example of this would be a home with a 20’ driveway off a main approved fire access road that where the fire engine would park, and hoses could reach all portions of the building within 150’.*
2. Height limits for site walls adjacent to driveway

*Response: See MICC 19.02.050 regarding height limits for side walls adjacent to a driveway.*

1. Landscaping provisions for driveway zone.

*Response: to be further discussed during meeting. Not sure what is being asked.*

1. Removal of earth/grading in the steep slope area (see east side of lot 20).

*Response: this will need to be evaluated by your geotechnical consultant.*

1. Proximity to top of slope or new top of slope if grading adjacent to steep slope allowed *Response: this will need to be evaluated by your geotechnical consultant.*
2. The SE corner of the house on lot 21 encroaches into the drip line of tree #35. LOD is not disturbed. Arborist will support pruning the tree in this location since it has an unbalanced crown in the direction of the proposed house.

*Response: I think there’s confusion about tree locations since no tree numbers are on the plan as required. These should reflect the arborist report. Perhaps you mean lot 20? Please see link for Tree Plan requirements at* [*http://www.mercergov.org/files/TreesSubmittalChecklist.pdf*](http://www.mercergov.org/files/TreesSubmittalChecklist.pdf)

*Tree 35 is in fair-poor condition with decay present at the base. Trees within striking distance of new development, especially if excavation within dripline is proposed. Need further risk assessment from Arborist. Arborist should be provided with these plans and cite them in their work. Air excavation under Arborist supervision will be required if the tree is in good enough health and structure to be retained. Project Arborist will then be able to confirm final limits of disturbance with analysis in report format.*

1. Tree removal and mitigation plan.

*Response: The Arborist Report appears to be adequate.*

*Please see question 12 for feedback on the plan. All exceptional trees and exceptional grove trees must be justified for removal under MICC19.10.060(3). A replanting plan should be created once the final number of removals is determined/justified. See above comment concerning exceptional trees/exceptional grove trees. Trees that cannot fit on site, at least 10’ away from each other, existing trees, structures and utilities. Will required a fee-in-lieu of approximately $500/tree.*

1. Please review storm design concept.

*Response: All drainage design shall be prepared by a licensed civil engineer and according with MICC 15.09.*

1. Are there any utility related concerns?

*Response: The side sewers and water service lines design shall meet the current City Standards. The project civil engineer shall prepare the design.*

1. Are there any other issues with this proposal?

*Response: See additional notes below.*

## Review Comments:

### Fire Comments:

Fire Contact: [Jeromy.hicks@mercergov.org](mailto:Jeromy.hicks@mercergov.org) or by phone at 206-275-7966.

I have included some basic notes regarding the Fire Review and evaluation processes. Please see the below information. There are several hyperlinks that may be used to help guide you through this process.

All this information is consolidated in our “Developer Manual”. \*\* I can provide this via email since in person pick up is not an option at this time.

Specific applicant requested questions are answered above.

1. [Fire access](https://mercerisland.municipal.codes/MICC/17.07):
   1. Access roads (defined under IFC 202) under 500’ are required to be 20’ in width. For access roads over 500’ they are required to be 26’. IFC 503.2.1, D103.1, MICC 17.07.020)
   2. Minimum driveway widths (for planning purposes) are outline in [MICC 19.09.040](https://mercerisland.municipal.codes/MICC/19.09.040)
   3. Grade shall not exceed 10%. Grades over 10% but under 20% (max) may be evaluated for code alternative requests. (IFC 503.2.7)
   4. Length shall not exceed 150’ from furthest portion of the building as one would walk. (IFC 503.2.1)
   5. Surface shall be able to withstand and imposed load of 75,000 pounds and be constructed of asphalt. (If grade exceeds 15% this shall be brushed concrete) (IFC D102.1, MICC 19.09.040)
   6. Fire access roads, private access roads, driveways in excess of 150’ shall have provisions for fire apparatus turn-around as listed/illustrated in Appendix D of the IFC.
2. Fire Flow (Hydrants)
   1. A hydrant capable of flowing the required fire flow as outline in the International Fire Code Appendix B shall be located within 300’ of the furthest portion of the building (600’) for a building with an approved sprinkler system. (IFC Appendix B)
3. [Sprinklers](http://www.mercergov.org/files/ResidentialSprinklerStandard.pdf)
   1. All new construction and alterations over 50% valuation are required to install a minimum of a NFPA 13d fire sprinkler system.
   2. Decreased fire flow, access, grade, or building size may require the installation of a NFPA 13r of 13 sprinkler system.
   3. Water meter sizing is required for the install of a fire sprinkler system. Prior to water meter sizing consider this. The Fire Marshals Office can help determine the minimum required water meter for your fire sprinkler system. Additional sizing may be required due to fixture count or review of City Engineering.
4. [Fire Alarm Systems](http://www.mercergov.org/SIB/files/Household%20Fire%20Alarm%20Standard%20-%202018%20version(1).pdf)
   1. NFPA 72 Monitored Fire Alarm systems may be required as part of mitigation for deficiencies as listed above or may be proposed as a code alternative.
5. [Fire code alternatives](http://www.mercergov.org/files/CodeAlternateInformationSheet.pdf)
   1. These may be considered upon application of a building permit. The building designer must propose such alternative and it must show how the alternative is equal to or above the required code.
   2. Fire Code alternatives are not considered as a replacement for the fire code. The individual building applicant must show that the adopted prescriptive code may not be followed as a result of extenuating circumstances.
   3. Fire Code Alternative help sheet: <http://www.mercergov.org/files/CodeAlternateInformationSheet.pdf>

**Follow up to PRE20-018 Meeting:**

1. Discussed increasing the driveway for lot 20 to 20’ wide drive-able surface. The grade must be under 10% without mitigation. The applicant stated that the grade is close to 15%. At 15% grade, mitigation will need to be completed. Over 15% will require mitigation and brushed concrete. The access road/driveway must be under 150’ without turn around and from where the fire truck parks (144’ from 93rd); the most remote part of the residence must be within 150’. The applicant stated that this is manageable.
2. Current deficiencies noted are grade, driveway width.
3. Fire flow from the closet hydrant (I5-01) is rated at 780gpm. The proposed residence (6500 square feet) would require 2000gpm (1000 gpm w/ sprinklers). The demand exceeds the required flow. A NFPA 13r sprinkler system will be required as the base system. The hydrant must be within 600’ of the furthest part of the structure as a vehicle would drive and a person would walk.
4. The applicant stated that they may modify the lot lines. I provided the Developer Manual via email. Notes are produced from information provided at the time of the pre-application meeting. Modifications occur with code and design. Fire plan review will be assessed at time of permit submittal and may differ from pre-application notes depending on design and access changes as well as fire code changes.

For additional information please refer to this helpful webpage: <http://www.mercergov.org/Page.asp?NavID=2614>

### Tree Comments:

Tree Contact: [John.Kenney@mercergov.org](mailto:John.Kenney@mercergov.org) or 206-275-7713.

Comments pertain to Arborist Report/Tree Plan prepared by Layton Tree Consulting, LLC dated 10-29-19

43 regulated trees were assessed on subject property, along with 7 off-site trees within close proximity of property on neighboring properties to the east and north. 30% tree retention required; 18 of the 43 regulated trees are proposed to be removed. 25 trees (58%) are proposed to be retained.

1. Please refer to [MICC 19.10](http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/MercerIsland/#!/MercerIsland19/MercerIsland1910.html) for our tree code
2. Tree retention and replacement will be required
3. Tree protection of retained trees will be required. 65 replacement trees are proposed per the Tree Inventory & Replacement Submittal Worksheet.
4. To be clear, this development is considered one lot currently and the tree inventory worksheet should reflect this. 30% of the viable trees need to be retained on site as part of the development proposal. Building permits will stay with this percentage and the same worksheet will be used. This is pertinent to the building pad conversation we had where all saved trees are located outside the building pad. Non-viable trees should not be included in the tree inventory worksheet under regulated trees. This would be after the project arborist provides further assessment of trees for risk and viability.
5. Sequential (phased) tree removal may be required (only remove trees necessary at each step of the review process)

For additional information please refer to this helpful webpage: <http://www.mercergov.org/Page.asp?NavID=2636>

### Civil Engineering Comments:

Civil Contact: [Ruji.Ding@mercergov.org](mailto:Ruji.Ding@mercergov.org) or 206-275-7703.

1. Please refer to [MICC Title 15](http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/MercerIsland/#!/MercerIsland15/MercerIsland15.html) for our Water, Sewers, and Public Utilities code.
2. 13R fire sprinklers require 2-inch lines and 1-1/2 inch meters for all three proposed lots.

For more information on Stormwater Permits please visit here: <http://www.mercergov.org/Page.asp?NavID=2680> For more information on Low Impact Development please visit here: <http://www.mercergov.org/Page.asp?NavID=2660>

### Building Comments:

Building Contact: [Paul.Skidmore@mercergov.org](mailto:Paul.Skidmore@mercergov.org) or 206-275-7718.

1. Geotechnical will be required due to mapped geologic hazards located on the site. A geologic peer review is not required.
2. Site has a wind exposure of “C”. Wind speed up (Kzt) is 1.0.
3. Refer to the included *Property Hazard Report* for additional information.

For additional information please refer to this helpful webpage: <http://www.mercergov.org/Page.asp?NavID=2606>

### Planning Comments:

Planning Contact: Mona.Davis@mercergov.org or 206-275-7706.

1. Residential Zoning Regulations – Single family dwellings are a permitted use in the R-8.4 zone. The net lot area shall be at least 8,400 square feet. Lot width shall be at least 60 feet and lot depth shall be at least 80 feet.
2. Subdivision Regulations – MICC 19.08.020 outline application procedures for short plats, MICC 19.08.040 outlines plat improvement requirements, MICC 19.08.050 outlines final plat regs.
3. Design Standards for Short plats – MICC 19.08.030
4. Control hazards/damage to property owners adjoining the project, particularly around drainage, critical slopes, access, etc. MICC 19.09.060(G) requires protection of adjoining property by taking measures suitable for the purpose of protection and liability for damages. There have been calls from neighboring properties expressing concerns with construction practices, which will be addressed as part of the construction permitting with demolition and new single-family development. I always encourage developers to be a good neighbor and talk with surrounding property owners during development to address their concerns.
5. A geotechnical report is required to address drainage and stormwater, particularly around not increasing damage to downstream or upstream properties, and development in hazards.
6. Residential lots – MICC 19.08.030(E)(2) Each side line of a lot shall be approximately perpendicular or radial to the center line of the street on which the lot fronts. Lot 21 does not comply in its proposed configuration. Additionally, the lots should be renumbered with the formal short plat submittal as lots 1, 2 and 3 (not 20, 21, 22). Consider an internal access to serve all three lots once additional analysis is completed on viable trees.
7. Identify the location of building pads for each proposed lot. This is also discussed in MICC 19.09.090. New subdivisions shall designate a building pad for each lot and shall be located to minimize or prevent impacts to trees and vegetation required for retention and disturbance of the existing, natural topography.
8. See optional development standards – MICC 19.08.030(G) for additional flexibility around saving trees with designated open space tracts
9. Property Development – MICC 19.09 discusses public and private streets and preferred practices around operations throughout construction. Proposed development shall incorporate preferred development practices by using common access drives and utility corridors, where feasible. See MICC 19.16.010 for the definition of “feasible”. Please address how redesigning the lot layout wouldn’t be feasible to have all lots access off one private roadway in your project narrative.
10. Residential Development standards are as follows:
    1. Setbacks – Refer to MICC 19.02.020(C) – Show all setbacks on each proposed lot

Front yard: 20-feet (from 93rd Ave SE)

Rear yard: 25-feet

Side Yard: Variable. Please see MICC 19.02.020(C)(1)(c)(iii)

* + 1. No eave and minor building element protrusion is allowed into the minimum side yard setback (MICC 19.02.020(C)(3)). Labeling the minimum side yard setback on the site plan is important due to the following:
       1. If the building height along the side yard is above 25 feet from the finished grade to the top of the exterior wall façade the minimum side yard is 10 feet, thus no eaves can protrude into the 10-foot minimum side yard setback.
       2. If the building height along the side yard is above 15 feet (non-gabled roof) and 18 feet (gabled roof) above the existing or finished grade (whichever is less) to the top of the exterior wall façade will have a minimum side yard of 7.5 feet, thus no eaves would be allowed into the 7.5 foot setback.
  1. Height limits / downslope height limit – MICC 19.02.020(E)
     1. Maximum height: 30 feet above the average building elevation (ABE) to the highest point of the roof
     2. Maximum height on Downhill Building Façade: at the furthest downhill extent of the proposed building to the top of the exterior wall façade supporting the roof framing, rafters, trusses, etc.
  2. Lot Coverage – MICC 19.020.020(F):
     1. Based on lot slope
     2. Calculated by totaling the following:
        1. All drivable surfaces (driveway, parking pad, turn-arounds, etc. regardless the material type (e.g. pervious driveway counts towards lot coverage)
        2. Roof line (includes eaves and covered decks)
  3. Hardscape: Allowed a maximum of 9% of the lot area
     + 1. Hardscape includes patios, uncovered steps, walkways, decks, retaining walls, rockeries, etc.
       2. Required landscaping is minimum 60% of lot area. A maximum of 9% of the net lot area may consist of hardscape improvements.
       3. Development proposals for new single-family homes shall remove Japanese knotweed and Regulated Class A, B & C weeds identified on the King County noxious weed list from required landscaping areas.
  4. Gross Floor Area - MICC 19.02.020(D)
     1. 40% of the lot area or 5,000 SF, whichever is less
     2. Based on ceiling height, additional GFA may be applied
        1. The gross floor area shall be **150 percent** of the floor area of that portion of a room(s) with a ceiling **height of 12 feet to 16 feet**, measured from the floor surface to the ceiling.
        2. The gross floor area shall be **200 percent** of the floor area of that portion of a room(s) with a ceiling height of **more than 16 feet**, measured from the floor surface to the ceiling.
        3. Staircases shall be counted as a single floor for the first two stories accessed by the staircase. For each additional story above two stories, the staircase shall count as a single floor area. For example, a staircase with a 10-foot by 10-foot dimension that accesses three stories shall be accounted as 200 square feet (100 square feet for the first two stories, and 100 square feet for the third story).
     3. Second or third level covered decks count towards GFA, only uncovered or covered decks on the main level don’t count towards GFA

1. Critical area constraints (on and off-site)
   1. A Critical Area Review (CAR1) was approved on October 2, 2019 (CAO19-018) that determined the site does not contain a regulated watercourse and is not regulated under MICC 19.07 – Environment.
   2. A Critical Area Study provided as part of the CAO19-018 review was prepared by Wetland Resources, Inc. on June 21, 2019 and peer reviewed by the city’s environmental consultant, ESA, on September 30, 2019.
   3. Include geotech report (hazards, mitigation, statement of risk, etc.) for development in potential slide and erosion hazard areas.
2. SEPA Review is not required. Short plat is exempt.
3. Underlying Plat limits – Floods Lake Side Tracts Division 5, Plat Block 4, Plat Lot 20-21-22
   1. Conditions – n/a
   2. Covenants – n/a
   3. Easements – show all from title report on short plat
4. Easements – show all existing easements on short plat per title report
5. Direct response to applicant questions provided above and within the content of these notes.
6. Impact fees (traffic, school, parks) – Impact fees do not vest with a short plat application. These are paid at building permit issuance. Fees are subject to change each year.
7. Land Use Application Process and Estimated Timeline:
   1. Required land use approvals
      1. Short plat administrative approval
      2. Construction plan approval, which includes grading permit and demolition
      3. Final plat approval prior to applying for building permits
   2. Summary of procedural steps
      1. Pre-Application meeting(s)
      2. Submit short plat application electronically
      3. Application Completeness Check
      4. Review begins
      5. Review comments and public notice of application
      6. Notice of Decision
      7. Appeal period (appeals are heard by the Hearing Examiner)
   3. Typically land use approvals are “valid” for a period of 5 years from the date of preliminary approval. A final plat application meeting all requirements of Chapter 19.15 shall be recorded within five years of the date of preliminary plat approval (MICC 19.15.150).
   4. Description of timeline:
      1. Overall, we estimate about 4-6 months from application to issuance of a preliminary decision, dependent on a number of factors (applicant responsiveness, quality of materials, accuracy of design to code, etc.)

For more information on Land Use and Planning please refer to this useful webpage: <http://www.mercergov.org/Page.asp?NavID=361>

I look forward to working with you. Please don’t hesitate to contact me should you require further assistance. If you redesign the short plat layout, I would recommend another pre-application meeting to review a revised proposal with staff.

Regards,

Mona Davis, Planning Manager / Project Planner

Community Planning & Development

**