



Drift Interior Architecture
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
Telephone Number (425) 478-0327

Date: March 20, 2026

Subject: Response Letter to City Comment for Record # 2505-049, 4433 86th Ave SE Mercer Island, WA 98040, Xiao Zhou

To: Reviewer
Mercer Island, Washington

1. SUB 1 Comment: Please have the geotechnical engineer of record review the plan set and provide a PE stamped letter indicating whether the proposed design conforms with their design and construction recommendations. Please include in that letter a verbatim statement of risk in accordance with MICC 19.07.160.B.3. SUB 1 Response: Author: Karan (karan@drift-ia.com) Subject: Sticky Note Date: 2/24/2026 3:46:48 AM added info for geotechnical engineer details SUB 1 Response: Author: jen tamblin (jen@drift-ia.com) Subject: Sticky Note Date: 2/26/2026 7:29:03 AM Letter will be provided as part of our next upload, we are submitting everything else while geotech finalizes their review and the letter will follow. SUB 2 Comment: Same as SUB 1 Comment.

RESPONSE: Minimal risk letter uploaded.

2. SUB 1 Comment: It appears the existing home is legally nonconforming due to encroachment into the setbacks. Per MICC 19.01.050(D)(1)(b), a legally nonconforming detached single-family dwelling may be intentionally altered or enlarged without losing its legal nonconforming status as long as no more than 40 percent of the length of the dwelling's existing exterior walls, excluding attached accessory buildings, is structurally altered. Please demonstrate the plan meets this code section on the plan set. Applicant Response: The existing residence meets the required 7.5 foot side yard setback and is not encroaching. Therefore, the structure is not legally nonconforming under MICC 19.01.050(D)(1)(b), and the 40 percent exterior wall alteration limitation does not apply. SUB 2 Comment: The existing home appears legally nonconforming due to nonconformance with the residential standard for corner lot setbacks, per MICC 19.02.020(C)(2)(a)(ii). Please demonstrate compliance with MICC 19.01.050(D)(1)(b).

RESPONSE: The only change to the existing nonconforming exterior wall is the addition of a new window. The wall itself is not being demolished, structurally altered, or extended, so no length of that wall counts toward the 40% threshold.

3. SUB 1 Comment: Please adjust the yard setbacks per MICC 19.02.020(C)(2)(a)(ii), on corner lots the front yard shall be measured from the narrowest dimension of the lot abutting a street. The yard adjacent to the widest dimension of the lot abutting a street shall be a side yard equivalent or greater than the front yard setback. If the side yard cannot be equivalent to the front yard, then both interior lot lines must have a rear yard setback. Applicant Response: Height from finished grade to top of exterior wall adjoining side yard: 20 feet. As the height exceeds 15 feet but does not exceed 25 feet, the minimum required side yard depth is 7'-6". Provided side yard setback: 7'-6". The proposed structure complies with MICC 19.02.020(C)(1)(c)(iii). SUB 2 Comment: The side yard setbacks must be adjusted per MICC 19.02.020(C)(2)(a)(ii). On corner lots, the front yard shall be measured from the narrowest dimension of the lot abutting a street. The yard adjacent to the widest dimension of the lot abutting a street shall be a side yard equivalent or greater than the front yard setback. If the side yard cannot be equivalent to the front yard, then both interior lot lines must have a rear yard setback. This

code section requires corner lots to have either two 20-foot setbacks along the property lines abutting the street or two 25-foot setbacks along the interior property lines. Please revise the setbacks.

RESPONSE: Corner lot configured with 25' setbacks from both interior lot lines, which permits the smaller street-side setbacks shown.

4. The ROW limits and roadway configuration are not consistent with the survey drawing, please update the site plan to make sure the existing roadway condition and ROW limits are correct and consistent with the survey. The existing site conditions must be shown correct and based on the survey drawing.

RESPONSE: Site plan has been updated to reflect ROW limits and roadway configuration per the survey drawing. All existing site conditions are now consistent with the survey.

5. SUB 1 Comment: There appears to be discrepancies with Gross Floor Area calculations on the planset and the site development worksheet. Please review the definition of Gross Floor Area per MICC 19.16.010. Please update the Gross Floor Area Calculations according to the definition and to be consistent with an updated site development worksheet. Applicant Response: GFA updated refer Z001
SUB 2 Comment: There appears to be discrepancies with lot coverage, hardscape, and gross floor area calculations on the planset and the site development worksheet. Please review the definitions per MICC 19.16.010 and update the calculations on the planset and site development worksheet to be consistent.

RESPONSE: All three calculations have been reviewed against MICC 19.16.010 definitions and updated on Sheet Z001 and the site development worksheet with detailed methodology shown.

6. SUB 1 Comment: Please review the definition of hardscape and update the hardscape calculations accordingly. Applicant Response: Updated per the definition
SUB 2 Please review the definition of hardscape per MICC 19.16.010 and update the hardscape calculations accordingly. Update the site development sheet to be consistent with lot coverage, hardscape, and gross floor area.

RESPONSE: Hardscape has been fully recalculated per MICC 19.16.010 with methodology shown on Sheet Z001. Site development worksheet updated and reconciled with lot coverage and GFA.

7. The garage appears to be included in the basement exclusion calculations despite being at grade. Please review the basement exclusion calculations method on the site development worksheet and provide more detailed calculations.

RESPONSE: Garage has been removed from the basement exclusion calculation as it is at grade. Detailed breakdown of the exclusion methodology is now shown on Sheet Z001 with updated GFA.

8. SUB 1 Comment: Please reference geotechnical engineer of record design report. SUB1 Response: Author: Karan (karan@drift-ia.com) Subject: Sticky Note Date: 2/24/2026 11:52:07 AM added info for geotechnical engineer details
SUB 2 Comment: No reference to the geotechnical report was provided on Sheet S1.0. Please reference geotechnical engineer of record design report on Sheet S1.0.

RESPONSE: Please see updated reference on structural sheet S1.0

Sincerely,

Jennifer Tamblin

Drift Interior Architecture

jen@drift-ia.com

(425) 478-0327