



April 21, 2022

Lauren Anderson, Planner
City of Mercer Island Community Planning & Development
9611 SE 36th Street
Mercer Island, Washington 98040

**Subject: 1st Review Completion Letter
Koneru Short Plat, File No. SUB21-008
PACE Project No. 21436**

Dear Niels:

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 April 13, 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:

Lauren Anderson, Planner - lauren.anderson@mercerisland.gov - 206.275.7704

1. General:

a. Please add the approval note: "This request does not guarantee that the lots will be suitable for development now or in the future. The legal transfer of the property must be done by separate instrument unless all lots herein are under the same ownership."

PACE Response: Approval note has been added to the Cover Sheet, CO.0, as requested

b. Add short plat application name and number to all sheets: Koneru Short Plat, SUB21-008.

PACE Response: The City project number has been added to the title block on all sheets as requested.

c. Please refer to the public comment the city has received, Attachment A.

i. Per MICC 19.08.030(C)(1), "where the project may adversely impact the health, safety, and welfare of, or inflict expense or damage upon, residents or property owners within or adjoining the project, other members of the public, the state, the city, or other municipal corporations due to flooding, drainage problems, critical slopes, unstable soils, traffic access, public safety problems, or other causes, the city council in the case of a long subdivision, or the code official in

the case of a short subdivision, shall require the applicant to adequately control such hazards or give adequate security for damages that may result from the project, or both.”

PACE Response: This comment has been noted and conveyed to the project owner/applicant. No adverse impacts are anticipated for this project.

d. Topographic map: for any existing buildings, the map shall show the finished floor elevations of each floor of the building.

PACE Response: Finished floor elevations have been added to the existing buildings on Sheet CO.1.

e. Note the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) on Sheet C1.0. Refer to MICC 19.16 definition of “Ordinary High Water Mark.”

PACE Response: The Ordinary High Water Mark shown on the plans is the surveyed vegetation line with an elevation of 19.6 and continues along the base of wall. MICC 19.16 notes the Ordinary High Water Mark is a “mark upon the soil a character distinct from that of the abutting upland”, which is what the survey crew located. According to MICC 19.16 an elevation of 18.6 (NAVD 88) can be used for the OHWM for establishment of building setback lines. Since the surveyed OHWM line at elevation 19.6 is higher than 18.6, setbacks measured from the survey line exceed what is required MICC 19.16.

f. Illustrate the property line boundary along the shoreline. If a portion of the property is below the OHWM, then it would meet the definition of “lands covered by water” pursuant to WAC 197-11-756 and would require SEPA review.

PACE Response: The east property line extends to “navigable water” according to the title report legal description. WAC 197-11-736 (3) states: Lands covered by water does not include adjacent lands and designated buffers above the OHWM. No work is proposed beyond the OHWM and therefore no work will occur in lands covered by water.

g. Provide side elevation drawings of the proposed driveway. Label existing and finished grade.

PACE Response: Additional finished grade spot elevations have been added on C2.0 to better define the driveway grading. The driveways design grades are less than 5% slope, which is relatively flat. Profiles can be added to the final construction drawing, if required.

h. Provide new legal descriptions for proposed Lot 1 and Lot 2.

PACE Response: New legal descriptions have been provided on Sheet C1.0

i. Please verify that the proposed future houses will be able to meet residential zoning standards, including setbacks/yards, height, gross floor area, and lot coverage. These standards were summarized at the previous pre-application meeting on this project on July 13, 2021.

PACE Response: Zoning and Development Summary tables are provided on C0.0. The yard setbacks are shown on C1.0. The building code compliance information will be provided on the architectural plans.

- j. Revise the following typos:
- i. Sheet C0.2: legal description misspells "said" in the second paragraph
 - ii. Sheet C1.0: piped watercourse note misspells "setback"

PACE Response: The typos on Sheet C0.2 and C1.0 have been corrected.

- k. Provide a table with the following information for the existing lot and Lots 1-2:
- i. Lot slope
 - ii. Maximum allowed lot coverage & hardscape
 - iii. Maximum allowed gross floor area (GFA)
 - iv. Net lot area
 - v. Lot coverage
 - vi. Hardscape
 - vii. Proposed lot coverage and hardscape*
 - viii. Gross floor area (GFA)*
 - ix. Lot width and depth
 - x. Parking stalls: covered and uncovered

*Excludes future building permit plans, as proposed lot coverage, hardscape, and GFA will be reviewed at the time of building permit submittal.

R-15 Zone: The net lot area shall be at least 15,000 square feet. Lot width shall be at least 90 feet and lot depth shall be at least 80 feet. Maximum allowed GFA in the R-15 Zone is 12,000sf or 40% of the lot area, whichever is less.

PACE Response: The Zoning and Development Summary tables on C0.0 have been updated to include the requested information.

2. Piped watercourse:

- a. Typo on Sheet C1.0: the note regarding the piped watercourse misspells "setback."

PACE Response: The typo on Sheet C1.0 has been corrected.

- b. For the portion of the piped watercourse off-site, revise the setback to be the standard 45 feet from the centerline of the piped watercourse. The setback reduction applies to the subject site only.

PACE Response: The setback from the piped watercourse has been shown as 45-ft offsite as noted.

- c. Pursuant to MICC 19.07.180(C)(6)(d), lots with a width greater than 50 feet can reduce the piped watercourse setback to 10 feet when daylighting is determined by a qualified professional to result in one or more of the 4 outcomes listed under 19.07.180(C)(6)(d)(i-v). Please clearly illustrate and label the reduced 10-foot piped watercourse setback on Lot 1 and Lot 2.

PACE Response: 10-ft piped watercourse setback on Lot 1 and Lot 2 has been called out on Sheet C1.0.

d. Clearly illustrate and label the piped watercourse centerline. Piped watercourse is noted but it is unclear where it is located as there are multiple lines that look similar that represent existing easements. Please use a different line to represent the piped watercourse and add an arrow.

PACE Response: The entire piped watercourse has been updated to the "SD" line type and has been called out on Sheets C1.0 and C3.0.

3. Building Pad:

a. Please illustrate the two (2) building pad areas that comply with MICC 19.09.090. In general, the building pad excludes setbacks and avoids and minimizes impacts to the following: trees, vegetation, topography, and critical areas (geohazards and piped watercourse setback).

PACE Response: A building pads comply with MICC 19.09.090. The building layout has attempted to minimize grading and avoid impacts to trees.

b. Please have your Geotechnical Engineer review the proposed building pad locations and indicate compliance with MICC 19.09.090(A)(2)(c)(i-iii) in a follow-up letter or report addendum.

PACE Response: The geotechnical engineer has prepared a standalone letter responding to City review comments.

4. Existing Improvements and Single-Family Residence:

a. The existing house will need to be demolished prior to Preliminary Short Plat approval or a condition of approval will be added that the existing house shall be demolished prior to Final Plat application. Please state when the existing house will be demolished. Permit #2112-250 is for a demo/rebuild.

PACE Response: Note has been added to Sheet C0.0 and C2.0.

b. Lot 1 and Lot 2 will need to reflect the changes to hardscape, lot coverage, and impervious surface related to the removal of existing improvements and single-family residence.

PACE Response: Existing and proposed hardscape, lot coverage, and impervious surface areas have been added to Sheet C0.0 as requested.

5. Easements:

a. Clearly list existing easements to remain and be extinguished, as well as proposed easements.

PACE Response: At this time there are not plans to extinguish any of the existing easements. New easements are called out on C1.0.

b. It is difficult to distinguish what lines represent easements and setbacks. Please differentiate the two with different line types and provide a legend.

PACE Response: The north property line has several overlapping easements. We obtained copies of the onsite and offsite easements from the title company. The easements and associated recording numbers

are now shown on the survey and Civil background. It is still difficult to separate the lines due to the number for overlapping easements. We can provide an AutoCAD file with the easement plotted using different colors if requested.

c. Note recording numbers and width for all existing easements.

PACE Response: Existing easements and their recording numbers have been added to the survey sheet and shown in background on the civil plans.

d. Note proposed easement widths.

PACE Response: Widths have been added to the proposed easement callouts.

e. Revise the 10' watercourse setback to "10' piped watercourse setback."

PACE Response: Dimension callout on Sheet C1.0 has been revised accordingly.

f. It appears there are a couple easements missing. Please illustrate and note all existing easements and the recording numbers. The following are shown on the city's GIS map on the subject property:

- i. 1996 10' storm easement; recording # 199606250590
- ii. 1962 sewer easement over shorelands and upland; recording # 5501889
- iii. 1964 10' sewer easement over second class shorelands; recording # 5758769

PACE Response: Copies of the record easements have been obtained from the title company and plotted on the survey and shown in background on the civil plans.

Off-site easements to the north of the subject site:

- iv. 1964 12' public sewer easement; recording # 5750937
- v. 1964 12' sewer easement; recording # 5750936
- vi. 1964 10' sewer easement; recording # 5787780
- vii. 1994 Storm drainage easement; recording # 199403250630
- viii. 1964 10' storm sewer easement; recording # 199606250591
- ix. 12' x 40' access easement for Lot 2 (plat); recording #SUB7902-001
- x. Private road, service & utility easement (plat); recording # 196302205546760

PACE Response: Copies of the record easements have been obtained from the title company and plotted on the survey and shown in background on the civil plans.

g. It appears that rip rap pipe outfall is proposed on top of the City's sewer line and potentially within the city sewer easements. Pursuant to MICC 19.02.020(H)(2), "no structure shall be constructed on or over any easement for water, sewer, storm drainage, utilities, trail, or other public purposes unless it is permitted within the language of the easement or is mutually agreed in writing between the grantee and grantor of the easement." Have you received approval from the City to complete this work within a city easement and over the city's sewer line? In addition, please provide a profile drawing of the proposed outfall.

PACE Response: The rip rap pad location has been moved to avoid encroachment into the sewer easements. The easement restricts construction of a "structure" within/over the easement. By definition a

structure has a foundation and requires a building permit. The rip rap pad is not a "structure" and would be allowed within the easement area.

h. Illustrate existing and proposed easements on the grading and utility plans.

PACE Response: More detailed easement information has been added to the plans.

i. There are many dimensions labeled that are assumed to be for easements. The dimensions need to be labeled with the easement type and recording number (if existing), as it is currently difficult to determine what the dimension is for.

PACE Response: I understand the difficulties following the easement linework. There are multiple overlapping easements and only so many line types that can be used. Plans have been updated to make the easement identification clearer.

Trees:

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

1. (For Architect) Move building pad to be outside of tree 15's dripline. Or provide Arborist evaluation that the tree would not have been 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.

PACE Response: The tree dripline encroachment is over an at grade deck. The deck will require minimal excavation and allows water to drain through. The project arborist will provide a letter responding to the tree comments.

2. (For Architect) Provide the tree inventory worksheet and include all trees removed within five years. This will include the trees that were removed under the non-development tree permit. The tree protection plan must show at least 30% of trees being protected and not damaged by construction for this subdivision to be approved.

https://www.mercerisland.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/community_planning_amp_development/page/21988/mercerislandtreeinventory.pdf

PACE Response: The project arborist will provide a letter responding to the tree comments.

3. (For Arborist) Update Arborists tree report to include dripline radius measurements. And other requirements in the checklist. See report requirements:

https://www.mercerisland.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/community_planning_amp_development/page/21988/treessubmittalchecklist.pdf

PACE Response: The project arborist will provide a letter responding to the tree comments.

4. (For Civil and Arborist) A tree protection plan with all Civil information must be created. No tree protection is shown on C3.0. The retaining wall, trench, and other utilities to be moved outside saved trees driplines/limits of allowable disturbance. The SD is shown within 9' of exceptional

tree 14. 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 19.10.060.3. and protected under 19.10.080.

https://www.mercerisland.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/community_planning_amp_development/page/21988/treessubmittalchecklist.pdf

PACE Response: Sheet L1.0 has been updating to show tree protection fencing for existing trees to be retained. The utility design and tree protection has been coordinated with the project arborist.

5. 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, see the following link

https://oregonstate.edu/trees/name_common.html. The trees need to be at least 10' 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: The project arborist will provide a letter responding to the tree comments.

Civil Engineering:

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

1. Easements:

- a. Clearly distinguish the existing easements from proposed easements.
- b. Clearly distinguish the private easements from public easements.
- c. Show the recording numbers for all existing easements.
- d. Show the city sewer easement.
- e. Move the proposed private storm drainage easement out of the existing public storm drainage easement.

PACE Response: Plans have been updated to make the easement identification clearer.

2. Tie this plat to at least two known city monuments on East Mercer Way.

PACE Response: The Existing Conditions Sheet CO.1 has been updated to show the monuments used for control for this survey.

3. Sheet C3.0:

- a. Show the limits, type, and recording number of the private easement that the proposed private water supply lines will be located.
- b. Show the public water main easement at the new water meter locations. Please note that the water meters and water service lines must be located inside the public water easement.

PACE Response: The private water lines will be located within the plat access/utility easement road, which is not well defined in any of the records. The existing water easement for the 4-inch main and water meters has been added and recording number called out.

Geotechnical Engineering:

1. Refer to Attachment B, First Geotechnical Peer Review Letter.

PACE Response: Response from Geotech Consultants, Inc. has been included with this submittal.

Fire:

Contact: Jeromy Hicks, Fire Marshal - Jeromy.hicks@mercerisland.gov – 206.275.7979.

1. This access road is less than 150' so it would be considered a "driveway." No fire comments.

PACE Response: Noted.

This concludes our response to the comments in the March 10, 2022 letter. Please feel free to call with any questions or if I can provide anything further.

Sincerely,

PACE Engineers, Inc.

John E. Anderson, PE
Senior Principal Engineer