

Appellant's Exhibit 12

(as referenced in June 30, 2017

Appellant WPDC Cleveland LLC's Witness and Exhibit List)

Anderson, James C.

From: Rick Driftmier <rick@driftmier.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2017 1:02 PM
To: Laing, Aaron M.
Cc: Anderson, James C.; Kevin Wallace (kwallace@wallaceproperties.com); Lee Driftmier
Subject: Origins - Review of drawings
Attachments: Block Building Drawings Review #2Ra.pdf

Good Afternoon Arron,

Here is the new review. Please contact me with any questions or additional information.

Rick



Rick Driftmier, AIA | Principal Architect

The Driftmier Architects, p.s.

7983 Leary Way NE, Redmond WA 98052

Phone: 425-881-7506 Fax: 425-881-7306

Email: rick@driftmier.com Web: www.driftmier.com

Committed to Design Excellence Since 1980

This e-mail and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain privileged and confidential information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient(s), kindly contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.



Help conserve resources—please print this email only if necessary

General

Yes, this permit set appears to include the exterior modifications to the building.

On the site plan included in the DRB set, it is indicated that parking from the bank property across 164th will be used. However, the revised permit set does not address parking.

It would be good to be able to read the DRB meeting minutes, but they are not posted online yet.

There are a number of red line markups to the drawings that are made in PDF format. The Rev1 Arch Set with 05/01/2017 revisions has been locked. Except for city staff initials on some of the formal redlines, we do not know who made what comments. Are some of these from the architect or are all of them from the City? Typically the architect has to make changes to the drawings and cannot simply redline changes. Also, since there are already other changes that are clouded in black by the architect, it seems like the city may have made all the redline markups. If the city made all of these changes, it would be very unusual. I have never seen a city redline corrections for an architect and then approve the set.

Change of Use

The project is clearly a change of use and clearly a change of occupancy. Redlines have been included to specifically strike this from the architectural set calling it a "Change of Use" and instead call it a "Change Occupancy". While both terms are in the International Building Code, it seems the "Change of Occupancy" is directly referencing the IBC.

"Change of Use" used here likely references the city's zoning code. The city's own Change of Use Flow Chart shows that a change from a warehouse to an office is a change of use. Therefore, a change from warehouse to retail store would certainly be a change of use. We have seen no evidence that the planning department has issued either a Change of Use approval or a Site Plan Entitlement approval. Planning approval is normally required for any exterior modification to an existing building.

Occupant Load

The occupant loads and room areas redlined on A0.1 are not the same as the numbers redlined on A1.0.

It is not clear what occupant loads are being added up on A0.1. The redlines show 20, 8 & 7 being added up to 51. I am not sure what "other" spaces are, but even if those 7 occupants are added, the numbers still do not equal 51.

Some of the occupant loads on A0.1 are not correct, and two of the tenant spaces are called "Retail Suite B". For the retail suite will 422 SF, at 60 SF per occupant would result in 7.033 people. This would be rounded up to 8, and not down to 7. For Retail Suite A, the 1029 SF would result in 17.15 people, which would be rounded up to 18.

The areas and occupant loads are not calculated correctly on A1.0. The redlines indicate that walls were excluded from the area calculations. However, this can only be done for assembly occupancies, such as

the employee room. Also, for the employee room, 140 SF at 15 SF per person would result in 9.33. This should be rounded up to 10 and not down to 9.

Plumbing

On A1.0, there is a redline that says "1 restroom is required per CH 20 WA ST Amendments". I believe this is supposed to read "CH 29".

Attic

This space is not what is typically described as an attic. Per the IBC, an attic is, "the space between the ceiling beams of the top story and the roof rafters". The access to this space is from the hallway, which has no ceiling other than the roof rafters. It is clearly a mezzanine, even if it is intended to be a staging area for accessing the roof. If there is no intent to use the space for storage, then the roof access ladder would simply extend all the way to the roof.

The structural drawings still call the space a mezzanine. The structural engineer's letter dated 4/27/17 notes that the awnings and stair will not be built, but no other structural changes are proposed. It appears that the components to install the awnings at a later date will be installed. It is clear that the Attic/Mezzanine is still designed for floor loads and storage. {Aaron: this is a red flag that the mezzanine will be used in the future when a bootlegged stair is built.}

Ladder

It seems unsafe to allow the general public to access the ladder whenever they use the restroom. Especially if the main tenant is not open for business, a patron possibly using the restroom from another tenant could hide out in the "attic" and break into the main tenant space after the other tenants close.

The hallway to the ladder is shown to be 37.25" clear. Per OSHA, there must be a minimum of 7" between the wall the ladder is mounted to and the back side of the rungs. Also, there must be a minimum of 30" between the front edge of the ladder and the wall across from it. This means the ladder and rungs can only be .25" thick. This obviously will not work.

Per OSHA, a ladder must extend a minimum of 42" past the top level. The plans call for the ladder to only extend 36".

ADA

The doors to the storage room and the employee room appear to still not provide ADA clearances. While the employee room could if there is no closer on the door, an employee room in a back hallway where customers will have access to the restroom will certainly require a closer and lock for security.

I do not believe door 100.2 can swing into the required clearance for door 100.1. There needs to be 48" from the swing of one door to the swing of another.

Drawing Inconsistencies

The architectural set does not show awning on the south side. However, the DRB set shows awnings and so does the structural set. While the structural engineer wrote a letter saying it was alright to not install the awning, his drawings still show it. Is it in, out, or to be added later after permitting and inspection?

The floor plan on A2.0 does not show any windows on the north exterior wall. However, storefront windows are shown on the elevation on A4.1. The International Building Code (Table 705.8) does not allow any openings at all (protected and/or sprinklered or not) within three feet of the property line. If windows are proposed here the west window would be less than 19 inches from the property line while the east window would be about 4 inches from the line. Neither are allowed by code.