



September 9, 2022

Ryan Harriman, Planning Manager
City of Mercer Island Community Planning & Development
9611 SE 36th Street
Mercer Island, Washington 98040

Subject: *2nd Review Completion Letter*
 Koneru Short Plat, File No. SUB21-008
 PACE Project No. 21436

Dear Ryan:

We are pleased to submit this letter and the accompanying documents in support of our proposed development of Koneru Short Plat. These submittal documents are provided in response to a review completion letter issued by City of Mercer Island on August 11, 2022. Review comments contained in that letter are provided below (plain text), along with a response (***bold italics***) indicating how each comment was addressed.

Planning:

Contact: Ryan Harriman, Planning Manager – ryan.harriman@mercerisland.gov – 206.275.7717.

1. Code Criteria Compliance Matrix: The applicant shall complete a Code Criteria Compliance Matrix for the proposed short subdivision. The code criteria compliance matrix shall include specific details and examples about how the proposed project is consistent with Chapter 19.02 MICC, Chapter 19.07 MICC< Chapter 19.08 MICC, and Chapter 19.10 MICC. The purpose of the code compliance matrix is to provide guidance to applicants on the requirements for the development of property. The applicant bears the burden of proof that the proposed project is consistent with all laws, standards, and requirements provided in the MICC. This is a tool to ensure the proposed development is consistent with the requirements of the MICC, a guide and reference for developers to ensure all requirements are accounted for in application submittals, and a tool for staff to seamlessly review proposals and to enhance the quality and speed of the review process. If a section of the code is not applicable to the proposed development, please indicate that in the matrix. A copy of the Excel files will be emailed with this comment letter.

PACE Response: The Code Criteria Compliance Matrix has been completed and included with the resubmittal materials as requested.

2. The applicant shall provide an analysis of school bus stops or state walking routes to schools. The applicant shall coordinate with the school district on bus stop locations that will serve the proposed development. The applicant shall provide the analysis and approval from the school district at the next submittal.

PACE Response: The school bus stop located along East Mercer Way will serve residents of the proposed short plat.

Trees:

Contact: John Kenney, City Arborist - john.kenney@mercerisland.gov – 206.275.7713.

1. Provide Arborist evaluation that Dead Tree 1 would not have been damaged with the building pads encroachment into the tree's dripline. Even though this tree was already allowed for removal under a non-development tree permit. Move building pad to be outside of Tree 15's dripline or provide arborist evaluation that the tree would not be damaged with the encroachment into the tree's dripline. Even though this tree was already removed under a non-development tree permit, since the tree was exceptional, it would have been required to be retained and not damaged by development in the tree protection zone. The minimum excavation zone for the deck will be conditioned for the building phase.
PACE Response: Previously removed exceptional tree will be replaced per MICC.

2. Provide the tree inventory worksheet and include all trees removed within five years. This will include the trees that were approved to be removed under the non-development tree permit before this development proposal. This was for five trees to be removed under permit 2104-048 (trees 6, 7, 8, 10, 15 in previous report). The tree protection plan must show at least 30% of trees being protected and not damaged by construction for this subdivision to be approved.
PACE Response: The tree inventory worksheet has been included with the resubmittal. The tree protection plan shows a minimum of 30% of trees are being protected to remain.

3. Update arborist tree report, a draft report has been submitted. Arborist will need to review new plans and confirm the distance of disturbance is adequate and will not damage saved tree.
PACE Response: Utilities and proposed construction elements have been placed at retained tree driplines and limits of disturbance as noted by arborist to preclude damage to trees.

4. Tree 573 is exceptional in size and now shown for removal. Fire had approved SUB 1; what has changed? The new hydrant is beyond the minimum recommended limits of disturbance. Please provide the access and hydrant requirements that conflict with the tree. Could some asphalt removal mitigate for the impacts of the new improvements?
PACE Response: Tree 573 has been shown as removed because of the extent of utility installation.

5. During building plan review a tree protection plan with all civil information must be created. Tree protection will need to be shown on C3.0. The retaining wall, trench, and other utilities to be moved outside saved trees driplines/minimum limits of allowable disturbance. The SD is shown within 9-ft of exceptional tree 576. Tree 575 also has an SD line within minimum limits of allowable disturbance. Update tree protection plan with tree protection chain link fence and all the following items in this checklist. Exceptional trees must be retained according to MICC 19.10.060.3 and protected under 19.10.080.
PACE Response: A tree protection plan has been included. Storm drain utility lines have been updated to be outside driplines or allowable disturbance area per arborist report.

6. A tree replanting plan will be required to mitigate for all removed trees. At least half of the trees need to be Pacific Northwest native. The trees need to be at least 10-ft apart from each other, structures, fences, and utilities. If requested and you can show no room exists on site for all the trees, the remainder can be a fee in lieu if requested.

PACE Response: A tree planting plan will be provided with the building permit phase review.

7. Protect Tree 580 that is shown for removal but not on the proposed lot for development. It appears the plan from the subdivision was used. A specific tree protection plan for building is required, see comment 2.

PACE Response: The single-family permit is for one parcel, not the two-lot short plat. Tree 580 is on the existing subject parcel for this building permit; therefore, removal of the existing tree is allowed.

Civil Engineering:

Contact: Ruji Ding, Senior Development Engineer - ruji.ding@mercerisland.gov – 206.275.7703

1. Note: All comments in the sheet set are not part of the Short Plat Review. The comments are for information only. All engineering review will be under a separate permit.
PACE Response: Noted. The engineering comments below have been addressed to corroborate the SFR permit plan set. The comments not addressed with this Short Plat permit resubmittal will be addressed at future permit phase.
2. Clarify whether the easements that the road/service/utility easement is subject to are private or public.
PACE Response: As noted in the callout, all easements are private easements between landowners.
3. For all easements shown, clarify if it is a public or private easement.
PACE Response: "Public" has been added to the appropriate easement callouts.
4. Clarify if this new private storm easement is for the benefit of Lot 2.
PACE Response: The private storm easement across Lot 1 is for the benefit of Lot 2.
5. Please either use different line types/weights to clearly distinguish the easement lines from the setback lines or use a separate easement plan from the setback plan. It is difficult to distinguish lines.
PACE Response: Linetypes have been updated to better clarify easements from setback lines. Additionally, more labels have been included to clear up any confusion.
6. Clarify if easements are existing or proposed.
PACE Response: All easements not located on the subject parcel are existing.
7. What is this 7-ft dimension representing?
PACE Response: This 7-ft dimension represents the private side sewer easement granted by Lot 1 to Lot 2.
8. Provide legal descriptions for all new easements.
PACE Response: Legal descriptions for new easements will be provided upon approval of utility layout and prior to permit issuance.
9. The private side sewer easement and private sewer line cannot be inside the public drainage easement.

PACE Response: Private side sewer and sewer line have been updated to be outside the public storm drainage easement to the max extent feasible. Given the location of the existing sewer stub for the parcel and location of existing utilities along the north property line, the least impactful location for the side sewer is as shown on the plans.

10. The private water line cannot be inside the public drainage easement.

PACE Response: The private water line has been updated to be outside the public drainage easement.

11. Please note that the new water service line must be connected to the 6-inch water main, not the 4-inch water main.

PACE Response: The new water service line has been updated to connect to the existing 6-inch water main.

12. The fire system design will be review under a separate permit.

PACE Response: Noted.

This concludes our response to the comments in the August 11, 2022 letter. Please feel free to call with any questions or if I can provide anything further.

Sincerely,

PACE Engineers, Inc.

John E. Anderson

Digitally signed by John E. Anderson
DN: C=US, E=johna@paceengrs.com,
O=PACE, CN=John E. Anderson
Date: 2022.10.12 10:09:28-07'00'

John E. Anderson, PE
Senior Principal Engineer