



August 22, 2017

Scott Reynolds
 City of Redmond
 15670 NE 85th Street
 Redmond, WA 98073-9710

SUBJECT: Response to Request for Additional Information:
 Holmgren Short Plat, LAND 2017-00548
 SEPA File Number SEPA-2017-00574

Scott,

Thank you for the comments on the Holmgren Short Plat submittal. We have addressed the comments as described below in the italicized responses.

The following items are included with this submittal for your review:

- Plans
- Technical Information Report
- Deviation Request
- Safe Walk Exhibit
- Habitat Assessment
- Gada Wagner Utility Easement
- Geotechnical Report
- Historic Resources Report

I. Planning-Development Review

C. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

1. SEPA

- a) General Note: Revise the SEPA Checklist to reflect any changes to the proposal resulting from this Request for Additional Information. If a SEPA Determination has been issued, the City may be required to amend or withdraw the determination per WAC 187-11-340 (3)(a).

2. PROJECT

- a) Lot Frontage/Access: Lot frontage and access for Lot 3 does not comply with RZC 21.08.170.G. Clarify or revise the plans as necessary to achieve code compliance.

Response: The easement serving lot 3 has been extended to allow full driveway width to lot 3.

- b) Open Space: The minimum open space calculation on sheet C1.01 is not meeting minimum code compliance. The current calculation is below the standards and includes a paved road over Lot 2 allocation. Revise the plan accordingly.

Response: The open space calculation has been revised to not include paved areas. Please see revised Lot Area Table on sheet C1.01 and Preliminary Plat on C1.03 for revised provided open space areas.,

c) Grading within the five foot Tree Buffer: Throughout the Plan Set, grading cannot take place within the 5' tree preservation buffer. Show the grading limits on the plans per RZC 21.72.060.C and revise the plans accordingly.

Response: The grading has been moved outside of the 5-foot buffer line.

d) Landscaping buffer: On sheet L2.01, show a 5' landscaping buffer around the whole site. In addition, the proposed landscaping within the buffer does not meet the minimum planting requirement per RZC 21.08.180 and RZC 21.32. Revise the plans accordingly.

Response: Plans revised as requested to include 5-foot transition landscape buffer that includes shrubs and trees. Trees are provided where possible to avoid utility conflicts. Please see sheet L2.01.

e) Ecological Score: On sheet L2.01, technique number 12 does not match RZC Table 21.32.060. Clarify the plans accordingly.

Response: Revised as requested, technique corrected.

f) Off Site Trees: On sheet L1.01, show all trees within 50' of the site that will be affected by road improvements. Updated the plans accordingly.

Response: Revised as requested.

g) Irrigation Plan: An irrigation plan could not be found. Provide compliance with RZC 21.32.100.

Response: Irrigation plan provided as part of resubmittal package. Please see sheet L3.01.

h) Barn HPI: DAHP has requested completion of a Historic Property Inventory (HPI) by a historic preservation professional for the existing barn structure on the site. Specific questions regarding this, please contact Kim Dietz at 425-556-2409.

Response: An Historic Resources Report was completed by David Peterson of Historic Resource Consulting on August 2, 2017 and Assessment letter on August 3, 2017. According to the assessment, "the building does not meet the typical criteria or thresholds for landmark designation."

i) Tree Retention Arborist Report: Tree 8334 will be affected by the installation of a pipe therefore the tree will be counted as impacted. The compliance chart within the arborist report will need to be updated as necessary. Cross-reference the plan sheet and update the arborist report as necessary.

Response: Grading and utilities have been revised to not impact this tree, therefore a revision of the arborist report is not necessary. Please see sheet L1.01 for revised Tree Retention Plan.

j) Tree Exception: Staff is unable to process the current tree exception letters due to Arborist Report updates and tree 8334 clarification. Once the revised Arborist report and tree retention is figured out, determination on Tree exception can be processed.

Response: Grading and utilities have been revised to not impact this tree, therefore the current tree exception letters can be processed for approval.

- k) Habitat assessment: The Critical Area report provided lacks analysis regarding wildlife on the site. Per Appendix 1 to the RZC, please submit a Habitat Unit Assessment Form for each type of habitat on the site.

Response: Wetland Resources has provided a Habitat Unit Assessment dated July 19, 2017 as requested.

- l) Building Separation: On sheet C1.01, the minimum building separation shall be 10', not 15' per Table 21.08.060B.

Response: Building separation information has been corrected to show 10 feet.

- m) Plat Requirement: On sheet C1.01, the plat requirement is not required in the Overlake neighborhood. Please revise accordingly.

Response: Deleted as requested.

- n) Proposed Building Footprint: Show a proposed building footprint on each buildable lot.

Response: Building footprints aren't proposed on preliminary plat submittals. We won't know what building is proposed for these lots until after the final plat is ready.

D. COURTESY NOTICES

1. NGPA – You may want to look into expanding the Native Growth Protection Area to encompass the healthy trees to the West of Lot 3. This can help you with the tree preservation and open space calculation.

Response: We have opted to save the trees on the lots.

2. Neighborhood meeting will need to be scheduled based off RZC 21.76.060.C.

Response: The neighborhood meeting is scheduled for August 24, 2017 at 5:30 at the Council Conference Room.

3. Redlines provided within the plans provide further clarification.

Response: Noted. All redlines have been responded to.

II. Engineering and Transportation

A. STAFF CONTACT Min Luo, Senior Engineer

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. SEPA

a) N/A

2. PROJECT

a) Make sure the adjacent parcels: 1425059181, 1425059164, 14250599008, 1425059114, and 1425059128 all have access right to access to and from the 35 feet access/utility easement. When those parcels come for re-development, direct access to NE 51st Street will not be allowed and all need to access to and from the 35 feet access/utility easement. If all the adjacent parcels can't have a right to access to and from the 35 feet, then a public local access road is required (Sheet C1.03)

Response: Please see the "Gada Wagner Utility Easement" which provides access along the easement to the City and all grantors. The existing easement with a hammerhead will be vacated and replaced with the new easement excluding the hammerhead. The newly proposed hammerhead will be placed in an emergency vehicle access easement.

b) Per RZC 21 Appendix 2. A. 2. Table 2, private local access street standards for 5-9 lots: 35 feet for the access, pavement width of 28 feet is required; for sidewalk, concrete 5 foot wide minimum for detached sidewalk or 6 foot wide minimum back of curb on one side. Half-street improvement width at least need to meet 20' paving for Emergency vehicle access purpose. The 6' sidewalk on one side with a vertical curb is also required for the half-street improvement.

Response: The proposed half street improvement width meets the 20-foot paving width and the 6-foot wide sidewalk satisfies the minimum. The additional 8 feet of pavement (for a full 28-foot pavement) will be installed when the adjacent parcels develop their properties.

c) Safe Walk Route: Per RCW 58.17; RZC 21.52.030, RZC 21.17.010(F)(2); RZC 21.74.020(I), Safe Walking Route(s). The Redmond Zoning Code requires that safe pedestrian linkages be provided between new developments and existing neighborhoods and public facilities. Verify safe walk routes from the development to all public schools within 1-mile radius. Provide map, route alignments, and identify areas where not meeting standards. Provide offsite walk route plan if required.

Response: Please see "Safe Walk Route Exhibit" included with this submittal.

d) Sheet C1.01 -Horizontal and Vertical Reference: Show Horizontal datum and vertical datum on the cover sheet. Tie to minimum of two City of Redmond Benchmarks. Tie to minimum of two City of Redmond Horizontal control monuments. Need to describe two horizontal datum.

Response: Three horizontal control monuments were tied and are presented on sheet C1.01.

e) Sheet C3.31, Where are Sections A and B on the plan view?

Response: These sections are pavement options; the labels have been corrected.

f) Sheet C3.31, Typical Section: sidewalk cross slope needs to be max 2%, target 1.5%. Call out ultimate cross section, use dash line to indicate future pavement width.

Response: The sidewalk slopes have been corrected and future improvements have been added.

g) Sheet 4.01, Sidewalk needs to continue all the way to the dead end road to meet safe walk route requirement.

Response: The sidewalk has been extended to a location across from lot 3.

h) Sheet 4.01, show driveway curb cut for the existing house.

Response: A Type 2 driveway curb cut has been added to provide access to the existing driveway.

i) Sheet 4.01, show approximate driveway location for new house and driveway width.

Response: Driveway locations have been added.

j) Sheet C5.01-Pavement Restoration: Per RZC Appendix 2. A. 8.e and Per COR STD SPEC Details 202, pavement grind and overlay area each side 25' min and to the edge of lane line if there any utilities trench on NE 51st Street.

Response: Pavement restoration 25 feet each direction has been added.

k) Sheet C7.01, 35' easement plus additional 35' tract needs to be extended to the dead end road.

Response: The access easement is intended to be 35 feet to a point that serves all five grantors of the easement (parcels 1425059181, 1425059128, 1425059114, 1425059131, and 1425059164). See "Gada & Wagner Utility Easement." Access and utility easements within the subject property will be granted as part of the short plat. Once the easement is fully on the property, there will be only two lots being served by extension of the easement. Two lots only require a 14-foot wide access road. We have also clarified with the Fire Department that a 14' wide access road is adequate for access to the hammerhead. There is not an access tract.

l) Sheet C7.01, call out this easement width.

Response: 35-foot wide easement width called out.

m) Sheet C7.01, call out sidewalk width.

Response: 6-foot sidewalk called out.

n) Sheet C7.01, call out curb radius.

Response: Radii of curbs called out.

o) Sheet C7.01, draw sight distance triangle along NE 51st St 20' by 100' and along the access road 20' by 65' per RZC 21.052.040.

Response: Sight Distance Triangles are presented.

p) C7.01- 14' pavement width does not meet Fire requirement. This road is considered a 35' private local access road/35' tract to the dead end and it requires 20' pavement all the way to the dead end.

Response: We have discussed this issue with Scott Turner that 14 feet of pavement does meet Fire's requirements for access to one lot and the hammerhead. The hammerhead does satisfy the minimum 20-foot pavement width.

q) Is this portion of the easement missing here?

Response: Yes, we had shown it incorrectly with the first submittal. The easement has been corrected to its full 35-foot width.

III. Utilities – Sewer and Water

A. STAFF CONTACT Zheng Lu

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. SEPA

a) N/A

2. PROJECT

a) Sheet C5.01, shortening water main as shown in redline.

Response: Water main has been shortened as requested.

b) Sheet C5.01, install two double water services as shown. Install fire hydrant/blowoff in the end of the 8" water main.

Response: Two double water services are shown; one for each lot and one for irrigation.

c) Sheet C5.01, change sewer main alignment from SSMH2 to SSMH3. Make sewer main 100% under asphalt pavement in accordance with COR Design Requirements Water & Wastewater Extensions, Section V 3(a).

Response: Revised as redlined.

d) Sheet C5.01, create and documents utility easements around water main and sewer main, 10' from water and sewer main and water components during CCR process.

Response: See "Gada & Wagner Utility Easement"

e) Sheet C5.01, vacate the existing utility easement during CCR.

Response: Existing easement is proposed to be vacated but will be replaced with a very similar easement. The only difference will be removing the existing hammerhead that straddles parcels 9164 and 9131.

f) Sheet C5.01, provide notes for abandonment of the existing water services.

Response: Callouts have been added for the abandonment of the existing water service.

g) Sheet C5.01, provide notes for abandonment of the existing sewer service as shown.

Response: The existing sewer stub also services the residence at 16118 NE 51st Street. This sewer service should remain in place until such time as the lot is redeveloped.

h) Sheet C5.02, shorten water main in profile.

Response: Revised as recommended.

i) Sheet C5.02, show new fire hydrant in profile.

Response: New location of fire hydrant reflected in profile.

IV. Stormwater, Clearing and Grading

A. STAFF CONTACT Jeff Dendy, PE Senior Engineer

2. PROJECT

a) The geotechnical report is marked draft and is unsigned. Provide a report that is based on the project grading plan. An opinion should be included covering the placement of the storm vault across the sub-surface drainage channel.

Response: The geotechnical report has been revised to address many of the comments brought up with this review and is no longer a draft.

b) Proposed fill exceeds 8 feet. A Deviation request package addressed to Lisa Rigg is required.

Response: See deviation request included with this resubmittal.

c) The grading plan creates slopes that drain toward the proposed house. Have the area surrounding the house drain away from the structure. Per IBC, Geotech report and Stormwater Notebook.

Response: The grades presented are only temporary in preparation for constructing houses. Specifically, on lot 2, the grades are proposed to prepare for a daylight basement. Once the building is completed, grades will be revised to slope away from the structure.

d) Cannot have a rockery in a fill slope. Can't have geo-webbing added if there is a pipe behind the wall. Provide sufficient setback between pipe and wall so the pipe can be replaced without dismantling the wall.

Response: We have deleted the rockery and replaced it with an Ultra-Block Wall as recommended by the geotechnical engineer in the updated Geotech report.

e) Per 2014 Ecology Manual volume 3, 3.2.3 Detention Vaults - setbacks, provide a minimum of 50 feet from the top of slopes greater than 15%.

Response: A geotechnical analysis has been prepared addressing this issue and has found that "a setback would not be necessary to maintain the stability of the slope."

f) Provide a quantitative downstream analysis of the existing conveyance system.

Response: A quantitative downstream analysis is not warranted since no indication of erosion, flooding or other nuisance problem has been found.

g) It is unclear what runoff the western pipe located between the trees to be saved is to collect. The critical areas report states that there is no stream.

Response: Even though there is no stream, sub-surface flows will be impacted by the placement of fill in the area of lots 2 and 3. To address this, an interceptor drain will be placed along the west boundary to capture subsurface flows as recommended by the geotechnical engineer.

C. COURTESY NOTICES

1. The storm reviewer acknowledges that the critical areas report states that there currently is no stream onsite. The Geotech report states that some borings had heavy seepage. It is possible that before the area developed, there was a stream. The surrounding topography indicates that the proposed project site presently has sub-surface flows. The design team needs to address the possibility that fills will disrupt the sub-surface flow regime. Placing a storm vault across the flow path might need further study.

Response: The storm designer acknowledges the existence of subsurface flows and has provided an interceptor drain to capture any upstream flow regimes attacking the west property line.

V. Fire

A. STAFF CONTACT: Please contact the following staff member for clarification regarding these comments.

1. Gary Smith, Deputy Fire Marshal

2. PROJECT

a) Make note on plans that all new homes will require fire sprinkler systems.

Response: *Note 2 on sheet C7.01 addresses this requirement.*

b) Redmond Fire Department Standards

(<http://www.redmond.gov/cms/one.aspx?portalId=169&pageId=137378>)

Response: <http://www.coredesigninc.com/>

c) Fire Lane Markings required on both sides of roadway, plans needs to reflect this. See RFD Standards, 2.1.2 for full details

Response: *Since the roadway is only an interim road width and will be expanded to be 28 feet wide with the future development of parcels 9131 and 9164, we would like to propose that the markings on the west side of the road to be Type 3 Metal signs at 75-foot spacing. Type 1 markings will be utilized on the east side curb.*

d) Need to see FULL hammerhead profiles to include slopes in all directions. This profile needs to show the approach to the hammerhead as well.

Response: *The profiles presented do reflect the full hammerhead. The approach is designed to be at a slope of 5.4% and the head having a slope of 6.55%*

e) Parcel 1425059164: This lot appears land locked and will need to use this access road for access sometime in the future. If so, the proposed access road shall be 20' wide till the end of this parcel.

Response: *The access road has been revised to be 20 feet wide to the end of the shared access easement which serves both parcel 9164 and the subject property. Beyond the access easement, the road will reduce down to be 14 feet where it only serves access to lot 3 and the proposed hammerhead.*

Sincerely,

CORE DESIGN, INC.



Robert H. Stevens, P.E.
Junior Project Manager