



June 9, 2021

City of Mercer Island
9611 SE 36th Street
Mercer Island, WA 98040-3732

RE: SUB19-002/SEP19-005 – 14-lot long subdivision proposed at 2825 W. Mercer Way
First Review & Request for Information
BlueLine Job No. 13-118

Dear Mona Davis,

This letter is in response to your review of the 2825 West Mercer Way project. The plans have been revised per the comments in your letter dated August 2, 2019. Below is a list of each comment with our responses in bold.

Arborist (John Kenney):

1. Sheet 9 - Only include viable regulated trees in the calculations. Please update the Tree Inventory and Replacement Submittal Sheet to address the following:
 - Under Large Regulated Trees section, only include viable trees over 10". The Leyland Cypress and Portugal Laurels will not be regulated on private property and do not need to go in this section.

The Tree Inventory and Replacement Submittal Information form has been updated accordingly.

- Update and confirm at least 30% of regulated trees are retained and protected.

The Tree Inventory and Replacement Submittal Information form has been updated and at least 30% of regulated trees are retained and protected.

- Update planting requirements based on viable trees removed.

The Tree Replacement table has been updated for removed non-viable trees to be replaced at a 1:1 ratio and removed exceptional trees to be replaced at a 6:1 ratio.

- Non-viable trees will not need to be retained, but will need to be replanted. Please demonstrate this has been accounted for.

The Tree Replacement table has been updated for removed non-viable trees to be replaced at a 1:1 ratio.

- Trees #4 and #5 are exceptional by size, but determined to be non-viable. Have your project arborist assess the trees for risk and likelihood of longevity. Update replanting ratio of both these trees at 6:1 ratio.

The project arborist has provided a memo with further assessment of trees #4 & #5 along with ISA basic tree risk assessment forms. The replanting ratio for removed exceptional trees has been updated to 6:1.

- Include Tree #25 in right-of-way tree section. This tree must be retained and utilities installed around it. Please demonstrate how this will be accomplished.

Tree #25 is shown as being retained. The gravel shoulder was dropped at this location and asphalt path is routed at the edge of the dripline to minimize impacts to the tree dripline.

- Confirm plans and arborist report match with tree numbers. For example, trees 34 & 35 are listed on the plans but not on the report. They are not regulated and can be removed from the plans.

These trees have been removed from the plans to reflect the arborist report.

2. Sheet 3 - Demonstrate Tree #2 is sufficiently protected (will survive) with 16 feet of protection. Building pad, driveway, wall and associated grading will need to be shown outside this protection area. This means showing at least 5-ft of space between building pad and driveway in addition to the 16-ft protection area. Also, the building footprint should be revised to reflect a more accurate footprint, which may require a longer driveway and smaller house footprint.

The lot 4 driveway width has been reduced to accommodate a 2'-3' wall at the dripline as needed to avoid impacts to the limits of disturbance for the tree. Additionally, the wall between lots 4 and 5 and lot 4 grading have been adjusted to avoid impacts to the limits of disturbance for the tree.

3. Chain link fence shall be used to protect all saved trees at their dripline. This will be required to be demonstrated on the site development plan. Please enlarge the notes on the detail provided on Sheet 8 provide a note on Sheet 8 to this effect.

The tree protection detail on Sheet 8 has been enlarged accordingly.

Engineering (Ruji Ding):

4. Transportation Concurrency Application and Traffic Impact Analysis is required in accordance with MICC 19.20.030. Please note that thresholds referencing net new trips considers trips from previous use as those *"trips generated by the previous use of the site within the one year immediately prior to the development permit application"*. The previous use as a Boys & Girls Club ceased years ago.

A Traffic Impact Analysis has been prepared by Gibson Traffic Consultants, Inc. and is included with the preliminary plat resubmittal.

5. Please clearly show and call out all existing public/private easements (including the easement to be extinguished) and proposed public/private easements on the plan.



The easements are shown on the plans.

6. The applicant needs to provide a formal request for vacating the existing public water easement on the property. This request shall include the exhibits, description of the project, the reasons for the vacation and eliminating the city water main and easement. The request will be reviewed by the City Council following review of the petition from the applicant. This process will need to be completed separately from the subdivision process and finalized prior to preliminary plat approval.

A formal request for vacating the existing public water easement has been prepared based on a prior example provided by the City. The request is not uploaded with the preliminary plat resubmittal, but will be emailed to the Engineering Department.

7. Please add the following note to the plan set: The utility design (water, sewer and storm) shown on the preliminary plans are conceptual only. They have not been reviewed for construction detail. The details, extents, alignments, locations, and all design-related features are not approved and will be further reviewed with the Site Development Permit.

This note has been added to the preliminary utility plan sheet (UP-01).

Planning (Mona Davis):

8. Correct the zoning to R-8.4. Other minor comments are provided on the plans, particularly around the tree protection detail for signage and fencing. Please address all review notes.

The zoning listed on the cover sheet (CV-01) has been updated accordingly.

9. A public meeting was held at the Community Center on June 20, 2019 to discuss the proposal. The meeting was well-attended by several neighbors to the subject property. Some of the issues that came out of that meeting included:

- Access to 62nd Ave SE is not preferred as the street is narrow.

The site plan has been revised and the number of lots accessing off of 62nd Ave SE has been reduced from 9 lots down to 6.

- Number of driveways onto public streets makes for dangerous walkways. The neighbors would prefer to see a single access into the development to serve all lots.

The proposed development meets City standards for driveways and sidewalks.

- Underground springs have created problems for surrounding homes in the past. Concerns with how the drainage will be handled, particularly around new impervious being proposed with 14 individual homes.

The development will include footing drains for structures and a storm drainage system that will collect and convey runoff in accordance with City and County standards.



- Heights of proposed trees blocking views from neighboring homes and would prefer applicant to select trees and design landscaping to avoid this.

Per MICC 19.10.070.B.3, replacement trees shall be conifers at least six feet tall and or deciduous at least one-half inches in diameter at the base. We are not aware of City code that limits the tree height at maturity. The client would be willing to plant a mix of trees with lower heights to preserve the views from neighbors.

- Light pollution and having too many street lights.

No street lights are proposed with this development.

- Lack of open space and removal of play fields.

The property will be developed into residential lots as allowed per zoning.

- Demolition process and hazardous abatement (which is being addressed as part of the SEPA Review for the demolition permit so not necessary to address with the subdivision at this time).

Concerns related to hazardous/toxic materials were related to demolishing the existing structure which occurred under separate permit.

Please address the specific concern of analyzing the potential of an alley access internal to the site to access all lots and removing the proposed private roadway off 62nd Ave SE. This would provide for rear loading garages and fronts of houses facing onto the streets. Alternatively, please evaluate the feasibility of a plat configuration where all homes access off an internal street.

The site plan has been revised and the number of lots accessing off of 62nd Ave SE has been reduced from 9 lots down to 6.

10. Several public comments were received during the public comment period. Here is a link to review those: <https://mieplan.mercergov.org/public/SUB19-002/Public Comment> Specifically, the applicant should address all concerns in the form of a spreadsheet as a separate document.

The public comments were reviewed and grouped into categories to provide responses. Please see the public comment response letter included with the preliminary plat resubmittal.

11. The demolition permit will need to be finalized before a decision is issued on the preliminary plat. Currently Demolition Permit 1704-191 is under review and on hold pending a threshold decision on the SEPA review for the demolition permit under SEP17-020, which is being processed by Senior Planner, Robin Proebsting. Further review of the preliminary plat will be put on hold until we know the outcome of the demolition decision.

The existing building has been demolished per the approved demo permit.



12. A cover letter addressing all of the numbered and bulleted comments from each reviewer outlined in this letter and on the plans is required at resubmittal.

This comment response letter provides responses to numbered and bulleted comments from each reviewer.

Fire review is complete and no additional information is required from their agency at this time.

Noted.

The City's processing of the Preliminary Long Subdivision and associated SEPA Review applications has been put on hold until these issues are resolved. Pursuant to MICC 19.15.110, all requested information must be submitted within 90 days or a request for extension requested.

Noted. This resubmittal addresses the issues received from the City.

Please call or email me with any concerns at 425-250-7247 or bpudists@thebluelinegroup.com.

Sincerely,



Brett K. Pudists, PE
Principal

CC: Eric Hansen

